

## Diplomatic Capital Disadvantage

<b><u>Diplomatic Capital Disadvantage.....</u></b>	<b><u>1</u></b>
<b><u>***Negative.....</u></b>	<b><u>2</u></b>
Position Overview .....	3
Diplomatic Capital Disadvantage 1NC 1/ .....	4
Diplomatic Capital Disadvantage 1NC 2/ .....	5
Diplomatic Capital Disadvantage 1NC 3/ .....	6
2NC Impact Overview .....	7
Uniqueness .....	8
Uniqueness – Answers to START .....	9
Link Wall.....	10
Internal Link .....	11
Internal Link .....	12
Impact – Answer to Deterrence Solves.....	13
Impact – Answer to No Arms Race .....	14
<b><u>***Affirmative Answers.....</u></b>	<b><u>15</u></b>
Diplomatic Capital 2AC .....	16
Diplomatic Capital 2AC .....	17
Diplomatic Capital 2AC .....	18

**\*\*\*Negative**

## **Position Overview**

The diplomatic capital disadvantage addresses the foreign policy implications of the affirmative plan. The argument holds that if Obama were to use his time and resources on the affirmative plan, he would not be able to also devote substantial time and resources to curbing Iran's nuclear program. Our Christian Science Monitor evidence states that Obama is currently planning to devote all of his attention to the Iran situation. Our second piece of evidence, from Stephen Walt, a professor of International Relations at Harvard University, states that Obama currently cannot focus on too many foreign policy issues at one time. If he forces more issues onto his plate, there will inevitably be trade-offs in other areas. Negative debates can argue that this means Iran's nuclear program will take a backseat to affirmative plan. Dennis Morgan, a professor at Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, outlines several potential consequences:

- Israel may launch preemptive strikes against Iran, hoping to cripple their nuclear program before it gets off the ground.
- Other nearby countries may respond with chemical, biological, or radiological weapons, which could spread rapidly and cause massive casualties.

The evidence goes on to say that even if each of these scenarios seem improbable by themselves, their collective total probability, spread out over a long period of time, makes them serious threats. Negatives can argue that both the plan and the Iran issue are pressing concerns, but there is only so much diplomatic capital that can be spent, and we must prioritize accordingly.

## Diplomatic Capital Disadvantage 1NC 1/

### **A – UNIQUENESS – Obama is preparing to ramp up diplomacy to stop Iranian nuclearization.**

**CSM 5-3-10** [“Iran's Ahmadinejad at NPT conference: Can Obama cut a nuclear deal with him?”, <http://www.csmonitor.com/Commentary/the-monitors-view/2010/0503/Iran-s-Ahmadinejad-at-NPT-conference-Can-Obama-cut-a-nuclear-deal-with-him>]

For one, **the United Nations Security Council appears poised to impose tougher sanctions on Iran over its violation of the NPT.** And in his speech, Ahmadinejad tried to deflect attention from Iran, focusing instead on Israel's nuclear arsenal and the slow pace of Western nations toward nuclear disarmament. And yet, **ultimately, if President Obama is to achieve his grand goal of a world without such weapons, he will need eventually to cut a deal with the Islamic Republic of Iran and its defiant leaders.** Mr. **Obama is taking small steps in that direction. The United States is expected to ask the NPT's 190 member nations at the month-long conference to endorse a plan to hold a Middle East conference aimed at ensuring a nuclear-free region,** starting with the appointment of a special UN envoy. **Such a step is a critical recognition by Obama that his denuclearization effort first requires more active diplomacy toward peace between rivals in the world if the NPT can continue to be a cornerstone for nonproliferation.** Previous attempts to improve the NPT faltered over the issue of Israel's weapons (highlighted by the 120-member Non-Aligned Movement). This time, Obama and Israel (which is not an NPT member) are more active in seeking to hold the proposed Middle East conference – but only after a peace agreement between Israel and its enemies in the region. That prospect may be a long way off, but it points to the problems that have eroded the NPT's effectiveness over the past four decades. The treaty's basic bargain is this: Nations that pledge not to seek nuclear weapons receive support for peaceful uses of atomic power while NPT members with such weapons must work to get rid of them. But both Iran and North Korea (the latter left the NPT and claims two nuclear tests) are breaking down that bargain. Their drive for nuclear capability and their rule-breaking of the treaty could touch a dangerous arms race in their regions – the very scenario that the NPT is designed to prevent. The hard question for President Obama now is this: What is he willing to do to achieve a zero-nuke world? He is already creating momentum for maintaining the NPT as an anti-arms-race tool. In addition to the possible Middle East conference, he was able to ink a new START pact with Russia in April that would further lower the number of nuclear warheads between the former cold-war foes – they still command 95 percent of the world's nukes. He has changed the conditions under which the US would use nuclear weapons. He held a conference in March aimed at securing atomic materials around the world. And he reportedly will add more transparency to the nuclear debate by revealing the number of US warheads. Such moves by Obama might warm up a majority of nations at the NPT conference to back US proposals aimed at improving the treaty. **The US seeks to beef up inspections of the nuclear programs by the International Atomic Energy Agency and to impose penalties on nations that leave or violate the treaty.** Those needed reforms should also help prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to terrorist groups. **Putting the nuclear genie back into a bottle will require all sorts of deals, trade-offs, and outbreaks of trust between longtime adversaries** (India and Pakistan, Russia and China, **Israel and Iran, to name a few**). **Is Mr. Obama up to the challenge?** So far, **he is moving as fast as he can.**

## Diplomatic Capital Disadvantage 1NC 2/

**B – LINK – The plan overloads Obama at a key moment, causing tradeoffs.**

**Walt, '09.** Stephen M, Prof of IR @ Harvard, "Nibbled to death by ducks?," 7-27, Foreign Policy, [http://walt.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2009/07/27/nibbled\\_to\\_death\\_by\\_ducks](http://walt.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2009/07/27/nibbled_to_death_by_ducks).

Moreover, **trying to advance the ball on so many different fronts simultaneously carries its own risks**. In particular, it provides governments that are opposed to some or all of Washington's agenda with an obvious way to respond: they can "just say no." In Taming American Power, I labeled this strategy "balking," (a term suggested to me by Seyom Brown) and I argued that it was a common way for weak states to prevent a dominant power from imposing its will. In a world where the United States remains significantly stronger than any other power, few states want to get into a direct test of strength with Washington. But American power is not so vast that it can simply snap its fingers and expect everyone to do its bidding. Why? Because exercising leverage is itself costly, and the more you do in one area, the more latitude that opponents somewhere else are likely to have. **There are still only 24 hours in a day, and the White House can't devote equal attention and political capital to every issue.** So states that don't want to do what Obama wants can delay, dither, obfuscate, drag their feet, or just say no, knowing that the United States doesn't have the resources, attention span, staying power, or political will to force their compliance now or monitor it afterwards. An even better tactic (perfected by a number of close U.S. allies) is to pretend to comply with American wishes while blithely going ahead with their own agendas. So NATO allies promise to increase their defense efforts but never manage to do much; Israel promises to stop building settlements but somehow the number of illegal settlers keeps growing, the Palestinians pledge to reform but make progress at a glacial pace, Pakistan suppresses jihadis with one hand and subsidizes them with the other, Iran agrees to negotiate but continues to enrich, China says it will crack down on copyright violations but the problem remains pervasive, and so on. In On War, Carl von Clausewitz famously described what he termed the "friction" of warfare; the accumulated set of minor obstacles and accidents that made even the simplest of objectives difficult to achieve. The same problem can arise in foreign policy: **even when everything is simple, "the simplest things are very difficult."** States that oppose what the United States is trying to do have lots of ways of increasing that friction without triggering an actual crisis. In other words, Obama's foreign policy may fail not because he loses some dramatic confrontation, but simply because a whole array of weaker actors manage to grind him down. **In this scenario he doesn't get vanquished, just "nibbled to death by ducks."** **Obama took office with energy, a new vision, an experienced team, and lengthy "to-do" list. But one can already sense the forward motion slowing, which will encourage opponents to dig their heels in deeper and throw more obstacles in his path. If the administration keeps trying to do everything at once, there is a real danger that their actual foreign policy achievements will be quite modest. The sooner they decide which goals they think they can actually bring off, and focus their energies there, the more likely they are to succeed.** And a **few tangible successes** now **might actually make the other items on their agenda easier to accomplish later on.**

## Diplomatic Capital Disadvantage 1NC 3/

**C – IMPACT – Stopping Iran is key to avert war. This includes the risk of WMD use.**

**Morgan '9** [Dennis Ray Morgan, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies at the Yongin Campus in South Korea, 2009, Futures, World on fire: two scenarios of the destruction of human civilization and possible extinction of the human race]

**Given the present day predicament regarding Iran's attempt to become a nuclear power,**

particular **attention should be given to** one of Moore's **scenarios depicting nuclear war that begins through an attack on Iran's supposed nuclear facilities.** According to Seymour Hersh **the nuclear option against Iran**

**has**, in fact, **been discussed by sources in the Pentagon as a viable option.** As Hersh reports, according to a former intelligence officer, the lack of "reliable intelligence leaves military planners, given the goal of totally destroying the sites, little choice but to consider the use of tactical nuclear weapons. 'Every other option, in the view of the nuclear weaponeers, would leave a gap,' the former senior intelligence official said. 'Decisive is the key word of the Air Force's planning. It's a tough decision. But we made it in Japan.'" The official continues to explain how White House and Pentagon officials are considering the nuclear option for Iran, "Nuclear planners go through extensive training and learn the technical details of damage and fallout - we're talking about mushroom clouds, radiation, mass casualties, and contamination over years. This is not an underground nuclear test, where all you see is the earth raised a little bit. These politicians don't have a clue, and whenever anybody tries to get it out - remove the nuclear option - they're shouted down". Understandably, some members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff were not comfortable about consideration of the nuclear option in a first strike, and some officers have even discussed resigning. Hersh quotes the former intelligence officer as saying, "Late this winter, the Joint Chiefs of Staff sought to remove the nuclear option from the evolving war plans for Iran - without success. The White House said, 'Why are you challenging this? The option came from you'". **This scenario has gained even more plausibility since a January 2007 Sunday Times report of an Israeli intelligence leak that Israel was considering a strike against Iran, using low-yield bunker busting nukes to destroy Iran's supposedly secret underground nuclear facilities.** In Moore's scenario, **non-nuclear neighboring countries would then respond with conventional rockets and chemical, biological and radiological weapons. Israel then would retaliate with nuclear strikes on several countries, including a pre-emptive strike against Pakistan, who then retaliates with an attack not only on Israel but pre-emptively striking India as well. Israel then initiates the "Samson option" with attacks on other Muslim countries, Russia, and possibly the "anti-Semitic" cities of Europe.** At that point, **all-out nuclear war ensues as the U.S. retaliates with nuclear attacks on Russia and possibly on China as well.** Out of the four interrelated factors that could precipitate a nuclear strike and subsequent escalation into nuclear war,

probably the accidental factor is one that deserves particular attention since its likelihood is much greater than commonly perceived. In an article, "20 Mishaps that Might Have Started a Nuclear War," Phillips cites the historical record to illustrate how an accident, misinterpretation, or false alarm could ignite a nuclear war. Most of these incidents occurred during a time of intense tension between the U.S. and the Soviet Union in the Cuban Missile Crisis, but other mishaps occurred during other times, with the most recent one in 1995. Close inspection of each of these incidents reveals how likely it is that an "accident" or misinterpretation of phenomena or data ("glitch") can lead to nuclear confrontation and war. In his overall analysis, Phillips writes: The probability of actual progression to nuclear war on any one of the occasions listed may have been small, due to planned "failsafe" features in the warning and launch systems, and to responsible action by those in the chain of command when the failsafe features had failed. However, **the accumulation of small probabilities of disaster from a long sequence of risks adds up to serious danger. There is no way of telling what the actual level of risk was in these mishaps but if the chance of disaster in every one of the 20 incidents had been only 1 in 100, it is a mathematical fact that the chance of surviving all 20 would have been 82%, i.e. about the same as the chance of surviving a single pull of the trigger at Russian roulette played with a 6-shooter.** With a similar series of mishaps on the Soviet side: another pull of the trigger. If the risk in some of the events had been as high as 1 in 10, then the chance of surviving just seven such events would have been less than 50:50. **Aggression in the Middle East** along with the willingness to use low-yield "bunker busting" nukes by the U.S. **only increases the likelihood of nuclear war and catastrophe in the future.** White House and Pentagon policymakers are seriously considering the use of strategic nuclear weapons against Iran. As Ryan McMaken explains, someone at the Pentagon who had . . . not yet completed the transformation into a complete sociopath leaked the 'Nuclear Posture Review' which outlined plans for a nuclear 'end game' with Iraq, Iran, Libya, North Korea, and Syria, none of which possess nuclear weapons. The report also outlined plans to let the missiles fly on Russia and China as well, even though virtually everyone on the face of the Earth thought we had actually normalized relations with them. It turns out, much to the surprise of **the Chinese and the Russians**, that they **are still potential enemies in a nuclear holocaust.**

## 2NC Impact Overview

### **Iran's acquisition of nuclear weapons will lead to a Middle East race to acquire nuclear weapons, increase oil prices, and unleash a wave of terrorism.**

Henry **Sokolski 2005** (Executive Director of the Nonproliferation Policy Education Center) "GETTING READY FOR A NUCLEAR-READY IRAN: REPORT OF THE NPEC WORKING GROUP" October, <http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/pub629.pdf>

These workshops identified three threats that are likely to increase **following Iran's acquisition of a nuclear weapons** option. 1. Even More Nuclear Proliferation. Iran's continued insistence that it acquired its nuclear capabilities legally under the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) would, if unchallenged, **encourage its neighbors (including Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Syria, Turkey, and Algeria) to develop nuclear options of their own** by emulating Iran's example, by overtly declaring possession (in Israel's case) or by importing nuclear weapons (in Saudi Arabia's case). **Such** announcements and **efforts**, in turn, **would likely undermine nuclear nonproliferation restraints internationally** and strain American relations with most of its key friends in the Middle East. 2. Dramatically Higher Oil Prices. **A nuclear-ready Iran could be emboldened to manipulate oil prices upward**. It might attempt this either by threatening the freedom of the seas (by mining oil transit points as it did in the 1980s, or **by threatening to close the Straits of Hormuz**), or by using terrorist proxies to threaten the destruction of Saudi and other Gulf state oil facilities and pipelines. 3. Increased Terrorism Designed to Diminish U.S. Influence. **With a nuclear weapons option acting as a deterrent to the United States** and allied action against it, **Iran would likely lend greater support to terrorists** operating against Israel, Iraq, Libya, Saudi Arabia, Europe, and the United States. The aim of such support would be to reduce American support for U.S. involvement in the Middle East, for Israel, and for actions against Iran generally, and to elevate Iran as an equal to the United States and its allies on all matters relating to the Persian Gulf and related regions. An additional aim of the terrorism that Iran would support would be to keep other nations from supporting U.S. policies and the continued U.S. military presence in the Middle East.

### **Iran nukes cause instability in the Middle East.**

Efraim **Inbar 2006** (Professor of Political Science at Bar-Ilan University and the Director of the Begin-Sadat Center for Strategic Studies) "The Need To Block A Nuclear Iran", MERIA Journal, March, <http://meria.idc.ac.il/journal/2006/issue1/jv10no1a7.html>

**Iran's nuclear program coupled with long-range delivery systems**, in particular, **threatens regional stability in the Middle East**. Iran's possesses the Shehab-3 long-range missile (with a range of 1,300 kilometers) that can probably be nuclear-tipped and is working on extending the range of its ballistic arsenal. American allies, such as Israel, Turkey, Saudi Arabia, and Gulf States are within range, as well as several important U.S. bases. The Chief of the IDF Intelligence Department, Maj. Gen. Aharon Zeevi (Farkash) reported that Iran has also acquired 12 cruise missiles with a range of up to 3,000 kilometers and with an ability to carry nuclear warheads.[14] Further improvements in Iranian missiles would initially put most European capitals, and eventually, the North American continent, within range of a potential Iranian attack. Iran has an ambitious satellite launching program based on the use of multi-stage, solid propellant launchers, with intercontinental ballistic missile properties to enable the launching of a 300-kilogram satellite within two years. **If Iran achieves this goal, it will put many more states at risk of a future nuclear attack**. [15]

## Uniqueness

**Obama is preparing to devote his diplomatic capital towards Iran – failure risks conflict that engulfs the entire Middle East, turning the case.**

**Blair 5-19-10** [David, “Threat of war across region is unspoken realization”, <http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/8311ff98-6366-11df-a844-00144feab49a.html>]

What if it all goes wrong? **The US and its allies have spent months painstakingly assembling a coalition behind imposing tougher sanctions on Iran to contain its nuclear ambitions.** Concessions have been offered along the way: last year, the US tried to secure Russia’s support by going so far as to tear up its plans for missile defence in Europe. **The drive to maximise pressure on Iran by any means short of military action has absorbed so much effort that it has become the largest single priority of the Obama administration’s diplomacy.** Yet the scale of the undertaking also reveals the depth of the fear. Behind today’s wrangles at the United Nations lies one harsh and usually unspoken realisation: if **everything fails and the US or Israel feels compelled to launch military strikes to destroy Iran’s nuclear facilities, the consequences would be profound. Officials stress war is far from imminent and there is plenty of time for diplomacy to work.** But **if a conflict were to break out in the years ahead, it could escalate beyond Iran’s borders to embroil the region and beyond. This is partly because of Iran’s position at the junction of the Middle East and south Asia and beside crucial oil supply routes.** More important, **Iran’s leaders have sought to guarantee their survival by amassing numerous options for retaliation and so maximising the risks of an attack.** Today, Tehran’s rulers have so many ways of hitting back that a strike on their nuclear plants could set off a chain reaction, **triggering a war that would involve every country in an arc from Lebanon to Afghanistan. Iran’s first response to any US or Israeli attack would probably be to activate the proxy forces it has spent many years building up across the Middle East.** The most prominent is Hizbollah, the radical Shia movement in southern Lebanon which possesses thousands of Iranian-supplied missiles, all targeted on Israel. In the event of war, Hizbollah would probably launch its arsenal – and experience suggests Israel’s response to any bombardment would include the invasion of Lebanon. The last time this happened, in 2006, Israel refrained from attacking the supply lines for Hizbollah’s missiles, which run through Syria. Israeli officials say this was a mistake they would avoid if events were to be repeated. Next time, the Israeli blow could land on Syria as well as Lebanon. **The Hamas movement in Gaza also benefits from Iranian weapons and its rockets could be used to open another front against Israel in the south. Thus a conflagration that begins in Iran could soon spread, taking in Israel, Lebanon and Syria and moving eastwards to the next country in this new crescent of conflict, Iraq. Iran has armed and funded Shia militia inside its neighbour since Saddam Hussein’s downfall in 2003, rendering Iraq vulnerable to subversion. In the event of war, Iran’s allies would probably be used to attack US forces in the country. Iran may try to spread the arc of turmoil even farther by using the same tactic in Afghanistan. The Sunni Taliban fighters have always been bitter rivals of Iran’s Shia regime, but there is evidence that they may have been thrust together by the remorseless logic of “my enemy’s enemy is my friend”. Western officials say convoys carrying weapons for the Taliban have crossed Iran’s frontier with Afghanistan. Whether this happened because of a high level decision in Tehran – or because local smugglers paid off border guards – is unclear. But one official in the region said that Iran could use this channel as another means of retaliation. “That is a tap they would turn up pretty dramatically if we were to launch a military strike,” he said. Iran could also try to turn geography to its advantage, probably by attacking shipping in the Strait of Hormuz at the entrance to the Gulf. Every day, tankers carrying about 17 million barrels of oil, or 40 per cent of the world’s seaborne shipments, pass through this vital waterway, only 33 miles wide at its most vulnerable point.** Finally, Iran could try to fire its Shahab 3 ballistic missiles at an array of regional targets, including Israel, the US Fifth fleet base in Bahrain and the US Central Command presence in Qatar. **As US diplomats engage in yet more weeks of costly bargaining at the UN, this is the scenario they are striving to avoid.**

**Obama has narrowed his foreign policy to Iran.**

**Hiatt 4-26-10** [Fred, “Obama’s governing discipline”, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/04/25/AR2010042502988.html>]

**Since both fronts would take enormous energy and political capital, Obama could not afford to squander whatever remained across an array of worthy electives. So over time he subordinated everything to just two: health-insurance reform and blocking Iran’s development of nuclear weapons. Anything else, no matter how popular or deserving, had to give way if it interfered with those.**

## Uniqueness – Answers to START

**START proves our uniqueness – part of Obama’s strategy to stop Iran.**

**Hiatt 4-26-10** [Fred, “Obama's governing discipline”, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/04/25/AR2010042502988.html>]

**Obama has put enormous energy into repairing relations with Russia**, for example, and relatively less into ties with allies such as India, Mexico or Britain **because stopping Iran would require Russia's support of sanctions.**

**Without a new START arms-control treaty, Russia would not play ball on Iran, so Obama worked assiduously to negotiate a new START.** The nuclear summit he hosted in Washington this month; playing down trade tensions with China; the relative reticence on North Korea's nukes; prodding Israel toward peace talks -- all of these were crafted with an eye toward Iran.

## Link Wall

### The plan saps Obama's diplomatic capital.

**The Economist** 4-29-10 ["Get your plan ready, Mr Obama",  
[http://www.economist.com/opinion/displaystory.cfm?story\\_id=16009089](http://www.economist.com/opinion/displaystory.cfm?story_id=16009089)]

**A clutch of knowledgeable Americans** who broadly agree with the two-state thesis **have been advising Mr Obama not to get involved**—at any rate, not yet. **Another failed American attempt to mediate between Israelis and Palestinians**, they argue, **would make the world's flailing superpower less potent elsewhere, draining much-needed capital in its quest for regional peace** in the no-less-troubled arc of discord that stretches from Iraq and Iran through to Afghanistan and Pakistan.

### Working towards a two-state solution will require diplomatic capital and directly trade-off with other areas.

Stephen **Walt, '9** – the Robert and Renée Belfer Professor of International Relations at Harvard University. "Obama's Report Card," April 2009, Foreign Policy,  
[http://www.foreignpolicy.com/story/cms.php?story\\_id=4890&print=1](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/story/cms.php?story_id=4890&print=1)

First, **he's already exhibiting the classic weakness of smart, young, energetic, curious, and well-educated presidents** like Bill Clinton or Jimmy Carter; **he's interested in too many things and trying to do too much at once. Look at his agenda so far: an opening to Iran, serious engagement for a two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict**, an outstretched hand to the Muslim world, and a commitment to major nuclear arms reductions. And don't forget the environment, Asia, and fixing the worst economic mess since the Great Depression. He's promising to take action on immigration, health care, and education. **None of these things fits in the category of low-hanging fruit, which means they will require time, effort, and an investment of political capital. A "to-do list" this long is bound to produce more disappointments than achievements, and I don't see anyone in the administration who is willing or able to impose a stricter set of priorities** -- let alone a grand strategy -- on all this restless ambition. He's like a student who's asked to pick one of three possible essay questions on an exam, and decides to impress the professor by answering all three. **Unless you're a genius, this is usually not a promising strategy.**

### The plan trades off.

**Bremmer '06** [Ian, Slate magazine, Aug 16, Lexis]

Several factors delayed outside efforts to end the violence and will limit the international community's ability to ensure it doesn't begin anew. First, **Washington's role** in Israel's relations with its neighbors **isn't what it used to be. The Bush administration has devoted what's left of its international political capital to helping build a stable Iraq, thwarting Iran's nuclear ambitions, responding to threats from North Korea, and managing increasingly complex relations with China and Russia. Little time and energy were left for the sort of shuttle diplomacy these bursts of Middle Eastern hostility have historically demanded.**

## Internal Link

### Capital is limited

Jackson **Diehl**, "A Mideast opportunity Obama shouldn't ignore", 3-19-2010,  
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/04/18/AR2010041802726.html>

**"Timing is everything** in life," George Mitchell said this year while discussing his daunting job as a Middle East envoy. **It's a piece of wisdom that applies perfectly to the** Obama **administration's troubles in the region --** and one that, curiously enough, Mitchell and his boss have willfully ignored. **The United States faces** three **big strategic challenges in the Middle East. One is the threat of Iran. The second is the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.** And the third is the corrupt and crumbling Arab autocracies of Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Yemen and half a dozen other states, which fuel Islamic extremism and provide almost all of al-Qaeda's recruits. **U.S. diplomacy can have an impact on all of those problems -- but Washington** can't impose solutions by itself. It **has to seek or create moments of opportunity and then use them well.** Policy has to be based on not only what the White House aspires to do but also what conditions on the ground make possible.

## Internal Link

### **Diplomatic capital is key to successful negotiations with Iran.**

**BBC '9** ["Obama offers Iran 'new beginning'" <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/7954211.stm>]

US President Barack **Obama has offered "a new beginning" of engagement with Tehran** in an unprecedented direct video message to the Iranian people. "**My administration is now committed to diplomacy that addresses the full range of issues before us.**" Mr Obama said. An advisor to Iran's president welcomed Mr Obama's message but said Washington had to fundamentally change policy. Relations between Iran and the US have been strained over Tehran's controversial nuclear activities. The US fears Iran's uranium enrichment programme is a cover to build atomic weapons, a charge Iranian officials deny. Mr **Obama**, like his predecessor, **wants Iran to abandon its uranium enrichment programme, but is trying to build up diplomatic capital before confronting the issue**, says the BBC's diplomatic correspondent Jonathan Marcus.

## Impact – Answer to Deterrence Solves

### **Deterrence can't solve Iran – 5 reasons.**

Cliff **Kupchan** is director, Europe and Eurasia, at the Eurasia Group, March **2007**

The National Interest, The Gramercy Round: Revisiting Iran?, Lexis

So the United States probably faces a choice between deterring a nuclear Iran and taking military action. Iran poses challenges to deterrence-multiple sources of power, unpredictability and inconsistent behavior are all inimical to deterrence theory. Factionalism could lead to dysfunctional outcomes in nuclear debates, where not only Ahmadinejad, but also the radical head of the paramilitary Basij, Mohammad Hejazi, and hard-liner Ayatollah Ahmad Jannati (Secretary General of the Guardian Council) may have a place at the table. Second, Ahmadinejad and his Abadgaran movement are risk-acceptant, which could pose specific challenges to deterrence. Under a nuclear shield, Tehran may more aggressively use Hizballah or other groups to attack Israel, or U.S. or foreign troops in Iraq, Afghanistan and Lebanon.

### **Conventional nuclear arms theory does not apply to Iran- religious extremism.**

**Hanson 2005** (Victor, Davis. Senior Fellow Hoover Institute. Stanford) Feb. 11, Chicago Tribune. “Who in their right mind would play nuclear poker with Iran?”

Autocracy and weapons of mass destruction are a lethal mix. Many Arab nations point to Israel and allege Western hypocrisy, since it is small and alone in the Middle East with nuclear capability. Well, aside from its unique creation from the ashes of the Holocaust and the proven record of its neighbors' efforts to destroy the Jewish people, Israel--unlike North Korea and Iran --is also singularly democratic in the region. Because consensual governments, as a rule, are hardly likely to attack like kind, their possession of terrifying weapons tends to prove less of a threat to global peace. The old Soviet Union was more dangerous than is contemporary Russia, despite a mostly intact nuclear arsenal. China's liberalization raises the hope that its nukes are less prone to be dropped today than during Mao's Great Leap Forward. A nuclear Iran of any sort is a problem. Yet, a nuclear theocratic Iran is a disaster since its zealous mullahs are unaccountable to either an electorate or censorious press. They are fueled by religious extremism and publicly have praised nuclear martyrdom. One or two such extremists in their dotage could well decide that an entire state should play the role of the lone suicide bomber so frequently canonized in that part of the world.

## Impact – Answer to No Arms Race

### **Iran proliferate will trigger a cascade of nuclear proliferation and allow terrorist access to the bomb.**

Graham T. **Allison** (director of Harvard's Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs) 4/20/2007 "How Likely is a Nuclear Terrorist Attack on the United States?", Council on Foreign Relations, <http://www.cfr.org/publication/13097/>

We should ask ourselves every day: Are nuclear materials that could fuel a terrorist's bomb more or less secure than they were a year ago? Thanks to initiatives like the Nunn-Lugar program, highly enriched uranium and plutonium in Russia are far safer from theft today than they were in the early 1990s. But the risk that terrorists will buy or steal nuclear material from a rogue state increases as more countries acquire the ability to produce weapons-usable material. Therefore it is vitally important to roll back North Korea's nuclear program and to constrain Iran before it reaches its enrichment finish line. By becoming a nuclear-armed state, each will trigger a cascade of proliferation in its neighborhood.

### **Iran acquisition would set off a chain effect of countries getting the bomb, this will collapse all global non-proliferation efforts.**

Norman **Podhoretz** (editor-at-large of COMMENTARY. His new book, World War IV: The Long Struggle Against Islamofascism) June 2007, "The Case for Bombing Iran", Commentary Magazine, <http://www.commentarymagazine.com/cm/main/viewArticle.aip?id=10882&page=all>

But there is, it has been reported, another consideration that is driving Bush. According to a recent news story in the New York Times, for example, Bush has taken to heart what "[o]fficials from 21 governments in and around the Middle East warned at a meeting of Arab leaders in March"—namely, "that Iran's drive for atomic technology could result in the beginning of 'a grave and destructive nuclear arms race in the region.'" Which is to say that he fears that local resistance to Iran's bid for hegemony in the greater Middle East through the acquisition of nuclear weapons could have even more dangerous consequences than a passive capitulation to that bid by the Arab countries. For resistance would spell the doom of all efforts to stop the spread of nuclear weapons, and it would vastly increase the chances of their use.

### **Iran nuclear acquisition will create instability and a nuclear arms race.**

Sammy **Salama** (senior Middle East Research Associate at CNS) and Heidi **Weber** December 22, 2006 "The Emerging Arab Response to Iran's Unabated Nuclear Program", Monterey Institute for International Studies Center for Nonproliferation Studies, [http://www.nti.org/e\\_research/e3\\_83.html](http://www.nti.org/e_research/e3_83.html)

Rising concerns over Iran's nuclear ambitions coupled with its increased influence in post-war Iraq have led many among Arab Gulf states, in particular Saudi Arabia to be concerned. During a visit to the United States in late September 2005, Saudi Foreign Minister Prince Faisal expressed discontent over Iran's influence in Iraq and echoed sentiments of alarm within the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) at Tehran's persistence in achieving nuclear technology. The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, while vast in territory and riches is still a country mired with strategic liabilities. Domestically, the Kingdom is still relatively small in population, roughly 27 million as of 2006. With its oil-based economy, the country is covered with soft targets tied to its petroleum production and other oil-based activities. As the leader of OPEC and the sole possessor of 25% of the world's proven petroleum reserves, Saudi Arabia sits in a tenuous position relative to Iran and its budding nuclear program. Strategic considerations aside, domestically, Saudi Arabia must consider the impact of foreign workers, roughly 5.5 million and their impact and role in the Saudi economy especially in the oil and service sectors. While the government continues to encourage private sector growth to relieve some of the country's dependence on oil, the near future points to a continued reliance on oil revenue to support growth in the Kingdom and its continued efforts to boost job training and education, infrastructure developments, and growth in power generation and telecom sectors. A nuclear Iran would pose a sincere threat to any and all of the goals that Saudi Arabia has set out for a prosperous future. Moreover, GCC Secretary General al-Attiyah, echoing Saudi sentiments, struck out at Iran and blamed them for interfering in the internal affairs of the GCC countries, stressing that "Iran attaining nuclear weapons will lead to instability in the region and an arms race that will spread an unjustified climate of mistrust," adding that "Iran is forcing the GCC states to 'side' with the superpowers due to Iran's insistent pursuit of nuclear weapons." [17]

**\*\*\*Aff Answers**

## Diplomatic Capital 2AC

**Non-unique – Obama is spending capital on START and disarmament**

**Walsh 2-16-10** [Bryan, “The Green Politics Behind Nuclear Power”,

<http://www.time.com/time/health/article/0,8599,1964571,00.html>]

**One of President Obama's signature ideals is the eventual elimination of nuclear weapons. He's spent diplomatic capital trying to negotiate a new nuclear-arms-control agreement with Russia, and in his Nobel Peace Prize speech in December, he called atomic-weapons control "the centerpiece of my foreign policy," asking all nuclear countries to work toward disarmament.**

## Diplomatic Capital 2AC

**No internal link – empirically negotiations have failed**

**Wall Street Journal 4-5-10**

[“Unserious About Iran”, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702303382504575163804139815206.html>]

**'Our aim is not incremental sanctions, but sanctions that will bite.'** Thus did Secretary of State Hillary Clinton seek to reassure the crowd at the American Israel Public Affairs Committee two weeks ago about the Obama Administration's resolve on Iran. **Three days later**, this newspaper reported on its front page that **"the U.S. has backed away from pursuing a number of tough measures against Iran"** in order to win Russian and Chinese support for one more U.N. sanctions resolution. **This fits the pattern we have seen across the 14 months of the Obama Presidency**. Mrs. Clinton called a nuclear-armed Iran "unacceptable" no fewer than four times in a single paragraph in her AIPAC speech. But **why should the Iranians believe her? President Obama set a number of deadlines last year for a negotiated settlement of Iran's nuclear file, all of which Tehran ignored, and then Mr. Obama ignored them too.** In his latest Persian New Year message to Iran, Mr. Obama made the deadline-waiver permanent, saying "our offer of comprehensive diplomatic contacts and dialogue stands." Mahmoud Ahmadinejad had a quick rejoinder. "They say they have extended a hand to Iran," the Iranian President said Saturday, "but the Iranian government and nation declined to welcome that." The Iranians have good reason to think they have little to lose from continued defiance. **Tehran's nuclear negotiator emerged from two days of talks** in Beijing on Friday saying, **"We agreed, sanctions as a tool have already lost their effectiveness."** He has a point. The Chinese have indicated that the most they are prepared to support are narrow sanctions on Iran's nuclear program of the type Tehran has already sneered at. As the Journal's Peter Fritsch and David Crawford reported this weekend, the Iranians continue to acquire key nuclear components from unsuspecting Western companies via intermediaries, including some Chinese firms. Yet the Administration still rolls the sanctions rock up the U.N. hill, in a fantastic belief that Russian and Chinese support is vital even if the price is sanctions that are toothless. French President Nicolas Sarkozy urged Mr. Obama a year ago to move ahead with sanctions even without the Russians and Chinese, but Mr. Obama insisted he needed both. A year later, everyone except apparently Mr. Obama can see who was right. **The Administration also argued upon taking office that by making good-faith offers to Iran last year, the U.S. would gain the diplomatic capital needed to steel the world for a tougher approach.** Yet **a year later the U.S. finds itself begging for U.N. Security Council votes** even from such nonpermanent members as Brazil and Turkey, both of which have noticeably improved their ties with Iran in recent months. The U.S. can at this point do more unilaterally by imposing and enforcing sanctions on companies that do business in Iran's energy industry. But **so far the Administration has shown considerably less enthusiasm for these measures** than has even a Democratic Congress. As for the potential threat of military strikes to assist diplomacy, Defense Secretary Robert Gates has made his doubts about their efficacy very public. The President's two-week public attempt to humiliate Benjamin Netanyahu has also considerably lessened the perceived likelihood of an Israeli strike on Iran, thereby further diminishing whatever momentum remains for strong sanctions. **All of these actions suggest to us that Mr. Obama has concluded that a nuclear Iran is inevitable,** even if he can't or won't admit it publicly. Last year Mrs. Clinton floated the idea of expanding the U.S. nuclear umbrella to the entire Middle East if Iran does get the bomb. She quickly backtracked, but many viewed that as an Obama-ian slip.

## Diplomatic Capital 2AC

### A nuclear Iran is not a threat and won't start an arms race

#### Bergh '9

[Godfried van Benthem van den Bergh was professor of international relations at Erasmus University, Rotterdam, and the Institute of Social Studies, The Hague, He has been a Harkness Fellow at Harvard University and the University of California at Berkeley; chairman of the Board of the Netherlands Association for International Affairs; and member of the Advisory Council for International Affairs of the Dutch Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Defense, "The Taming of the Great Nuclear Powers", May 2009, [http://www.carnegieendowment.org/files/taming\\_great\\_powers.pdf](http://www.carnegieendowment.org/files/taming_great_powers.pdf)]

In the case of Iran the attitude of Washington—and its European allies in the Security Council—proved counterproductive. It has made Iran's uranium enrichment program a symbol of national pride. Iran has always denied that it aims at producing nuclear weapons. But America based its policy on the suspicion that Iran was lying. Even if so, **it remains an open question how dangerous such slow proliferation would be, in view of the de facto acceptance of Israel, India, and Pakistan as new nuclear powers. This distinction between slow (or one by one) and quick (or "cascading" proliferation), as introduced by Kenneth Waltz, remains crucial.**<sup>31</sup> **There is no sign of the often invoked proliferation cascade in the Middle East. The nuclear arsenal of Israel might have led Arab states to such developments, but for more than forty years did not. The danger of a nuclear-armed Iran has been much exaggerated, as if it would practically mean the end of the world.**<sup>32</sup> Actually, **the main**, and very important, **result of the NPT regime and the IAEA inspections might be that they slowed down nuclear proliferation.**

### Iran has no ambitions beyond deterrence – use would be suicide

#### Bergh '9

[Godfried van Benthem van den Bergh was professor of international relations at Erasmus University, Rotterdam, and the Institute of Social Studies, The Hague, He has been a Harkness Fellow at Harvard University and the University of California at Berkeley; chairman of the Board of the Netherlands Association for International Affairs; and member of the Advisory Council for International Affairs of the Dutch Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Defense, "The Taming of the Great Nuclear Powers", May 2009, [http://www.carnegieendowment.org/files/taming\\_great\\_powers.pdf](http://www.carnegieendowment.org/files/taming_great_powers.pdf)]

Iran's nuclear program remains the most contentious and difficult issue. It seems possible, however, to extricate Iran and the United States from the conflict about Iran's nuclear enrichment program and the dispute about the possibility that it could lead to the development of a nuclear weapon. Constructive diplomacy must be informed by a realistic analysis of the consequences of that possibility. **One should ask what Iran could do with a small and vulnerable nuclear arsenal that it cannot already do**, such as providing arms to Hizbollah and Hamas. **Why assume that it might attack Europe or Israel (and later America) with nuclear missiles? The answer to the eventuality of a threat from Iran is not BMD, but deterrence. That the Iranian leadership would be willing to commit national suicide is a fantasy.**

### No link – Crisis response proves diplomatic capital is not finite.

#### Wolffe '02 [Richard, Financial Times London, Nov 1, Lexis]

According to several US officials, these **conservatives** have found themselves frozen out of decision-making on North Korea by the State Department and career foreign service officials specialising in Asian affairs on the national security council. They **have been** further **stymied by** Mr **Bush's view that the administration should concentrate on one crisis at a time and that the current focus should remain on Iraq**, these officials say. Sean McCormack, spokesman for the national security council, dismisses such accounts. **"This idea that we put on the red light because we don't need another thing on the plate is just not the way foreign policy works. You don't get to pick and choose your crises."**