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# 1nc Shell—Obama Re-election Good DA (Romney Bad)—Iran Strikes

**A. 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.

**b. Link and internal link**

**1. infrastructure will influence voters in November**

**Houston Chronicle May 18 2012**

**(“**Americans Value Highways and Bridges as a National Treasure”

[http://www.chron.com/business/press-releases/article/Americans-Value-Highways-and-Bridges-as-a-3568488.php accessed tm 5/19](http://www.chron.com/business/press-releases/article/Americans-Value-Highways-and-Bridges-as-a-3568488.php%20accessed%20tm%205/19) )

A new survey from HNTB Corporation finds two-thirds (66 percent) of Americans who intend to vote during this year's presidential election feel that a candidate's standing on American transportation infrastructure will influence their decision; more than one in five (22 percent) say this will be extremely influential on who they vote for. "Our highways, bridges and other transportation infrastructure are essential assets that support growth and investment in the U.S. economy," said [Pete Rahn](http://www.chron.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=business%2Fpress-releases&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Pete+Rahn%22), HNTB leader national transportation practice. "People expect them to be resilient, reliable and safe."

**2. plan is unpopular <insert specific link card from link section>**

**c. Impact—Iran strikes**

**1. Obama will hold off Israel and prevent Iran strikes**

**Hurst, ’12** (Stephen, AP, 4/18/12, <http://www.breitbart.com/Big-Peace/2012/04/18/Romneys-foreign-policy-may-mean-hardball-is-back>, JD)

Even so, Romney will campaign, Williamson said, as the man who can return the United States to a country that ensures "peace through strength rather than just managing the gradual decline of our military strength." Romney is particularly harsh on Obama's handling of Iran and concerns it may be building a nuclear weapon. The president is clearly trying to head off a threatened Israeli attack on Iranian nuclear installations. While Obama has not ruled out a U.S. attack, he has not been as directly threatening as Romney, who positions himself much closer to Israel and hardline Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. In one Republican debate, Romney said: "If we re-elect Barack Obama, Iran will have a nuclear weapon. And if we elect Mitt Romney, if you elect me as the next president, they will not have a nuclear weapon."

# 1nc Shell—Obama Re-election Good DA (Romney Bad)—Iran Strikes

**2. If Israel or the US attacks Iran, a rapidly escalating war would break out in the Middle East and would engulf all the great powers**

Trabanco 9 (Jose M. A., writer for Global Research, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=11762>)

In case of an Israeli and/or American attack against Iran, Ahmadinejad's government will certainly respond. A possible countermeasure would be to fire Persian ballistic missiles against Israel and maybe even against American military bases in the regions. Teheran will unquestionably resort to its proxies like Hamas or Hezbollah (or even some of its Shiite allies it has in Lebanon or Saudi Arabia) to carry out attacks against Israel, America and their allies, effectively setting in flames a large portion of the Middle East. The ultimate weapon at Iranian disposal is to block the Strait of Hormuz. If such chokepoint is indeed asphyxiated, that would dramatically increase the price of oil, a very threatening retaliation because it will bring intense financial and economic havoc upon the West, which is already facing significant trouble in those respects. In short, the necessary conditions for a major war in the Middle East are given. Such conflict could rapidly spiral out of control and thus a relatively minor clash could quickly and dangerously escalate by engulfing the whole region and perhaps even beyond. There are many key players: the Israelis, the Palestinians, the Arabs, the Persians and their respective allies and some great powers could become involved in one way or another (America, Russia, Europe, China). Therefore, any miscalculation by any of the main protagonists can trigger something no one can stop. Taking into consideration that the stakes are too high, perhaps it is not wise to be playing with fire right in the middle of a powder keg.

# Uniqueness—Too Close to Call—Economy key

**Economy key to voter decisions—too close to call plan undermines Obama support give Romney the edge**

**LA Times June 18 2012**

[http://www.latimes.com/business/money/la-fi-mo-vote-pocketbooks-20120618,0,5451110.story](http://www.latimes.com/business/money/la-fi-mo-vote-pocketbooks-20120618%2C0%2C5451110.story) accessed tm 6/18

A majority of people in a new poll say they’ll vote according to their pocketbook in November — but that doesn’t necessarily give either presidential candidate an edge. Fifty-nine percent of Americans say their personal financial situation is a critical factor determining who they’ll back for president, [according to the research](http://www.bankrate.com/finance/economics/personal-finances-2012-election.aspx%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank) by Bankrate.com. However, equal numbers support [President Obama](http://www.latimes.com/topic/politics/government/barack-obama-PEPLT007408.topic) and [Mitt Romney](http://www.latimes.com/topic/politics/government/mitt-romney-PEPLT007376.topic) on this count — each gets 21% — with half of respondents saying neither candidate would have a big effect on their financial well-being. The poll is the latest to underscore the significance of the economy to voters. But it also indicates that neither candidate appears to hold a definitive edge. "At this point, the election seems too close to call,” said Claes Bell of Bankrate.com. The survey of 1,000 adults was done by Princeton Survey Research Associates International from June 7-10. The margin of sampling error is plus or minus 3.6 percentage points.

# Uniqueness—Obama winning

**Obama winning now but economy key to success—models prove**

**Silver, polling guru NYTimes, June 7 2012**

(Nate,New York Times <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/06/07/election-forecast-obama-begins-with-tenuous-advantage/> accessed tm 6/18)

The first look at the 2012 FiveThirtyEight presidential forecast has Barack Obama as a very slight favorite to win re-election. But his advantage equates to only a two-point lead in the national popular vote, and the edge could easily swing to Mitt Romney on the basis of further bad economic news.

Mr. Obama remains slightly ahead of Mr. Romney in most national polls, and he has had a somewhat clearer advantage in polling conducted at the state level. Mr. Obama would be about 80 percent likely to win an election held today, according to the model.

However, the outlook for the Nov. 6 election is much less certain, with Mr. Obama having winning odds of just over 60 percent. The forecast currently calls for Mr. Obama to win roughly 290 electoral votes, but outcomes ranging everywhere from about 160 to 390 electoral votes are plausible, given the long lead time until the election and the amount of news that could occur between now and then. Both polls and economic indicators are a pretty rough guide five months before an election.

# Uniqueness—Obama losing now

**National polls show Romney tied or in lead—better indicator**

**Silver, polling guru NYTimes, June 7 2012**

(Nate,New York Times <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/06/07/election-forecast-obama-begins-with-tenuous-advantage/> accessed tm 6/18)

One of the confusing aspects of this presidential race so far is that national polls have often shown a race that is nearly tied — or Mr. Romney sometimes leading — while Mr. Obama has more often had the lead in polls of crucial battleground states. Sites that project the presidential outcome based on the state polls have thus seemed to show a [tangible advantage for Mr. Obama](http://elections.huffingtonpost.com/2012/romney-vs-obama-electoral-map), while those that look at the trend in national polls seem to imply that the race is too close to call.

Any evaluation of the presidential race needs to reconcile this discrepancy. That America is highly divided along partisan lines does not negate the basic mathematical identity that the whole must equal the sum of the parts.

**Race to close to call—multiple factors make Romney win possible**

**New Zealand Herald June 16 2012**

(“obama makes light of blunder as race tightens”, lexis accessed tm 6/18)

Although opinion polls failed to take off in Romney"s favour after [Obama](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnlib/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T14948416320&returnToId=20_T14948416338&csi=257912&A=0.3405913320362197&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=Obama&indexType=P" \t "_parent)"s gaffe, the presidential race remains extremely tight and could go against [Obama](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnlib/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T14948416320&returnToId=20_T14948416338&csi=257912&A=0.3405913320362197&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=Obama%20&indexType=P" \t "_parent) if the meltdown in the eurozone countries spreads across the Atlantic. The past few days have seen a raft of weak economic data. [Obama](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnlib/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T14948416320&returnToId=20_T14948416338&csi=257912&A=0.3405913320362197&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=Obama&indexType=P" \t "_parent)"s sky-high ratings of four years ago around the rest of the world, inspired by his message of hope and change, have eroded, according to a Pew Research Centre survey in 21 countries. And, in the past week he became the butt of jokes by TV comedians comparing him to the last one-term Democratic president, Jimmy Carter. Also hanging over the campaign is a much-anticipated ruling of the Supreme Court, expected before the end of the month, which may throw out all or part of [Obama](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnlib/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T14948416320&returnToId=20_T14948416338&csi=257912&A=0.3405913320362197&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=Obama&indexType=P" \t "_parent)"s healthcare reforms on constitutional grounds. The reforms, which will provide an additional 32 million African Americans with healthcare coverage, were enacted early in 2010 after a long and bitter debate. Money talks in this campaign like never before. Again, the Supreme Court justices played a critical role in 2010 by allowing huge amounts of money to be spent by so-called Super-PACS, by striking down a law restricting corporate and union funding of political campaigns. Romney raised more than US$17 million ($21.7 million) more than [Obama](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnlib/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T14948416320&returnToId=20_T14948416338&csi=257912&A=0.3405913320362197&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=Obama%20&indexType=P" \t "_parent) last month, although the President stands to profit more from wealthy donors from Hollywood and the gay community following his recent embrace of same-sex marriage. So one of the key questions to be answered in the course of the campaign is the extent to which the flooding of swing states with TV ads will influence the average voter. The US$2.7 million spent by the pro-Romney Super-PAC Restore our Future on TV spots in Iowa certainly contributed to the defeat of former House speaker Newt Gingrich in the state caucuses last January. The other major uncertainty is whether the candidates" party base will turn out massively to vote in order to clinch the election. It seems that despite their reservations about Romney"s Mormon faith, the Republican grass roots hate [Obama](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnlib/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T14948416320&returnToId=20_T14948416338&csi=257912&A=0.3405913320362197&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=Obama%20&indexType=P" \t "_parent) more than the former Governor. As for [Obama,](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnlib/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T14948416320&returnToId=20_T14948416338&csi=257912&A=0.3405913320362197&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=Obama,%20&indexType=P" \t "_parent) it remains to be seen whether his core constituency of black and Latino voters will bother to cast a ballot given their disappointment, respectively, on economic prospects and immigration reform.

**Romney winning now—Rasmussen polls**

**The San Francisco Examiner June 18 2012** <http://www.examiner.com/article/a-breakdown-of-the-most-recent-obama-versus-romney-polls-2> accessed tm

Poll of 1500 “likely voters” taken from 6/8/2012 to 6/10/2012 Romney 47% Obama 44% **Analysis:** Rasmussen’s results are consistent with their results from one week ago when the pollster also had a three-point lead. Rasmussen’s tracking uses a “likely voter” sampling method, which excludes some registered voters. In the past, Rasmussen [has been accused of producing biased results](http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/11/04/rasmussen-polls-were-biased-and-inaccurate-quinnipiac-surveyusa-performed-strongly/) that tend to favor Republican candidates. Rasmussen does not include cell phone users, but attempts to compensate by using an “online survey tool to interview randomly selected participants from a demographically diverse panel.” [In 2008](http://electoralmap.net/2012/2008_election.php#reportcard) Rasmussen’s final poll matched up well with the final result in the race, and its polls in the final month were fairly consistent. Rasmussen uses a sample that has “baseline targets” of 35.8% Republicans, 33.0% Democrats, and 31.2% “unaffiliated” voters, despite other surveys that show Democrats' actually outnumbering Republicans in the general population.

# Uniqueness—Obama losing now

**No change in polling numbers despite political events—bad news for Obama and your link**

**LA Times June 14 2012**

**(“**Running in place as they duke it out;” lexis accessed tm 6/18)

Since mid-April, the average price for a gallon of regular gasoline has dropped nearly 40 cents, [President Obama](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnlib/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T14948416379&returnToId=20_T14948416388&csi=306910&A=0.77052556344832&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=President%20Obama%20&indexType=P" \t "_parent) has announced support for same-sex marriage, government statisticians have delivered two disappointing monthly jobs reports, tensions have ebbed and flowed with Iran, and [Mitt Romney](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnlib/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T14948416379&returnToId=20_T14948416388&csi=306910&A=0.77052556344832&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=Mitt%20Romney%20&indexType=P" \t "_parent) has clinched the Republican presidential nomination. And the presidential polls? Flat-lined. Contradicting reams of punditry, national polls have not moved an inch amid those events -- not to mention the lesser political battles that have animated cable news programs. In Gallup's daily polling, to take one example, Romney and [Obama](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnlib/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T14948416379&returnToId=20_T14948416388&csi=306910&A=0.77052556344832&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=Obama%20&indexType=P" \t "_parent) were tied 46% to 46% on April 11. Two months later, the poll had [Obama](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnlib/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T14948416379&returnToId=20_T14948416388&csi=306910&A=0.77052556344832&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=Obama%20&indexType=P" \t "_parent) up one point, 46% to 45%, a statistically identical result. For more than seven weeks, neither candidate's standing has moved more than three points -- well within the poll's margin of error. Instead of a race, the campaign for president has turned into something more closely resembling trench warfare: dug-in armies, intense exchanges of fire, no movement. The lack of movement is problematic for [Obama.](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnlib/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T14948416379&returnToId=20_T14948416388&csi=306910&A=0.77052556344832&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=Obama.%20&indexType=P" \t "_parent) Both candidates, of course, would like to have broken free by now. But for Romney, just keeping [Obama](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnlib/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T14948416379&returnToId=20_T14948416388&csi=306910&A=0.77052556344832&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=Obama%20&indexType=P" \t "_parent) below 50% counts as an advantage, on the assumption that a majority of late deciders are more likely to vote against the incumbent. By contrast, many Democratic strategists had hoped that by now [Obama](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnlib/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T14948416379&returnToId=20_T14948416388&csi=306910&A=0.77052556344832&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=Obama%20&indexType=P" \t "_parent) would have started to build a lead over the Republican, whom they derided earlier this year as a weak nominee with little popularity even within his own party. The stasis reflects the electorate. Over the last decade, voters have become polarized into warring partisan camps, more so than at any point since the 1930s. [Obama](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnlib/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T14948416379&returnToId=20_T14948416388&csi=306910&A=0.77052556344832&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=Obama%20&indexType=P" \t "_parent) and Romney each get nearly 90% support from their respective partisans, most of whom have strongly held views. Meantime, pollsters report that the percentage of undecided voters hovers somewhere in the high single digits, with even fewer in some swing states. "Two big things are going on," said Stanley B. Greenberg, who served as the chief pollster for Bill Clinton's campaign in 1992 and Al Gore's in 2000. The poor condition of the economy holds [Obama's](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnlib/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T14948416379&returnToId=20_T14948416388&csi=306910&A=0.77052556344832&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=Obama%27s%20&indexType=P" \t "_parent) vote down, he said. At the same time, demographic trends that favor Democrats -- an increasing number of nonwhite voters and a greater percentage of college-educated professionals -- pushes his vote up. Those opposing forces have combined to lock the race into a nearly even division that has proved stubbornly resistant to change.

**Obama numbers low—even Obama girl’s not voting for him**

**Irish Times June 12 2012**

**(“**Events appearing to conspire against wobbly [Obama](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnlib/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T14948416379&returnToId=20_T14948416398&csi=142626&A=0.1025475304352036&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=Obama&indexType=P" \t "_parent)” lexis accessed tm 6/18)

PRESIDENT [BARACK Obama](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnlib/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T14948416379&returnToId=20_T14948416398&csi=142626&A=0.1025475304352036&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=BARACK%20Obama%20&indexType=P" \t "_parent) will travel to Baltimore and Philadelphia today as he struggles to right his wobbly campaign and put the disastrous first 10 days of June behind him. Events though seem to conspire against the US leader. A CNN poll published yesterday showed him tied with Republican candidate [Mitt Romney](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnlib/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T14948416379&returnToId=20_T14948416398&csi=142626&A=0.1025475304352036&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=Mitt%20Romney%20&indexType=P" \t "_parent) at 45 per cent. In a special election in Arizona today, the Republican candidate has campaigned on an anti-[Obama](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnlib/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T14948416379&returnToId=20_T14948416398&csi=142626&A=0.1025475304352036&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=Obama%20&indexType=P" \t "_parent) platform. The election, to fill the seat of Democratic congresswoman Gabrielle Giffords, who was severely wounded in a shooting rampage in 2011, is seen as a test similar to last week s gubernatorial recall in Wisconsin. To add insult to injury, even the [Obama](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnlib/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T14948416379&returnToId=20_T14948416398&csi=142626&A=0.1025475304352036&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=Obama%20&indexType=P" \t "_parent) Girl whose video Crush on [Obama](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnlib/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T14948416379&returnToId=20_T14948416398&csi=142626&A=0.1025475304352036&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=Obama%20&indexType=P" \t "_parent) went viral in the 2008 campaign, now says she doesn t know for whom she will vote. I m not as excited as I was the last time, that s for sure, Amber Lee Ettinger said.

# They say “polls flawed”

**Our polls focus on consensus trends not outliers—their ev flawed**

**Silver, polling guru for 538, 2012**

**(**Nate, NYTimes, June 13 2012 <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/06/13/statistical-noise-in-election-polls/> accessed tm)

There are roughly six presidential polls being released on an average day right now, and the number is sure to proliferate in the coming weeks. Each of those six polls might include demographic breakdowns for, say, 15 demographic groups. That means that on a typical day, you might have 90 demographic subsamples to pick from. Several of these results almost certainly will fall outside of the margin of error — they will be outliers. Unfortunately, the news media has a tendency to focus on the outlying results, while missing the consensus trend. The most implausible results often get the most attention.

# They say “your internal link ev can’t possibly be that good”

**The study used traditional polling measures with a margin of error of plus or minus 3 %**

**Houston Chronicle May 18 2012**

**(“**Americans Value Highways and Bridges as a National Treasure”

[http://www.chron.com/business/press-releases/article/Americans-Value-Highways-and-Bridges-as-a-3568488.php accessed tm 5/19](http://www.chron.com/business/press-releases/article/Americans-Value-Highways-and-Bridges-as-a-3568488.php%20accessed%20tm%205/19) )

About the survey
HNTB’s America THINKS national highway survey polled a random nationwide sample of 1,024 Americans April 2-10, 2012. It was conducted by [Kelton Research](http://www.chron.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=business%2Fpress-releases&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Kelton+Research%22), which used an e-mail invitation and online survey. Quotas were set to ensure reliable and accurate representation of the total U.S. population ages 18 and over. The margin of error is +/- 3.1 percent.

# Answers to they say “other issues trash bipartisanship”

**Public most focused on infrastructure---want compromise on transportation infrastructure**

**Hart Research Associates and Public Opinion Strategies, 2011**

**(“**The Rockefeller Foundation Infrastructure Survey: Findings from a national survey of registered voters, conducted byHart Research Associates and Public Opinion Strategies” Feb 14 2011 [http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf accessed tm 5/22/12](http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf%20accessed%20tm%205/22/12))

Voters want common ground on transportation legislation more than on any other issue. Americans want leaders to seek common ground across a host of issues, but they want it on transportation legislation more than any other area. 71% of voters say there should be common ground on this issue—higher than other major issues—while 19% say leaders should hold fast to their positions, which is lower than other major issues. By comparison, the next-highest issue is legislation dealing with the budget deficit, where 69% would like to see common ground and 25% want to see leaders holding fast to their positions. This pattern holds across other issues as well, from energy development to health care reform to tax cuts to Social Security.

# Affirmative Answers---polls flawed

**No uniqueness--Election prediction is historically no better than dumb luck at predicting the winner—means you can’t trust their uniqueness evidence**

**Rothschild**, economist at Yahoo Labs. He has a Ph.D. in applied economics from the Wharton School of Business at the University of Pennsylvania **and** **Wilson**, editor of The Signal, **2012**

 (David and Chris, “Obama likely to win 2012 election with 303 electoral votes,” February 21,accessed 5/21/12 http://news.yahoo.com/blogs/signal/obama-poised-win-2012-election-303-electoral-votes-202543583.html)

With fewer than nine months to go before Election Day, The Signal predicts that Barack Obama will win the presidential contest with 303 electoral votes to the Republican nominee's 235.

How do we know? We don't, of course. Campaigns and candidates evolve, and elections are dynamic events with more variables than can reasonably be distilled in an equation. But the data--based on a prediction engine created by Yahoo! scientists--suggest a second term is likely for the current president. This model does not use polls or prediction markets to directly gauge what voters are thinking. Instead, it forecasts the results of the Electoral College based on past elections, economic indicators, measures of state ideology, presidential approval ratings, incumbency, and a few other politically agnostic factors.

We'll dip into what the model says in a moment, but first a note about models in general: there are a lot of them, from complex equations generated by nerdy academics (like the team at The Signal) to funny coincidences like the Redskins Rule, which holds that the incumbent party keeps the White House if Washington's football team wins its last home game. (This is true in 17 of the last 18 elections!) Every year, some of these models are right and some are wrong, and the difference is often just luck. As a result, models get a bad rap as being very good at predicting the past and lousy at predicting the future.

**No internal link--Focus on national polls flawed---and ignore the multiple things effect election before November**

**Kleinsmith**, Blogger his blog, Rise of the Center, is the fastest growing blog targeting centrist independents and moderates, **2012** (Solomon “Opinion: Individual Mandate Might Sink Obama in Swing States,” February 28,accessed 5/21/12 http://www.wnyc.org/blogs/its-free-blog/2012/feb/28/opinion-individual-mandate-dragging-obamas-numbers-down-swing-states/)

Pulling back a bit, the real moral of this story is how useless some polls are. National approval ratings make for good and cheap headlines, but it's the polling in the swing states that we should be focusing on if we want to be looking at what actually matters. If it ends up being Romney, anyone who says one side or the other will win for sure is fooling themselves. There are just too many variables that could very easily have an effect of a few points one way or the other; that makes any sort of prediction at this stage no more meaningful than that of sports fans before the start of the regular season predicting that, "This year...This is the year our team goes all the way!"

Among those variables is what might happen if the Supreme Court rules for, or against, the individual mandate. Or what if the Supreme Court declared the entire law unconstitutional, as one of the judges in a lower court did last year? Will that billionaire who gave $10 million to Gingrich double down and really give $100 million to a SuperPAC in support of the GOP nominee? Will liberal donors catch the bug, following Bill Maher's goading? Will the Americans Elect candidate be a left or right leaner, and will that catch fire?

Regardless, when major developments happen, and news organizations trot out the national polling data, ignore it. Head over to your favorite polling aggregation site and look for the latest data from the swing states. In this respect, the national polls are sort of like popularity polls for college football teams, while the only polls that actually matter in the end are those that are counted in the Bowl Championship Series ratings.

# Affirmative Answers—polls flawed

**Can’t evaluate polls—polling biases of states versus national polls**

**Silver, polling guru NYTimes, June 7 2012**

(Nate,New York Times <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/06/07/election-forecast-obama-begins-with-tenuous-advantage/> accessed tm 6/18)

Instead, the disparity between state and national polls probably stems from a more banal factor: it likely results from the different types of polling firms that are active in each of these domains.

The polling firms that have dominated the national polls are Gallup and Rasmussen Reports, each of which release national tracking numbers on a daily basis. These firms have had Republican-leaning [“house effects”](http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/11/06/when-house-effects-become-bias/) so far, meaning that they show more favorable results for Mr. Romney than the consensus of polls.

Meanwhile, some pollsters that are more active at the state level, like Public Policy Polling and Marist College, have had Democratic-leaning house effects, giving Mr. Obama better results than the consensus does.

# \*\*\*Link and Link Turn Debate\*\*\*

# \*\*\*Unpopular\*\*\*

# Link—funding mechanism unpopular

**skepticism about funding mechanisms make actual investment under current funding structures unpopular**

**Hart Research Associates and Public Opinion Strategies, 2011**

**(“**The Rockefeller Foundation Infrastructure Survey: Findings from a national survey of registered voters, conducted byHart Research Associates and Public Opinion Strategies” Feb 14 2011 [http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf accessed tm 5/22/12](http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf%20accessed%20tm%205/22/12))

A large majority of voters see room for improvement in how the government spends money on infrastructure and they endorse a host of reforms in this area. 64% of voters say that how the government currently spends money on building and maintaining our transportation infrastructure is inefficient and unwise, including one in four (26%) who says it is very inefficient. Just 32% say the government currently spends efficiently and wisely. Republicans (72% unwise) and independents (67% unwise) are particularly adamant that this is the case, though 56% of Democrats say that current spending is unwise as well. Given this attitude, it is unsurprising that the public supports a number of measures that would change the way in which transportation dollars are spent.

# Link—federal policy for new programs unpopular

**Public support local say in transportation and opposes new programs rather then fixing existing ones**

**Hart Research Associates and Public Opinion Strategies, 2011**

**(“**The Rockefeller Foundation Infrastructure Survey: Findings from a national survey of registered voters, conducted byHart Research Associates and Public Opinion Strategies” Feb 14 2011 [http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf accessed tm 5/22/12](http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf%20accessed%20tm%205/22/12))

Indeed, two-thirds or more of respondents favor nine of the 10 reforms tested in the survey, with the highest levels of support for holding government accountable for collecting data and certifying that all projects are delivered on time and fit into an overall national plan (90% favor), and allowing local regions to have a greater say in how transportation dollars are used in their area (90% favor), and having a “fix it first” policy that focuses on maintaining existing transportation systems before building new ones (86% favor).

# Link—new roads unpopular

**Public supports investment in repairs but not new roads**

**Davis 2009**

(Stephen Lee, “Poll Finds Americans Favor Smarter Transportation Spending in Stimulus Bill” January 16, 2009 <http://t4america.org/blog/2009/01/16/poll-most-americans-want-stimulus-to-emphasize-road-and-bridge-repair-and-transit-not-new-road-construction-poll-finds/> Accessed tm 5/22/12)

**WASHINGTON –** Eighty percent of Americans want transportation and other infrastructure spending included in the economic stimulus bill to target projects that achieve multiple goals and create new jobs, according to a survey sponsored by the National Association of Realtors® and Transportation for America.

The 2009 Growth and Transportation Survey describes what Americans think about how development affects their immediate community. An overwhelming 80 percent believe it’s more important that a stimulus plan include efforts to repair existing highways and build public transit rather than build new highways. Forty-five percent of those polled said construction of new highways should “definitely” or “probably” not be included in the plan.

# Link—infrastructure bank—see infrastructure bank neg

# Link—High Speed Rail Unpopular-public

**Public opposes high speed rail**

**San Francisco Examiner June 11, 2012**

<http://www.examiner.com/article/obama-walker-kasich-on-different-tracks-as-ca-voters-derail-bullet-train-plan> accessed tm

With a big recall win last Tuesday for Wisconsin's Republican Gov. Scott Walker and a week ending gaffe on the good health of the private sector that drew howls of derision from his projected Republican presidential rival Mitt Romney, [President Barack Obama didn't have his best week](http://www.examiner.com/article/bls-may-jobs-report-disappoints-as-positive-job-creation-forges-forward).

Now, with less than 150 days until Election Day, the results of a recent poll in California on whether Gov. Jerry Brown should pursue or halt an expensive plan to build high-speed rail shows that Mr. Obama and GOP governors like Walker and [John Kasich in Ohio](http://www.examiner.com/article/did-ohio-gov-kasich-play-fast-and-loose-with-ohio-jobs-facts-on-meet-the-press) are on the opposite sides of the tracks when it comes to whether high-priced, high-speed rail technology [HSR] is a good idea—and if it is, whether government should pay for it.

A helpful answer to this explosive question came recently from a [USC Dornsife/LA Times survey](http://www.greenbergresearch.com/index.php?ID=2749) of Golden State voters that revealed 59 would now oppose building high-speed rail if the measure were placed on the ballot again. Sixty-nine percent said that they would "never or hardly ever" ride the bullet train if it were built.

When Mr. Obama became president, he included in the stimulus funding plan about $8 billion in high-speed rail funding. At the time, California voters had previously approved a $10 billion bond fund in 2008, which when added to projected funding from Washington and private investors for a line connecting San Francisco to Los Angeles would total about $45 billion.

# Link—High Speed Rail unpopular—GOP

**GOP opposed to high speed rail proposals**

**San Francisco Examiner June 11, 2012**

<http://www.examiner.com/article/obama-walker-kasich-on-different-tracks-as-ca-voters-derail-bullet-train-plan> accessed tm

In the 2010 races, when Tea Party governors like Walker in Wisconsin and Kasich in Ohio railed against their opponent's plans to build high-speed rail projects because they wanted to cut, not increase, government spending, the HSR proposal by Mr. Obama was a bold if not controversial step forward. When the White House awarded states with slices of the HSR pie in 2009, which were sold to the public as guaranteed job creators that would produce trains that would zip riders from one major metropolitan area to another at speeds only seen in Europe, Japan or China, Wisconsin placed 3rd with $800 million and Ohio 4th with $400 million behind California and Florida, numbers one and two. Gov. Walker, who beat his Democratic opponent last Tuesday by about 7 points after having out spent his Milwaukee mayor rival by 8 to 1, and John Kasich, who won by only 2 percentage points in 2010, promised to derail their respective state's plans for high-speed if elected. They were, and they did.

# Link—High Speed Rail hurts Obama

**Obama linked to high speed rail—unpopular hurts his chances at re-election by providing fodder for Romney campaign**

**San Francisco Examiner June 11, 2012**

<http://www.examiner.com/article/obama-walker-kasich-on-different-tracks-as-ca-voters-derail-bullet-train-plan> accessed tm

Then-candidate Kasich took every opportunity to bash the plan to link Ohio's three largest cities with a passenger train whose average speed was 39 mph and whose top speed would top out at 79 mph—hardly high speed by world standards. Kasich promised to kill the ill-fated train plan dubbed the 3C because it would connect Cincinnati to Cleveland via Columbus. Post election, candidate-elect Kasich sought approval by Obama transportation secretary Ray LaHood to apply the $400 million awarded the Buckeye State to other transportation projects, but the answer was no. LaHood then redistributed Ohio's funds to [other states](http://www.examiner.com/government-in-columbus/new-mexico-rail-runner-express-train-recalls-issues-with-ohio-s-3c-train) including California who wanted more for their passenger train plans.

Now that Mr. Romney has reached parity in national polls with Mr. Obama—who still enjoys leads in both Wisconsin and Ohio, key states that went for the President four years ago—the conscious change of mind by California voters that one of President Obama's big signature ideas is spinning out of control out west only serves to put the White House further on the defensive even though the big TV attack ad guns Republicans expect to fund with a billion or more in [Super PAC money](http://www.examiner.com/article/billionaire-spending-on-romney-gop-poses-reversal-of-fortune-for-obama-dems) have yet to be aimed and fired.

# \*\*Popular\*\*

# Link—federal govt funding for infrastructure popular—public

**Public favors federal government funding for infrastructure—and thinks its underfunded in the SQ**

**Houston Chronicle May 18 2012**

**(“**Americans Value Highways and Bridges as a National Treasure”

[http://www.chron.com/business/press-releases/article/Americans-Value-Highways-and-Bridges-as-a-3568488.php accessed tm 5/19](http://www.chron.com/business/press-releases/article/Americans-Value-Highways-and-Bridges-as-a-3568488.php%20accessed%20tm%205/19) )

Clearly, Americans hold the nation's infrastructure in high regard. Nearly nine in ten (89 percent) Americans feel it’s important for the federal government to fund the maintenance and improvements of interstate highways. Yet, this infrastructure isn’t receiving the fiscal attention it deserves. Congress recently approved the ninth extension of transportation legislation that originally expired in 2009. The [Highway Trust Fund](http://www.chron.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=business%2Fpress-releases&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Highway+Trust+Fund%22) – due to inflation, rising construction costs and increasingly fuel efficient vehicles – no longer collects enough money to support the U.S. surface transportation system, remaining solvent only through a series of infusions from federal general revenue funds. More than half of Americans (57 percent) believe the nation’s infrastructure is underfunded.

# Link--High Speed rail popular—bipart

**High speed rail popular with GOP and Dems in Congress**

**Hart,** director of government relations at Quarles & Brady, and vice president of government affairs for the US High Speed Rail Association.**May 23 2012**

**(**Thomas, Politico, <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0512/76682.html> accessed tm)

Even as Congress looks into a new surface transportation bill, U.S. transportation systems confront daunting challenges of overcrowding and disrepair. Delays and waste cost the nation more than $100 billion per year in lost time, productivity and energy. The U.S. needs modern public transportation not dependent on oil or traffic patterns. Most developed nations now have high-speed rail, sleek trains that reach more than 200 mph. Here, this option would be most viable in two distinct corridors on the East and West Coasts – the Northeast Corridor, from Boston to Washington, and California. The Northeast Corridor is already one of most valuable U.S. transportation assets. With I-95, it’s the only continuous link between the major population centers of Washington, Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York and Boston. This is the nation’s most densely populated region with 18 percent of the U.S. population living in just 2 percent of its land area. The NEC region alone would be the world’s sixth-largest economy, with a gross domestic product of $2.59 trillion. The NEC is already a mature rail corridor — Amtrak and regional rail services show ridership spikes whenever gas prices increase. Amtrak’s Acela service, however, averages only 80 mph. True high-speed rail in this corridor could prove competitive with air travel, particularly because rail can easily connect to other local and regional transit networks. There is growing consensus among Democrats and Republicans in Congress that the NEC is ideally suited for high-speed rail development. Differences remain, however, on the best path for development.

# Link—high speed rail incentives popular

**Plan uses incentives—those are popular—their link evidence all assumes government subsidies not public private partnerships**

\*be sure read with perm on states cp to solve the net benefit

**Hart,** director of government relations at Quarles & Brady, and vice president of government affairs for the US High Speed Rail Association.**May 23 2012**

**(**Thomas, Politico, <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0512/76682.html> accessed tm)

Rep. John Mica (R-Fla.), chairman of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, introduced controversial legislation last year that would privatize Amtrak, only to meet strong Democratic resistance. Tea party Republicans eliminated federal funding for high-speed rail in 2012, preferring private-sector financing. Indeed, high-speed rail funding may be zeroed out in the surface transportation bill now being negotiated in a House-Senate conference — though there is growing bipartisan support for provisions that could spark private investment through tax incentives and government guarantees. Given the current political realities, most policymakers now do support a public-private partnership model for the NEC. It’s already proven successful and for infrastructure development at the state and local level as well as in Europe and Asia.

# Link—high speed rail popular (opposition to it unpopular)

**Support for high speed rail is popular—its opposition to it that isn’t Republicans for Rail proves**

**Hart,** director of government relations at Quarles & Brady, and vice president of government affairs for the US High Speed Rail Association.**May 23 2012**

**(**Thomas, Politico, <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0512/76682.html> accessed tm)

The political winds are beginning to shift, and some elected officials see that there can be political consequences from strongly opposing high-speed rail. The governors on record as opposing projects are among the least popular — including Rick Scott in Florida, who rejected federal money. A new political group is now forming Republicans for Rail. There is also talk of starting a rail super PAC to generate money and grass-roots support for additional rail transit investments. If this political shift continues in the crucial 2012 elections, prospects for U.S. high-speed rail, particularly along the East and West Coasts, could finally brighten.

# Link turn National Infrastructure Bank—popular

**Bipartisan support for using infrastructure for common ground—and few think that the current spending is adequate or efficient support the use of national infrastructure bank**

**Hart Research Associates and Public Opinion Strategies, 2011**

**(“**The Rockefeller Foundation Infrastructure Survey: Findings from a national survey of registered voters, conducted byHart Research Associates and Public Opinion Strategies” Feb 14 2011 [http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf accessed tm 5/22/12](http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf%20accessed%20tm%205/22/12))

Even with a highly polarized electorate that remains steadfast in its belief that things in the nation are off on the wrong track there is wide agreement—across the partisan spectrum—that leaders in Washington should be seeking common ground. Nowhere is this more true than legislation related to the country’s transportation infrastructure. Indeed, two in three voters say that making improvements in infrastructure is very important, and most voters say that in its current state the nation’s transportation system is barely adequate. Voters seek better and safer roads and more public transportation options, widely agreeing that the United States would benefit from an expanded and improved public transportation system. 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.

# Link—infrastructure bipartisan public support

**Bipartisan support for federal investment in infrastructure**

**Rockefeller Foundation, 2011**

**(“**Rockefeller Foundation Infrastructure Survey Reveals Bipartisan Support for Transportation and Infrastructure Investments and Reform” press release, Feb 14 2011 [http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/news/press-releases/rockefeller-foundation-infrastructure accessed tm 5/22/12](http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/news/press-releases/rockefeller-foundation-infrastructure%20accessed%20tm%205/22/12))

February 14, 2011 – An exclusive Rockefeller Foundation survey released today reveals overwhelming bipartisan support for federal investment in transportation and infrastructure projects.

The survey showed that 71% of voters think leaders in Washington should seek common ground on legislation related to roads, bridges and transit systems, including 66% of Tea Party supporters and 71% of Republicans.  Two out of three voters say that improving the country’s transportation infrastructure is highly important. Nearly half of all voters said that roads are often or totally inadequate and that only some public transportation options exist.  Eighty percent of voters agree that federal funding to improve and modernize transportation will boost local economies and create millions of jobs, and view it as critical to keeping the United States as the world’s top economic superpower.

**Infrastructure investment popular with public—local ballot measures prove**

**Davis, 2012 (**Stephen Lee, “Kicking off transportation vote 2012” May 10, <http://t4america.org/blog/2012/05/10/kicking-off-transportation-vote-2012/> accessed 5/22 tm)

As the House and Senate struggle to come to agreement over renewing the federal program, local governments and voters are feeling urgency about the state of our infrastructure. And voters across the political spectrum are supportive of spending their money on improving it – despite an ongoing a fiscal crisis and the anti-government rhetoric that permeates political discourse.

With maintenance needs growing along with population and travel demand, local governments increasingly are asking voters to approve ballot measures to fund transportation – and usually succeeding.

**public wants bipartisan coop on passage of infrastructure investment**

**Rockefeller Foundation, 2011**

**(“**Rockefeller Foundation Infrastructure Survey Reveals Bipartisan Support for Transportation and Infrastructure Investments and Reform” press release, Feb 14 2011 [http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/news/press-releases/rockefeller-foundation-infrastructure accessed tm 5/22/12](http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/news/press-releases/rockefeller-foundation-infrastructure%20accessed%20tm%205/22/12))

“Half a century ago, Americans built an interstate highway system that enabled unrivaled economic prosperity and opportunity, said Rockefeller Foundation President Judith Rodin.  “Today, almost half of Americans think that their transportation options and roads are inadequate.  The Rockefeller Foundation Infrastructure Survey shows that American voters want Washington to work together to pass laws that ensure we fix the infrastructure we have and provide more Americans with more transportation options befitting a 21st century economic power.”

**Voters regardless of party support investment in infrastructure**

**Rockefeller Foundation, 2011**

**(“**Rockefeller Foundation Infrastructure Survey Reveals Bipartisan Support for Transportation and Infrastructure Investments and Reform” press release, Feb 14 2011 [http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/news/press-releases/rockefeller-foundation-infrastructure accessed tm 5/22/12](http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/news/press-releases/rockefeller-foundation-infrastructure%20accessed%20tm%205/22/12))

“As the transportation debate in Washington begins to heat up, this new Rockefeller Foundation Infrastructure Survey shows that the American people, no matter their political party, support transportation and infrastructure reform, said Marcia L. Hale, President of Building America’s Future Education Fund.  “As voters continue to demand that economic reforms come ahead of politics, I call on all our representatives in Washington to listen closely to what the public is saying.”

# Link—reducing emissions popular

**Public wants investments that decrease reliance on oil and decrease emissions**

**Davis 2009**

(Stephen Lee, “Poll Finds Americans Favor Smarter Transportation Spending in Stimulus Bill” January 16, 2009 <http://t4america.org/blog/2009/01/16/poll-most-americans-want-stimulus-to-emphasize-road-and-bridge-repair-and-transit-not-new-road-construction-poll-finds/> Accessed tm 5/22/12)

Americans are also very interested in energy conservation. Eighty-nine percent agreed that transportation investments should support the goals of reducing energy use, with 58 percent agreeing strongly. Three in four of those polled also want the stimulus plan to support the reduction of carbon emissions that lead to global warming and climate change.

# Link—public transportation popular

**Vast majorities favor expanded public transportation system**

**Rockefeller Foundation, 2011**

**(“**Rockefeller Foundation Infrastructure Survey Reveals Bipartisan Support for Transportation and Infrastructure Investments and Reform” press release, Feb 14 2011 [http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/news/press-releases/rockefeller-foundation-infrastructure accessed tm 5/22/12](http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/news/press-releases/rockefeller-foundation-infrastructure%20accessed%20tm%205/22/12))

But Americans want changes in the way the Federal government invests in infrastructure and makes policy. Two-thirds of respondents favored 9 of 10 reforms tested in the survey, with 90 supporting more accountability and certification that projects are delivered on time and fit into a national plan. In terms of priorities, a vast majority (80 percent) believe the country would benefit from an expanded and improved public transportation system and 57 percent believe that “safer streets for our communities and children” should be the one of the top two priorities if more money is to be invested in infrastructure.

# Link-national infrastructure bank popular

**National infrastructure bank popular—efficiency trumps concerns about deficit spending**

**Rockefeller Foundation, 2011**

**(“**Rockefeller Foundation Infrastructure Survey Reveals Bipartisan Support for Transportation and Infrastructure Investments and Reform” press release, Feb 14 2011 [http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/news/press-releases/rockefeller-foundation-infrastructure accessed tm 5/22/12](http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/news/press-releases/rockefeller-foundation-infrastructure%20accessed%20tm%205/22/12))

This Rockefeller Foundation Infrastructure Survey highlights 4 key findings:

1. **American voters see improvement in transportation infrastructure as a way to improve the economy and their quality of life:** With federal unemployment rates hovering at 9%, Americans feel that improvements to transportation and infrastructure will create millions of jobs – eight in ten voters think transportation and infrastructure will boost local economies and create jobs including 64% of Tea Party supporters and 66% of Republicans.
2. **American voters are looking for consensus and cooperation in Washington:** Americans want their elected officials to work together, especially around the issue of transportation and infrastructure (66% of voters say this is a time where they would like leaders in Washington to make compromises and seek common ground).  More than any other issue tested, American voters would like to see compromise on legislation related to transportation and infrastructure (71%).
3. **American voters see room for improvement in how government spends money on infrastructure:**  With a high federal deficit, Americans overwhelmingly say that that current government spending on building and maintaining transportation infrastructure is inefficient and unwise – 64% overall and 72% of Republicans.  Americans support a host of reforms aimed at making spending more efficient while still producing results. For instance, 90% support allowing local regions to have some input on how transportation dollars are used in their area.
4. **American voters are open to several funding streams for national transportation projects:** With overwhelming support for transportation and infrastructure improvements, Americans are open to several funding streams.  Seventy-eight percent encourage more private investment and 72% of voters support imposing penalties on projects that go over budget or exceed their deadline.  Sixty percent of voters support establishing a National Infrastructure Bank, 59% support issuing new transportation bonds and 58% support eliminating subsidies for American oil companies that drill in other countries. Only 27 percent support increasing the gas tax, although almost half of all respondents believe it increases annually (it has not increased since 1993).

# Link—bipart public support for infrastructure

**Bipart support for funding reforms for infrastructure—public wants infrastructure to be source of compromise**

**Hart Research Associates and Public Opinion Strategies, 2011**

**(“**The Rockefeller Foundation Infrastructure Survey: Findings from a national survey of registered voters, conducted by Hart Research Associates and Public Opinion Strategies” Feb 14 2011 [http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf accessed tm 5/22/12](http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf%20accessed%20tm%205/22/12))

The Bottom Line: Voters of all political stripes are tired of partisan gridlock in Washington—they want leaders to work together and seek compromise to get things done for the country. They overwhelmingly say elected leaders should cooperate when it comes to transportation infrastructure, seeing improvement in this area as a way to improve the economy, make communities safer, and improve Americans’ quality of life. And while voters oppose some funding streams they widely endorse others, and they clearly see a need for reform when it comes to financing transportation projects.

# AT conservatives hate public transportation

**Conservatives support alternatives to cars**

**Barry, 2010**

**(**Sean, “American Conservative magazine “rails against the machine,” promotes alternatives to the automobile”,

July 9, 2010, <http://t4america.org/blog/2010/07/09/american-conservative-magazine-rails-against-the-machine-promotes-alternatives-to-the-automobile/> accessed tm 5/22/12)

It seems like everything in Washington these days is politically charged — economic recovery, health care and Wall Street reform, to name a few. Unfortunately and often without good reason, transportation becomes one of them.

William Lind, a respected figure in right-wing circles, is adamant that public transportation shouldn’t be, explaining why in “Rail Against the Machine,” featured in this month’s American Conservative magazine — part of a special package in American Conservative on public transportation with contributions from a host of special authors.

Lind is the co-author with the late Paul Weyrich of a recent book called “Moving Minds: Conservatives and Public Transportation” and was featured in a Transportation for America [online debate](http://t4america.org/webinars/%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank) late last year. His argument is simple: there is nothing inherently conservative about favoring highways — and nothing un-conservative about alternatives to the automobile.

# \*\*\*Internal link and Impacts\*\*\*

# Iran Strikes Internal link—Obama stops Iran strikes

**Hurst, ’12** (Stephen, AP, 4/18/12, <http://www.breitbart.com/Big-Peace/2012/04/18/Romneys-foreign-policy-may-mean-hardball-is-back>, JD)

Even so, Romney will campaign, Williamson said, as the man who can return the United States to a country that ensures "peace through strength rather than just managing the gradual decline of our military strength." Romney is particularly harsh on Obama's handling of Iran and concerns it may be building a nuclear weapon. The president is clearly trying to head off a threatened Israeli attack on Iranian nuclear installations. While Obama has not ruled out a U.S. attack, he has not been as directly threatening as Romney, who positions himself much closer to Israel and hardline Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. In one Republican debate, Romney said: "If we re-elect Barack Obama, Iran will have a nuclear weapon. And if we elect Mitt Romney, if you elect me as the next president, they will not have a nuclear weapon."

**Israel will hold off strikes now because of Obama strategy**

**Foster, ’12** (Daniel, National Review, 3/8/12, [http://www.nationalreview.com/corner/292970/obama-casually-offers-israel-goodies-bomb-iran-iafteri-election-daniel-foster#](http://www.nationalreview.com/corner/292970/obama-casually-offers-israel-goodies-bomb-iran-iafteri-election-daniel-foster), JD)

The president, who in a recent press conference admonished Republicans for their “casual” discussion of possible war with Iran, has apparently offered Israel sweeteners for delaying any strike against Tehran’s nuclear facilities until after the election. From The New York Post: WASHINGTON — The US offered to give Israel advanced weaponry — including bunker-busting bombs and refueling planes — in exchange for Israel’s agreement not to attack Iranian nuclear sites, Israeli newspaper Maariv reported Thursday. President Obama reportedly made the offer during Israeli prime minister Benjamin Netanyahu’s visit to Washington this week. Under the proposed deal, Israel would not attack Iran until 2013, after US elections in November this year. The newspaper cited unnamed Western diplomatic and intelligence sources.

**Israel strike on Iran facilities spirals leading to laundry list of conflicts and nuclear war**

Claude Salhani, foreign editor and a political analyst with United Press International, 9-13-2004, “Four Day War”, The American Conservative, http://www.amconmag.com/2004\_09\_13/article.html

Israel is unlikely to accept Iran’s word that its nuclear program is meant solely for peaceful purposes and aimed at developing commercial energy. The possibility of decisive military action is, indeed, high. What follows is the unfolding of a worst-case scenario, an imaginary yet all-too-possible depiction of how events might develop if Israel were to attack Iran’s nuclear facilities. Day One: Wednesday In a pre-dawn raid, undisclosed numbers of Israeli warplanes, taking off from military airbases in the Negev, destroy Iran’s main nuclear facility at Bushehr. Israel’s armed forces have released no details, but it is believed the planes flew over parts of Jordan, northern Saudi Arabia, and Iraq, refueling in mid-air before reaching their target. Military analysts speculate that the planes must have refueled somewhere over Iraq. During the one-hour raid, Iran claims to have shot down “several” Israeli fighters. Television images show pilots being lynched by furious mobs before Iranian authorities could reach them. The after-effects of the raid shake the Arab and Islamic world. Millions take to the streets demanding immediate action against Israel. In planning the attack, Israel weighed the threats of Arab and Muslim reaction. The only other nuclear threat, and a possible danger to Israel, is Pakistan. Israel considered striking Pakistan’s nuclear sites, too, but Indian intelligence reports that Pakistan lacks long-distance delivery for its warheads. Bombay is the farthest they can reach. Additional reassurance from American intelligence convinced Israel that as long as Musharraf remains in power, Pakistan does not represent an imminent threat. The decision was made not to hit Pakistan. Day Two: Thursday Believing that Israel would never undertake such actions without U.S. approval, or at least a tacit nod from the American administration, Iran retaliates. Thousands of Revolutionary Guards are dispatched across the border into Iraq with orders to inflict as many casualties on American troops as possible. Fierce clashes erupt between coalition forces and Iranians. Within hours, more than 400 U.S. troops are killed, and many more wounded in heavy fighting. Iranian sleeper agents, who have infiltrated Iraq since the downfall of Saddam, urge Iraqi Shi’ites into action. They cut major highways and harass coalition troops, preventing reinforcements from reaching units under attack. Several helicopters are shot down. Tehran orders the Lebanese Shi’ite movement, Hezbollah, into action against northern Israel. Hezbollah launches scores of rockets and mortars against kibbutzim, towns, and settlements. Israel retaliates. Casualties are high on both sides of the frontier. Tension in the Middle East reaches a boiling point. In Washington, the Cabinet convenes in an emergency session. Massive demonstrations erupt all over the Arab and Islamic world. Crowds of gigantic proportions take to the streets, ransacking Israeli embassies in Cairo, Amman, and Ankara. American embassies in a number of other cities are burned. With police overwhelmed, the military is called in. Armies open fire, killing hundreds, adding to the outrage. Day Three: Friday Following Friday prayers across the Islamic world, crowds incited by fiery sermons in mosques from Casablanca to Karachi take to the streets in the worst protests yet. Government buildings are ransacked, and clashes with security forces result in greater casualties. Martial law is declared, and curfew imposed, but this fails to prevent further mayhem and rioting. Islamist groups call for the overthrow of governments and for immediate military action against Israel. In Saudi Arabia, Islamist militants engage in open gun battles with security forces in several cities. The whereabouts of the Saudi royal family are unknown. In Indonesia, Malaysia, Egypt, and a dozen other countries, crowds continue to run amok, demanding war on Israel. Day Four: Saturday A longstanding plan to overthrow Musharraf is carried out by senior Pakistani army officers loyal to the Islamic fundamentalists and with close ties to bin Laden. The coup is carried out in utmost secrecy. Pakistan’s intelligence service, the ISI—a long-time supporter of the fundamentalists—in agreement with the plotters, takes control of the country’s nuclear arsenal and its codes. Within hours, and before news of the coup leaks out, Pakistan, now run by pro-bin Laden fundamentalists, loads two nuclear weapons aboard executive Lear jets that take off from a remote military airfield, headed for Tel Aviv and Ashdod. Detouring and refueling in east Africa, they approach Israel from the south. The crafts identify themselves as South African. Their tail markings match the given identification. The two planes with their deadly cargo are flown by suicide pilots who, armed with false flight plans and posing as business executives, follow the flight path given to them by Israeli air traffic control. At the last moment, however, the planes veer away from the airfield, soar into the sky and dive into the outskirts of the two cities, detonating their nuclear devices in the process. The rest of this scenario can unfold in a number of ways. Take your pick; none are encouraging. Israel retaliates against Pakistan, killing millions in the process. Arab governments fall. Following days of violence, Syria, Jordan, and Egypt succumb to Islamist rebels who vow open warfare with Israel. The Middle East regresses into war, with the fighting claiming hundreds of thousands of lives. A much-weakened Israel, now struggling for its very survival, deploys more nuclear weapons, targeting multiple Arab capitals. The Middle East is in complete mayhem, as the United States desperately tries to arrange a cease-fire.

Iran Strikes Bad Impact-- AT “strikes coming now”

 **US relying on sanctions now – won’t strike**

**AP 4/21/2010**

(“US: Iran strike 'off table' for now”

http://www.jpost.com/IranianThreat/News/Article.aspx?ID=173602&utm\_source=twitterfeed&utm\_medium=twitter)

The United States has ruled out an attack on Iran’s nuclear program in the short term, a top Defense Department official said on Wednesday. Instead, the US will focus on negotiations with Teheran and continue its aggressive pursuit of United Nations sanctions against the Islamic regime. “Military force is an option of last resort,” Undersecretary of Defense for Policy Michele Flournoy told reporters during a briefing in Singapore. “It’s off the table in the near term.” Flournoy said the US has not seen Iran engage productively. But, “right now the focus is a combination of engagement and pressure in the form of sanctions.”

# Iran Strikes Bad Impact-nuclear war and extinction

**Israel involvement in conflicts risk nuclear escalation and a global bloodbath**

Ivashov ‘7 [Leonid. Analyst at the Strategic Culture Foundation. “Iran: The Threat of Nuclear War” The AP, 21 April 07. Lexis//MGW-JV]

What might cause the force major event of the required scale? **Everything seems to indicate that** Israel **will be sacrificed.** Its involvement in a war with Iran - especially in a nuclear war - is bound to trigger a global catastrophe. The statehoods of Israel and Iran are based on the countries' official religions. **A military** conflict **between Israel and Iran** will immediately evolve into a religious one**, a conflict between Judaism and Islam. Due to the presence of numerous Jewish and Muslim populations in the developed countries,** this would make a global bloodbath inevitable. All of the active forces of most of the countries of the world would end up fighting, with almost no room for neutrality left. Judging by the increasingly massive acquisitions of the residential housing for the Israeli citizens, especially in Russia and Ukraine , a lot of people already have an idea of what the future holds. However, it is hard to imagine a quiet heaven where one might hide from the coming doom. Forecasts of the territorial distribution of the fighting, the quantities and the efficiency of the armaments involved, the profound character of the underlying roots of the conflict and the severity of the religious strife all leave no doubt that this clash will be in all respects much more nightmarish than WWII.

# Iran Strikes Bad Impacts—Israeli strikes on Iran bad—nuclear war

**Israeli strike on Iran escalates to US nuclear weapon usage**

Jorge **Hirsch**, Professor of physics at the University of California San Diego, 2-20-20**06**, <http://www.antiwar.com/orig/hirsch.php?articleid=8577>

The U.S. has just declared that it will defend Israel militarily against Iran if needed. Presumably this includes a scenario where Israel would initiate hostilities by unprovoked bombing of Iranian facilities, as it did with Iraq's Osirak, and Iran would respond with missiles targeting Israel. The U.S. intervention is likely to be further bombing of Iran's facilities, including underground installations that can only be destroyed with low-yield nuclear bunker-busters. Such nuclear weapons may cause low casualties, perhaps only in the hundreds [.pdf], but the nuclear threshold will have been crossed. Iran's reaction to a U.S. attack with nuclear weapons, no matter how small, cannot be predicted with certainty. U.S. planners may hope that it will deter Iran from responding, thus saving lives. However, just as the U.S. forces in Iraq were not greeted with flowers, it is likely that such an attack would provoke a violent reaction from Iran and lead to the severe escalation of hostilities, which in turn would lead to the use of larger nuclear weapons by the U.S. and potential casualties in the hundreds of thousands. Witness the current uproar over cartoons and try to imagine the resulting upheaval in the Muslim world after the U.S. nukes Iran. - The Military's Moral Dilemma - Men and women in the military forces, including civilian employees, may be facing a difficult moral choice at this very moment and in the coming weeks, akin to the moral choices faced by Colin Powell and Dan Ellsberg. The paths these two men followed were radically different. Colin Powell was an American hero, widely respected and admired at the time he was appointed secretary of state in 2001. In February 2003, he chose to follow orders despite his own serious misgivings, and delivered the pivotal UN address that paved the way for the U.S. invasion of Iraq the following month. Today, most Americans believe the Iraq invasion was wrong, and Colin Powell is disgraced, his future destroyed, and his great past achievements forgotten. Daniel Ellsberg, a military analyst, played a significant role in ending the Vietnam War by leaking the Pentagon Papers. He knew that he would face prosecution for breaking the law, but was convinced it was the correct moral choice. His courageous and principled action earned him respect and gratitude. The Navy has just reminded [.pdf] its members and civilian employees what the consequences are of violating provisions concerning the release of information about the nuclear capabilities of U.S. forces. Why right now, for the first time in 12 years? Because it is well aware of moral choices that its members may face, and it hopes to deter certain actions. But courageous men and women are not easily deterred. To disobey orders and laws and to leak information are difficult actions that entail risks. Still, many principled individuals have done it in the past and will continue to do it in the future ( see [1], [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8], [9].) Conscientious objection to the threat and use of nuclear weapons is a moral choice. Once the American public becomes fully aware that military action against Iran will include the planned use of nuclear weapons, public support for military action will quickly disappear. Anything could get the ball rolling. A great catastrophe will have been averted. Even U.S. military law recognizes that there is no requirement to obey orders that are unlawful. The use of nuclear weapons against a non-nuclear country can be argued to be in violation of international law, the principle of just war, the principle of proportionality, common standards of morality ([1], [2], [3], [4], [5]), and customs that make up the law of armed conflict. Even if the nuclear weapons used are small, because they are likely to cause escalation of the conflict they violate the principle of proportionality and will cause unnecessary suffering. The Nuremberg Tribunal, which the United States helped to create, established that "The fact that a person acted pursuant to order of his government or of a superior does not relieve him from responsibility under international law, provided a moral choice was in fact possible to him." To follow orders or to disobey orders, to keep information secret or to leak it, are choices for each individual to make – extremely difficult choices that have consequences. But not choosing is not an option. - America's Collective Responsibility - Blaming the administration or the military for crossing the nuclear threshold is easy, but responsibility will be shared by all Americans. All Americans knew, or should have known, that using nuclear weapons against a non-nuclear country like Iran was a possibility given the Bush administration's new policies. All Americans could have voiced their opposition to these policies and demand that they be reversed. The media will carry a heavy burden of responsibility. The mainstream media could have effectively raised public awareness of the possibility that the U.S. would use nuclear weapons against Iran. So far, they have chosen to almost completely hide the issue, which is being increasingly addressed in non-mainstream media. Members of Congress could have raised the question forcefully, calling for public hearings, demanding public discussion of the administration's plans, and passing new laws or resolutions. So far they have failed to do so and are derelict in their responsibility to their constituents. Letters to the president from some in Congress [1], [2] are a start, but are not likely to elicit a meaningful response or a change in plans and are a far cry from forceful action. Scientific organizations and organizations dealing with arms control and nuclear weapons could have warned of the dangers associated with the Iran situation. So far, they have not done so ([1], [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8]). Scientists and engineers responsible for the development of nuclear weapons could have voiced concern [.pdf] when the new U.S. nuclear weapons policies became known, policies that directly involve the fruits of their labor. Their voices have not been heard. Those who contribute their labor to the scientific and technical infrastructure that makes nuclear weapons and their means of delivery possible bear a particularly heavy burden of moral responsibility. Their voices have barely been heard. - The Nuclear Abyss - The UnitedStates is preparing to enter a new era: an era in which it will enforce nuclear nonproliferation by the threat and use of nuclear weapons. The use of tactical nuclear weapons against Iran will usher in a new world order. The ultimate goal is that no nation other than the U.S. should have a nuclear weapons arsenal. A telltale sign that this is the plan is the recent change in the stated mission of Los Alamos National Laboratory, where nuclear weapons are developed. The mission of LANL used to be described officially as "Los Alamos National Laboratory's central mission is to reduce the global nuclear danger" [1] [.pdf], [2] [.pdf], [3] [.pdf]. That will sound ridiculous once the U.S. starts throwing mini-nukes around. In anticipation of it, the Los Alamos mission statement has been recently changed to "prevent the spread of weapons of mass destruction and to protect our homeland from terrorist attack." That is the present and future role of the U.S. nuclear arsenal, to be achieved through threat (deterrence) and use of nuclear weapons. References to the old mission are nowhere to be found in the current Los Alamos documents, indicating that the change was deliberate and thorough. It is not impossible that the U.S. will succeed in its goal. But it is utterly improbable. This is a big world. Once the U.S. crosses the nuclear threshold against a non-nuclear country, many more countries will strive to acquire nuclear weapons, and many will succeed. The nuclear abyss may turn out to be a steep precipice or a gentle slope. Either way, **it will be a one-way downhill slide toward a bottomless pit.** We will have entered a path of no return, leading in a few months or a few decades to global nuclear war and unimaginable destruction. But there are still choices to be made. Up to the moment the first U.S. nuclear bomb explodes, the fall into the abyss can be averted by choices made by each and every one of us.

# Iran Strikes Affirmative Answers

**No retaliation, war, or regional conflict**

**Bronner, ‘12** (Ethan, NYT staff reporter, 1/26/12, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/01/27/world/middleeast/israelis-see-irans-threats-of-retaliation-as-bluff.html?_r=1&hp>, JD)

JERUSALEM — Israeli intelligence estimates, backed by academic studies, have cast doubt on the widespread assumption that a military strike on Iranian nuclear facilities would set off a catastrophic set of events like a regional conflagration, widespread acts of terrorism and sky-high oil prices. Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu has said he thinks Iranian citizens will welcome an attack. The estimates, which have been largely adopted by the country’s most senior officials, conclude that the threat of Iranian retaliation is partly bluff. They are playing an important role in Israel’s calculation of whether ultimately to strike Iran, or to try to persuade the United States to do so, even as Tehran faces tough new economic sanctions from the West. “A war is no picnic,” Defense Minister Ehud Barak told Israel Radio in November. But if Israel feels itself forced into action, the retaliation would be bearable, he said. “There will not be 100,000 dead or 10,000 dead or 1,000 dead. The state of Israel will not be destroyed.” The Iranian government, which says its nuclear program is for civilian purposes, has threatened to close the Strait of Hormuz — through which 90 percent of gulf oil passes — and if attacked, to retaliate with all its military might. But Israeli assessments reject the threats as overblown. Mr. Barak and Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu have embraced those analyses as they focus on how to stop what they view as Iran’s determination to obtain nuclear weapons. No issue in Israel is more fraught than the debate over the wisdom and feasibility of a strike on Iran. Some argue that even a successful military strike would do no more than delay any Iranian nuclear weapons program, and perhaps increase Iran’s determination to acquire the capability. Security officials are increasingly kept from journalists or barred from discussing Iran. Much of the public talk is as much message delivery as actual policy. With the region in turmoil and the Europeans having agreed to harsh sanctions against Iran, strategic assessments can quickly lose their currency. “They’re like cartons of milk — check the sell-by date,” one senior official said. But conversations with eight current and recent top Israeli security officials suggested several things: since Israel has been demanding the new sanctions, including an oil embargo and seizure of Iran’s Central Bank assets, it will give the sanctions some months to work; the sanctions are viewed here as probably insufficient; a military attack remains a very real option; and postattack situations are considered less perilous than one in which Iran has nuclear weapons. “Take every scenario of confrontation and attack by Iran and its proxies and then ask yourself, ‘How would it look if they had a nuclear weapon?’ ” a senior official said. “In nearly every scenario, the situation looks worse.” The core analysis is based on an examination of Iran’s interests and abilities, along with recent threats and conflicts. Before the United States-led war against Iraq in 1991, Saddam Hussein vowed that if attacked he would “burn half of Israel.” He fired about 40 Scud missiles at Israel, which did limited damage. Similar fears of retaliation were voiced before the Iraq war in 2003 and in 2006, during Israel’s war against Hezbollah in southern Lebanon. In the latter, about 4,000 rockets were fired at Israel by Hezbollah, most of them causing limited harm. “If you put all those retaliations together and add in the terrorism of recent years, we are probably facing some multiple of that,” a retired official said, speaking on the condition of anonymity, citing an internal study. “I’m not saying Iran will not react. But it will be nothing like London during World War II.” A paper soon to be published by the Institute for National Security Studies at Tel Aviv University, written by Amos Yadlin, former chief of military intelligence, and Yoel Guzansky, who headed the Iran desk at Israel’s National Security Council until 2009, argues that the Iranian threat to close the Strait of Hormuz is largely a bluff. The paper contends that, despite the risks of Iranian provocation, Iran would not be able to close the waterway for any length of time and that it would not be in Iran’s own interest to do so. “If others are closing the taps on you, why close your own?” Mr. Guzansky said. Sealing the strait could also lead to all-out confrontation with the United States, something the authors say they believe Iran wants to avoid. A separate paper just published by the Begin-Sadat Center for Strategic Studies says that the fear of missile warfare against Israel is exaggerated since the missiles would be able to inflict only limited physical damage. Most Israeli analysts, like most officials and analysts abroad, reject these arguments. They say that Iran has been preparing for an attack for some years and will react robustly, as will its allies, Hezbollah and Hamas. Moreover, they say, an attack will at best delay the Iranian program by a couple of years and lead Tehran to redouble its efforts to build such a weapon. But Mr. Barak and Mr. Netanyahu believe that those concerns will pale if Iran does get a nuclear weapon. This was a point made in a public forum in Jerusalem this week by Maj. Gen. Amir Eshel, chief of the army’s planning division. Speaking of the former leaders of Libya and Iraq, he said, “Who would have dared deal with Qaddafi or Saddam Hussein if they had a nuclear capability? No way.”

# Iran Strikes Affirmative Answers

**Israel will bomb Iran before Republicans in the Oval Office can**

**Washington Times, February 22, 2012** (Ilan Berman, staff, “BERMAN: Iran’s relentless nuclear quest,” accessed 2/22/12 http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2012/feb/22/irans-relentless-nuclear-quest-425301412/)

Chances are, however, it won’t be the United States that implements them. Politically, the Obama administration is fast turning the page on the Middle East. Recent months have seen the administration “pivot” toward Asia in pursuit of much-needed foreign-policy victories. America’s strategic footprint in the region, too, is fast receding. With the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Iraq complete, Washington shows little interest in the type of extended political and economic engagement necessary to secure our long-term interests there. The same situation is playing out in Afghanistan, where Mr. Panetta’s recent revelation that the U.S. plans to depart Afghanistan in 2013, a full year ahead of schedule, has sent fatigued coalition allies scrambling for the exits. Against this backdrop, repeated pledges by White House officials that “all options are on the table” in dealing with Iran’s nuclear ambitions ring hollow to everyone - and to the Iranians most of all.

That leaves Israel. For years, officials in Jerusalem have cautioned that Iran’s nuclear ambitions and its expanding strategic arsenal make it a global - rather than local - problem. For just as long, they have opted to take a back seat to the West, hopeful that a multilateral consensus to seriously confront Iran would emerge. Such a consensus, however, has been exceedingly slow in coming, and today - while they continue to hold out hope that sanctions might cause Iran to reverse its current destructive course - they clearly are contemplating other options.

That they have been forced to do so is a reflection of the flaws in our approach to Iran, which relied on diplomacy too heavily and for too long and embraced serious economic pressure far too late. That an Israeli strike on Iran is an increasing probability is a product of the West’s failure to lead on one of the most pressing strategic challenges of our time.

**Strike on Iran won’t escalate**

**New York Times, February 29, 2012** (Thom Shanker, Helene Cooper and Ethan Bronner, staff, “U.S. Sees Iran Attacks as Likely if Israel Strikes,” accessed 2/29/12 http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/29/world/middleeast/us-sees-iran-attacks-as-likely-if-israel-strikes.html?partner=rss&emc=rss)

While a missile retaliation against Israel would be virtually certain, according to these assessments, Iran would also be likely to try to calibrate its response against American targets so as not to give the United States a rationale for taking military action that could permanently cripple Tehran’s nuclear program. “The Iranians have been pretty good masters of escalation control,” said Gen. James E. Cartwright, now retired, who as the top officer at Strategic Command and as vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff participated in war games involving both deterrence and retaliation on potential adversaries like Iran.

# 2nc CTBT Impact Module

**Obama pushing CTBT---key element of the nuclear agenda**

**Reuters 2/17/12**

[**http://in.reuters.com/article/2012/02/17/nuclear-test-ban-idINDEE81G0F620120217 accessed tm 2/18**](http://in.reuters.com/article/2012/02/17/nuclear-test-ban-idINDEE81G0F620120217%20accessed%20tm%202/18)

The administration of U.S. President Barack Obama said in May last year that it was preparing a push for approval of the treaty, arguing that Washington no longer needs to conduct such tests but does need to stop other countries from doing so. But it has not given a precise time when it would seek a Senate vote on the treaty, which the chamber rejected when fellow Democrat Bill Clinton was president in the 1990s. A two-thirds majority would be needed for approval. Obama, who will seek a second term this year, has made clear he sees the test ban pact as a step toward his vision of a world without nuclear weapons, such as the new START arms reduction treaty the Senate approved last year.

**Ratification key to nonproliferation regime while maintaining nuclear deterrent**

Gottemoeller, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Arms Control, Verification and Compliance, 2011

(Rose Gottemoeller, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Arms Control, Verification and Compliance, 6/9, 2011, “Leadership and the Future of Nuclear Energy,” US State Department, <http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/WO1106/S00304/leadership-and-the-future-of-nuclear-energy.htm>, accessed 9/14 JM)

While working toward the entry-into-force of the CTBT, the United States will continue its nearly two-decade long moratorium on nuclear explosive testing. We call on all other governments to declare or reaffirm their intention not to test. Many national security experts, including Henry Kissinger, Brent Scowcroft, and George Shultz, who were not supportive of the CTBT in 1999 are now in favor of its ratification. They see it as an important part of a post-Cold War agenda for combating nuclear proliferation. In order to ratify the Treaty, we will need to win the support of a Senate whose composition has changed significantly since 1999. An important step will be to convince those Senators who had concerns when the Treaty was last considered. Our recent experience working with the Senate to gain their advice and consent to ratification of the New START Treaty has prepared us well for what is expected to be a thorough and robust debate over the CTBT In anticipation of the ratification effort, the Administration commissioned a number of reports, including an updated National Intelligence Estimate and a National Academy of Sciences (NAS) report to assess the ability of the United States to monitor compliance with the Treaty and the ability of the United States to maintain a safe, secure and effective nuclear arsenal in the absence of explosive nuclear testing. An unclassified version of the NAS report is expected to be released soon. These authoritative reports, together with others, will help to inform the Senate’s assessment of the CTBT. Ratification of the CTBT by the United States will encourage other states to sign and ratify the Treaty, including those remaining States whose ratifications are necessary for the Treaty to enter into force. An in-force CTBT will deter states from testing nuclear weapons and raise the costs for any state that might choose to pursue a testing program. If nuclear testing is prohibited, other countries will be constrained in their ability to develop new, advanced nuclear weapons and modernize their existing arsenals. This Treaty keeps the United States at the forefront of the global nuclear nonproliferation regime without jeopardizing the effectiveness of our nuclear deterrent. A legally binding ban on nuclear testing is an essential step on the path toward a world without nuclear weapons. The national security of the United States, and all States, will be enhanced when CTBT enters into force. Thank you again for inviting me to join you today. I would be glad to answer any questions on this or other arms control topics of interest.

# CTBT Internal link—Obama Key to CTBT

**Obama would push CTBT**

**Global Security Newswire, ’12** (2/22/12, <http://www.nti.org/gsn/article/white-house-again-lobby-congress-ctbt-ratification/>, JD)

The White House remains intent on persuading Congress to ratify an international pact that would prohibit nuclear-weapon testing, the State Department's top arms control official recently said (see GSN, July 20, 2011). The United States is one of eight nations that still must ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty before it can enter into force. President Obama early in his tenure called for Senate passage of the pact, which last came up for a vote in the upper chamber in 1999, Defense News reported on Tuesday. "A lot has changed since 1999, and people have not had a chance to really look at the CTBT and understand what it can accomplish for U.S. national security," acting Undersecretary of State Rose Gottemoeller said. "The International Monitoring System [for the treaty] was barely getting off the ground back then. Now, the International Monitoring System is over 80 percent complete in its deployment and we can see its effectiveness," she said of the worldwide complex of nuclear-test detection technologies (see GSN, Feb. 17). The system, comprised of more than 300 monitoring sites and laboratories spread across the globe, was able to successfully pinpoint the release of trace amounts of radiation into the atmosphere following the March 2011 disaster at the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear energy site in Japan, Gottemoeller said. Additionally, the Energy Department's Stockpile Stewardship and Management Program has made significant advancements, the undersecretary said. The program, managed by the semiautonomous National Nuclear Security Administration, is focused on ensuring the reliability, safety, and effectiveness of the U.S. nuclear arsenal absent any new testing. "It has come a long way and it is developing quite a bit of capability," Gottemoeller said. The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty has been ratified by 157 countries. A total of 44 "Annex 2" nations must deliver legislative approval for its entry into force; the holdouts from that group are China, Egypt, India, Iran, Israel, North Korea, Pakistan and the United States. Advocates say the treaty would help stem nuclear proliferation by preventing nations from conducting test explosions required to develop new or more potent weapons. Opponents of the U.S. ratification argue the potential remains for countries to secretly detonate nuclear devices without being detected and that the United States might in the future need to end its two-decade voluntary moratorium on testing to ensure the viability of its strategic deterrent. Gottemoeller said she has been informing congressional lawmakers and their aides on issues related to the treaty. "I expect to be doing a lot more of that in 2012. "We're not going to set a deadline for ratification; we want to make sure the time is right. Believe me, I was at the [Energy Department] in 1999 and watched the treaty go down in flames. I don't want to see that happen again," said Gottemoeller, who played a leading role in negotiating the 2010 New START nuclear arms control accord with Russia. In pursuing Senate ratification of New START, Gottemoeller said she was pleased to see a number of lawmakers give considerable focus to understanding the technical specifics of the treaty. "I'm hoping that the same thing will happen with the CTBT and we won't have people rushing to judgment," she said (Kate Brannen, Defense News, Feb. 21).

# CTBT Internal link—Obama Key to CTBT

**Obama’s key to CTBT passage**

Kimball, ‘11 (Daryl is the Executive Director of the Arms Control Association. May 18, 2011, “Obama Administration to Begin Effort to Engage Senate on CTBT,” <http://www.projectforthectbt.org/TauscherCaseforCTBT>)

In the most detailed and substantive address by a senior Barack Obama administration official to date, Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security Ellen O. Tauscher (to the left) spoke at the Arms Control Association's May 10 annual meeting on "The Case for the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty." She made it clear that the administration would soon engage with Republican and Democratic Senators on the CTBT and provide updated information on the key technical issues that gave some Senators reason for pause during the 1999 debate on the treaty. Tauscher explained in detail why prompt U.S. approval is in the United States national security interests. She said: "... we are in a stronger position to make the case for the CTBT on its merits. To maintain and enhance that momentum, the Obama Administration is preparing to engage the Senate and the public on an education campaign that we expect will lead to ratification of the CTBT." "In our engagement with the Senate, we want to leave aside the politics and explain why the CTBT will enhance our national security. Our case for Treaty ratification consists of three primary arguments: "One, the United States no longer needs to conduct nuclear explosive tests, plain and simple. Two, a CTBT that has entered into force will obligate other states not to test and provide a disincentive for states to conduct such tests. And three, we now have a greater ability to catch those who cheat." Under Secretary Tauscher's prepared remarks are available online. A video and full transcript of the event is available online. Tauscher's address speech builds upon National Security Advisor Tom Donilon's March 29 reiteration of the administration's commitment to ratification and entry into force of the CTBT. He said: "We are committed to working with members of both parties in the Senate to ratify the CTBT, just as we did for New START. We have no illusions that this will be easy. But we intend to ... make our case to the Senate and the American people." "So, When's the Vote?" Reporters at the event asked Tauscher and other speakers, including Sen. Robert Casey, Jr. (D-Pa.): - "In what timeframe do you think the Senate should act on the CTBT?" - "Do you think it should take this vote before the 2012 elections?" - "And what your assessment of how the votes are lining up?" But given that the Senate hasn't engaged on the topic in over a decade and given that the hard work of making the case for the CTBT has really just begun, its just too early for clear answers to such questions. Senator Casey said it well when he said: "In my judgment, we should act before the 2012 elections. I don’t have a high degree of confidence that we will. I think that would obviously be preferable, but I don’t have great confidence that will happen. In terms of the vote count, I’m not paid to do that. There are others who do that as part of their job. So, even if I were – even if I wanted to hazard a guess, it would be – the margin of error would have to be substantial. So it’s hard to – it’s hard to predict. Obviously I don’t think you can – that any of us can overlay the votes on New START on this vote. It’s going to be a different debate in some ways, and frankly a more difficult debate, from my side of the debate. It’s going to be, I think, a longer and more difficult challenge to get the treaty passed. But what’s why I think it’s important to start now, as best we can, to keep the treaty in the news, so to speak, to begin the outreach and engagement and education process." Under Secretary Tauscher said: "We recognize that a Senate debate over ratification will be spirited, vigorous and likely contentious. The debate in 1999 unfortunately was too short and too politicized. "The treaty was brought to the floor without the benefit of extensive committee hearings or significant input from administration officials and outside experts. We will not repeat those mistakes. But we will make a more forceful case when we are certain the facts have been carefully examined and reviewed in a thoughtful process. We are committed to taking a bipartisan and fact-based approach with the Senate." "For my Republican friends who voted against the treaty in 1999 and might feel bound by that vote, I have one message: Don’t be. The times have changed. Stockpile stewardship works. We have made significant advances in our ability to detect nuclear testing. As my good friend and fellow Californian, George Shultz, likes to say – those who opposed the treaty in 1999 can say they were right. But they would be more right to vote for the treaty today." "So we have a lot of work to do to build the political will be need to ratify the CTBT," Tauscher said. The Bottom line: making the case on the CTBT will take time but the process has finally begun. The White House and treaty proponents must now follow through with a serious, sustained effort to highlight the case for the CTBT. For their part, all Senators have a responsibility to take another look at the treaty in light of the new evidence that has accumulated in the decade since the Senate's brief review of the subject in 1999 and not rush to a judgement based on old information or misconceptions.

# CTBT Internal link—Romney doesn’t push CTBT

**Romney opposes arms control measures**

**Hartung, ’12** (William, director at the Center for International Policy’s COMMON DEFENSE CAMPAIGN: ARMS & SECURITY PROJECT 3/28/12, <http://www.ciponline.org/research/entry/romneys-foreign-policy-fantasies>, JD)

In a blog post at the web site of Foreign Policy magazine, Republican presidential frontrunner Mitt Romney attempts to paint the Obama administration as "soft" on Russia, and on security issues more broadly. But Romney's tirade reveals more about his own worldview than it does about President Obama's approach to foreign policy. Romney claims that the administration "granted" Russia limits on our nuclear arsenal. Apparently Romney is referring to the New START treaty, which limited deployed U.S. and Russian warheads at 1,550 while establishing a rigorous verification and monitoring regime that can serve as a foundation for further reductions in the bloated nuclear arsenals of both sides. The lesson of New START is not that we have gone too far in reducing nuclear arsenals, but that we haven't gone nearly far enough. In that context, President Obama's commitment to engage Russia on nuclear reductions during his second term is both admirable and essential. Of necessity, part of that effort will involve talking about missile defense, which Moscow, rightly or wrongly, views as a potential threat to its nuclear deterrent. Romney and his fellow anti-arms control ideologues seem to think that it's possible to negotiate without even giving lip service to the other side's deepest concerns. This puts them far out of the historical mainstream of the Republican Party, in which presidents ranging from Richard Nixon, to Ronald Reagan to George H.W. Bush negotiated and/or signed nuclear arms control agreements with a Soviet Union that was far more heavily armed than today's Russia.

**Ratification key to security, proliferation, and global influence**

**Gottemoeller, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Arms Control, Verification and Compliance, 2011**

(Rose Gottemoeller, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Arms Control, Verification and Compliance, 6/9, 2011, “Leadership and the Future of Nuclear Energy,” US State Department, <http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/WO1106/S00304/leadership-and-the-future-of-nuclear-energy.htm>, accessed 9/14 JM)

The CTBT establishes a global legal ban on any nuclear weapon test explosion or any other nuclear explosion. The United States has not conducted a nuclear explosive test since 1992, in keeping with our moratorium on nuclear testing. Thus, as a practical matter, our policies and practices are consistent with the central prohibition of the Treaty. But without the ratification and entry into force of the Treaty, we cannot accrue all its benefits. U.S. ratification of the CTBT is in our national security interest. As stated in the April 2010 Nuclear Posture Review: “Ratification of the CTBT is central to leading other nuclear weapons states toward a world of diminished reliance on nuclear weapons, reduced nuclear competition, and eventual nuclear disarmament.” Ratification of the CTBT would be a significant affirmation of the importance the United States attributes to the international nonproliferation regime and, when the Treaty enters into force, to reducing the role of nuclear weapons in international security. Establishing a global, legally enforced ban on nuclear weapon tests will make America more secure. The U.S. can maintain a safe and effective nuclear deterrent without conducting explosive nuclear tests, but would-be proliferators could not develop, with confidence, advanced nuclear weapon designs without conducting an explosive nuclear test. The CTBT would subject suspected violators to the threat of intrusive on-site inspections and, if warranted, international sanctions. In short, much has changed since the U.S. Senate declined to provide its consent to ratification of the CTBT in 1999. At that time the Senate expressed concerns about the verifiability of the Treaty and the continuing safety and reliability of America’s nuclear deterrent without nuclear testing. With regard to verifiability, the CTBT’s Preparatory Commission has made great progress in the last decade toward establishing the Treaty’s verification regime. For the United States, this system will augment our highly sophisticated and significantly improved U.S. national technical means for monitoring nuclear explosions anywhere in the world.

# CTBT Good-Proliferation Impacts

**Impact -- US Ratification Is Key To Prevent Global Prolif and Nuke War.**

DAVIS **Co-Executive Director of the British American Security Information Council** 7.

[Dr. Ian, Co-Executive Director of the British American Security Information Council, “Getting the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Back on Track” Huffington Post -- April 11, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/dame-anita-roddick-and-dr-ian-davis/getting-the-nuclear-test-_b_45625.html>, accessed 9/14 JM]

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.

**Escalates to extinction.**

Utgoff, Deputy Director of the Strategy, Forces 2 (Victor A., Deputy Director of the Strategy, Forces, and Resources Division of the Institute for Defense Analysis, Survival Vol 44 No 2 Proliferation, Missile Defence and American Ambitions, p. 87-90)

In sum, widespread proliferation is likely to lead to an occasional shoot-out with nuclear weapons, and that such shoot-outs will have a substantial probability of escalating to the maximum destruction possible with the weapons at hand. Unless nuclear proliferation is stopped, we are headed toward a world that will mirror the American Wild West of the late 1800s. With most, if not all, nations wearing nuclear 'six-shooters' on their hips, the world may even be a more polite place than it is today, but every once in a while we will all gather on a hill to bury the bodies of dead cities or even whole nations.

# CTBT Good-Hegemony

**Ratification solves US Heg.**

Nunn, Former Senator from Georgia and CEO of the Nuclear Threat Initiative, 07 (Sam, HEARING OF THE EMERGING THREATS AND CAPABILITIES SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, April 11, Lexis accessed tm 9-14)

Number six, we should work to bring the Comprehensive Test Ban treaty into force in the United States and in other key states. And I would urge the committee to go back and take a look at the reasons that people opposed that ratification back a number of years ago and to review those and look at what's happened since then . Look at the stewardship program. Look at the simulation. Look at the technology that we can now use to ease some of the concerns that were legitimate at the time that was debated. I believe that the report of the former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, John Shelley Coshevilli (sp), when -- a year or two after that was debated, I think that ought to be reviewed again by the committee and by the Senate, and that the safeguards he recommends as a road map to ratification should be updated and taken very seriously. I think that's very important in terms of the United States' leadership in the world. When we don't ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, it's awfully hard to lead from a position of moral authority throughout the world. I know we have to deal with the problems, but I think they can be dealt with. I would note, Mr. Chairman, that former President Gorbachev, who has recently published his own essay in support of the Schultz/Kissinger/Perry/Nunn essay in the Wall Street Journal, has advocated ratification of the CTBT and removing nuclear weapons from hair-trigger status as two crucial steps that should be taken without delay by the United States and Russia and other members of the nuclear club. And I believe the world should take President Gorbachev up on his challenge. The United States and Russia should also, in my view, move to change the Cold War posture of their deployed nuclear weapons to greatly increase warning time in both countries and ease our fingers away from the nuclear trigger.

**Ratification sends a key signal – boosts US leadership.**

Nunn, Former Senator from Georgia and CEO of the Nuclear Threat Initiative, 07 (Sam, HEARING OF THE EMERGING THREATS AND CAPABILITIES SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, April 11, Lexis accessed tm 9-14)

So all of those are, I think, important ways that we could lead. I also believe if the Senate of the United States took a real lead in looking again at the comprehensive test-ban treaty it would be to our advantage. I think you'll find that some of those concerns we've already dealt with that were legitimate back then. I think it's time for a fresh look. I think it would send a totally different signal to the world.

# Affirmative Answers CTBT Bad/not so good--They say “India will follow US and ratify”

**India will not ratify – Media opposition**

**Baru, 09**

[ISAS Insights No. 49, 5 February 2009, “The Growing Influence of Business and Media on Indian Foreign Policy,” by Professor Sanjaya Baru is a Visiting Senior Research Fellow at the Institute of South Asian Studies, an autonomous research institute at the National University of Singapore, se1.isn.ch/serviceengine/Files/ISN/96448/ipublicationdocument\_singledocument/B87FED9F-883F-4E9D-B9C2-7198871316BA/en/50.pdf+Some+critics+of+the+media+may+dismiss+its+role+as+peripheral+given+the+limited+reach+of+media+in+an+educationally+backward+society.+To+be+sure,+foreign+policy+always+engages+the+elite+much+more&hl=en&gl=us&pid=bl&srcid=ADGEEShZ1x4LsGpCV3SS\_Y4rprueu1HOi\_YIABHrCNCHDLxDhAb6lyTBIdhPEpRXGZav40RsOecypbqb40Df2kyLjvVEutHbqsmtDQeXnU3xU64gMM0rlnCc661s89LPRmM5s1amYqx7&sig=AHIEtbST4f\_rh4zVL7kQF2-dXXWV4o1\_7Q, accessed 9/14/11, GVK]

i) An early example of the media playing an important role in shaping public opinion and government policy with respect to a foreign and strategic policy issue, in the context of domestic political discord, was the role played by The Times of India in 1996 on the issue of India signing up on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) agreement.20 Indian political parties were divided on the issue of India’s stance on the CTBT since India had for a long time advocated such a test ban and had, in fact, sponsored the CTBT. However, when CTBT got linked to Nuclear Proliferation Treaty renewal and India felt it was being discriminated against on the question of its nuclear status, the view gained ground that India should not sign CTBT. A major debate took place in the columns of Indian newspapers in which the Times of India editorially called for India rejecting CTBT in the form in which it was then being proposed. India can be a signatory only as an acknowledged nuclear weapons power and not as a non-weapon state. This finally became the official Indian position.

The entire mainstream media has been a strong and consistent supporter of the India-United States agreement on cooperation in civil nuclear energy. Overwhelming media support for the civil nuclear agreement, with the exception of *The Hindu*, under the pro-Communist Party of India editorship of N. Ram, and *The Asian Age,* during the editorship of M. J. Akbar, strengthened the government’s hand in politically defending its case at home, against political criticism from Left and Right opposition. More than print, television played an extremely influential role in generating public support for the nuclear accord. No major television news channel campaigned against the agreement, while many of them took a strong supportive stance.

Some critics of the media may dismiss its role as peripheral given the limited reach of media in an educationally backward society. To be sure, foreign policy always engages the elite much more than the masses. Hence, it is rarely a subject for mass politics, except perhaps in the case of India- Pakistan relations, and that too in northern India.21 However, the fact remains that with the decline of large pan-Indian national political parties and the emergence of fractured coalitions, difference between political parties on national policy issues, including foreign policy, is bound to grow. With such diversity of opinion in the political arena, the national media can secure for itself an influential autonomous role provided it is

12able to articulate a national policy that will find wide public acceptability and will stand the test of professional scrutiny.

# Affirmative Answers CTBT Bad/not so good—deterrence

CTBT would collapse deterrence

Monroe, Former Director of the Defense Nuclear Agency, 07

(Robert, *Washington Times*, Nuclear Testing Realities, December 4, Questia)

Reality No. 1 is that **U.S. ratification of the CTBT would do unbelievably grave damage to U.S. national security. Nuclear weapons exist - tens of thousands of them. More states now have them than ever before,** and they're being improved. A whole world of fourth- generation nuclear weapons is just around the corner. More than half the world's population lives in states that have nuclear weapons, and other states and terrorist organizations are striving to acquire them, and use them. The U.S. will continue to face serious nuclear weapon threats for generations to come. Our very lives will depend upon our ability to develop new nuclear weapon strategies and advanced nuclear weapons to deter these threats. **Our survival will depend on our nuclear technology being superior to that of anyone else in the world, decade after decade. This will certainly require testing, which the CTBT would deny.**

Causes multiple scenarios for nuclear war

**Spring,** Heritage Foundation Foreign Policy Studies Research Fellow in National Security Policy **07**

(Baker, “Ratifying the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty: A Bad Idea in 1999, a Worse Idea Today,” June 29, http://www.heritage.org/Research/HomelandDefense/wm1533.cfm)

\* The nuclear threat is expanding. Established nuclear powers (Russia and China), new de facto nuclear powers (India, North Korea, and Pakistan), and aspiring nuclear powers (Iran) are moving forward in establishing or expanding their nuclear capabilities. Russian leaders continue to believe that a modernized nuclear arsenal plays a central role in their national strategy.[9] China is expanding the number of nuclear-capable missiles in its arsenal.[10] India and Pakistan conducted nuclear tests in 1998, and North Korea conducted one in 2006. Iran continues to defy multilateral demands that it freeze its program for enriching uranium. Without the option to conduct tests in the future, the United States will see lesser powers equal and eventually surpass its nuclear capabilities.

 \* Nuclear proliferation is creating the need for a modern U.S. nuclear arsenal that is suited to maintaining stability in a multi-polar setting. The U.S. nuclear arsenal is suited for the bipolar setting of the Cold War; it is not designed to address nuclear multi-polarity created by proliferation. Indeed, the Cold War nuclear deterrence policy and the arsenal it created are likely undermining nuclear stability and increasing the prospect for the use of nuclear weapons.[11] A permanent ban on nuclear testing will bar the United States from developing a new nuclear-deterrent posture. The new arsenal should include nuclear weapons, along with conventional and defensive weapons, that support a damage limitation strategy. Such a strategy aims to prevent or limit the damage from attacks by enemies armed with weapons of mass destruction.

# Affirmative Answers CTBT Bad/not so good—deterrence

Testing’s key to deterrence and US primacy

Medalia, Specialist in National Defense in the Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division at the Congressional Research Service, 8

(Jonathan, 3-12-8, “Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty: Issues and Arguments,” March 12, [www.fas.org/sgp/crs/nuke/RL34394.pdf](http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/nuke/RL34394.pdf), accessed 7-12-09)

CTBT opponents argue that the ability to maintain existing weapons without testing through LEP, even if it can be done, misses the point. Deterrence, as they see it, requires continuing to hold at risk assets that enemy leaders prize. However, they argue, current nuclear warheads have many limitations. ! Current warheads, which were designed during the Cold War, were given high yield to destroy hard targets like Soviet missile silos. But that yield, in this view, could cause the United States to refrain from using these weapons out of concern for inflicting massive civilian casualties in the target area and beyond. As a 2006 Defense Science Board study stated, “weapons that are not seen as useable and effective by potential adversaries cannot be an effective, reliable deterrent.”54 ! Current warheads, if exploded near the Earth’s surface, would leave much residual radiation that would contaminate large areas and kill many people, barring the United States from using them, the treaty’s opponents believe. ! The radiation output of current warheads, they argue, differs from that needed for such missions as destroying chemical or biological agents or generating electromagnetic pulse. ! Current warheads cannot destroy key targets that enemy leaders would value highly, such as hardened and deeply buried bunkers where weapons of mass destruction, key communications nodes, or the leaders themselves might hide. WR1 shares these limitations. For example, it would have about the same yield as the W76 it would replace, and would use a reentry body55 that cannot penetrate the ground. CTBT opponents see deterrence as dynamic, so that it continues to require new military capabilities that can only be embodied in new weapons that could only be developed with nuclear testing. The Threat Reduction Advisory Committee, an expert panel advising DOD, stated that one reason to test would be “[t]o support certification — prior to quantity production — of new nuclear weapons, should the decision be made that a new weapon design requiring testing is the only option to achieve a needed capability.” It provided examples of weapons requiring “tailored physics package design for nuclear effects for new missions,” including:

# Affirmative Answers CTBT Bad/not so good—deterrence

Other nations will pursue nuclear weapons even if we disarm—maintaining deterrence key to check back WMD release

**Chyba**, Professor of Astrophyics and International Affairs at Princeton University and Served on the National Security Council Staff in the Clinton Administration, **08**

(Christopher, “Time for a Systematic Analysis: U.S. Nuclear Weapons and Nuclear Proliferation, December, <http://armscontrol.org/act/2008_12/Chyba#authbio>)

Despite this, skeptics have been quick to insist that disarmament advocates have failed to establish a causal connection between the pursuit of disarmament and the prevention of nuclear weapons proliferation. In November 2007, The Wall Street Journal published a reply by former Defense Secretary Harold Brown and former Deputy Defense Secretary John Deutch titled "The Nuclear Disarmament Fantasy," in which the authors declared that "[a] nation that wishes to acquire nuclear weapons believes these weapons will improve its security. The declaration by the U.S. that it will move to eliminate nuclear weapons in a distant future will have no direct effect on changing this calculus. Indeed, nothing that the U.S. does to its nuclear posture will directly influence such a nation's (let alone a terrorist group's) calculus." Such steps, they assert, would also not "convince North Korea, Iran, India, Pakistan or Israel to give up their nuclear weapons programs." [8]Brown and Deutch are hardly alone. A 2004 report to Congress by the secretaries of state, defense, and energy argued that "rogue state proliferation...marches forward independently of the U.S. nuclear program" and that "North Korea and Iran appear to seek [weapons of mass destruction (WMD)] in response to their own perceived security needs, in part, to deter the United States from taking steps to protect itself and allies in each of these regions. In this regard, their incentives to acquire WMD may be shaped more by U.S. advanced conventional weapons capabilities and our demonstrated will to employ them to great effect."[9] Former Bush administration Assistant Secretary of State for Arms Control Stephen Rademaker agrees that U.S. nuclear weapons policy is irrelevant to Iranian or North Korean nuclear decision-making, which he argues is driven by hunger for power and prestige. Nevertheless, he asserts, "[s]o long as there is one nuclear weapon remaining in the U.S. inventory, [arms control activists] will point to this as the root cause of nuclear proliferation."[10]A group of 11 members of the Bush administration's International Security Advisory Board (ISAB) to the Department of State have argued that a key role of U.S. nuclear weapons policy is to help prevent nuclear proliferation by providing a "nuclear umbrella" to countries-31, by the authors' count-that might otherwise be tempted to develop their own nuclear weapons.[11] Similarly, the full ISAB claims that "[t]here is clear evidence in diplomatic channels that U.S. assurances to include the nuclear umbrella have been, and continue to be, the single most important reason many allies have forsworn nuclear weapons."[12] If this were the most salient nonproliferation role for U.S. nuclear weapons, careless moves toward disarmament might in fact drive proliferation rather than curtail it.