# **Iran Aff**

### **Contention One is Israel**

#### **The Iran bill is being debated in congress now and will likely pass. In addition to a new round of sanctions, it includes a war mandate to support any Israeli strike against Iran. This makes a US-backed Israeli strike on Iran inevitable**

Perr 13 Jon, New Democrat Network; “Senate sanctions bill could let Israel take U.S. to war against Iran” *Daily Kos*; December 24, 2013; <http://www.dailykos.com/story/2013/12/24/1265184/-Senate-sanctions-bill-could-let-Israel-take-U-S-to-war-against-Iran>

As 2013 draws to close, the negotiations over the Iranian nuclear program have entered a delicate stage. But in 2014, the tensions will escalate dramatically as a bipartisan group of Senators brings a new Iran sanctions bill to the floor for a vote. As many others have warned, that promise of new measures against Tehran will almost certainly blow up the interim deal reached by the Obama administration and its UN/EU partners in Geneva. But Congress' highly unusual intervention into the President's domain of foreign policy doesn't just make the prospect of an American conflict with Iran more likely. As it turns out, the Nuclear Weapon Free Iran Act essentially empowers Israel to decide whether the United States will go to war against Tehran.¶ On their own, the tough new sanctions imposed automatically if a final deal isn't completed in six months pose a daunting enough challenge for President Obama and Secretary of State Kerry. But it is the legislation's commitment to support an Israeli preventive strike against Iranian nuclear facilities that almost ensures the U.S. and Iran will come to blows. As Section 2b, part 5 of the draft mandates:¶ If the Government of Israel is compelled to take military action in legitimate self-defense against Iran's nuclear weapon program, the United States Government should stand with Israel and provide, in accordance with the law of the United States and the constitutional responsibility of Congress to authorize the use of military force, diplomatic, military, and economic support to the Government of Israel in its defense of its territory, people, and existence.¶ Now, the legislation being pushed by Senators Mark Kirk (R-IL), Chuck Schumer (D-NY) and Robert Menendez (D-NJ) does not automatically give the President an authorization to use force should Israel attack the Iranians. (The draft language above explicitly states that the U.S. government must act "in accordance with the law of the United States and the constitutional responsibility of Congress to authorize the use of military force.") But there should be little doubt that an AUMF would be forthcoming from Congressmen on both sides of the aisle. As Lindsey Graham, who with Menendez co-sponsored a similar, non-binding "stand with Israel" resolution in March told a Christians United for Israel (CUFI) conference in July:¶ "If nothing changes in Iran, come September, October, I will present a resolution that will authorize the use of military force to prevent Iran from developing a nuclear bomb."¶ Graham would have plenty of company from the hardest of hard liners in his party. In August 2012, Romney national security adviser and pardoned Iran-Contra architect Elliott Abrams called for a war authorization in the pages of the Weekly Standard. And just two weeks ago, Norman Podhoretz used his Wall Street Journal op-ed to urge the Obama administration to "strike Iran now" to avoid "the nuclear war sure to come."¶ But at the end of the day, the lack of an explicit AUMF in the Nuclear Weapon Free Iran Act doesn't mean its supporters aren't giving Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu de facto carte blanche to hit Iranian nuclear facilities. The ensuing Iranian retaliation against to Israeli and American interests would almost certainly trigger the commitment of U.S. forces anyway.¶ Even if the Israelis alone launched a strike against Iran's atomic sites, Tehran will almost certainly hit back against U.S. targets in the Straits of Hormuz, in the region, possibly in Europe and even potentially in the American homeland. Israel would face certain retaliation from Hezbollah rockets launched from Lebanon and Hamas missiles raining down from Gaza.¶ That's why former Bush Defense Secretary Bob Gates and CIA head Michael Hayden raising the alarms about the "disastrous" impact of the supposedly surgical strikes against the Ayatollah's nuclear infrastructure. As the New York Times reported in March 2012, "A classified war simulation held this month to assess the repercussions of an Israeli attack on Iran forecasts that the strike would lead to a wider regional war, which could draw in the United States and leave hundreds of Americans dead, according to American officials." And that September, a bipartisan group of U.S. foreign policy leaders including Brent Scowcroft, retired Admiral William Fallon, former Republican Senator (now Obama Pentagon chief) Chuck Hagel, retired General Anthony Zinni and former Ambassador Thomas Pickering concluded that American attacks with the objective of "ensuring that Iran never acquires a nuclear bomb" would "need to conduct a significantly expanded air and sea war over a prolonged period of time, likely several years." (Accomplishing regime change, the authors noted, would mean an occupation of Iran requiring a "commitment of resources and personnel greater than what the U.S. has expended over the past 10 years in the Iraq and Afghanistan wars combined.") The anticipated blowback?¶ Serious costs to U.S. interests would also be felt over the longer term, we believe, with problematic consequences for global and regional stability, including economic stability. A dynamic of escalation, action, and counteraction could produce serious unintended consequences that would significantly increase all of these costs and lead, potentially, to all-out regional war.¶ If this all sounds like the hypothetical scenarios of a bunch of doves in the Pentagon and the State Department, it is worth recalling the America reaction to the 1996 bombing of the Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia which killed 19 U.S. servicemen and wounded hundreds of others. As former Clinton and Bush counter-terrorism chief Richard Clarke recounted in his book, Against All Enemies, President Clinton and the Joint Chiefs contemplated a massive U.S. invasion of Iran in response to the involvement of its agents:¶ In our meeting with the Pentagon in 1996, Shali was talking about al-out war. The military had a plan for almost any contingency. The plan on the shelf for war with Iran looked like it had been drawn up by Eisenhower. Several groups of Army and Marine divisions would sweep across the country over the course of several months.¶ (Ultimately, President Clinton opted against the invasion of Iran, in part because of the difficulty in proving the U.S. intelligence case against Tehran to the international community. In the end, the U.S. launched a large-scale covert action campaign against Iranian intelligence assets worldwide. Apparently, the message was received with zero distortion; Iran has not targeted United States interests since.)¶ The Pentagon's 2012 war-gaming in a simulation called "Internal Look" served to reinforce for U.S. military officials "the unpredictable and uncontrollable nature of a strike by Israel, and a counterstrike by Iran." As for the impact on the global economy, in November, the Federation of American Scientists estimated that a U.S. campaign of air strikes would cost $700 billion; a full-scale invasion could have a total impact of $1.7 trillion.¶ At the heart of the clash between Congressional hawks and President Obama is a disagreement over the so-called "red line" for Tehran. In the United States and in Israel alike, Obama has said the United States will not allow Iran to obtain an actual nuclear weapon. But most of his Republican foes and some of his Democratic allies have sided with Bibi Netanyahu in demanding Iran never possess a "nuclear weapons capability." That bottom line on Iranian nuclear know-how wouldn't just scuttle the interim deal and ongoing negotiations with Tehran, as the Obama administration and 10 Democratic Senate committee chairmen have warned. By the standard, an American war with Iran would be almost a foregone conclusion. And if Chuck Schumer, Bob Menendez, John McCain, Lindsey Graham and over 30 other Senators get their way, Israel may well have a green light to start it.

#### The bill is coming—the latest vote count says they’re within one vote of a super-majority and the Iranian foreign minister says prospects are grim

Vick 2-18 Karl, Jerusalem Bureau Chief, Time Magazine; “Iran’s Foreign Minister Sounds Glum About Nuke Talks Over Skype” *Time*; February 18, 2014; http://world.time.com/2014/02/18/irans-foreign-minister-zarif-skype/

Iranian Foreign Minister Mohammad Javad Zarif sounds a bit glum as he expresses optimism about the talks on his country’s nuclear program, which resumed briefly in Vienna on Tuesday.¶ “I think we cannot negotiate unless we are optimistic,” Zarif said in a live Skype video conference with the University of Denver, where he earned both master’s and doctorate degrees in international studies in the 1980s. “But we need to be realistic. Unfortunately what we have seen in the last two months has not encouraged us. And I can understand the politics of constituency in the United States, but from an Iranian perspective … what has happened in the last two months has been less than encouraging.” He said there was “a great deal of concern in Iran whether the United States is serious about wanting to reach an agreement.”¶ Zarif evidently was alluding to efforts in the U.S. Congress to pass tough new sanctions on Iran despite the completion of an interim agreement providing Tehran with a measure of relief from sanctions as a reward for freezing its nuclear program for at least six months to provide room for negotiations toward a final agreement. Those talks were what began on Tuesday, in relatively brief sessions that officials reported were devoted to discussions of how to move forward.¶ But Zarif indicated the momentum generated by the festive Nov. 24 signing of the interim accord — after decades of icy relations between Tehran and Washington — had been dissipated as hard-liners in both countries objected to the pact, though he clearly preferred to dwell on the American backlash. Skeptics of the talks in the U.S. Senate came within a vote of the supermajority that would override the veto President Obama vowed to use against a bill that would impose harsh new sanctions on Iran if talks broke down.¶ “I cannot be frank and honest with you and say that things have developed in the right direction, because people have started looking at it strictly from the perspective of their domestic constituencies,” Zarif said. “I believe we have lost basically the last two months in order to start cracking that wall of mistrust between the two countries.” He added, rallying a bit, “But I’m not pessimistic. We can move forward.”¶ Zarif faces skepticism among Iranian hard-liners as well — including the cleric who holds ultimate power in Iran, Supreme Leader Ayatullah Ali Khamenei. In a speech delivered on Monday, Khamenei offered support for Zarif’s efforts, and pledged fealty to the interim accord, but, after noting the opposition in Congress, added his usual dour assessment of American goodwill, “What our Foreign Ministry and officials have started will continue, and Iran will not violate its commitments,” Khamenei said. “But this will not lead anywhere.”

#### Bill’s coming, Obama can’t hold off pressure

Reinl 2-17 James, freelance foreign correspondent; “Iran and US: Tough talk as talks get tougher” *Al Jazeera*; February 17, 2014; http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/features/2014/02/iran-us-tough-talk-as-talks-get-tougher-201421775519711760.html

During that time, domestic tensions have risen in Iran and the United States. Hard-liners in each country have criticised their leaders for weakness by making too many concessions while hammering out deals with a long-standing enemy. ¶ US President Barack Obama has been attacked for appeasing Iran, leaving a key US ally, Israel, exposed - and for nudging Saudi Arabia and other Middle Eastern countries towards countering a potential Iranian threat by hatching their own nuclear plans. ¶ He struggled to dissuade US senators from derailing talks by seeking new anti-Iran sanctions in Congress. Obama has since used tougher language on Tehran, saying it has little wiggle room in proving that its nuclear work is peaceful. "If they meet what technically gives us those assurances, then there is a deal to be made," he said during a While House press conference alongside his French counterpart, Francois Hollande. "If they don't, there isn't." ¶ Iran rallies to mark 35 years of revolution¶ Rouhani's promise¶ Some 10,000km away in Tehran, Iranian President Hassan Rouhani has his own problems. Critics handed out leaflets during celebrations of the 35th anniversary of the Islamic Revolution on February 11, warning that sanctions would continue to hobble Iran even if it dropped its nuclear ambitions.¶ Rouhani's promise that Iran would pursue peaceful atomic research "forever" - together with news of the test launch of domestic-built long-range ballistic missiles with radar-evading capabilities - was widely seen as a sop to his critics. ¶ "The biggest danger remains attacks from hardliners in the US and Iran," said Meir Javedanfar, a politics lecturer at Israel's Interdisciplinary Center Herzliya. "In Iran, for now, it seems that Rouhani has the support of Ayatollah Khamenei. This is likely to give him room for manoeuvre. However, such support is not open ended, nor is it a blank cheque. Rouhani has to ensure that he always operates within the red-lines set by Iran's most powerful man." ¶ These pressures come as Iran joins the permanent members of the UN Security Council - Russia, France, Britain, the US and China - as well as Germany (the so-called "P5+1" group) in Austria's capital for the next stage of a reconciliation drive that is only expected to get harder. ¶ Interim deal¶ The interim deal, which took effect on January 20, saw Iran agree to a six-month curb on uranium enrichment and to avoid fuelling or commissioning a heavy-water reactor in Arak. In return, the P5+1 and the European Union provided sanctions relief valued at $6-7bn. ¶ To succeed, this week's talks must deliver a long-term solution by July 20. It must permit Iran's stated desire of using nuclear know-how peacefully while offering safeguards to satisfy the West that Tehran will not develop atomic weapons. ¶ Western diplomats appear to be softening on their stance that Iran must abandon all uranium enrichment, as is demanded in UN Security Council resolutions, and focusing on the "breakout time" it would take Iran to shift from uranium enrichment to building weapons. By maximising the breakout time, the US could maintain a window for launching military strikes on Iran, should Tehran trigger alerts from UN monitors by switching from peaceful atomic work to weapons-related activities. ¶ This will involve restricting the amount and purity of uranium Iran can enrich; the number of spinning centrifuge machines it can keep and use to refine uranium; the type of research carried out; and the ways in which UN inspectors keep tabs on nuclear sites. ¶ "There are hardliners in Iran and the US who oppose the nuclear agreement. In both countries they are for the moment reined back by the country's leader."¶ - Henry Precht, former US State Department official¶ Other hurdles include the Fordow underground enrichment site and a planned reactor at Arak. Iran says it will produce medical isotopes, but Western diplomats see it as a potential site for making weapons-grade plutonium. ¶ Fifty-fifty¶ Obama estimates the chance of a deal at no more than 50 percent. While the prospect of improved US-Iranian relations and forestalling more conflict in the Middle East is tantalising, many analysts say the US president is too optimistic. "If there is a genuine desire on the part of the Iranians to craft a new relationship with the United States, is that real opportunity going to survive what is a pretty tough political climate between the two countries?" asked Jim Lindsay, from the New York-based Council on Foreign Relations. ¶ As the discussions inch forward, businesspeople have started eyeballing Iran's 80 million consumers, some of the world's biggest oil and gas reserves and an economy worth around $500bn, which would be re-opened by the lifting of UN sanctions. ¶ A desire for trade could pressure some P5+1 members to push for an early lifting of sanctions, particularly if Iran appears to be "reasonable and moderate, and it is the US that is demanding too much," said Muhammad Sahimi, a nuclear expert at the University of Southern California. ¶ But, according to Sahimi, the biggest pressure remains on Rouhani. Iran's relatively moderate president, who replaced the firebrand Mahmoud Ahmadinejad in August, only has a limited time to show that bargaining with the US will work. "Khamenei will not support the negotiations indefinitely. They must bear fruit for Iran and preserve the country's nuclear rights. That fruit must be lifting of the sanctions," he said. "If the US drags its feet and wants Iran to surrender, it will not work." ¶ While Rouhani has to satisfy his conservatives, the same is true in Washington. ¶ "There are hardliners in Iran and the US who oppose the nuclear agreement. In both countries they are for the moment reined back by the country's leader," said Henry Precht, a former US State Department official. "The difference is that in Iran, hard-line mullahs are dependent on their leader. In the US, the president may think he is dependent on the opposition and eventually be obliged to yield."

#### This is a reversal of Obama’s previous doctrine, which would refuse support to an Israeli strike

Cole 13 Juan, Richard P. Mitchell Collegiate Professor of History, University of Michigan; specializes in Modern Middle Eastern and South Asian History; “Obama will Veto new Iran Sanctions, Israel War Mandate pushed by AIPAC Senators” *Informed Comment*; December 21, 2013; http://www.juancole.com/2013/12/sanctions-mandate-senators.html?utm\_source=feedburner&utm\_medium=feed&utm\_campaign=Feed%3A+juancole%2Fymbn+%28Informed+Comment%29

The bill they crafted includes $55 bn in new sanctions on Iran and requires the United States to support Netanyahu in any war he launches on Iran. (President Obama and his officials have in the past have hinted broadly that Israel is welcome to attack Iran but is on its own if it does so.)

#### **The war mandate encourages Israel to provoke war – it’s a signal of US backing**

McConnell 13 Scott, Founding Editor, The American Conservative; PhD, History, Columbia University; “Schumer-Menendez-Kirk Open the Back Door to War” *The American Conservative*; December 20, 2013; http://www.theamericanconservative.com/schumer-menendez-kirk-open-the-back-door-to-war/

Democrats Charles Schumer (N.Y.) and Robert Menendez (N.J.) have joined Republican Mark Kirk (Ill.) in placing a ticking bomb under President Obama’s Christmas tree. The bomb is an AIPAC-sponsored bill that commits the United States to stop Iran from enriching any uranium at all, and also requires the United States to “stand with Israel” in the event Netanyahu decides, for reasons of “self-defense,” to start a war with Iran. The purpose of the bill is transparent: to scuttle the P5+1 (U.S., Britain, France, Germany, Russia, and China) diplomacy with Tehran, because it is well known to everyone concerned that Iran is not going to abandon completely a nuclear energy program underway since the Shah was in power. Gary Sick, the Columbia University Iran expert, has posted on his website an open letter to Schumer, noting that the bill seeks to “remove any negotiating authority from the U.S. government by specifying in advance the terms of an impossible settlement.” Further, Sick observes, the bill “outsources any decision about resort to military action to the government of Israel, by committing the United States in advance to support any military action by Israel.” These are the two central points. Netanyahu wants war with Iran, but he doesn’t want to fight it by himself. Schumer, Menendez, and Kirk hope to compel the United States to step in and finish the job after Israel throws the first punch. But even if such a war were just (which it isn’t), or even if we had allies besides Israel (which we wouldn’t), the aftermath of such a war ends most likely (as the former hawk Kenneth Pollack argues in his exhaustive analysis “Unthinkable“) with an American occupation of Iran. At a cost in blood and treasure many times the invasion of Iraq. There is no realistic scenario under which Iran’s government is going abandon entirely its nuclear program. Schumer, Kirk, and Menendez know this perfectly well. Their resolution is a backdoor to war. They just don’t have the courage, as yet, to say so.

#### **US support for a first strike increases Israeli aggression exponentially. Absent US support, Israel won’t risk attack**

Giraldi 12 Philip, executive director, Council for the National Interest; former CIA officer; PhD, European History, University of London; “Entangled With Israel” The American Conservative; September 3, 2012; http://www.theamericanconservative.com/articles/entangled-with-israel/

Israel’s attempt to steer American foreign policy has been nowhere more evident than in the sustained campaign to move the United States in the direction of war with Iran,a war that serves no American interest unless one believes that Tehran is willing to spend billions of dollars to develop a nuclear weapon only to hand off the result to a terrorist group. The most recent overtures by the Israeli government have pushed the United States to make a declaration that negotiations with Iran have failed and will not be continued. For Israel, this is a necessary first step towards an American military intervention, as failed negotiations mean there is no way out of the impasse but by war, if the Iranians do not unilaterally concede on every disputed point. Two recent op-eds have elaborated the argument, promoting the necessity of convincing the Israelis that the United States is absolutely serious about using military force against Iran if the Iranians seek to retain any capacity to enrich uranium. One might note in passing that this new red line, sometimes also called the abstract “capability” to create a nuclear weapon, has been achieved by moving the goal posts back considerably. At one time Iran was threatened with a military response if it actually acquired a nuclear weapon (which is still the official position of the Obama administration), but earlier benchmarks within that policy saying that enrichment should not exceed 20 percent or that the enrichment should not take place on Iranian soil have been abandoned in favor of what now amounts to zero tolerance. Those who note that Iran, which is a signatory to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and is under IAEA inspection, has a clear legal right to enrich uranium for peaceful purposes have been ignored in favor of those who believe that Iran is somehow a special case. On August 17, the Washington Post and The New York Times featured op-eds explaining why the United States must do more to convince Israel not to attack Iran this year. Amos Yadlin, a former head of Israel’s military intelligence who is believed to be close to the country’s political leadership, argued in the Post that Obama must basically convince the Israelis that he will use force against Iran if sanctions do not convince the country’s leadership to abandon enrichment of nuclear fuel. Over at the Times, Dennis Ross, a former senior U.S. diplomat who has been described as Israel’s lawyer, made pretty much the same arguments. Both advocated giving Israel refueling tankers and special munitions that would enable an attack on Iran to be more effective, thereby widening the window of opportunity for sanctions to work, in light of Israeli arguments that hardened Iranian sites might soon be invulnerable to attack. Ross advocates giving Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu effectively a blank check, asking him what he will need to attack Iran and granting the Israeli government commitments for a full range of U.S. military support. Both Yadlin and Ross argue that it is necessary to create the conditions for Israel to delay a possible attack until 2013. As Yadlin puts it, “if the United States wants Israel to give sanctions and diplomacy more time, Israelis must know that they will not be left high and dry if these options fail.” Assuming that Ross and Yadlin are speaking for the Israeli government, which is almost certainly the case, Israel is essentially demanding a commitment from Washington to attack Iran unless the issue of Iran’s ability to enrich uranium is resolved through negotiation or through Iranian surrender of that right. In return, Israel will not attack Iran before the American election. So in effect, Washington would be promising to fight a war later if Israel does not start one now. Israel knows it cannot successfully attack Iran unilaterally and must have the United States along to do the heavy lifting. It also knows that the threat to attack Iran before the election is a powerful weapon, with neither Mitt Romney nor Barack Obama welcoming such a potentially game-changing diversion from their debate on the economy and jobs. Critics like Arnaud de Borchgrave have correctly noted that many former generals and intelligence officers in the United States and Israel have, in fact, decided that the basic premise is wrong. Iran does not pose a threat that could not be contained even if it does some day make the political decision to obtain a crude nuclear device. Launching a new war in the Middle East to prevent it from doing so would create “mayhem” throughout the region, guarantee a breakdown in Egypt-Israel relations, and create a perfect breeding ground for the civil war in Syria to spill out and lead to turmoil among all of its neighbors. American ships in the Persian Gulf would be attacked, unrest in Bahrain would turn to revolution, and the Palestinians would stage a new intifada. Israel would be bombarded from Lebanon and from Iran. Gas prices would soar, economic recovery would stall worldwide, and European nations now struggling to deal with unprecedented unemployment levels would watch the eurozone collapse before the rage of hundreds of thousands protesters in the streets. Americans would again become the targets of international terrorism. And there is another serious objection to going along with the Israeli government’s thinking. Israel is by its own volition not an ally of the United States in any technical sense because alliances are troublesome things that require rules of engagement and reciprocity, limiting the partners’ ability to act independently. If Israel obtains a virtual commitment from the United States to go to war in 2013, it would mean enjoying the benefits of having a powerful patron to do its fighting without any obligation in return, beyond delaying unilateral military action until a more suitable time. A guarantee from Washington for Israel’s security which still permits unilateral action by Netanyahu is all too reminiscent of the entangling arrangements that led to World War I. The fact that the murder of an Austrian Archduke in the Balkans led to a world war that killed tens of millions was due to promises not unlike what Israel is demanding today. If the United States commits to unconditional support for an Israeli attack on Iran, it will be a surrender of one of the defining attributes of national sovereignty: the power to choose when and where to go to war. Amos Yadlin suggests at one point that President Obama go to Congress and get approval in advance to take military action “to prevent Iran’s acquisition of a military nuclear capability.” Such a pre-approval for war certainly raises constitutional issues, but it also creates a virtual casus belli because Iran already has the “capability” to enrich uranium for potential military uses. A guarantee precludes any consideration that the United States might actually have an overriding national interest to avoid a war. It denies that the United States should be able to exercise complete sovereignty over the issue of Iran, and it also freezes the status quo, as if new ways of looking at the problem of the Iranian nuclear program could not evolve over the next few months. Washington should make no commitment to anyone about what it will do vis-à-vis Iran in 2013 no matter what inducements are offered. As the 19th-century British Prime Minister Lord Palmerston put it, “We have no eternal allies, and we have no perpetual enemies. Our interests are eternal and perpetual, and those interests it is our duty to follow.” Let America’s actual interests dictate U.S. foreign policy.

#### Israel won’t attack without US support – extremely sensitive to US concerns

Zanotti et al 12 (Jim Zanotti, Coordinator Specialist in Middle Eastern Affairs. Israel: Possible Military Strike Against Iran’s Nuclear Facilities. CRS. http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/mideast/R42443.pdf)

Despite the reference by Defense Minister Barak to the possible need for “overt or tacit support, particularly from America” before approving an Israel strike, it is unclear to what extent Israeli decisionmakers might be influenced by the stated positions and anticipated responses of U.S. policymakers in the Obama Administration and Congress regarding an attack. Not surprisingly, Israeli leaders are extremely sensitive to U.S. views for a variety of reasons, including but not limited to: • Strong U.S.-Israel relations dating back to when the United States was the first country to recognize the provisional Jewish government as the de facto government of Israel upon its declaration of statehood in May 1948; • Robust ongoing military and security cooperation, including significant U.S. arms sales and other forms of support; and • Trade ties and important bilateral economic and scientific cooperation.141 Israeli leaders’ perspectives about the possible effects of a strike on U.S. political and material assistance to Israel, possible negative security consequences for the United States from a potential Iranian retaliation, and the probability of future U.S. military action to prevent a nuclear-armed Iran may, among other considerations, influence the Israeli decisionmaking process An Israeli journalist wrote in March 2012 that Israel did not ask permission when it acted to prevent Saddam Hussein and Bashar al Asad from obtaining nuclear weapons, but that “the [Obama] administration can credibly counter that in neither case did Israeli unilateralism threaten to draw America into an armed conflict, as it does now.”142 According to three Israeli analysts (including two former officials) mentioned above: Even after the withdrawal of its troops from Iraq, the U.S. remains extremely exposed to Iranian retaliation—either directly against its forces in the area or by Iran’s attempting to ignite a broader conflict in the region—so an Israeli strike would harm U.S. interests in the region and would place many U.S. lives at risk. And while in an election year America’s political reaction to such a strike may be mitigated by domestic political considerations, the reaction of the U.S. defense community to an Israeli military strike might be extremely negative, as such an action might be seen as representing Israeli insensitivity to and disregard of U.S. priorities and concerns.143 Some reports have speculated that an Israeli decision to attack, if it occurs, could come before the U.S. presidential election in November 2012, with one Israeli report stating, “A second-term president, not constrained by electoral necessities, will be able to apply a lot more pressure on the Israeli government not to attack.”144 Separate from the question of whether the United States might support an Israeli strike on Iran, Israeli decisionmakers might be influenced by how they anticipate the United States would respond after an attack, including in the event of retaliation by Iran and its allies. Although the United States does not have a formal treaty obligation to defend Israel in the event it is attacked, successive Administrations have either stated or implied that the United States would act to protect Israel’s security if it were endangered—including by Iran—and have worked with Congress to ensure and bolster Israel’s “qualitative military edge” over regional security threats.145

#### Israel strikes trigger a massive war

Reuveny, 10 (Rafael Reuveny is a professor in the School of Public and Environmental Affairs at Indiana University. Con: Unilateral strike could trigger World War III, global depression, <http://gazettextra.com/news/2010/aug/07/con-unilateral-strike-could-trigger-world-war-iii-/#sthash.tGUOoSDf.dpuf>)

A unilateral Israeli strike on Iran’s nuclear facilities would likely have dire consequences, including a regional war, global economic collapse and a major power clash. For an Israeli campaign to succeed, it must be quick and decisive. This requires an attack that would be so overwhelming that Iran would not dare to respond in full force. Such an outcome is extremely unlikely since the locations of some of Iran’s nuclear facilities are not fully known and known facilities are buried deep underground. All of these widely spread facilities are shielded by elaborate air defense systems constructed not only by the Iranians but also the Chinese and, likely, the Russians as well. By now, Iran has also built redundant command and control systems and nuclear facilities, developed early warning systems, acquired ballistic and cruise missiles and upgraded and enlarged its armed forces. Because Iran is well-prepared, a single, conventional Israeli strike—or even numerous strikes—could not destroy all of its capabilities, giving Iran time to respond. Unlike Iraq, whose nuclear program Israel destroyed in 1981, Iran has a second-strike capability comprised of a coalition of Iranian, Syrian, Lebanese, Hezbollah, Hamas, and, perhaps, Turkish forces. Internal pressure might compel Jordan, Egypt, and the Palestinian Authority to join the assault, turning a bad situation into a regional war. During the 1973 Arab-Israeli War, at the apex of its power, Israel was saved from defeat by President Nixon’s shipment of weapons and planes. Today, Israel’s numerical inferiority is greater, and it faces more determined and better-equipped opponents. Despite Israel’s touted defense systems, Iranian coalition missiles, armed forces, and terrorist attacks would likely wreak havoc on its enemy, leading to a prolonged tit-for-tat. In the absence of massive U.S. assistance, Israel’s military resources may quickly dwindle, forcing it to use its alleged nuclear weapons, as it had reportedly almost done in 1973. An Israeli nuclear attack would likely destroy most of Iran’s capabilities, but a crippled Iran and its coalition could still attack neighboring oil facilities, unleash global terrorism, plant mines in the Persian Gulf and impair maritime trade in the Mediterranean, Red Sea and Indian Ocean. Middle Eastern oil shipments would likely slow to a trickle as production declines due to the war and insurance companies decide to drop their risky Middle Eastern clients. Iran and Venezuela would likely stop selling oil to the United States and Europe. The world economy would head into a tailspin; international acrimony would rise; and Iraqi and Afghani citizens might fully turn on the United States, immediately requiring the deployment of more American troops. Russia, China, Venezuela, and maybe Brazil and Turkey — all of which essentially support Iran — could be tempted to form an alliance and openly challenge the U.S. hegemony. Russia and China might rearm their injured Iranian protege overnight, just as Nixon rearmed Israel, and threaten to intervene, just as the U.S.S.R. threatened to join Egypt and Syria in 1973. President Obama’s response would likely put U.S. forces on nuclear alert, replaying Nixon’s nightmarish scenario. Iran may well feel duty-bound to respond to a unilateral attack by its Israeli archenemy, but it knows that it could not take on the United States head-to-head. In contrast, if the United States leads the attack, Iran’s response would likely be muted. If Iran chooses to absorb an American-led strike, its allies would likely protest and send weapons, but would probably not risk using force. While no one has a crystal ball, leaders should be risk-averse when choosing war as a foreign policy tool. If attacking Iran is deemed necessary, Israel must wait for an American green light. A unilateral Israeli strike could ultimately spark World War III.

#### Middle East wars escalate and go nuclear

**Russell 9** (James, Senior Lecturer in the Department of National Security Affairs – Naval Postgraduate School, “Strategic Stability Reconsidered: Prosepects for Nuclear War and Escalation in the Middle East,” Online)

Strategic stability in the region is thus undermined by various factors: (1) asymmetric interests in the bargaining framework that can introduce unpredictable behavior from actors; (2) the presence of non-state actors that introduce unpredictability into relationships between the antagonists; (3) incompatible assumptions about the structure of the deterrent relationship that makes the bargaining framework strategically unstable; (4) perceptions by Israel and the United States that its window of opportunity for military action is closing, which could prompt a preventive attack; (5) the prospect that Iran’s response to pre-emptive attacks could involve unconventional weapons, which could prompt escalation by Israel and/or the United States; (6) the lack of a communications framework to build trust and cooperation among framework participants. These systemic weaknesses in the coercive bargaining framework all suggest that escalation by any the parties could happen either on purpose or **as a result of miscalculation** or the pressures of wartime circumstance. Given these factors, it is disturbingly easy to imagine scenarios under which a conflict could **quickly escalate** in which the regional antagonists would consider the use of chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons. It would be a mistake to believe the nuclear taboo can somehow magically keep nuclear weapons from being used in the **context of an unstable strategic framework**. Systemic asymmetries between actors in fact suggest a certain increase in the probability of war – a war in which escalation could happen quickly and from a variety of participants. Once such a war starts, events would likely develop a momentum all their own and decision-making would consequently be shaped in unpredictable ways. The international community must take this possibility seriously, and muster every tool at its disposal to prevent such an outcome, which would be an unprecedented disaster for the peoples of the region, with **substantial risk for the entire world.**

#### And even if it doesn’t escalate, a small nuclear conflagration in the Middle East causes environmental damage significant enough to cause extinction

Beth Hoffman Staffwriter for Inside Bay Area, “'Nuclear winter' looms, experts say,” 2006 Lexis)

Researchers at the American Geophysical Union's annual meeting warned Monday that even a small regional nuclear war could burn enough cities to shroud the globe in black smoky shadow and usher in the manmade equivalent of the Little Ice Age. "Nuclear weapons represent the greatest single human threat to the planet, much more so than global warming," said Rutgers University atmospheric scientist Alan Robock. By dropping imaginary Hiroshima-sized bombs into some of the world's biggest cities, now swelled to tens of millions in population, University of Colorado researcher O. Brian Toon and colleagues found they could generate 100 times the fatalities and 100 times the climate-chilling smoke per kiloton of explosive power as all-out nuclear war between the United States and former Soviet Union. For most modern nuclear-war scenarios, the global impact isn't nuclear winter, the notion of smoke from incinerated cities blotting out the sun for years and starving most of the Earth's people. It's not even nuclear autumn, but rather an instant nuclear chill over most of the planet, accompanied by massive ozone loss and warming at the poles. That's what scientists' computer simulations suggest would happen if nuclear war broke out in a hot spot such as the Middle East, the North Korean peninsula or, the most modeled case, in Southeast Asia. Unlike in the Cold War, when the United States and Russia mostly targeted each other's nuclear, military and strategic industrial sites, young nuclear-armed nations have fewer weapons and might go for maximum effect by using them on cities, as the United States did in 1945. "We're at a perilous crossroads," Toon said. The spread of nuclear weapons worldwide combined with global migration into dense megacities form what he called "perhaps the greatest danger to the stability of society since the dawn of humanity." More than 20 years ago, researchers imagined a U.S.-Soviet nuclear holocaust would wreak havoc on the planet's climate. They showed the problem was potentially worse than feared: Massive urban fires would flush hundreds of millions of tons of black soot skyward, where -- heated by sunlight -- it would soar higher into the stratosphere and begin cooking off the protective ozone layer around the Earth. Huge losses of ozone would open the planet and its inhabitants to damaging radiation, while the warm soot would spread a pall sufficient to plunge the Earth into freezing year-round. The hundreds of millions who would starve exceeded those who would die in the initial blasts and radiation.

### Contention Two Is Negotiations

#### **Iranian fear of US invasion derails nuclear negotiations in the status quo**

AP 2-8 Associated Press; “Iran leader: Don't pin hope on sanctions relief” *Boston Herald*; February 8, 2014; http://bostonherald.com/news\_opinion/international/middle\_east/2014/02/iran\_leader\_dont\_pin\_hope\_on\_sanctions\_relief

Iran's Supreme Leader urged officials Saturday not to pin hopes for economic recovery on the sanctions relief from a landmark deal reached with world powers on Tehran's nuclear program.¶ Ayatollah Ali Khamenei also called on critics of the interim nuclear deal achieved on Nov. 24 in Geneva to be fair and give time to President Hassan Rouhani to pursue his policy of engagement with the outside world.¶ "The only solution to the country's economic problems is to employ (Iran's) infinite domestic capacities, not to pin hopes on the lifting of sanctions. No expectations from the enemy," Khamenei told army officers in Tehran.¶ Khamenei has given his blessing to Rouhani's outreach policies. But he also has held to the line that the United States is fundamentally Iran's adversary.¶ The deal is the centerpiece of Rouhani's policy. Iran on Jan. 20 stopped enriching uranium to 20 percent and started neutralizing its existing stockpile of that grade — just steps away from weapons material — in order to fulfil commitments reached under the interim deal.¶ The U.S. and the European Union also lifted some sanctions — blamed for a sharp devaluation of the Iranian rial over the last two years — in response to the Iranian moves. The currency has recovered somewhat since Rouhani took office last summer.¶ Under the historic deal, Iran agreed to halt its 20 percent enrichment program, but will continue enrichment up to 5 percent. It also will convert half of its stockpile of 20 percent enriched uranium to oxide, and dilute the remaining half to 5 percent.¶ In return, the U.S. and the EU simultaneously announced the lifting of sanctions on petrochemical products, insurance, gold and other precious metals, auto industry, passenger plane parts and services.¶ They also plan to release $4.2 billion Iranian assets of oil revenues blocked overseas, in eight installments over a period of six months. The first installment of $550 million was provided to Iran on Feb. 1, according to Iranian officials.¶ The interim Geneva accord will last for six months as Iran and the six-nation group — the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council plus Germany — negotiate a final deal. Those talks are to start Feb. 18 in Vienna.¶ Rouhani and his foreign minister, Mohammad Javad Zarif, have a tough task selling the accord to skeptics. Iran's hard-liners call the deal a "poisoned chalice," saying Rouhani made too many concessions in return for too little.¶ Prominent hard-liner Ayatollah Mohammad Taqi Mesbah Yazdi earlier this week accused the president of selling Iran's "dignity" under the Geneva deal.¶ But Khamenei defended Rouhani and urged critics to be patient and fair.¶ "No more than a few months have passed since the (Rouhani) government took office. Authorities should be given the opportunity to push forward strongly. Critics should show tolerance toward the government," he said in comments posted on his website, leader.ir.¶ Khamenei's support is crucial for Rouhani's diplomatic success in negotiations with the six-nation group.¶ Khamenei, who has the final say on all state matters, said American officials are "lying" when they say they are not seeking regime change in Iran.¶ "American officials tell our authorities at talks that they are not after regime change in Iran. They are lying because they won't hesitate a moment if they had the ability to do so," he said.¶ He said "tactics and methods can be changed but principles must remain rock solid."¶ Rouhani has said his countrymen elected him last June to change the country's foreign policy and shift away from the bombastic style adopted under his predecessor, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad. But he also asserts that the Islamic Republic's core principles will remain unchanged.

#### The threat of a US strike convinces Iran that they need a nuclear weapon for self-defense

Pillar ’13, Paul R. Pillar, 28 year CIA veteran, visiting prof at Georgetown for security studies and a member of the Center for Peace and Security Studies, International Security, Volume 38, Number 1, Summer 2013 “Correspondence: Nuclear Negotiations with Iran,” p. 179

Sebenius and Singh do acknowledge another difficulty: that Iran would perceive negotiations as merely a cover for a U.S. strategy of regime change. Oddly, they try to brush aside this problem by saying that the threat of military action “is not incompatible with negotiations, because it is a consequence of no deal rather than the actual U.S. objective” (p. 81). What matters for this purpose, however, is not the actual U.S. objective but the Iranian perception of it. American public discourse about Iran has already given Tehran ample reason to suspect that the objective is regime change. One of the most recent applications of U.S. military force in the Middle East— participation in the Western intervention to overthrow Muammar al-Qaddafi in Libya—probably has worsened the problem. The intervention ousted a regime that several years earlier had reached an agreement with the United States and the United Kingdom not only to give up its nuclear and other unconventional weapons programs, but to eschew international terrorism. That experience exacerbated what may be the biggest challenge in negotiating a nuclear deal with Tehran: convincing the Iranians that the United States not only wants an agreement with the Islamic Republic but would abide by it for the long term rather than, as with Libya, seizing the first good opportunity to overthrow the regime. Further saber rattling directed at Iran would exacerbate that challenge, as well as stoke whatever interest the Iranians have in acquiring nuclear weapons as a deterrent.

#### The issue of military intervention is comparatively a bigger issue than sanctions. Assuring Iran of US non-intervention is key

Gobry, 13 (Pascal-Emmanuel Gobry, lecturer at HEC Paris business school, A Completely Unrealistic Iran Grand Bargain Proposal. http://www.forbes.com/sites/pascalemmanuelgobry/2013/03/12/a-completely-unrealistic-iran-grand-bargain-proposal/)

It’s a testament to how dim the prospects of a sustainable solution to Iran‘s nuclear weapons program that we’ve forgotten what a good Endgame would look like: a Grand Bargain where Iran gets a wholesale lifting of sanctions and introduction into the “respectable” international community, access to civilian nuclear technology and acceptable security guarantees in exchange for abandoning its nuclear weapons program, submitting to international control thereof, and ending its sponsorship of terror groups. It’s at least possible to imagine a sanctions/sabotage program so crippling that the Iranian regime would fear losing the support of its middle class and seek a better way. The example of Burma shows that it’s at least conceivable that an international sanctions regime can motivate a tyrannical regime to implement some degree of reform. If we grant that the Iranian leadership would at least be theoretically amenable to such a Grand Bargain, it seems to me that the biggest holdup concerns the security guarantees. The Iranian leadership evidently believes (and, from their perspective, not without reason) that the United States wants not so much a nuclear-free Iran as regime change, and sees building nuclear capability as the only insurance policy against regime change. This is why I think that the US Libya intervention was such a blunder of epic proportions. Remember that Ghadafi struck a deal with the international community to abandon its WMDs, renounce terror and indemnize terror victims in exchange for respectability for the regime. The international community then reneged on the deal and militarily effected regime change in Libya (regardless of the humanitarian reasons for doing so, that is what happened). Much more than throwing the Sahel into turmoil (though that headache will be with us for decades), this is the key reason why Libya was such a fantastic blunder. Think about it from your average tinpot dictator’s perspective; the combined examples of Libya, Iraq and North Korea point to a very simple conclusion: if you have nukes, the US will mostly leave you alone; if you don’t, the US will jump at any pretext to bomb you into oblivion. Why US policymakers haven’t looked at the whole chessboard is mystifying to me. Any Grand Bargain deal that would have any chance of getting the Iranian leadership onboard would therefore have to square that circle and provide iron-clad security guarantees to the Iranian regime. It can’t be a “cross your heart” promise from the US and Israel not to attack Iran, because that wouldn’t be credible. Iran would have to get an ironclad, credible security guarantee.

#### The war mandate makes this scenario especially likely

Larison 13 Daniel, senior editor, The American Conservative; PhD, History, The University of Chicago; “Sabotaging Diplomacy with Iran” *The American Conservative;* December 23, 2013; http://www.theamericanconservative.com/larison/sabotaging-diplomacy-with-iran/

In addition to setting an unreasonable goal for a final deal, the bill endorses an Israeli attack on Iran and asserts that the U.S. should support that attack. The text reads: if the Government of Israel is compelled to take military action in legitimate self-defense against Iran’s nuclear weapon program, the United States Government should stand with Israel and provide, in accordance with the law of the United States and the constitutional responsibility of Congress to au-thorize the use of military force, diplomatic, military, and economic support to the Government of Israel in its defense of its territory, people, and existence. It can’t be stressed often enough that an illegal and unauthorized attack on Iran would have nothing to do with “legitimate self-defense.” So-called preventive war cannot ever really be waged in self-defense. No state is compelled to wage preventive war. It is a perfect example of an unnecessary and avoidable war. Regardless, Iran wouldn’t perceive an unprovoked attack on its territory by another state as legitimate or an act of self-defense, but as unwarranted aggression. If Congress passed this bill, and Obama signed it, they would be telling Iran that there was no point in pursuing a negotiated deal with the U.S. and the other members of the P5+1, because the U.S. would have already confirmed publicly that it has no problem with an Israeli attack on their country. Obama is right to threaten to veto the legislation, since signing it would be the equivalent of sabotaging his administration’s own diplomatic efforts.

Sanctions themselves won’t kill the deal –that’s just White House exaggeration

**Hudson 13**

John Hudson, national security reporter at Foreign Policy, Foreign Policy, 12/2/13, “How Congress Could Steamroll Iran Sanctions Past Obama", http://thecable.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2013/12/02/how\_congress\_could\_steamroll\_iran\_sanctions\_past\_obama //jchen

Though some Democrats fear burning bridges with the White House, aides tell The Cable that negotiations between senators in both parties are closing in on legislation that would impose new sanctions on Tehran after six months -- the length of the preliminary nuclear deal recently hammered out in Geneva. The bill would include an option to delay the punitive action if U.S. talks on a final deal appear promising. Despite earlier reports that Republican hawks would dismiss such legislation as overly lenient, a Senate aide says that's not the case.

Like perhaps no other foreign policy issue, Iran sanctions have pitted President Obama against a sizeable portion of his own party. In the last week, powerful Democrats such as Sens. Robert Menendez of New Jersey and Chuck Schumer of New York have openly defied the White House and advocated for new sanctions legislation.

On Friday, the administration attempted to demonstrate support for its Geneva deal by circulating a handout of lawmakers saying positive things about the agreement. But out of 535 members of the House and Senate, the White House only collected statements from 17 lawmakers -- in a list that counted mildly supportive tweets as endorsements.

In the latest sign of Democrats' open willingness to cross the administration, Menendez accused the White House of "fear-mongering" in its claims that new sanctions legislation would kill the nuclear deal and lead to war with Iran.

"As one of the architects of the sanctions regime we've had on Iran, this is exactly the process that has brought Iran to the negotiating table," Menendez told Face the Nation on Sunday. "While we have heard naysayers in the past say, no, we shouldn't pursue those sanctions, it seems to me that prospectively looking for sanctions that are invoked six months from the date of enactment ... sends a message to Iran, as it has throughout this process, that there is a consequence if you don't strike a successful deal."

Sources say a version of that proposal is currently being hammered out between Democrats and Republicans despite White House opposition. The law would work like this: If after six months, when the current interim deal with Iran is set to expire, no deal is made, then new sanctions against Tehran will take effect. However, if at that juncture, the White House needs more time to finish negotiating a final comprehensive deal, the bill gives the administration more flexibility.

#### Security concerns are the primary motivator of Iranian nuclearization – the plan causes denuclearization regardless of the success or failure of negotiations.

Bowman, 08 (Bradley Bowman is a 2007-2008 Council on Foreign Relations International Affairs Fellow.

Prior to his CFR fellowship, he served as an Assistant Professor of American Politics, Policy, and

Strategy in the Department of Social Sciences at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. The ‘Demand-Side’:

Avoiding a Nuclear-Armed Iran. Orbis 52.4)

As the Bush administration began the verbal escalation to war, Iran¶ opposed the U.S. invasion of Iraq. The relative ease with which the U.S.¶ military overthrew Saddam Hussein and occupied Baghdad in three weeks—¶ something Iran could not do in eight years—seems to have caused great¶ consternation in Tehran. After the Iraq invasion, then-Iranian President¶ Mohammad Khatami said, ‘‘They tell us that Syria is the next target, but¶ according to our reports, Iran could well follow.’’¶ 14¶ In April 2003, Iran found¶ itself essentially surrounded by U.S. forces commanded by a U.S. administra-¶ tion suggesting that Iran could be next. To Iran’s south, a powerful U.S. naval¶ presence patrolled the Persian Gulf, augmented by an impressive string of U.S.¶ military bases in Kuwait, Bahrain, Qatar, Oman, and the United Arab Emirate¶ (UAE). To Iran’s west, over 100,000 American troops guarded Iraq. To Iran’s¶ North, U.S. troops were present in Azerbaijan and the central Asian republics.¶ 15¶ To Iran’s east, significant numbers of U.S. and other NATO troops patrolled¶ Afghanistan.¶ This sense of encirclement and strategic vulnerability prompted Iran¶ to seek a ‘‘grand bargain’’ with the United States in May 2003, only three¶ weeks after the Iraq invasion. This offer, apparently approved by the¶ Supreme Leader and the result of intense internal debate in Tehran, repre-¶ sented a major shift in Iranian policy, offering to address every major U.S.¶ objection to Iranian foreign policy.¶ 16¶ When the United States rejected the¶ offer out-of-hand, it confirmed the arguments of the hardliners and undercut¶ those of the moderates, convincing many Iranians that the United States had¶ a greater interest in regime change than in policy change. This rejection of¶ the Iranian negotiating proposal may also have left some Iranians believing¶ that the United States opposed Iranian power and regional influence, not just¶ its policies. Such an Iranian perception lead many in Tehran to conclude¶ that they are unable to negotiate with the United States, motivating their¶ leadership to push ahead with policies they might otherwise view as¶ negotiable.¶ Some leading observers dismiss the security motivation for the Iranian¶ nuclear weapons program, citing examples of confident and dismissive Iranian¶ rhetoric. In a comment, before the 2007 NIE release, for instance, Brigadier¶ General Mohammad-Ali Jafari, head of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps,¶ downplayed a U.S. attack as ‘‘highly unlikely.’’ If the United States were to mount an attack on Iran, Jafari said Iran has ‘‘the proper means to nullify its¶ aggression.’’¶ 17¶ U.S. analysts and decision makers should not consider such¶ comments evidence that security from a U.S. attack does not represent an¶ important motivation for the Iranian nuclear program. High level Iranian¶ officials put forward a brave face in public, but are fearful in private. In¶ public, Iranian officials issue the standard lines similar to those of Jafari; in¶ private, these individuals quietly and anxiously ask questions such as, ‘‘Do you¶ think the United States will attack?’’ These Iranian responses were echoed in¶ multiple interviews with Arab Government leaders and scholars. There is a¶ genuine concern in the region—among both Arabs and Iranians—that the¶ United States will attack Iran. While the December 2007 Iran NIE undoubtedly¶ diminished some of these fears, subsequent statements by Khamenei suggest¶ Iranian fears of a U.S. attack are reduced but still palpable. For example, in¶ January 2008, Khamenei argued that the time was not right for establishing¶ relations with the United States by underscoring that relations between¶ Washington and Baghdad did not preclude the United States from attacking¶ Iraq.¶ 18¶ Some argue that Iranian fears of a U.S. attack will compel the Iranians¶ to negotiate. However, my interviews suggest these Iranian fears are having¶ the opposite effect. Fears of a U.S. attack validate a long-running Iranian belief¶ that Iran needs nuclear weapons to deter a U.S. attack. Consequently, a self-¶ reinforcing interplay has developed in which Iranian nuclear progress invites¶ escalating U.S. threats, and these threats, in turn, encourage Iran to push ahead¶ with its nuclear program. Until this cycle is broken, the likelihood of war or a¶ nuclear-armed Iran will grow.

#### Iran proliferation causes regional proliferation.

Brookes, 10 (Peter, a Heritage Foundation senior fellow, is a former deputy assistant secretary of defense, Congressional staffer, CIA and State Department officer, and navy veteran. The Post-Iran Proliferation Cascade. Journal of International Security Affaris. Fall Winter 2010. 19. http://www.securityaffairs.org/issues/2010/19/brookes.php)

In just the last four years, no fewer than fourteen countries in the Middle East and North Africa have announced their intention to pursue civilian nuclear programs–programs which, irrespective of their stated purpose, many believe are a hedge against the possibility of a nuclear Iran. Possible Atomic Aspirants Syria United Arab Emirates Jordan Egypt Yemen Saudi Arabia Bahrain Kuwait Oman Qatar Algeria Libya Morocco Tunisia Of course, it is possible that the intentions of these states are honest ones, spurred on by domestic energy needs. Not all countries are blessed with abundant natural resources, and consequently could be seeking an efficient and durable source of energy. There are even those that may be attempting to diversify their energy sources beyond simply oil and natural gas, or seeking to free up their energy reserves for profitable international export instead of costly domestic consumption. In addition, due to increasing concerns about climate change, some have come to see nuclear power, once considered an expensive investment, as an attractive alternative to fossil fuels, due to its reduced emissions and potential cost efficiency. In some cases, it could also be an issue of national pride–a matter of keeping up with the nuclear Jones-es; or even an effort to demonstrate to your neighbors and the world the scientific and technical achievement involved in developing, building, and safely operating a peaceful, civilian nuclear power industry. Of course, developing an indigenous nuclear industry is a significant undertaking. A nuclear reactor can take a decade and three to ten billion dollars to build. Even more time and money is required if a full nuclear fuel cycle, including enrichment capacity, is desired. But such work is transformative. The development of scientific and technical capabilities for a civilian nuclear power program is instrumental to the subsequent building of the bomb. Even if it remains in compliance with the tenets of the NPT, a state can go quite a long way toward developing a nuclear program with a potential military dimension. Having the necessary nuclear infrastructure, especially that which would provide for a full nuclear fuel cycle, would allow concerned states to offset an Iranian nuclear breakout by possessing the theoretical potential to create a nuclear arsenal themselves. Indeed, some analysts see the construction of nuclear power plants in Saudi Arabia as symbolic of Riyadh’s dread over Iran’s nuclear activities, and as a move which will surely deepen tensions between the cross-Gulf rivals. In fact, many are convinced that the development of an Iranian Shi’a bomb will inevitably be matched by a Saudi Sunni bomb. It has long been rumored the Saudis have a deal with the Pakistanis for access to its nuclear inventory, or the stationing of Islamabad’s nuclear-capable missiles in the Kingdom in the likelihood of a change in Iran’s nuclear status.5 Of course, while this is possible, it does pose a number of political and strategic dilemmas for Pakistan, such as the health of its relationship with neighboring Iran, and a potential dilution of its nuclear deterrent against rival India. Egypt, the long-standing leader of the Arab world, operates two research reactors, has significant scientific and technical capabilities on nuclear matters, and is interested in nuclear power. Of course, developing a nuclear program with a military dimension is a possibility; however, doing so would surely hurt its ties with United States, could increase tensions with neighboring Israel, and drain less-than-plentiful government coffers. Other countries that have expressed an interest in nuclear power, such as Jordan, Morocco, and Tunisia, are likely doing so because of more local concerns. None of them have significant indigenous energy sources, and as a result are focused on the development of alternative energy sources. But that isn’t true for all of the states that have launched atomic plans. Kuwait and Qatar have significant holdings of oil and natural gas, which makes their respective decisions to pursue a nuclear program difficult to explain in a context other than that of a hedge against Iran’s growing capabilities. And in some cases, these nuclear dreams have started to become reality. For example, the United Arab Emirates (UAE), a country with the fifth largest proven oil reserves in the Middle East, last year completed a “123” agreement with the United States, paving the way for heightened nuclear cooperation and technology transfer between Washington and Abu Dhabi. During the Bush administration, Bahrain, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia also signed Memoranda of Understanding related to nuclear cooperation that–if pursued by the Obama White House–could lead to additional agreements such as the one struck with the UAE. Turkey, another major regional power and NATO member, is also considering its nuclear options. Since taking power in 2002, the country’s ruling Justice and Development Party (AKP) has plotted a friendlier course toward neighboring Iran, a country Ankara historically has seen as a competitor. But despite the current, warm ties, Ankara may eventually come to see Tehran as a regional rival that could “undercut Turkey’s desired role as a respected and powerful mediator between east and west,” according to a 2008 Report to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.6 Indeed, a shift in Ankara’s sentiments toward Tehran could incite interest in a nuclear program with a military dimension. And the current strains in Turkey’s existing relationships with the United States and Europe may make such a decision less taboo than in the past. Then there is Syria. Damascus was caught with its hands in the nuclear cookie jar when Israel destroyed its undeclared nuclear facility at al-Kibar back in 2007. That plant–likely a reactor capable of producing fissile material–was being built with North Korean assistance.7 Of course, Syria’s nuclear activities are not focused on checking Iran; indeed, given the enduring partnership between the two countries, Syria might be receiving nuclear assistance from Iran. Rather, Syria’s strategic efforts are directed toward Israel. Regional states are also banding together in pursuit of nuclear status. Most directly, the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC)–consisting of Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Bahrain, Oman, UAE, and Qatar–is now said to be contemplating a joint nuclear program that would pool resources and share electrical power among member states.8 And although some of the members’ interest in nuclear issues is stronger than others, as evidenced by the existence of separate indigenous programs, many analysts believe this joint effort was sparked specifically in response to Iran’s nuclear activities.9.

#### **Mid east proliferation causes nuclear war.**

Heisbourg ’12, [Francois Heisbourg, Chairman of the International Institute for Strategic Studies, prof at the Geneva Center for Security Policy, July 2012, “How Bad Would the Further Spread of Nuclear Weapons Be?”, <http://www.npolicy.org/userfiles/file/oving%20Beyond%20Pretense%20web%20version.pdf#page=182>]

Human societies tend to **lack the imagination to think through**, and to act upon, what have become known as “**black swan” events** 26 : **That which has never occurred** (or which has happened very rarely and in a wholly different context) **is deemed not to be in the field of reality,** and to which must be added eventualities that are denied because their consequences are too awful to contemplate. The extremes of human misconduct (the incredulity in the face of evidence of the Holocaust, the failure to imagine 9/11) bear testimony to this hardwired trait of our species. This would not normally warrant mention as a factor of growing salience if not for the recession into time of the original and only use of nuclear weapons in August 1945. Nonuse of nuclear weapons may soon be taken for granted rather than being an absolute taboo. Recent writing on the reputedly limited effects of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombs 27 may contribute to such a trend, in the name of reducing the legitimacy of nuclear weapons. Recent, and often compelling, historical accounts of the surrender of the Japanese Empire that downplay the role of the atomic bombings in comparison to early research can produce a similar effect, even if that may not have been the intention. 28 However desirable it has been, the end of atmospheric nuclear testing 29 has removed for more than three decades the periodic reminders that such monstrous detonations made as to the uniquely destructive nature of nuclear weapons. There is a real and growing risk that we forget what was obvious to those who first described in 1941 the unique nature of yet-to-be produced nuclear weapons. 30 The risk is no doubt higher in those states for which the history of World War II has little relevance and that have not had the will or the opportunity to wrestle at the time or ex post facto with the moral and strategic implications of the nuclear bombing of Japan in 1945. Unsustainable strains are possibly the single most compelling feature of contemporary proliferation. Examples include tight geographical constraints–with, for instance, New Delhi and Islamabad, located within 300 miles of each other; nuclear multi-polarity against the backdrop of multiple, crisscrossing sources of tension in the Middle East, as opposed to the relative simplicity of the U.S.-Soviet confrontation; the existence of doctrines, such as India’s “cold start,” and force postures, such as Pakistan’s broadening array of battle- field nukes, that rest on the expectation of early use; and the role of non-state actors as aggravating or triggering factors when they are perceived as operating with the connivance of an antagonist state (in the past, the assassination of the Austrian Archduke in Sarajevo in 1914; and in the future, Hezbollah operatives launching rockets with effect against Israel or Lashkar-e-Taiba commandos doing a “Bombay” redux in India?). Individually or in combination, **these factors test crisis management capabilities** more severely than anything seen during the Cold War with the partial exception of the Cuban Missile Crisis. Even the overabundant battlefield nuclear arsenals in Cold War Central Europe, with their iffy weapons’ safety and security arrangements, were less of a challenge: The U.S. and Soviet short-range nuclear weapons so deployed were not putting U.S. and Soviet territory and capitals at risk. It may be argued that these risk factors are known to potential protagonists and that they therefore will be led to avoid the sort of nuclear brinksmanship that characterized U.S. and Soviet behavior during the Cold War in crises such as the Korean War, Berlin, Cuba or the Yom Kippur War. Unfortunately, the multiple nuclear crises between India and Pakistan demonstrate no such prudence, rather the contrary. And were such restraint to feed into nuclear policy and crisis planning, along the lines of apparently greater U.S. and Soviet nuclear caution from the mid-seventies onwards, the fact would remain that initial intent rarely resists the strains of a complex, multiactor confrontation between inherently distrustful antagonists. It is also worth reflecting on the fact that during the 1980s there was real and acute fear in Soviet ruling circles that the West was preparing an out-of-the-blue nuclear strike, a fear which in turn fed into Soviet policies and dispositions. 31 The Cold War was a set of crises and misunderstandings that came within a whisker of a nuclear holocaust. India and Pakistan’s nuclear standoff is deeply unstable, not least as a result of the interaction with non-state actors. A multipolar nuclear Middle East would make the Cuban Missile Crisis look easy in comparison.

Great conflicts tend to occur when one or several of the antagonists views the status quo as sufficiently undesirable and/or unsustainable to prompt forceful pro-action. Notwithstanding widespread perceptions to the contrary, this was not the case of the USSR and the United States during the Cold War. The U.S. had chosen a policy of containment, as opposed to roll-back, of the Soviet Empire within the limits established as a result of World War II. The Soviet Union seized targets of opportunity outside of its 1945 area of control but avoided direct confrontation with U.S. forces. Messianic language from the USSR on the global victory of communism or from the U.S. about the end of the Evil Empire did not take precedence over the prime Soviet concern of preserving the Warsaw Pact and the U.S. pursuit of containment, or, no less crucially, their mutual con¿- dence that they could achieve these aims without going to war with each other No such generalization can be made about the Middle East, a region in which the very existence of a key state, Israel, is challenged, while other states have gone to war with each other (e.g. Iran-Iraq War, and the Gulf War of 1990-1991), or are riven by deep internal conflicts. Actors such as Hezbollah, with its organic and functional links with Islamic Iran and Alawite Syria, add to the complexities and dangers. Extreme views and actions vis à vis the strategic status quo are widely prevalent. Although the India-Pakistan relationship corresponds to something akin to the U.S.-Soviet “adversarial partnership,” that does not apply to radical non-state actors prevalent in Pakistan with more or less tight links to that country’s military intelligence services (ISI, Inter-Services Intelligence). The potential for danger is compounded by the variety of such groups: the Pashtu-related Pakistani Taliban (TTP), Kashmiri-related groups, and Jihadi militants from the core provinces of Punjab and Sind. Their common characteristics are extreme radicalism, high levels of operational pro¿ciency, and shared enmity of India. Their potential for triggering a conflict between the two countries is substantial, above and beyond the intentions of government of¿cials. sum, some seventy years after the launch of the Manhattan Project, there is every reason to upgrade and reinforce nonproliferation policies if nuclear use is to be avoided during the coming decades. Some markers to that end will be laid in our concluding section. What Is to Be Done? In light of the preceding analysis, the most obvious short run implication is the absolute need to secure a satisfactory conclusion of the Iranian file. Anything that feeds the perception of less-than full compliance of Iran with the strictest international safeguards or, worse, that creates the impression that recessed deterrence is in place, would lead to further proliferation in the Middle East and beyond. What happens to the Iranian nuclear program will be essential to the future of proliferation and nonproliferation prospects.

#### Iran proliferation is uniquely destabilizing -- multiple actors.

Joshi, 13 (Shashank, Research Fellow of the Royal United Services Institute. IV. THE IMPLICATIONS OF A NUCLEAR IRAN. Whitehall Papers Volume 79, Issue 1, 2012 Special Issue: The Permanent Crisis: Iran's Nuclear Trajectory.)

First, nuclear deterrence depends on attribution. Only by accurately attributing a nuclear strike to a single, deterrable entity can we hope to make our deterrent threats credible. When there are multiple nuclear entities, such a process of attribution grows more difficult. According to a recently declassified intelligence assessment from 1984, ‘the existence of the separately controlled US, British, and French strategic nuclear strike systems increase[d] Moscow's uncertainty about nuclear escalation’.89 This was not only because it was unclear which Soviet adversaries might participate in a retaliatory strike, but also because it would not always be clear which ones might have launched a first strike – particularly from submarines (it is notable that the US, too, had doubts over its ability to make such distinctions).90 The existence of separately controlled US and Israeli nuclear weapons therefore presents a challenge for Iran. Separately controlled Iranian and, say, Saudi Arabian nuclear weapons would generate similar problems for the US, Israel and Europe – and perhaps even Pakistan and India. The problem would worsen if India were in the future to deploy nuclear-armed submarines in the region. This problem is especially acute for three further reasons: first, the proximity of these states and the correspondingly short missile and, to a lesser extent, aircraft flight times;91 second, the lack of sophisticated early-warning systems that could compensate for such short flight times; and third, the possession and deployment of dual-use ballistic missiles – that is, those capable of carrying both conventional and nuclear warheads. Each of these problems is a feature of the scenario in South Asia, where missile flight times are a matter of a few minutes.92 However, they assume greater prominence in a multipolar setting in which identifying the source of a nuclear strike may not be simple. Calculating Sufficiency and Vulnerability Second, multipolar nuclear relationships can complicate a state's calculations about the survivability and sufficiency of its own nuclear arsenal. States might resort to worst-case calculations and develop arsenals based on the aggregate nuclear capability of any plausible coalition of nuclear states ranged against them. Moreover, efforts to configure a deterrent to a number of different states is difficult, and increases the probability of error. As Christopher Ford observes, ‘the more players there are, the more chances there will be for the system to break down, through accident, error, miscalculation, miscommunication, or some other pathology’.93

#### The existential risk warrants the effort to avoid nuclear war

Rivers 2 Dennis Rivers, Nuclear Age Peace Foundation and the Peacemaker Community Revised March 30, 2002

Six Arguments for Abolishing Nuclear Weapons <http://nonukes.org/cd18_sixarg.htm>

Reason One: The entire world would be more secure if the planet were free of nuclear weapons.

Nuclear weapons are the only type of weapon in existence that have the capacity to annihilate the human species and countless other species.

The very existence of nuclear weapons leaves open the possibility that a nuclear exchange might take place. This could happen intentionally, inadvertently (as in the Cuban Missile Crisis when the U.S. and USSR almost blundered into nuclear war), or by an accidental launch. The list of historical false alarms is long; for instance, in 1979 someone fed a war game simulation into a North American Air Defense computer. Thinking that the alert was real, fighter planes were scrambled and nuclear bombers were readied before the error was discovered.

In the absence of total nuclear disarmament, terrorists might acquire nuclear weapons. Such a scenario has become more probable since the USSR dissolved. There have been many reports of attempts to smuggle weapons-grade plutonium from Russia. The fewer nuclear weapons there are in the world, the fewer there are for terrorists to try to steal. Every step toward the abolition of nuclear weapons would increase our security.

Without abolition, there is always the danger that nuclear weapons will proliferate - that more and more countries will obtain them. It is ultimately unrealistic to expect that in a world in which some nations rely upon nuclear weapons, other nations will not seek to attain them. A world where there are many nuclear-armed countries would be even more dangerous.

The end of the Cold War has meant that there are no more nuclear-armed opponents, except India and Pakistan. Nuclear weapons do not serve even an arguable purpose when a country has friendly relations with a former opponent.

#### **Iran has the capability to build a bomb**

Heinonen and Henderson, 13 (Simon Henderson is the Baker Fellow and director of the Gulf and Energy Policy Program at The Washington Institute. Olli Heinonen is a senior fellow at the Harvard Kennedy School's Belfer Center and a former deputy director-general for safeguards at the IAEA. Rouhani and Iran's Nuclear Progress. http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/policy-analysis/view/rouhani-and-irans-nuclear-progress)

Uranium enrichment. Iran continues to enrich uranium and increase the number of centrifuges installed, including around 18,000 of the IR-1 type centrifuge and 1,000 of the more efficient IR-2m type. Yet it will not need more than a small fraction of the enriched uranium it has already produced in the foreseeable future, let alone new uranium. Its sole nuclear power reactor uses low-enriched fuel supplied by Russia. Tehran persists in claiming that it needs some of the new enriched uranium it is producing to fuel a research reactor in the capital, despite refusing a past international offer to supply such fuel. Worryingly, this research reactor requires 19.75 percent enriched uranium; Iran is currently producing 20 percent enriched fuel for it. In 20 percent fuel, the ratio of ordinary uranium-238 to its fissile isotope uranium-235 has already been processed from the 993:7 figure seen in natural uranium to 28:7, just short of the 1:7 needed for weapons-grade uranium. Iran continues to convert some of its 20 percent uranium into an oxide form, but most of this oxide (apart from a small amount that has been further processed into fuel plates) should be considered part of the enriched stockpile because it is comparatively easy to reconvert into centrifuge feedstock. The increase in Iran's centrifuges and enriched uranium stockpile has opened the door for multiple breakout scenarios at the Natanz and Fordow enrichment plants, especially if there are other undeclared plants available. For the past three years, discussions of Iran's breakout potential centered on its steadily growing stockpile of 20 percent uranium, but the number of centrifuges is now so great that the arithmetic has changed: the government's huge stockpile of 3.5 percent enriched uranium is now a crucial part of the calculation. As a result, a previous diplomatic proposal -- asking Iran to cap enrichment at 20 percent and ship most of that material abroad -- is now much less relevant in terms of curbing the risk of breakout. The Arak heavy-water reactor. This research reactor will use natural-uranium (i.e., non-enriched) fuel rods, and it will be "moderated" using heavy water. Yet such reactors also produce plutonium, which could serve as an alternative nuclear explosive if separated from the spent fuel. Although Iranian officials told the IAEA that construction delays had pushed the reactor's start-up date to after the "first quarter of 2014," they subsequently indicated that "start-up" means "commissioning using nuclear material," according to a footnote in the latest report. This ambiguous phrasing could complicate any attempt to take military action against the facility if it became necessary, though another footnote indicates that Iranian officials told the IAEA three days before the report was published that they would give the agency notice "at least six months prior to the first introduction of nuclear material into the facility." As soon as nuclear fuel is brought to a reactor site, the whole facility becomes politically "unbombable" because of IAEA resolutions regarding attacks on safeguarded nuclear plants. And once the fuel is inserted and the reactor has gone critical, any military strikes could cause huge radiation emissions. (Israel's 1981 raid on Iraq's nuclear reactor and its reported 2007 raid on Syria's reactor both took place before nuclear material was inserted.) Possible military dimensions. The IAEA remains frustrated at Iran's lack of cooperation regarding "undisclosed nuclear-related activities involving military-related organizations, including the development of a nuclear payload for a missile." Tehran has dismissed these concerns, which focus on the Parchin facility on the outskirts of the capital. Unidentified "member states" have told the agency that Iran conducted "hydrodynamic experiments" at Parchin, an indication that it may be trying to perfect the type of implosion device needed to make an atomic bomb using highly enriched uranium or plutonium. The government continues to block IAEA requests to visit the site and has bulldozed and asphalted the areas of concern, preventing the agency from taking potentially revealing samples even if it were allowed there. IMPACT OF SYRIA DEBATE Since the IAEA released its Iran report, Washington and other capitals have been absorbed in the debate over allegations that Syrian used chemical weapons on its own people. President Obama decided to delay a U.S. response until Congress has had time to debate the evidence; intentionally or not, this approach may well affect the Iranian nuclear issue. Washington's current policy toward Iran is based on the belief that U.S. intelligence will provide timely warning if Tehran decides to make a nuclear bomb. The assumption is that Iran cannot break out and produce sufficient nuclear explosive for a weapon without the international community having time to spot what is going on, debate it, and counter it. Yet President Obama's delay on Syria creates doubt that he would behave in a sufficiently timely fashion to counter Iran. Meanwhile, Israel has long indicated that it will make its own assessment of Iran's nuclear progress. Last September, Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu presented his redline during a speech before the UN General Assembly: namely, Israel did not want Iran to acquire enough 20 percent enriched uranium to make a nuclear bomb if the material was further processed. Yet when one factors in gaseous centrifuge feedstock and oxide that could be reconverted to feedstock, Iran is now past this line. ROUHANI'S POSITION Despite being inaugurated only weeks ago, President Rouhani should hit the ground running on the nuclear issue. He served as Iran's top nuclear negotiator from 2003 to 2005 and was also involved in crafting nuclear policies as secretary of the Supreme National Security Council from 1989 to 2005. His election was widely attributed to his campaign promises of bringing relief from international nuclear sanctions. Since winning office, Rouhani has been assessing his strengths within Iran's power structure, which is dominated by Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei. He has also been crafting a new nuclear negotiating team. Although he has already publicly indicated that suspending the nuclear program is not an option, his administration's actual negotiating strategy has not yet crystallized. This strategy will be at least partly shaped by Tehran's assessment of President Obama's determination to act in Syria, a close ally of Iran. In other words, events in Damascus could be an important indicator of the direction and progress of nuclear negotiations with Iran.

### Plan

#### The United States federal government should statutorily prohibit the non-defensive introduction of United States armed forces into hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran.

### Contention Four Is Solvency

#### **A demonstration of congressional support is a prerequisite to negotiations – Iran doesn’t think Obama can deliver on his promises.**

Alterman, 13 (Jon B. Alterman holds the Zbigniew Brzezinski Chair in Global Security and Geostrategy and directs the Middle East program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS). Al-monitor. US-Iran Nuclear Deal Hinges On Syria Vote. http://www.al-monitor.com/pulse/originals/2013/09/us-iran-nuclear-deal-hinges-on-syria-vote.html)

To start, it is worth noting the extent to which foreign governments are sophisticated consumers of American political information. Decades of international cable news broadcasts and newspaper websites have brought intimate details of US politics into global capitals. Foreign ministers in the Middle East and beyond are US news junkies, and they seem increasingly distrustful of their embassies. For key US allies, the foreign minister often seems to have made him- or herself the US desk officer. Most can have a quite sophisticated discussion on congressional politics and their impact on US foreign relations. The Iranian government is no exception. While former president Mahmoud Ahmedinejad was emotional and shrill in his opposition to the United States, there remains in Iran a cadre of Western-trained technocrats, fluent in English and nuanced in their understanding of the world. President Hassan Rouhani has surrounded himself with such people, and Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei has charged them with investigating a different relationship between Iran and the United States. As they do so, they cannot help but be aware that on the eve of Rouhani’s inauguration, the US House of Representatives voted 400–20 to impose stiff additional sanctions on Iran**.** The House saw Rouhani’s electoral victory as a call for toughness, not potential compromise. If Iran were to make concessions in a negotiation with the United States, they would surely seek sanctions relief and other actions requiring congressional approval. To make such concessions toObama, they would need some confidence that he can deliver. A president who cannot bring around a hostile Congress is not a president with whom it is worth negotiating.

#### The United States should provide a security assurance to Iran.

Leverett and Leverett 08 (Flynt Leverett, senior fellow and director of the New America Foundation’s Geopolitics of Energy Initiative, served as senior director for Middle East affairs at the National Security Council. Hillary Mann Leverett, CEO of STRATEGA, a political risk consultancy, is a former Foreign Service officer who served as director for Iran, Afghanistan, and Persian Gulf affairs at the National Security Council. The Grand Bargain. http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/features/2008/0808.leverett.html)

From an Iranian perspective, one of the essential found-ations for a U.S.-Iranian grand bargain is a clear explanation of the American position toward the Islamic Republic. The United States would need to clarify that it is not seeking a change in the nature of the Iranian regime, but rather changes in Iranian policies that Washington considers problematic. The United States would also need to emphasize its commitment to the ongoing improvement of U.S.-Iranian relations.¶ In this regard, Iran would need the following assurances from the United States:¶ 1. As part of a strategic understanding addressing all issues of concern to both sides, the United States would commit not to use force to change the borders or form of government of the Islamic Republic of Iran. This is the essential substance of a U.S. security assurance.

#### Advocating for material rapprochement with Iran is key to challenge racist discourse that demonizes Iran

Richman 13 [Sheldon Richman is vice president and editor at The Future of Freedom Foundation in Fairfax, Va. (www.fff.org). OCTOBER 10, 2013 The War Caucus The Ongoing Demonization of Iran http://www.counterpunch.org/2013/10/10/the-ongoing-demonization-of-iran/]

So, despite overtures from the new Iranian president, Hassan Rouhani, Iran’s regime must still be demonized as a group of religious fanatics — mad mullahs — who cannot be reasoned with and who want nothing more than to lob nuclear warheads at the United States and Israel. Nonsense. Over a decade ago, Iran’s leaders made credible offers of cooperation with the United States that included peace with Israel. In fact, after the 9/11 attacks, the Iranian government tried to cooperate with the Bush administration on a number of fronts. The two sides actually began working together at the end of 2001, until hawkish American officials put a stop to it, as reporter Gareth Porter explained in 2006. Thus, Rouhani’s current efforts are not a “charm offensive” — as they are prejudicially labeled even by the media — but rather a renewal of Iran’s wish for détente. We rarely hear about the previous offers, perhaps because they conflict with the mainstream media’s dominant narrative of Iran as an implacable threat. Apparently those who want war with Iran — the neoconservatives, the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, the members of Congress beholden to AIPAC, and the government of Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu — make better news copy than would-be peacemakers. Too bad. War would be catastrophic. Let’s remember that the Islamic Republic of Iran arose only after a U.S.-backed despotism was overthrown in 1979. Rather than seeking to make amends for what had been inflicted on the Iranians, successive U.S. administrations worked to isolate and subvert Iran until a more pliant regime could be installed. Diplomats who favored rapprochement were ignored or marginalized — which suited the leaders of Israel, Saudi Arabia, and other Sunni Arab regimes allied with the United States. (Iran is dominated by Shi’ite Muslims, the sectarian rivals of the Sunnis.)

#### Academic debates about alternative policy strategies towards Iran are crucial to demonstrate the potential of cooperative diplomacy. The alternative cedes debates to neoconservatives who ensure continued policy failure and violence in the Middle East and beyond.

Ingram 13 [1. Paul Ingram is the Executive Director of the British American Security Information Council (BASIC), based in London and Washington (since 2007). He leads the UK Trident Commission secretariat in London, and BASIC’s work on the Middle East (Iran, Egypt, the Gulf States, and the WMD Free Zone initiative) and on NATO’s nuclear posture. He presented a peak-time weekly TV talk-show on global strategic issues on IRINN (domestic Iranian TV), for five years (2007-2012), and visited Iran several times in that period. He also taught at the UK National School of Government on their Top Management Programme (2007-2012). He has published a number of articles through BASIC, and other international media, available through the BASIC website: http://www.basicint.org/people/Paul-Ingram 2. Seyed Hossein Mousavian is a Research Scholar at the Program on Science and Global Security. He is a former diplomat who served as Iran’s Ambassador to Germany (1990-1997), head of the Foreign Relations Committee of Iran’s National Security Council (1997-2005) and as spokesman for Iran in its nuclear negotiations with the European Union (2003-5). He has taught at Islamic Azad University (Tehran), served as Vice President of Iran’s official Center for Strategic Research (Tehran) and was the editor in chief of the Tehran Times. Mousavian earned a PhD in international relations from the University of Kent in the U.K. His research focuses on options for resolving the crisis over Iran’s nuclear program through diplomacy and improving US-Iran relations. His most recent book is: The Iranian Nuclear Crisis: A Memoir, 2012, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 612 pages. A list of other recent publications are available here: http://www.princeton.edu/sgs/facultystaff/ seyed-hossein-mousavian/ Finding a way out of the nuclear dispute with Iran: back to basics Paul Ingram1 and Hossein Mousavian2 October 2013, http://www.basicint.org/sites/default/files/ingrammousavian-iranbacktobasics-2013\_1.pdf]

Conclusions: think positive Outcomes in the Middle East are dominated by pessimists who assume the worst of their competitors and more powerful external actors. We assume that because the region has been beset by conflict and bloodshed that this will always be the case. Our imagination and our optimism is stifled. Given the history and the depths of distrust, this is hardly surprising, and sometimes those assumptions are wellfounded. But every so often events can surprise us in positive ways, and Iran’s recent election should be doing just that right now. We have the freedom to escape the apparent traps we think we are in, and find new approaches that better meet our objectives to strengthen security and manage power relationships. We are not starting from scratch. Many years of diplomatic effort have gone into developing nonproliferation regimes, and a majority of states in the Middle East have ratified them. But their indefinite support cannot be taken for granted, when others in the region break those norms with impunity. It is better to work with the grain, recognize the rights that go with membership of these regimes, and cooperate with states that are developing dual-use technology to strengthen inspection and verification procedures. This is what President Rouhani is likely to be asking when he presents Iran’s package of proposals on the nuclear file, and we would do well to heed him. People view the acquisition of nuclear weapons by Iran with alarm. And quite right, it would be a major step backwards for everyone’s security and risk sparking a destabilizing arms race that can only lead to the use of nuclear weapons in the end, bar a miracle. But the approach taken by many members of the international community only serves to bestow upon nuclear weapons a power they do not naturally possess, and thereby unintentionally encourages this proliferation. It is time to change the tune of nuclear deterrence. This can best be done by the nuclear weapon states moving away from an ‘us-and-them’ strategy of technology denial while remaining attached to their own arsenals. Coercing Iran to give up its civilian nuclear power ambitions for fear they could be used to acquire the magic the nuclear weapon states claim for themselves will be a self-defeating strategy. If nuclear deterrence actually has the value many ascribe to it, then nuclear proliferation is inevitable, and with it, the eventual use of nuclear weapons. The U.S. intelligence community’s latest combined National Intelligence Estimate finds that Iran has no nuclear bomb, has not diverted fissile material, nor recently engaged in efforts to weaponize its capabilities, and has not yet made any decision to do so. The case against Iran is based upon fear of the possibilities rather than any legitimate proof of intention to break out of its NPT responsibilities. The same cannot be said of some other NPT members and their Treaty responsibilities. 43 years after the NPT came into force and 23 years after the end of the Cold War, the five nuclear weapon states, with over 20,000 nuclear warheads held among them, still act as if the Treaty gives them some form of indefinite legitimacy in their possession, and show little intent to engage in serious disarmament (beyond reductions in the numbers of warheads). India, Pakistan and Israel are allowed to develop their nuclear arsenals outside the NPT and thus severely undermine the Treaty, sometimes under the protection and implicit support of the United States (Israel), or where penalties are shallow and brief, only for the state to be accepted later into the nuclear club (India). It is time to open up a global cross-cultural and honest strategic dialogue about the role of nuclear deterrence in the twenty-first century, and the damage it does to the national security both of states targeted by nuclear weapons, and those engaged in the targeting. We need officials, analysts and academics to come together from the states with nuclear weapons and those with the potential capabilities to develop them to address this issue not just from a moral, legalistic or idealistic disarmament and non-proliferation angle, though this is indeed an important dimension, but also from a hardnosed military utility angle, and from an angle of safety and security. It is also important to consider the humanitarian impacts of the use of nuclear weapons, as this would serve to better underline just how unusable they are. We need to have a more honest debate around how the current strategy pursued by the international community is unintentionally driving Iranian responses that further deepen international suspicions. But we also need to discuss more openly why the acquisition of nuclear weapons by Iran would dramatically and directly undermine Iranian security and Iranian soft power amongst the constituencies it cares about. The possession of nuclear weapons is not a national right, whether that state is in or out of the NPT, of whatever status. The universal norm against the use of nuclear weapons has been building up over the decades, particularly since the end of the Cold War. We need to extend that norm to possession by any state. The security impact from possession and thus threat is international, and is an important but under-recognized block to the essential cooperative diplomacy required to address all the great global issues of our time – such as the management of ecosystems under pressure from growing populations and ever-increasing consumption, rising pollution, financial stress, poverty and migration.

# 2ac

#### No threatening programs and current defenses solve.

Orent 9 [Wendy, Ph.D. in anthropology from the University of Michigan, leading freelance science writer, and author of Plague: The Mysterious Past and Terrifying Future of the World's Most Dangerous Disease, "America's Bioterror Bugaboo." Los Angeles Times (Los Angeles, CA) 17 Jul 2009: A.29. SIRS Researcher. Web. 29 January 2010]

After the anthrax letter attacks of October 2001, the Bush administration pledged $57 billion to keep the nation safe from bioterror. Since then, the government has created a vast network of laboratories and institutions to track down and block **every remotely conceivable** form of bioterror threat. The Obama administration seems committed to continuing the biodefense push, having just appointed a zealous bioterror researcher as undersecretary of science and technology in the Department of Homeland Security. But is the threat really as great as we've been led to believe? Last summer, the FBI concluded that the anthrax letters that killed five Americans came not from abroad but from an American laboratory, the United States Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Diseases. Meanwhile, the Russian bioweapons program was officially shut down in 1992, and it's unlikely that anything remaining of it could pose much of a threat. Iraq, it has turned out, had no active program. And Al Qaeda's rudimentary explorations were interrupted, according to an Army War College report, by the U.S. invasion of Afghanistan.

#### No lashout.

Garfinkle 9 [Adam, PhD International Relations @ UPenn, former professor of foreign policy and Middle East politics @ UPenn and Johns Hopkins, and editor of The American Interest. “Does Nuclear Deterrence Apply in the Age of Terrorism?” Foreign Policy Research Institute, http://www.fpri.org/footnotes/1410.200905.garfinkle.nucleardeterrenceterrorism.html, May 2009]

Indeed, it would probably be so much easier to hide and deliver than if there were a bioweapons attack, it would not be obvious right away whether it was in fact an attack or a naturally occurring event—for example a smallpox, anthrax or possibly an Ebola outbreak. In the event of a nuclear terrorist incident, we would probably be able to trace back to the source of the attack and would thus probably be able to retaliate or in other ways ensure that those who struck us were never able to do so again. But after a bioweapons attack, it is more likely that we would not be able to trace back the source. Biotechnology, especially in conjunction with nanotechnology, is being conducted around the world today, and we do not even have a database on the research that is going on. There is no international agreement to build such a database either. We ought to have one, or we may in fact end up living one day in an age of WMD terror.

#### Credibility isn’t a thing

Mearsheimer 14 [John J., Political Science at UChicago, America Unhinged, January 2, The National Interest, From the January-February 2014 [1] issue]

First, the credibility problem is **greatly overrated**. As Daryl G. Press notes in his important book, Calculating Credibility [5], when a country backs down in a crisis, its credibility in subsequent crises is not reduced. “A country’s credibility, at least during crises,” he writes, “is driven not by its past behavior but rather by power and interests." Thus, the fact that America suffered a humiliating defeat in the Vietnam War did not lead Moscow to think that the U.S. commitment to defend Western Europe was not credible. So even if the United States fails to enforce the norm against the use of chemical weapons in Syria, there is no good reason to think the leadership in Tehran will conclude Washington is not serious about preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. After all, American policy makers have gone to enormous lengths over the past decade to make clear that a nuclear Iran is unacceptable.

#### New qualified evidence proves it won’t escalate.

Kang 10 [David, professor of international relations and business and director of the Korean Studies Institute at the University of Southern California. His latest book is East Asia Before the West: Five Centuries of Trade and Tribute (Columbia University Press, 2010). 12/31 . http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/koreas-new-cold-war-4653]

However, despite dueling artillery barrages and the sinking of a warship, pledges of “enormous retaliation,” in-your-face joint military exercises and urgent calls for talks, the risk of all-out war on the Korean peninsula is less than it has been at anytime in the past four decades. North Korea didn’t blink, because it had no intention of actually starting a major war. Rather than signifying a new round of escalating tension between North and South Korea, the events of the past year point to something else—a new cold war between the two sides. In fact, one of my pet peeves is the analogies we use to describe the situation between South and North Korea. We often call the situation a “powder keg” or a “tinderbox,” implying a very unstable situation in which one small spark could lead to a huge explosion. But the evidence actually leads to the opposite conclusion: we have gone sixty years without a major war, despite numerous “sparks” such as the skirmishing and shows of force that occurred over the past month. If one believes the situation is a tinderbox, the only explanation for six decades without a major war is that we have been extraordinarily lucky. I prefer the opposite explanation: deterrence is quite stable because both sides know the costs of a major war, and both sides—rhetoric and muscle-flexing aside—keep smaller incidents in their proper perspective.

#### Stronger statutory checks on Presidential war powers increase America’s resolve

Matthew C. Waxman 13, Professor of Law at Columbia Law School; Adjunct Senior Fellow for Law and Foreign Policy, Council on Foreign Relations, “The Constitutional Power to Threaten War”, Forthcoming in Yale Law Journal, vol. 123 (2014), 8/25/2013, PDF

A second argument, this one advanced by some congressionalists, is that stronger legislative checks on presidential uses of force would improve deterrent and coercive strategies by making them more selective and credible. The most credible U.S. threats, this argument holds, are those that carry formal approval by Congress, which reflects strong public support and willingness to bear the costs of war; requiring express legislative backing to make good on threats might therefore be thought to enhance the potency of threats by encouraging the President to seek congressional authorization before acting.181 A frequently cited instance is President Eisenhower’s request (soon granted) for standing congressional authorization to use force in the Taiwan Straits crises of the mid- and late-1950s – an authorization he claimed at the time was important to bolstering the credibility of U.S. threats to protect Formosa from Chinese aggression.182 (Eisenhower did not go so far as to suggest that congressional authorization ought to be legally required, however.) “It was [Eisenhower’s] seasoned judgment … that a commitment the United States would have much greater impact on allies and enemies alike because it would represent the collective judgment of the President and Congress,” concludes Louis Fisher. “Single-handed actions taken by a President, without the support of Congress and the people, can threaten national prestige and undermine the presidency. Eisenhower’s position was sound then. It is sound now.”183 A critical assumption here is that legal requirements of congressional participation in decisions to use force filters out unpopular uses of force, the threats of which are unlikely to be credible and which, if unsuccessful, undermine the credibility of future U.S. threats.¶ A third view is that legal clarity is important to U.S. coercive and deterrent strategies; that ambiguity as to the President’s powers to use force undermines the credibility of threats. Michael Reisman observed, for example, in 1989: “Lack of clarity in the allocation of competence and the uncertain congressional role will sow uncertainty among those who depend on U.S. effectiveness for security and the maintenance of world order. Some reduction in U.S. credibility and diplomatic effectiveness may result.”184 Such stress on legal clarity is common among lawyers, who usually regard it as important to planning, whereas strategists tend to see possible value in “constructive ambiguity”, or deliberate fudging of drawn lines as a negotiating tactic or for domestic political purposes.185 A critical assumption here is that clarity of constitutional or statutory design with respect to decisions about force exerts significant effects on foreign perceptions of U.S. resolve to make good on threats, if not by affecting the substance of U.S. policy commitments with regard to force then by pointing foreign actors to the appropriate institution or process for reading them.

#### No impact---power is self-defeating

Tom Engelhardt 5, created and runs the Tomdispatch.com website, a project of The Nation Institute where he is a Fellow. Each spring he is a Teaching Fellow at the Graduate School of Journalism at the University of California, Berkeley. <http://www.tomdispatch.com/post/32668/>

Here it is worth reviewing the positions Yoo advocated while in the executive branch and since, and their consequences in the "war on terror." At every turn, Yoo has sought to exploit the "flexibility" he finds in the Constitution to advocate an approach to the "war on terror" in which legal limits are either interpreted away or rejected outright. Just two weeks after the September 11 attacks, Yoo sent an extensive memo to Tim Flanigan, deputy White House counsel, arguing that the President had unilateral authority to use military force not only against the terrorists responsible for the September 11 attacks but against terrorists anywhere on the globe, with or without congressional authorization.¶ Yoo followed that opinion with a series of memos in January 2002 maintaining, against the strong objections of the State Department, that the Geneva Conventions should not be applied to any detainees captured in the conflict in Afghanistan. Yoo argued that the president could unilaterally suspend the conventions; that al-Qaeda was not party to the treaty; that Afghanistan was a "failed state" and therefore the president could ignore the fact that it had signed the conventions; and that the Taliban had failed to adhere to the requirements of the Geneva Conventions regarding the conduct of war and therefore deserved no protection. Nor, he argued, was the president bound by customary international law, which insists on humane treatment for all wartime detainees. Relying on Yoo's reasoning, the Bush administration claimed that it could capture and detain any person who the president said was a member or supporter of al-Qaeda or the Taliban, and could categorically deny all detainees the protections of the Geneva Conventions, including a hearing to permit them to challenge their status and restrictions on inhumane interrogation practices.¶ Echoing Yoo, Alberto Gonzales, then White House counsel, argued at the time that one of the principal reasons for denying detainees protection under the Geneva Conventions was to "preserve flexibility" and make it easier to "quickly obtain information from captured terrorists and their sponsors." When CIA officials reportedly raised concerns that the methods they were using to interrogate high-level al-Qaeda detainees -- such as waterboarding -- might subject them to criminal liability, Yoo was again consulted. In response, he drafted the August 1, 2002, torture memo, signed by his superior, Jay Bybee, and delivered to Gonzales. In that memo, Yoo "interpreted" the criminal and international law bans on torture in as narrow and legalistic a way as possible; his evident purpose was to allow government officials to use as much coercion as possible in interrogations.¶ Yoo wrote that threats of death are permissible if they do not threaten "imminent death," and that drugs designed to disrupt the personality may be administered so long as they do not "penetrate to the core of an individual's ability to perceive the world around him." He said that the law prohibiting torture did not prevent interrogators from inflicting mental harm so long as it was not "prolonged." Physical pain could be inflicted so long as it was less severe than the pain associated with "serious physical injury, such as organ failure, impairment of bodily function, or even death."¶ Even this interpretation did not preserve enough executive "flexibility" for Yoo. In a separate section of the memo, he argued that if these loopholes were not sufficient, the president was free to order outright torture. Any law limiting the president's authority to order torture during wartime, the memo claimed, would "violate the Constitution's sole vesting of the Commander-in-Chief authority in the President."¶ Since leaving the Justice Department, Yoo has also defended the practice of "extraordinary renditions," in which the United States has kidnapped numerous "suspects" in the war on terror and "rendered" them to third countries with records of torturing detainees. He has argued that the federal courts have no right to review actions by the president that are said to violate the War Powers Clause. And he has defended the practice of targeted assassinations, otherwise known as "summary executions."¶ In short, the flexibility Yoo advocates allows the administration to lock up human beings indefinitely without charges or hearings, to subject them to brutally coercive interrogation tactics, to send them to other countries with a record of doing worse, to assassinate persons it describes as the enemy without trial, and to keep the courts from interfering with all such actions.¶ Has such flexibility actually aided the U.S. in dealing with terrorism? In all likelihood, the policies and attitudes Yoo has advanced have made the country less secure. The abuses at Guantánamo and Abu Ghraib have become international embarrassments for the United States, and by many accounts have helped to recruit young people to join al-Qaeda. The U.S. has squandered the sympathy it had on September 12, 2001, and we now find ourselves in a world perhaps more hostile than ever before.¶ With respect to detainees, thanks to Yoo, the U.S. is now in an untenable bind: on the one hand, it has become increasingly unacceptable for the U.S. to hold hundreds of prisoners indefinitely without trying them; on the other hand our coercive and inhumane interrogation tactics have effectively granted many of the prisoners immunity from trial. Because the evidence we might use against them is tainted by their mistreatment, trials would likely turn into occasions for exposing the United States' brutal interrogation tactics. This predicament was entirely avoidable. Had we given alleged al-Qaeda detainees the fair hearings required by the Geneva Conventions at the outset, and had we conducted humane interrogations at Guantánamo, Abu Ghraib, Camp Mercury, and elsewhere, few would have objected to the U.S. holding some detainees for the duration of the military conflict, and we could have tried those responsible for war crimes. What has been so objectionable to many in the U.S. and abroad is the government's refusal to accept even the limited constraints of the laws of war.¶ The consequences of Yoo's vaunted "flexibility" have been self-destructive for the U.S. -- we have turned a world in which international law was on our side into one in which we see it as our enemy. The Pentagon's National Defense Strategy, issued in March 2005, states,¶ "Our strength as a nation state will continue to be challenged by those who employ a strategy of the weak, using international fora, judicial processes, and terrorism."¶ The proposition that judicial processes -- the very essence of the rule of law -- are to be dismissed as a strategy of the weak, akin to terrorism, suggests the continuing strength of Yoo's influence. When the rule of law is seen simply as a device used by terrorists, something has gone perilously wrong. Michael Ignatieff has written that "it is the very nature of a democracy that it not only does, but should, fight with one hand tied behind its back. It is also in the nature of democracy that it prevails against its enemies precisely because it does." Yoo persuaded the Bush administration to untie its hand and abandon the constraints of the rule of law. Perhaps that is why we are not prevailing.

#### No escalation.

Patrick 11 [Stewart, The Brutal Truth Failed states are mainly a threat to their own inhabitants. We should help them anyway. BY STEWART PATRICK | JULY/AUGUST 2011 http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/06/20/the\_brutal\_truth?page=full]

For analysts wondering where the next shoe may drop, the annual Failed States Index (FSI) produced by Foreign Policy and the Fund for Peace has become required reading. Launched in 2005, the index has spawned many imitators (including one I constructed in 2008 with Susan E. Rice, now the U.S. ambassador to the United Nations), but remains the marquee brand. Each year government officials and policy analysts pore over its rankings, seeking evidence of dramatic deterioration in the relative standing of the world's most troubled countries. This attention reflects a widespread conviction that state failure poses grave risks to international security, a view embraced by U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, who has warned of "the chaos that flows from failed states," and her Pentagon counterpart, Robert Gates, who called them "the main security challenge of our time." It may be time, however, to revisit our assumptions about just how much these troublesome countries matter to the rest of the world. The brutal truth is that the vast majority of weak, failing, and failed states pose risks primarily to their own inhabitants. When governments cannot discharge basic functions, their citizens pay the heaviest price. Countries in the top ranks of the FSI face a much higher risk of internal conflict, civil violence, and humanitarian catastrophe (both natural and man-made). They are settings for the worst human rights abuses, the overwhelming source of the world's refugees, and the places where most U.N. peacekeepers must go. Home to humanity's "bottom billion," they suffer low or negative economic growth, and their populations are more likely to be poor and malnourished; experience pervasive insecurity; endure gender discrimination; lack access to education, basic health care, and modern technology; and die young or suffer chronic illness. Think of Nigeria (No. 14 on the list), a country that spends only $10 per capita on health care annually and has an average life expectancy of just 46 years, or Zimbabwe (6), whose venal authoritarian leader, Robert Mugabe, has driven a once-promising country into repressive horror. Beyond those living in such countries, the heaviest brunt of state failure is borne by neighboring states; violent conflict, refugee flows, arms trafficking, and disease are rarely contained within national borders. A case in point has been the devastation wrought throughout Africa's Great Lakes region in the decade and a half since the Rwandan genocide, with warring militias, arms flows, and epidemics crisscrossing notional national frontiers. As the Great Lakes show, the risk of regional contagion is compounded when weak and vulnerable states are adjacent to other countries with similar characteristics and few defenses against spillovers. And even when they are not exporting violence, fragile states impose dramatic economic costs on their neighbors. According to Oxford University economist Paul Collier and his colleague Lisa Chauvet, the total cost of a single country falling into the "fragile state" category, for itself and its neighbors, may reach $85 billion. This is a gargantuan sum, equivalent to 70 percent of worldwide official development assistance from international donors in 2009. But such troubles -- bad as they are -- do not automatically endanger the wider world, much as it may be a convenient sales pitch to argue otherwise. The world, it turns out, is not quite as interdependent as advertised. What happens in the poorest, most marginalized, and most dysfunctional places in the developing world only rarely comes back to bite those living in the wealthy world. What happens in failed states often stays in failed states.

#### SOP inevitable -- a strong congress is built into the American system.

Annapolis Institute 11 (Imperial Congress costs us a fortune. http://www.annapolisinstitute.net/library/commentaries/imperial-congress-costs-us-fortune)

Another theory is the idea of the Imperial Congress. Unlike Europe's parliamentary systems, where strong executives dominate legislatures through strong parties, the American system has weak parties, a weak executive and a strong Congress.¶ The Imperial Congress, when a majority of its members can agree, can pretty much run the show. We saw this in the mid-1970s when Congress passed a series of laws, including the Budget Impoundment Control Act and the War Powers Act, which further undermined the constitutional powers of the president.¶ Initially the Imperial Congress got its way in the recent so-called Budget Summit. It forced the President to back down on his campaign promise of no new taxes, abandon his campaign pledge to re-establish a growth-producing capital gains exemption, and give up his demand for Congressional budget reform.¶ After the President did his public mea culpas, the Budget Summiteers reached agreement, but the Congressional leaders who cut the deal couldn't make it stick. Other members of Congress, the backbenchers, rebelled against their own leaderships.¶ So here we are, back where we started before the Summit. The real problem is that we have a Congress that can't make a deal with itself.¶ As a result, we are seeing in the U.S. what we have seen in so many other nations: a political system that is sabotaging the economic system.¶ Perhaps deep cuts in government spending, as required by Gramm-Rudman-Holings if the President and Congress can't reach an agreement, would be better than a patched together package of tax increases.¶ At least it would give voters a clear choice on Nov. 6, between incumbents who sidestepped the tough choices and got us into this mess, and newcomers who may show some backbone. An election that counts for something. Perhaps we should give it a try.

#### That ensures constant interventionary wars

Schlesinger 04, (Arthur M. Jr., Professor Emeritus, City University of New York Graduate Center, THE IMPERIAL PRESIDENCY, 2004, p. 497-498.)

There is little more typically American than to despair of the republic. As early as 1802, Hamilton pronounced the Constitution a “frail and worthless fabric.” Seventy years later Henry Adams declared that “the system of 1789” has “broken down.” The dirges of our own day are hardly novel. But the constitutional strain imposed by chronic international crisi is new. Tocqueville’s warning lingers. International crisis has given American Presidents the opportunity to exercise almost royal prerogatives. Some Presidents have exercised these prerogatives with circumspection. Others have succumbed to the delusion that American has been charged by the Almighty with a global mission to redeem fallen humanity. In The Imperial Presidency I doubted that a messianic foreign policy, America as world savior, was reconcilable with the American Constitution (see pages 163-166, 206-208, 298). Nearly two decades later, I conclude with the same question. When an American President conceives himself the appointed guardian of the world in which an eternal foreign threat requires a rapid and incessant deployment of men, weapons and decisions behind a wall of secrecy, the result can only be a radical disruption of the balance of the American Constitution. It is hard to reconcile the separation of powers with a foreign policy driven by an indignant ideology and disposed to intervene unilaterally and secretly everywhere around the planet. The Constitution must buckle under the weight of a vainglorious policy, aiming at the redemption of lesser breeds without law, relying on secret actions and duplicitous methods, involving the United States in useless wars and grandiose dreams.

#### **Afghanistan collapse inevitable**

Ajami 13 [Fouad Ajami](http://search.bloomberg.com/search?q=Fouad%20Ajami&site=wnews&client=wnews&proxystylesheet=wnews&output=xml_no_dtd&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&filter=p&getfields=wnnis&sort=date:D:S:d1&partialfields=-wnnis:NOAVSYND&lr=-lang_ja), senior fellow at Stanford University’s Hoover Institution Nov 26, 2013 Why Obama Keeps Putting Up With Karzai’s Chutzpah http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-11-26/why-obama-keeps-putting-up-with-karzai-s-chutzpah.html

With no national debate, with Congress mired in all sorts of disputes, Obama proposes a U.S. commitment in Afghanistan that runs to 2024. The hope that this commitment will produce a decent government that could defeat the Taliban is a thin reed. We should dispense with the illusion that the forces we train will stand up and fight, that an Afghan regime addicted to foreign handouts will come together when it truly matters.

With our guns and money, we have suspended the feuds of Afghanistan. When we truly pack up our gear, the hard truth of that country will win out. The warlords and the vultures will take what they can and leave the place to darkness and ruin.

#### Framework laws restrain the executive even when opposed.

Huq 12 [Aziz, Assistant Professor of Law, University of Chicago Law School, “Binding the Executive (by Law or by Politics),” The University of Chicago Law Review, 79:777]

There is some merit to this story. But in my view it again understates the observed effect of positive legal constraints on executive discretion. Recent scholarship, for example, has documented congressional influence on the shape of military policy via framework statutes. This work suggests Congress influences executive actions during military engagements through hearings and legislative proposals.75 Consistent with this account, two legal scholars have recently offered a revisionist history of constitutional war powers in which “Congress has been an active participant in setting the terms of battle,” in part because “congressional willingness to enact [ ] laws has only increased” over time.76 In the last decade, Congress has often taken the initiative on national security, such as enacting new statutes on military commissions in 2006 and 2009.77 Other recent landmark security reforms, such as a 2004 statute restructuring the intelligence community, 78 also had only lukewarm Oval Office support.79 Measured against a baseline of threshold executive preferences then, Congress has achieved nontrivial successes in shaping national security policy and institutions through both legislated and nonlegislated actions **even in the teeth of White House opposition**.80

#### De facto federalism limits instability.

Cordesman and Mann 6/26 [Anthony H. Cordesman and Sean T. Mann, Arleigh A. Burke Chair in Strategy at CSIS, AFGHANISTAN: THE FAILING ECONOMICS OF TRANSITION Third Working Draft: June 26, 2012 http://csis.org/files/publication/120626\_Afghan\_Uncert\_Econ\_Trans.pdf]

It is still clear, however, that the economics of Transition – and the level of future US and other donor military and civilian aid efforts – are critical if Afghanistan is to have a chance of creating a reasonable level of post-2014 security and stability. It is also important to remember – for all the problems involved in creating any form of successful ransition – that the various insurgent groups still represent relatively small, unpopular movements with ethnic and sectarian ties that limit their influence in many parts of the country. Even if the US and its allies cannot achieve the level of post-2014 stability and security they desire, this does not mean that Afghanistan cannot achieve relative stability based on some form of de facto federalism or sharing of power between the central government and given factions. This may limit insurgent gains and control as well as mitigate the risk that Afghanistan will become a center of terrorism.

#### No civil war – compromise is likely.

Dreyfuss 7/18 [Robert, independent, investigative journalist in the Washington, D.C, area, who writes frequently for The Nation, Rolling Stone, and other publications. His blog, The Dreyfuss Report, appears at TheNation.com. He is the author of ‘Devil’s Game: How the United States Helped Unleash Fundamentalist Islam’. Predictions for Afghan Civil War Are Foolhardy July 18, 2012 http://thediplomat.com/2012/07/18/predictions-for-afghan-civil-war-are-foolhardy/]

Far more likely, Afghanistan will muddle through – what some U.S. commanders call “Afghan good enough” – and both Afghanistan’s rambunctious factions and its trouble-making neighbors will look over the cliff and then decide that it’s time to compromise. Omar Samad thinks that’s probably what’s going to happen. Samad, former Afghan Ambassador to France and Canada, says that as long as a number of pieces fall into place between now and 2014, the various actors in the Afghan drama are likely to strike a deal, and he points to a series of Track II diplomatic encounters, most recently in Paris and Kyoto, to back this up. “Those who are concerned about a Taliban takeover and about an unjust power grab by the Taliban would be satisfied [with] a requirement that the Taliban accept to be a political force, and not an armed force,” says Samad, in an interview with The Diplomat. And, he says, if the Pakistani strategists who handle “the Taliban file” in Islamabad can be persuaded to cooperate, then an arrangement might be worked out. “The Taliban’s choice will be made easier if Pakistan plays a more constructive and helpful role,” he says.

#### Afghanistan’s stabilizing.

Stavridis 8/30 [James Stavridis, The Guardian, We will win in Afghanistan, 8/30/12, http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2012/aug/30/we-will-win-in-afghanistan]

We will win in Afghanistan Despite setbacks, the international effort to bring lasting peace and stability to Afghanistan is working Much has been written in the past week regarding Nato's ongoing efforts to bring peace and stability to Afghanistan. It is clear to me that the coalition of 50 nations with troops in Afghanistan today will face formidable challenges over the next few years. However, there has been measurable and substantial progress in three specific areas. First and foremost, Afghanistan is no longer a safe haven for terrorists, which was a primary goal of Nato member states. Second, Nato forces in Afghanistan have been training and operating alongside Afghan national security forces (ANSF) for many years now, and these efforts are delivering tangible results. Three-quarters of Afghan citizens now live in areas increasingly protected by Afghan army and police – who number today close to 350,000. Indeed, the capability and confidence of the ANSF has improved markedly over the last 18 months, to the point where it is making significant gains in the fight against the Taliban. As a result, this has been a particularly difficult summer for the insurgency, which has seen the elimination of two top-level commanders in the past few days alone. Over the next 28 months this progress will be expanded and solidified, so that the Afghan government will be fully in the lead for security by the end of 2014. This effort is on track and will succeed. Thirdly, the entire international community has made specific pledges to partner with Afghanistan over the long-term. At the recent Tokyo conference on Afghanistan, over 80 nations made significant commitments to finance the ANSF beyond 2014, and a generous programme of development and support will continue over the next four years. Afghan society is changing for the better every day. Today, there are more than 8 million children in 15,000 schools across Afghanistan, up from less than 1 million under the Taliban. Of the 8 million, 37% are girls; and of the 175,000 teachers, 30% are women. Mobile phones number over 18m, up from essentially zero under the Taliban. The economy has been growing by 5% annually for the past five years.

#### No Russian war.

MacGregor 11 [Lean, Mean Fighting Machine How to slash the Pentagon budget? Declare victory and go home. BY DOUGLAS MACGREGOR | APRIL 26, 2011 http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/04/26/lean\_mean\_fighting\_machine]

For one thing, there is no existential military threat to the United States or to its vital strategic interests. The nuclear arsenals in Russia and China could be used against the United States and its forces, but Russian and Chinese leaders have no incentive to contemplate suicide in a nuclear confrontation with the United States. Russia's diminished million-man armed forces are hard-pressed to modernize, let alone secure their own country, which borders 14 other states. For all its rhetoric, Russia's military focus is on restive Muslim populations in the Caucasus and Central Asia, not on NATO.

#### No war – regional powers have incentives to cooperate and relations are resilient.

Burns 6 [Nicholas, Under Secretary for Political Affairs, U.S. Department of State, “Knocking on NATO’s Open Door,” Feb 19, http://zagreb.usembassy.gov/issues/060221.htm]

A decade ago, the countries of Southeast Europe were reeling from the impact of Europe's bloodiest war in half a century. With the determined intervention of NATO, genocide and ethnic cleansing in Bosnia were brought to an end; a few years later in Kosovo, NATO again intervened to end ethnic cleansing in the region. Southeast Europe seemed to some a tangle of intractable inter-ethnic conflicts in which only massive international peacekeeping deployments could keep the warring parties apart. But the United States and its friends in the region looked to tell a different story: one that would require friends to make hard choices for the sake of a peaceful and prosperous future for their people. Today's story is indeed different, in part thanks to the tremendous efforts of Albania, Croatia and Macedonia. The region's nascent democracies have largely normalized their relations. Peacekeeping contingents have downsized, and a return to war is unlikely. The region is not only increasingly stable, but it contributes to international coalitions that work to end conflicts elsewhere. Southeast Europe is on the path to changing from being a consumer to a provider of security. On February 13 in Washington, the United States hosted the Foreign Ministers of Albania, Croatia, and Macedonia to discuss recent accomplishments of these members of the Adriatic Charter, or "A3." Founded in May 2003, the A3 brings Albania, Croatia and Macedonia into a partnership with the United States to advance their individual and collective candidacies for NATO and other Euro-Atlantic institutions. Serbia and Montenegro and Bosnia and Herzegovina were present as observers. At the meeting, we reviewed A3 progress on their individual NATO Membership Action Plans, and sought ways to bring NATO membership closer. We also shared lessons learned from deployments in international coalitions. Finally, we recommitted ourselves to our cooperation as friends and, if reforms continue to meet necessary standards, full Allies in the greatest Alliance in history: NATO. Not so long ago, such goals would have been impossible to imagine. The countries of the region have worked hard to gain this new status. With fresh memories of war and dictatorship, the A3 partners share a resolve to strengthen their democratic institutions, market economies and human rights, and to fight corruption and crime. The path to NATO and the European Union promotes a positive cycle of change: the more candidate countries do to pursue reforms required for membership, the more support they get for the accession process. Though difficult, the reforms are key to lasting peace and prosperity in the region.

# 1ar

#### their reasons it’s slow prove it’s riskier – costs mean less safety and crude bombs.

Busch, Associate Professor of Political Science, Department of Government, Christopher Newport University, former Research Fellow, Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Kennedy School of Government, ‘4 (Nathan E. No End In Sight: The Continuing Menace of Nuclear Proliferation. University Press of Kentucky, p. 302)

Moreover, a rapid development of nuclear arsenals could also increase the risks of accidental and unauthorized use, because the emerging NWSs would not necessarily have had time to establish the infrastructures and controls necessary for safe maintenance of their nuclear arsenals. Indeed, Waltz is confident that emerging NWSs will "have time to learn how to care for" their arsenals, because they "can build sizable forces only over long periods of time."" But if newly proliferating states have access to sufficient quantities of smuggled or stolen fissile materials, the time it would take to produce a sizable force could be greatly reduced. If NWSs have inadequate MPC&A, then Waltz's argument is much weaker: emerging NWSs would not necessarily have the time to learn about how to ensure the safe care of their nuclear weapons. Thus, the optimists' own arguments imply that adequate MPC&A must be implemented by established and aspiring nuclear weapons states.

#### **Statistically no basis for nuclear optimism.**

Hellman ’09

Martin E. Hellman, Ph.D., Professor Emeritus (Electrical Engineering) at Stanford University, 9-7-2009. [How Confident Should a Nuclear Optimist Be?, http://nuclearrisk.org/email23.php]

In a five-page essay in the September 7 issue of Newsweek, Jonathan Tepperman explains Why Obama Should Learn to Love the Bomb by quoting the dean of nuclear optimism, Prof. Kenneth Waltz: "We now have 64 years of experience since Hiroshima. It's striking and against all historical precedent that for that substantial period, there has not been any war among nuclear states." Tepperman calls for "coldblooded calculations about just how dangerous possessing them [nuclear weapons] actually is." This response rises to that challenge and shows that **the data used to justify nuclear optimism is highly misleading**. In the same way that life-insurance companies utilize statistical analysis to produce cold blooded projections of fatality rates for individuals, **statistics tells us that, to be 95% confident of our statements, we cannot project the last 64 years of nuclear non-use more than 21 years into the future**. And, **with the fate of the earth at stake, a higher confidence level would seem appropriate. To be 99% confident about our statements, nuclear optimism can only be justified for another 14 years**. Statistics does not rule out that we might survive significantly longer than these time horizons, but it does say that **the data thus far cannot be used to justify such hopes with any degree of confidence**. To understand why we can only be confident of surviving time horizons significantly shorter than the 64 years of non-use already experienced, it helps to consider related "space shuttle optimism" arguments that led to the loss of Challenger and her crew. The engineers who had designed the shuttle's booster engine tried to delay Challenger's final launch because the weather that morning was unusually cold, and previous cold weather launches had a higher incidence of partial "burn through" on O-rings designed to seal the booster. But those at NASA responsible for the launch decision suffered from the common misperception that the shuttle's prior 23 successful launches provided ample evidence that it was safe to proceed with launch number 24. Instead, as we now know, that launch suffered catastrophic burn through of the O-rings, with resultant loss of the shuttle and her entire crew. NASA's optimistic reasoning was literally dead wrong. Even 23 perfect launches would not have provided sufficient evidence to confidently predict success for launch number 24, and previous near misses, in the form of partial O-ring burn through, made optimism even more outrageous and unsupportable. **The unassailable, cold blooded conclusion provided by statistics** and Challenger's deadly lesson **is that 64 years of nuclear non-use, particularly with near misses such as the Cuban missile crisis, is no cause for nuclear optimism.**

#### They conflate what states should do with what they will do – no proof they’ll always be rational on nuclear weapons.

Sagan, Professor of Poli Sci at Stanford, Co-director of Center for International Security and Cooperation, ‘3 (Scott D. The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: A Debate Renewed, p. 83-84)

By assuming that all nuclear states will behave quite rationally and will therefore take all the necessary steps to fulfill the requirements of deterrence, Waltz and other nuclear proliferation optimists have confused prescriptions of what rational states *should* do with predictions of what real states *will* do. This is an error that the classical American realists rarely committed: Hans Morgenthau and George Kennan believed that states should follow the logic of balance-of-power politics, but their whole enterprise was animated by a fear that the United States would fail to do so.84 This is also an error that Waltz avoided in Theory of International Politics, where he noted that "the theory requires no assumptions of rationality . . . the theory says simply that if some do relatively well, others will emulate them or fall by the wayside."85 Adding this element of natural selection to a theory of international relations puts less of a burden on the assump¬tion of rationality. My approach is consistent with this vision. Many nuclear states may well behave sensibly, but some will not and will then "fall by the wayside." Falling by the wayside, however, means using their nuclear weapons in this case and thus has very serious implications for the whole international system.

#### Nukes don’t always deter war – multiple examples.

Sagan, Professor of Poli Sci at Stanford, Co-director of Center for International Security and Cooperation, ‘3 (Scott D. The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: A Debate Renewed, p. 175-176)

How far does the nuclear writ run? History suggests that while many states facing nuclear adversaries may well be cautious, some states have nevertheless launched attacks in the face of such uncertainty. In 1973, Egypt and Syria attacked Israel despite the fact that Israel had a small nuclear arsenal at the time. In 1982, Argentina invaded the British-owned Falkland Islands, despite the fact that Great Britain had hundreds of nuclear weapons. In January 1991, during the Persian Gulf war, Iraq launched barrage after barrage of SCUD missiles into the cities of Israel, despite Israel having an estimated one hundred nuclear weapons and long-range Jericho missiles in its possession. 35 After the invasion of Kuwait, Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir declared that "anyone attempting an attack on Israel will be bringing upon himself a great disaster." 36 How could Saddam Hussein have been absolutely certain that Israel would not retaliate with nuclear weapons? Governments take gambles, especially when they are in desperate straits. Nuclear weapons may well produce prudence, but it is a prudence that still leaves room for war.