## CASE

#### Technology is unproven and institutional inertia locks in conventional generators for the next several decades

New Scientist 11

[End our atomic legacy. Source: New Scientist; 3/26/2011, Vol. 209 Issue 2805, p5-5, 5/8p]

In the case of nuclear power, this approach could bring great benefits. One good example is the liquid fluoride thorium reactor, which as the name suggests, relies on the element thorium as a less risky alternative to uranium. Though the technology is as yet unproven, these reactors promise tantalising safety advantages, as we explain on page 8. These include cooling systems that sidestep the risk of hydrogen explosions of the kind that shattered Fukushima. So why don't we start anew? One reason is institutional inertia. It is so much easier to license a plant of known design, based on decades of experience, than spend time, effort and possibly a lot of money developing a novel design. That's probably why countries with vibrant economies and less bias towards legacy technologies, such as China and India, are showing most interest in thorium. As New Scientist argued last week, we have more to fear from climate change than nuclear power. That means, at least in the short term, nuclear power will remain an essential ingredient of efforts to curb carbon emissions. But given that four-fifths of our nuclear generating capacity is more than 20 years old, it would be sensible to make changes. While thorium reactors are still some way off, the latest generation of conventional reactors offers more comprehensive safety features (see page 11). In the wake of Fukushima, renewables will undoubtedly play a greater role. But the nuclear industry should also seize the opportunity to cut the umbilical cord with its military origins once and for all.

## Impact

### 2NC Impact Calculus – Magnitude

#### Extend Morgan 2009 – US and Israeli strikes are likely to use nuclear bunker busters because of unreliable intelligence causing global nuclear holocaust.

#### The impact is extinction – 3 scenarios [1.] Causes US-China-Russia nuclear war.

#### [2.] Middle East CBW conflict – causes extinction

Ochs 2

Richard, June 9, pg. <http://www.freefromterror.net/other_articles/abolish.html>.

Of all the weapons of mass destruction, the genetically engineered biological weapons, many without a known cure or vaccine, are an extreme danger to the continued survival of life on earth. Any perceived military value or deterrence pales in comparison to the great risk these weapons pose just sitting in vials in laboratories. While a "nuclear winter," resulting from a massive exchange of nuclear weapons, could also kill off most of life on earth and severely compromise the health of future generations, they are easier to control. Biological weapons, on the other hand, can get out of control very easily, as the recent anthrax attacks has demonstrated. There is no way to guarantee the security of these doomsday weapons because very tiny amounts can be stolen or accidentally released and then grow or be grown to horrendous proportions. The Black Death of the Middle Ages would be small in comparison to the potential damage bioweapons could cause. Abolition of chemical weapons is less of a priority because, while they can also kill millions of people outright, their persistence in the environment would be less than nuclear or biological agents or more localized. Hence, chemical weapons would have a lesser effect on future generations of innocent people and the natural environment. Like the Holocaust, once a localized chemical extermination is over, it is over. With nuclear and biological weapons, the killing will probably never end. Radioactive elements last tens of thousands of years and will keep causing cancers virtually forever. Potentially worse than that, bio-engineered agents by the hundreds with no known cure could wreck even greater calamity on the human race than could persistent radiation. AIDS and ebola viruses are just a small example of recently emerging plagues with no known cure or vaccine. Can we imagine hundreds of such plagues? HUMAN EXTINCTION IS NOW POSSIBLE.

#### [3.] Causes India-Pakistan conflict – that causes extinction

Fai 7/8/01 (Ghulam Nabi; Executive director - Kashmiri American Council) Washington Times l/n wbw

The foreign policy of the United States in South Asia should move from the lackadaisical and distant (with India crowned with a unilateral veto power) to aggressive involvement at the vortex. **The most dangerous place on the planet is** Kashmir, a disputed territory convulsed and illegally occupied for more than 53 years and **sandwiched between nuclear -capable India and Pakistan**. **It has ignited two wars** between the estranged South Asian rivals in 1948 and 1965, **and a third could trigger nuclear volleys and a nuclear winter threatening the entire globe**. The United States would enjoy no sanctuary. This apocalyptic vision is no idiosyncratic view. **The director of central intelligence, the Defense Department, and world experts generally place Kashmir at the peak of their nuclear worries**. **Both India and Pakistan are racing like thoroughbreds to bolster their nuclear arsenals and advanced delivery vehicles**. **Their defense budgets are climbing despite widespread misery amongst their populations**. Neither country has initialed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, or indicated an inclination to ratify an impending Fissile Material/Cut-off Convention.

## UQ

#### Obama winning nationally now

#### polls

Sherfinski Oct. 3rd

[David Sherfinski, October 3rd, 2012, National, Florida, Virginia poll numbers tighten; Obama up 8 in Ohio, <http://www.washingtontimes.com/blog/inside-politics/2012/oct/3/national-fla-va-poll-numbers-tighten-obama-8-ohio/>, uwyo//amp]

An NBC/Wall Street Journal poll among likely voters nationwide gives Mr. Obama a 3-point edge, at 49 percent to 46 percent — within the margin of error of 3.4 percentage points. Mr. Obama led by 5 points, 50 percent to 45 percent, in a poll from two weeks ago after the Democrats and Republicans held their national political conventions.

#### approval rating

Lombardo Oct. 2nd

[Steve Lombardo, Global CEO EdelmenBerland, October 2nd, 2012, Election Monitor: The Most Important Week of the Campaign, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/steve-lombardo/election-monitor-the-most_b_1932358.html?utm_hp_ref=@pollster>, uwyo//amp]

The president's job approval numbers are now in the re-elect zone. The latest Gallup poll has President Obama's approval rating at 50 percent. While this is slightly behind President G. W. Bush's September 2004 numbers, it is well ahead of where he was six months ago (42 percent). As you can see from the below chart, the two presidents to lose reelection -- President Carter and President G.H.W. Bush -- had an approval rating well below 50 percent in November. If the president's approval rating stays at or near 50 percent, he has a strong likelihood of winning reelection.

#### electoral college

Downie Oct. 4th

[James Downie, October 4th, 2012, Obama lost the first debate, but he will still win the election, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/post-partisan/post/obama-lost-the-first-debate-but-he-will-still-win-the-election/2012/10/04/9c3b7eb8-0deb-11e2-bd1a-b868e65d57eb_blog.html>, uwyo//amp]

Consider the task facing Romney going into Wednesday’s debate: Nationally, RealClearPolitics’s poll average had him down three points; Nate Silver’s model had him down four. He had held a lead in a major poll exactly once since the end of August. The electoral college looked even worse for him: RealClear’s map gave Obama 269 electoral votes safe or leaning to Romney’s 181 (with 88 in toss-up states); HuffPost Pollster gave Obama a 290-191 lead; and Nate Silver’s model had Obama winning an average of 319 electoral votes to Romney’s 218, a comfortable margin. Even Karl Rove had 277 votes safe or leaning to Obama, with another 70 as toss-ups.

#### Obama leading women now

#### polls

Salant & Giroux Oct. 2nd

[Jonathan D. Salant and Greg Giroux , October 2nd, 2012, Obama Leads Romney by 18 Points Among Women, <http://www.businessweek.com/news/2012-10-02/obama-leads-romney-nationally-with-18-point-edge-among-women>, uwyo//amp]

President Barack Obama’s advantage over Republican challenger Mitt Romney among female voters is similar to his pre-election margins four years ago, though Obama’s edge among all voters is smaller than at a similar point in 2008. Obama leads by 56 percent to 38 percent among women in a survey of likely voters released today by Quinnipiac University. Romney leads among men, 52 percent to 42 percent. He had a four- percentage-point advantage among all voters.

#### Large lead

Zuckerman Oct. 2nd

[Esther Zuckerman, October 2nd, 2012, Women Are Keeping Obama Ahead of Romney, http://www.theatlanticwire.com/politics/2012/10/women-are-keeping-obama-ahead-romney/57515/#, uwyo//amp]

Findings: Obama has an 18 point lead among women in a new Quinnipiac University national poll. Pollster: Quinnipiac Methodology: Landline and cell phone interviews with 1,912 likely voters September 25 through 30 with a margin of error of +/-2.2 percent. Why it matters: From Ann Romney's "I love you women" to the "war on women," the female demographic has been oft-discussed and hotly contested in this election season. Quinnipiac attributes Obama's 18 point lead with women to his small lead in the national race among likely voters. Yesterday Ronald Brownstein at the National Journal attributed Obama's lead in swing states to a "surprisingly strong performance among blue-collar white women who usually tilt toward the GOP." Caveat: While the Quinnipiac poll gives Obama a slightly larger lead than some recent polls, it's still pretty tight in general.

‘

## LINK

### 2NC A2 “Obama pushing nuclear now”

First- Link Magnifier-Congress isn’t in session until after the election, plan would force Obama to lobby congress to reconvene for the sole purpose of pushing through nuclear incentives –we control the uniqueness question

#### Second, Not pushing nuclear energy- policy initiatives slanted against nuclear industry

Wang 9/23

(Brian, Next Big Future, “Carnival of Nuclear Energy,” September 23, 2012, <http://nextbigfuture.com/2012/09/carnival-of-nuclear-energy-123.html//wyo-mm>)

This is due to a profound lack of influence in Washington by the nuclear industry, compared to other energy industries. Recently, some have tried to suggest that the industry (Exelon Corp., specifically) has had significant influence with Obama, due to campaign contributions and its presence in Illinois. This view is absurd. Here’s a question: What is the ONLY major energy source that was NOT mentioned at all in Obama’s Democratic convention speech? He (the Democratic candidate) even made brief mention of “clean coal”, but didn’t mention nuclear at all. Due in large part to this lack of influence, the current regulatory playing field is heavily slanted against nuclear, with nuclear’s requirements being orders of magnitude more strict than those applied to fossil fuels (as measured by dollars spent per unit of public health and safety benefit, etc.). Five years ago, it seemed like things were finally moving in a more fair, balanced direction, with the prospect of CO2 limits, etc., but now things seem set to get even worse.

Lack of influence means congressmen have no incentive to do the plan b/c won’t benefit their reelection efforts-partisanship guarantees uphill battle no congressman or woman wants due to record low approval ratings that might risk their reelection

AND special session guarantees Obama has to address it in his campaign rhetoric- he wouldn’t risk calling congress back unless he thought it would win him the election-

Campaign rhetoric is key to swing voters now because it determines whether or not they turnout- previous attempts to push nuclear led to low summer enthusiasm, but the impact has already been resolved

### Link Magnifier

#### Obama’s margin for error is small—plan deflates democrat enthusiasm

TNF 12

[1-3, The New Fuelist, Obama’s tall environmental task in 2012 http://www.newfuelist.com/blog/obama-coal-regulations-keystone-pipeline]

In case you can’t see it, that’s a treacherous tightrope Barack Obama is walking on these days whenever he steps into the circus-like national energy and environmental policy debate. And his margin for political error on environmental issues will shrink even more during this election year. To avoid alienating environmentalists who supported him in 2008, he must not forget to occasionally—and substantially—lean to the left. But if he wants to hold on to coveted independent voters who are more worried about the slumping economy than they are about pollution, he must also periodically shift back to the middle and right. The proposed Keystone XL pipeline embodies the President’s conundrum. From the right, calls for increased “energy security” and for the creation of (a disputed number) of pipeline-related jobs make it hard for him to say no. On the left, a large and organized anti-pipeline contingent has taken pains to turn the decision on the pipeline—which will carry crude made from Canadian oil sands, the extraction and production of which makes the fuel much more greenhouse gas-intense than conventional oil—into a political make-or-break for Obama on climate change. The administration spent 2011 establishing what it must view as a politically necessary middle ground on the environment. It engineered a drastic ratcheting up of fuel efficiency standards for automakers, and sold it as a way to both reduce greenhouse gas emissions and the burden on the consumer. It also introduced landmark regulations on air pollution from power plants, while placating utilities—and outraging many supporters—by delaying the EPA’s proposed tightening of the nation’s standards for smog. And it earned at least temporary relief from pressure to decide on the Keystone XL by punting the issue past the election, to 2013. But it’s going to be tougher to maintain balance on the tightrope this year. Congressional Republicans, by demanding a much-earlier Obama decision on the Keystone XL in exchange for their support of the recent payroll tax extension, have hinted at their party’s desire to force the President’s hand on environmental issues. The GOP’s presidential nominee will undoubtedly attempt to paint Obama as an over-regulator and irrational environmentalist—an attack line which will warrant a defense. And therein lies Obama’s tall task: to defend his administration’s substantial forays into environmental regulation in terms that resonate with independents whose main concern is the economy—all while simultaneously ensuring that his frustrated environmentalist supporters don’t completely lose their patience.

#### Energy is THE crucial issue

NJ 11

[National Journal, “Perry -- Like Obama -- Touts Questionable Job Gains in Energy Plan,” 10/14, <http://www.nationaljournal.com/energy/perry-like-obama-touts-questionable-job-gains-in-energy-plan-20111014>,uwyo//amp]

It’s not clear how the Perry campaign came up with the 1.2 million jobs number, but energy policy experts say it appears to be drawn from a publicity campaign by the American Petroleum Institute, the lobbying arm of the oil industry. For the past year, API has been running ads claiming that opening up U.S. public lands and waters to aggressive drilling would create 1 million jobs. API, naturally, was delighted with the speech. “It’s so important to have presidential candidates out there talking about the resources we have out there,” Rayola Douger, senior economic advisor for API, said of Perry’s speech. “We can bring 1 million jobs to the market in the decade if given [the] opportunity to do this development. Until now, no one but the oil and gas industry has been saying this.” It’s probably true that both mandating clean-energy development and aggressively pushing offshore drilling would create some new jobs. But the number of jobs in each of those sectors only represents about 1 percent of the economy. That a hard-right conservative candidate would seize on energy production and environmental regulation as his first line of attack against the sitting president is new in the political arena, said Kevin Book, an analyst with ClearView Energy Partners LLC. The linking of energy production to job creation and environmental rules to job stagnation signals that both issues are likely to be central to the rest of the 2012 election narrative. “You haven’t seen this before,” said Book. “Energy’s always been a supporting plank of the economy – now it’s being sold as a driver.” “You have a situation where environmental policy is a differentiating point. Energy and environment used to be also-rans. It really says something about politicization of energy, and of the EPA,” Book said. Republicans have been attacking EPA for the last year as a symbol of a government overregulation of industry, as the agency begins the process of rolling out nearly a dozen new environmental rules reining in pollution from coal plants and oil refineries. Although some of the rules were recently written, many date back to the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, a law signed by President George H.W. Bush, and are only now being implemented for the first time. The pileup of delayed rules has led to unprecedented levels of EPA action, which has industry grumbling. Perry tapped into that in his Friday speech, using the current rhetoric of his party to frame the rules as job destroyers. “If they have their way in shutting down gas and coal production, the Obama legacy will be more than 2.4 million energy jobs lost in oil, gas, and coal,” he told steel mill workers outside of Pittsburgh. “ The choice this election is between two very different visions for our country.” One big difference between Obama’s and Perry’s energy-jobs plans is a president’s ability to push it through. While it’s likely that Obama’s plan could have generated jobs in the renewable sector, there’s no way to know how many, since none of his climate or green-energy bills made it through Congress -- nor are they likely to as long as Republicans control one chamber.

#### Energy key -- Romney will use it to win election

Kingston 12

[John, Director of News @ Platts, focused on energy policy, “US election 2012: if not "all energy, all the time," a lot of energy for sure” The Barrel -- April 11 -- <http://www.platts.com/weblog/oilblog/2012/04/11/election_2012_i.html>]

Get ready for the energy election of 2012. Maybe because it was at a New York Times forum devoted to energy, so the inclination was to talk with that sort of grand vision. But three reporters for the Times who are out on the campaign trail made it clear to a packed room that energy will be a key area in which Mitt Romney goes after Barack Obama in 2012. As Helene Cooper, the Times' White House correspondent, noted, the Obama adminstration has a lot of confidence going into the campaign. But if national retail gasoline prices were to head toward the $5/gal mark, "all bets would be off." And lurking in the background to that is the possibility of some sort of spike in price driven by an Iranian incident. With the Romney vs. Obama race all but assured, the campaigns are now focusing more on each other, rather than on the GOP nominating process. As as the Times' domestic correspondent Jim Rutenberg said, "so far, energy is what the campaign is all about." The panelists showed two ads, one from the Obama campaign and one from American Crossroads, the Karl Rove-led group. We weren't able to find them online, but found similar ones that pretty much say the same thing as those shown at the Times forum. You can see them here and here. The "gist" of the American Crossroads ad, according to Rutenberg, is that "the Obama administration is shirking blame for everything," and is doing so on energy policy as well. "Drilling is down on federal lands, and federal lands' output is down." But Cooper quickly noted that the Obama administration's retort is that "it's down because we took a time out (the moratorium after Macondo)." Although that move still gets criticized in some quarters, the administration is "screaming about this," since it believes the drop in federal lands' output is justified by the actions it took in the wake of the Macondo spill. (This report does show that federal onshore production has risen, though the total is down. See page 5). When the President talks about energy, the Romney campaign "just loves it," according to Ashley Parker, the Times' reporter covering the former Massachussetts governor. "They like it because it gives (them) an opening." The candidates' statements on the stump are telling. For example, Parker said the presumptive GOP candidate only really started talking about energy last month. And when he does, he never fails to mention the Keystone XL pipeline project, and the Obama Administration's shelving of it, at least until 2013. The mere mention of Keystone XL, Parker said, makes the audience "go wild." By contrast, Cooper said the Obama administration talks about alternatives and touts the Chevy Volt. (Though in the ad that was shown to the conference, like the one linked to earlier here, the rise in US oil output also is front and center.) For the Obama administration, talking about "Big Oil" is not just about oil, Cooper noted. "This is the entire Obama campaign for this year," she said. Linking Romney to oil companies drives home the message that the multi-millionaire is "a patron of the rich. You're going to see that across the board. It's not just about energy." Or as she put it for both sides, eyeing gasoline prices: "That's what is going on...to see who takes the fall for this."

### LINK WALL

#### Only a risk of the link – public massively opposed to nuclear expansion and there’s no constituency to lobby for the plan.

CSI 12

[Civil Society Institue, “SURVEY: CONGRESS, WHITE HOUSE FOCUS ON FOSSIL FUELS, NUCLEAR POWER IS OUT OF TOUCH WITH VIEWS OF MAINSTREAM AMERICA” November 3 -- <http://www.civilsocietyinstitute.org/media/110311release.cfm>]

If Congress thinks it has found a winning issue in trashing wind and solar power ... and if the Obama Administration believes that voters will reward it for boosting coal, gas and nuclear power ... then both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue are making serious miscalculations about the sentiments of mainstream Americans - including Republicans and Tea Party supporters -- one year before the 2012 elections, according to the findings of a major survey of 1,049 Americans conducted October 21-24, 2011 by ORC International for the nonprofit and nonpartisan Civil Society Institute (CSI).¶ Documenting a major gulf between the views of Americans and the Congress/White House on energy policy, the CSI survey includes the following key findings:¶ • If Washington had to choose between fossil fuel/nuclear subsidies and wind/solar subsidies, "clean energy" aid would get support from three times more Americans than fossil fuel/nuclear energy subsidies. Only a bit more than one in 10 American adults (13 percent) - including just 20 percent of Republicans, 9 percent of Independents, 10 percent of Democrats, and only 24 percent of Tea Party supporters - are in favor of concentrating federal energy subsidies on the coal, nuclear power and natural gas industries. When it comes to focusing federal subsidies on wind and solar, 38 percent of all Americans are supportive -- about three times the support level for fossil fuel/nuclear subsidies. Only about one in 10 Americans (13 percent) - including just 26 percent of Tea Party supporters -- believes that "no energy source should receive federal subsidies."¶ • Fossil fuel subsidies are opposed by Americans on a bipartisan basis. Six in 10 Americans - including a strikingly uniform 59 percent of Republicans, 65 percent of Independents, 59 percent of Democrats, and 59 percent of Tea Party members -- oppose "federal subsidies for oil and gas, coal, natural gas and other fossil fuel companies."¶ • Nuclear reactor loan guarantees are opposed by Americans on a bipartisan basis. More than two out of three Americans (67 percent) - including 65 percent of Republicans, 66 percent of Independents, 68 percent of Democrats and 62 percent of Tea Party backers - disagree that "taxpayers and ratepayers should provide taxpayer-backed loan guarantees for the construction of new nuclear power reactors in the United States through proposed tens of billions in federal loan guarantees for new reactors."¶ • Most Americans want the U.S. to shift federal loan guarantee support from nuclear power to wind and solar energy. About seven in 10 Americans (71 percent) - including 55 percent of Republicans, 72 percent of Independents, 84 percent of Democrats, and almost half (47 percent) of Tea Party backers -- strongly or somewhat support "a shift of federal loan-guarantee support for energy away from nuclear reactors and towards clean renewable energy such as wind and solar."¶ • A strong majority of Americans want the U.S. to make the investments needed to be a clean energy leader on a global basis. More than three in four Americans (77 percent) - including 65 percent of Republicans, 75 percent of Independents, 88 percent of Democrats, and 56 percent of Tea Party members -- agree with the following statement: "The U.S. needs to be a clean energy technology leader and it should invest in the research and domestic manufacturing of wind, solar and energy efficiency technologies."¶ Pam Solo, founder and president, Civil Society Institute, said: "Americans of all political stripes have moved ahead of Washington and want our nation to make smarter choices about cleaner and safer sources of power. Common sense is the driving force in American opinion, which focuses not on whether Washington should help usher in a renewable, clean energy future, but how it should proceed in doing so. Americans believe that the energy industries have an undue influence over decisions made by Washington. They want leadership and problem solving from Washington for a clean energy future. Americans understand that we can no longer have our economy and environment tethered to 'old' energy solutions that are unsafe, unhealthy and simply unable to meet our long-term needs."¶ Graham Hueber, senior researcher, ORC International, said: "One clear message of this survey sit that there is no clear 'Old Fuel Constituency' in the sense of a large number of unified Americans who favor fossil fuels and nuclear power over wind and solar power. In fact, Republicans and Tea Party supporters who might seem like the most logical place for such a constituency are somewhat more likely than others to support federal subsidies for fossil fuels and nuclear power, but they also would prefer development of cleaner sources of energy. These are actually quite striking findings in the context of the 2012 election campaign."¶

#### Women are aligned against nuclear power

Hanger 2012

[John Hanger, Special Counsel at the law firm Eckert Seamans, operate Hanger Consulting LLC, and speak to diverse audiences, April 25, 2012, US Public Opinion Survey on Nuclear Energy: Women Turn Against Nukes, <http://www.dianuke.org/us-public-opinion-survey-on-nuclear-energy-women-turn-against-nukes/>, uwyo//amp]

Men overwhelmingly support nuclear power 72% to 27%. Women actually oppose nuclear power, with 51% opposing and 42% supporting. Men support nuclear power by 30 points more than women do. Women oppose nuclear power by 24% points more than men do. That is one of the bigger gender differences that I have ever seen on an issue. Other interesting facts in the Gallup poll are that the high point of support for nuclear power was 62% in 2010 and the low point was 46% in 2001. I am not sure what drove those numbers in those years. Perhaps it is nothing more than polling variability or noise. Or perhaps it has something to do with the economic times of 2001 and 2010. Bottom line is that US support for nuclear power remains strong and steady, though the issue has one of the biggest gender differences that I have ever seen.

### WOMEN KEY

#### They outvote men- guarantees women staying at home has a substantial impact

#### Particularly key to Obama

Ball 12

[Molly, national politics staff writer, “This election will be all about women” The Atlantic -- April 2 -- http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2012/04/this-election-will-be-all-about-women/255355/]

As the 2012 general election gets under way, analysts have posited that young, secular women are likely to be the most coveted swing group. The degree to which the Obama campaign can win them over may well be the single most pivotal factor in the campaign. But as Romney seeks to make inroads, he may need to find a new way of reaching women voters.

## INTERNAL LINK

### 2NC – AT: Obama = Strikes

#### Obama will block a strike

Aaron David Miller, distinguished scholar at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars and served as a Middle East negotiator in Democratic and Republican administrations, “Netanyahu’s red line isn’t getting him anywhere”, CNN, 9/28/2012

The logic of getting a great many countries to sign on to some new line in the sand on paper might make sense. Since Israel can't or won't (yet) enforce its own new red line -- Iran is moving to enrich higher levels of uranium -- it will require others to join it to be effective.¶ But this is a club few seem ready to join. Indeed, Israel's most important ally seems very reluctant to get locked into trip wires or red lines that might commit it to what Obama seems determined to try to avoid -- a military strike against Iran's nuclear sites.¶ In fact, the cruel reality from Netanyahu's perspective is that with the exception of Israel's government, which sees a putative military strike as a war of necessity, everyone else -- without exception -- sees it as a war of discretion.¶ Iran has no weapon. It hasn't tested one and doesn't have enough fissile material to produce one. Nobody is ready for Iraq War redux, least of all an American president who is running on extricating America from costly and unpredictable wars, not getting the United States into new ones.

#### Obama pushing sanctions, negotiations, and diplomacy

Karon 2012

[Tony Karon, senior editor at TIME, January 23, 2012, Amid New Sanctions, Obama Confronts the Challenges of Diplomacy With Iran, http://globalspin.blogs.time.com/2012/01/23/can-obama-and-iran-talk-their-way-out-of-war/#ixzz1kJ7xrO00, uwyo//amp]

Despite the deafening racket of the mass-media drums of war, neither President Obama or the Pentagon have an appetite for a confrontation with Iran that could unleash havoc across the Middle East, and would at best simply delay Tehran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons. Yet, although U.S. intelligence believes that Iran has not yet taken a decision to build weapons, it has also shown no inclination to halt its nuclear development despite facing an unprecedented array of sanctions. In an election year in which Obama’s opponents paint him as weak in the face of an Iranian menace they routinely exaggerate, and in the face of a continued Israeli threat to unilaterally initiate hostilities, the President finds his options narrowing. Monday’s formal adoption by the European Union of an embargo on Iranian oil tightens the screws of what Tehran views as a campaign of economic warfare by Western powers. At the same time, however, the Administration appears to be once again turning its attention to the vexed question of finding a diplomatic solution to the standoff. Negotiations are clearly on the minds of both sides. “Consensus can only be reached through serious negotiations based on a cooperative approach and not via the wrong path of sanctions,” said Iranian foreign ministry spokesman Ramin Mehmanparast on Saturday. And President Obama, in his interview with TIME’s Fareed Zakaria last week, stressed that sanctions are designed to urge Iran to take “a diplomatic path where they forego nuclear weapons, abide by international rules and can have peacefulnuclear power as other countries do, subject to the restrictions of the Non-Proliferation Treaty.”

#### Obama won’t strike Iran – empirics and the failure of political pressures prove

Gause, Professor of Political Science at the University of Vermont and Lustick, Bess W. Heyman Professor of Political Science at the University of Pennsylvania, 12

(F. Gregory the III, Ian S., Summer 2012, Middle East Policy Council, American and the Regional Powers in a Transforming Middle East, <http://www.mepc.org/journal/middle-east-policy-archives/america-and-regional-powers-transforming-middle-east>, accessed 7-4-2012, JKE

The problem posed for Washington in Iran currently is a striking example of how history, not repeating itself, nevertheless often rhymes. U.S. decision makers are confronting an intense campaign of public and private pressure, originating in Israel and from many of Israel's supporters in the United States, reinforced by some of America's Gulf allies, to "do something" about Iran. That "something" differs, among the advocates, from regime change to carrying out, participating in, or at least authorizing an attack on Iranian nuclear facilities. Once again, the specter of a totalitarian threat to the civilized world is portrayed as rising in Tehran — Red Communism in 1953, tyrannical Islamist fundamentalism in 2012. Debates rage, simulations are performed and wagers are made on insider.com. Will the United States and/or Israel attack Iran this year? The very fact that this is an issue of explicit and regular discussion is a major success for the Netanyahu government. It is a substantial justification for wondering if, indeed, the United States is more capable of implementing policies tailored to its interests now than it was during the Cold War or in Iraq during the George W. Bush administrations. We think it is. Despite this being an election year, when the leverage of Israeli governments over U.S. foreign policy is greatest, the United States will not attack Iran. The Obama administration is proving to be less susceptible to manipulation by its local allies than past administrations were, recognizing that its broader interests in a changing Middle East cannot be secured by military adventures. If such an attack does occur, it will be carried out by Israel against an American red light, not encouraged by an American green or yellow light. The administration's quiet but determined diplomacy has restrained Israel, while simultaneously implementing what is perhaps the most sophisticated and effective array of economic sanctions ever imposed on a country as large and important as Iran. It has organized a broad international front against Iranian proliferation and increased the pressure on Tehran at every level. It might not succeed, in the end, in preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear-weapons capability. But its approach has a much greater chance of success in preventing a nuclearized military confrontation in the region than a military strike that would unite Iranians (at least temporarily) behind their government, end domestic differences over nuclear strategy and, at best, set back its program a few years. In a broader context, the Iran case signifies that the United States is finding it easier to adapt to the disappearance of the old order in the Middle East than are local allies whose fundamental political logics are contradicted by twenty-first-century winds of change. Under this president, the United States is neither paralyzed against action out of fear of error, nor misled into a simplistic and dangerously uniform "doctrine." For evidence of the agility of American policy in the Middle East under the Obama administration, consider the degree to which policies in Iraq, Libya, Egypt and Syria have been specifically tailored to the challenges, opportunities and constraints those very different settings present, much as the administration's approach to the Iranian nuclear issue has been.

#### Obama won’t strike – prefers diplomacy and abhors sabre rattling

The Herald, Editorial, March 5th/2012

(3-5-2012, The Herald (Glasgow), *Obama Warns of Loose Talks on Iran Strike*, HS – News; Pg. 3, Lexis-Nexis, accessed 4-3-2012, JKE)

PRESIDENT Barack Obama has warned against loose talk of a war with Iran ahead of a meeting at which he will urge Israel s prime minister not to order a strike on the Islamic Republic s nuclear facilities. On the eve of his talks with Benjamin Netanyahu, Obama used a speech to the pro-Israel US lobby group, American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC), to pledge his support for the Jewish state and to argue that international sanctions on Iran must be given more time to work. I firmly believe that an opportunity remains for diplomacy backed by pressure to succeed, Obama told a crowd of 13,000 at the AIPAC policy conference. Obama said the bluster about a military strike was counter-productive because it has been driving up global oil prices, boosting demand for Iranian oil and helping to offset the impact of sanctions on its economy. Already, there is too much loose talk of war, the President said.

### 2NC – Romney = Strikes

#### [\_\_] Extend the Daily KOs 2012 evidence – the biggest foreign policy difference between Obama and Romney is their approach to Iran.

#### -Obama will continue to use negotiations and sanctions to pressure Iran without resorting to military action or kowtowing to Israeli pressure.

#### -Romney would do the opposite – his close friendship with Netanyahu and cowboy approach to foreign policy will result in a strike on Iran.

#### [\_\_] Romney ensures strikes:

#### – campaign rhetoric forces his hand

Collinson 2012

[Stephen Collinson, journalist, AFP, January 11, 2011, Republicans attack Iran, seek to wound Obama, http://news.yahoo.com/republicans-attack-iran-seek-wound-obama-025751227.html, uwyo//amp]

Talking tough on Iran, Republican White House hopefuls are trying to puncture President Barack Obama's national security armor in the cauldron of the 2012 election campaign. They disdain Obama as weak towards Tehran, demand regime change and propose military attacks on Iran's subterranean nuclear program. Ironically, the Republican assault comes as Obama aides and some independent analysts argue that US and allied pressure is actually working, as new sanctions take an unprecedented toll on the Iranian economy. But Republicans fault Obama for his vow to engage US enemies, expressed in his own White House campaign in 2008, and say the administration has balked at imposing the "crippling" sanctions it promised. Republican frontrunner Mitt Romney's rhetoric has been so stark that some critics worry he risks backing himself into a corner if elected president. "If we reelect Barack Obama, Iran will have a nuclear weapon. If you elect Mitt Romney ... they will not have a nuclear weapon," he said in November.

#### – he will present military action as the only option

Dilek 11

(Emine, “All Republican Candidates Favor War with Iran”, 9-20, http://www.addictinginfo.org/2011/09/20/all-republican-candidates-favor-war-with-iran/, DOA: 11-12-11,)

All Republican Candidates Favor War with Iran Prepare yourself my fellow Americans. If you elect a Republican President in the 2012 elections, more than likely we will be at war with Iran before his or her Presidency is over. In a disturbing new article written by Trita Parsi, a columnist for Salon.com, he expertly connects the dots on which single foreign policy issue is uniting all GOP candidates: Iran. He writes that when it comes to Arab Spring and all other foreign policy issues, GOP candidates are all over the place. But when it is about Iran, they all agree; USA must be tougher. Parsi asserts that “Republicans will present a narrative that diplomacy was tried and failed, sanctions are tough but insufficient, and the only remaining option is some form of military action. As the memory of the Iraq invasion slowly fades away, Republican strategists calculate, the American public will return to rewarding toughness over wisdom at the ballot boxes.”