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What would it mean if such a regime went nuclear? Let's assume, for the sake of argument, that a nuclear-armed Iran would never use its atomic weapons or give them to terrorists. Even under that optimistic scenario, Tehran's acquisition of nukes would make the world an infinitely more dangerous place. For one thing, it would surely spark a wave of proliferation throughout the Greater Middle East, with the likes of Turkey, Egypt, and Saudi Arabia - all Sunni-majority Muslim countries - going nuclear to counter the threat posed by Shiite Persian Iran. For another, it would gravely weaken the credibility of U.S. security guarantees. After all, Washington has repeatedly said that the Islamic Republic will not be permitted to get nukes. If Tehran demonstrated that these warnings were utterly hollow, rival governments and rogue regimes would conclude that America is a paper tiger. Once Tehran obtained nuclear weapons, it would have the ultimate trump card, the ultimate protection against outside attack. Feeling secure behind their nuclear shield, the Iranians would almost certainly increase their support for global terrorism and anti-American dictatorships. They would no longer have to fear a U.S. or Israeli military strike. Much like nuclear-armed North Korea today, Iran would be able to flout international law with virtual impunity. If America sought to curb Iranian misbehavior through economic sanctions, Tehran might well respond by flexing its muscles in the Strait of Hormuz. As political scientist Caitlin Talmadge explained in a 2008 analysis, "Iranian closure of the Strait of Hormuz tops the list of global energy security nightmares. Roughly 90 percent of all Persian Gulf oil leaves the region on tankers that must pass through this narrow waterway opposite the Iranian coast, and land pipelines do not provide sufficient alternative export routes. Extended closure of the strait would remove roughly a quarter of the world's oil from the market, causing a supply shock of the type not seen since the glory days of OPEC." Think about that: The world's leading state sponsor of terrorism has the ability to paralyze the global economy, and, if not stopped, it may soon have nuclear weapons. As a nuclear-armed Iran steadily expanded its international terror network, the Western Hemisphere would likely witness a significant jump in terrorist activity. Tehran has established a strategic alliance with Venezuelan leader Hugo Chávez, and it has also developed warm relations with Chávez acolytes in Bolivia, Ecuador, and Nicaragua while pursuing new arrangements with Argentina as an additional beachhead in Latin America Three years ago, the U.S. Treasury Department accused the Venezuelan government of "employing and providing safe harbor to Hezbollah facilitators and fundraisers." More recently, in July 2011, Peru's former military chief of staff, Gen. Francisco Contreras, told the Jerusalem Post that "Iranian organizations" are aiding and cooperating with other terrorist groups in South America. According to Israeli intelligence, the Islamic Republic has been getting uranium from both Venezuela and Bolivia. Remember: Tehran has engaged in this provocative behavior without nuclear weapons. Imagine how much more aggressive the Iranian dictatorship might be after crossing the nuclear Rubicon. It is an ideologically driven theocracy intent on spreading a radical Islamist revolution across the globe. As the Saudi plot demonstrates, no amount of conciliatory Western diplomacy can change the fundamental nature of a regime that is defined by anti-Western hatred and religious fanaticism.

#### Independently, the imposition of sanctions will destroy relationships with key allies and credibilty
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The Obama administration has spent weeks asking Congress to hold off on imposing new sanctions to avoid giving Tehran a reason to walk away from the current nuclear talks. On Friday, the administration rolled out a new rationale. They warned that the measures could harm Washington's relationships with its key foreign allies as well. The White House's willingness to unfreeze billions of dollars in Iranian money in exchange for Iranian concessions on its nuclear program has sparked skepticism -- and in some cases outright anger -- on Capitol Hill. The White House has launched a full-on lobbying blitz to reassure wavering lawmakers, and the efforts began paying off Friday as key senators who had either raised skepticism about the wisdom of holding off new sanctions or kept silent came out in support of the administration position. Sen. John McCain, a leading Iran hawk, told the BBC that he's skeptical of talks with Iran but willing to give the administration a "couple of months" before supporting additional sanctions. Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-CA), meanwhile, said she strongly opposed putting additional punitive measures in place against Tehran amid the delicate diplomatic negotiations. "The purpose of sanctions was to bring Iran to the negotiating table, and they have succeeded in doing so," she said. "Tacking new sanctions onto the defense authorization bill or any other legislation would not lead to a better deal. It would lead to no deal at all."

#### Economic collapse leads to terrorism
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But there's another reason why the financial crisis heightens the risk of global terrorism. Militants thrive in places where no one is fully in charge. The global recession threatens to create more such places. No matter how cohesive and determined a terrorist organization, it needs a supportive environment in which to flourish. That means a location that provides a steady stream of funds and recruits and the support (or at least acceptance) of the local population. Much of the counter-terrorist success we've seen in Iraq's al Anbar province over the past two years is a direct result of an increased willingness of local Iraqis to help the Iraqi army and US troops oust the militants operating there. In part, that's because the area's tribal leaders have their own incentives (including payment in cash and weaponry) for cooperating with occupation forces. But it's also because foreign militants have alienated the locals. The security deterioration of the past year in Pakistan and Afghanistan reflects exactly the opposite phenomenon. In the region along both sides of their shared border, local tribal leaders have yet to express much interest in helping Pakistani and NATO soldiers target local or foreign militants. For those with the power to either protect or betray the senior al-Qaeda leaders believed to be hiding in the region, NATO and Pakistani authorities have yet to find either sweet enough carrots or sharp enough sticks to shift allegiances. The slowdown threatens to slow the progress of a number of developing countries. Most states don't provide ground as fertile for militancy as places like Afghanistan, Somalia, and Yemen. But as more people lose their jobs, their homes, and opportunities for prosperity -- in emerging market countries or even within minority communities inside developed states -- it becomes easier for local militants to find volunteers. This is why the growing risk of attack from suicide bombers and well-trained gunmen in Pakistan creates risks that extend beyond South Asia. This is a country that is home to lawless regions where local and international militants thrive, nuclear weapons and material, a history of nuclear smuggling, a cash-starved government, and a deteriorating economy. Pakistan is far from the only country in which terrorism threatens to spill across borders.

#### Agreements on implementation of interim deal now
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Iran's chief negotiator has said talks in Geneva with world powers through the night on implementing a nuclear deal had made "good progress".¶ Negotiations continued throughout the night until early on Tuesday morning in the Swiss city "and the two sides have made good progress on different issues", Abbas Araqchi, Iran's lead negotiator, said in comments carried by official news agency IRNA.¶ They are "going to submit their conclusions to the vice-ministers and political heads because there are still questions to be resolved on the political level," he said, stressing that "the experts had done their work".¶ He said there would probably be "a meeting next week with Olga Schmitt", the deputy to European Union foreign policy head Catherine Ashton, who has been representing the P5+1 group in Tehran.¶ Experts from Iran and the so-called P5+1, the US, Britain, France, Russia and China plus Germany, have been holding technical talks on implementing an agreement reached on November 24 on Iran's controversial nuclear programme.¶ The interim deal requires that Iran freeze or curb its nuclear activities for six months in exchange for some sanctions relief while the two sides try to reach a comprehensive agreement.¶ Hamid Baeedinejad, who heads the Iranian delegation of experts, said the Geneva agreement should be implemented in late January, the ISNA news agency has reported.

#### Iran is adding hardliners to negotiations- ensures progress
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Iran has boosted its team in charge of nuclear talks with world powers, adding what are believed to be hard-liners and conservatives in an apparent effort to silence critics of the landmark interim accord reached in Geneva in November.¶ The semi-official news agencies Fars and Mehr reported on Wednesday that new members have joined the high council, which directs strategies in the talks and which is led by the country's moderate president Hassan Rohani and foreign minister Mohammad Javad Zarif.¶ The agencies did not identify the new members, saying only that representatives of "all branches of power and other senior figures" are now on the council.¶ The development comes a day after Iran and Western negotiators reported they were nearing an understanding on the details of implementing the Geneva accord.¶ The deal puts strong limits on Iran's uranium enrichment program in return for an easing of some international sanctions on Tehran for six months while a permanent deal is negotiated. The United States and its allies believe Iran's nuclear program is aimed at producing a nuclear weapon, a claim that Tehran denies, saying it is intended only for peaceful purposes.¶ Over the past month, experts from Iran and the so-called "5+1" countries — the U.S., Britain, France, Russia, China and Germany — have held several rounds of talks in Geneva to work out details on carrying out the agreement. The most recent session was on Monday, and on Tuesday, both sides reported progress in the talks.

#### 1NC Ev--- every trick in the book will be used to bring it to the floor

#### Key senators still pushing Iran sanctions bill – Obama pc key to avoiding sanctions that would disrupt the nuclear deal.
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WASHINGTON, Feb 7 — An influential US senator sought today to revive a push for sanctions to curb Iran’s nuclear ambitions, arguing that calling for new penalties is not war-mongering as suggested by the White House. Senator Robert Menendez, a Democrat, went on the offensive in a marathon floor speech outlining his distrust of the Iranian regime, saying he was “deeply sceptical” of Teheran’s intention to adhere to an interim agreement with world powers over its nuclear programme. Menendez, chairman of the powerful Senate Foreign Relations Committee, is lead sponsor of a bill that would trigger sanctions if Iran walks away from the interim deal, which eases existing economic penalties in return for Teheran freezing its nuclear programme. “In my view, Iran’s strategy, consistent with their past approaches that have brought them to a nuclear threshold state, is to use these negotiations to mothball its nuclear infrastructure programme just long enough to undo the international sanctions regime,” Menendez said. Iran insists its nuclear drive is purely peaceful, but Menendez warned that it has refused to destroy any of its centrifuges, and was “weeks to months away from breakout” uranium enrichment capacity to produce a bomb should it ever resume the programme. “Let everyone understand: if there is no deal we won’t have time to impose new sanctions before Iran could produce a nuclear weapon.” Menendez’s legislation has support from 59 senators in the 100-member chamber. But Obama has threatened a veto and several Democrats who favor the bill have since stepped back from a possible damaging vote against their own leader. And Iranian officials have warned that new sanctions legislation could kill the negotiations. Earlier in the day, 42 Republicans wrote to Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, who controls the chamber’s schedule, pressing for a vote. But Menendez distanced himself from that tactic, saying “we cannot be pressured by a partisan letter into forcing a vote.”

#### Obama PC key to keep sanctions off the table
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Led by Sens. Mark Kirk and Menendez, a large bipartisan group of senators has been pushing legislation to drastically limit Iran’s ability to export petroleum if the Islamic Republic breaks the conditions of an interim agreement or abandons a permanent nuclear deal with global powers. It also would require a dramatic rollback of Iran’s nuclear program as a condition for further lifting existing sanctions. But the White House is increasingly urging Senate Democrats who back the bill to avoid acting until after the six-months of negotiations play out. After Obama made a similar case during his State of the Union address, several Democrats who back the sanctions bill — like Sen. Chris Coons of Delaware — privately urged party leaders to postpone a vote for now. “I think most of us feel these negotiations should have a chance,” Senate Majority Whip Dick Durbin said Thursday. As Democrats toned down their rhetoric, Republicans have increasingly pushed Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid to schedule a vote on the issue, including in a Thursday letter to the Nevada Democrat, which was signed by 42 GOP senators. “Now we have come to a crossroads,” the Republicans wrote in the letter spearheaded by Kirk. “Will the Senate allow Iran to keep its … nuclear infrastructure in place… or will the Senate stand firm on behalf of the American people and insist that any final agreement with Iran must dismantle the (country’s) nuclear infrastructure…?”

#### Having to defend authority derails the current agenda

Kriner 10 Douglas L. Kriner (assistant professor of political science at Boston University) “After the Rubicon: Congress, Presidents, and the Politics of Waging War”, University of Chicago Press, Dec 1, 2010, page 68-69.

While congressional support leaves the president’s reserve of political capital intact, congressional criticism saps energy from other initiatives on the home front by forcing the president to expend energy and effort defending his international agenda. Political capital spent shoring up support for a president’s foreign policies is capital that is unavailable for his future policy initiatives. Moreover, any weakening in the president’s political clout may have immediate ramifications for his reelection prospects, as well as indirect consequences for congressional races.59 Indeed, Democratic efforts to tie congressional Republican incumbents to President George W. Bush and his war policies paid immediate political dividends in the 2006 midterms, particularly in states, districts, and counties that had suffered the highest casualty rates in the Iraq War. 60 In addition to boding ill for the president’s perceived political capital and reputation, such partisan losses in Congress only further imperil his programmatic agenda, both international and domestic. Scholars have long noted that President Lyndon Johnson’s dream of a Great Society also perished in the rice paddies of Vietnam. Lacking the requisite funds in a war-depleted treasury and the political capital needed to sustain his legislative vision, Johnson gradually let his domestic goals slip away as he hunkered down in an effort first to win and then to end the Vietnam War. In the same way, many of President Bush’s highest second-term domestic proprieties, such as Social Security and immigration reform, failed perhaps in large part because the administration had to expend so much energy and effort waging a rear-guard action against congressional critics of the war in Iraq.61 When making their cost-benefit calculations, presidents surely consider these wider political costs of congressional opposition to their military policies. If congressional opposition in the military arena stands to derail other elements of his agenda, all else being equal, the president will be more likely to judge the benefits of military action insufficient to its costs than if Congress stood behind him in the international arena.

#### Limiting the authority is extremely controversial and will require massive political capital – it tanks the agenda

Munoz 5/23 Carlo Munoz (staff writer at the Hill covering defense and national security) “ President Obama on Thursday promised to ramp down or cancel outright a number of 9/11-era U.S. counterterrorism policies that would usher in a new chapter in America's war on terror.” The Hill 5/23/13 <http://thehill.com/blogs/defcon-hill/policy-and-strategy/301737-obama-seeks-to-ramp-down-911-rules-for-war-on-terror>

Calls to close the Guantánamo Bay prison camp and to codify rules on drone strikes made headlines, but Obama’s promised effort to change the rules of engagement in the war on terror may have the biggest ramifications for national security. Passed by Congress in the days immediately after 9/11, those rules — known as Authorization of the Use of Military Force (AUMF) — gave the Pentagon and intelligence agencies unprecedented authority to wage war against al Qaeda and other militant groups. The authorization opened the door to a much wider range of aggressive and controversial counterterrorism tactics for the military, unbinding it from traditional rules of war. Supporters of the law argue the rules — which underpin the detainee program and armed drone strikes — allowed American forces to decimate al Qaeda's senior leadership, including Osama bin Laden. But Obama argued in his address Thursday at the National Defense University that the law has expanded beyond its intent and should be repealed. "I look forward to engaging Congress and the American people in efforts to refine, and ultimately repeal, the AUMF’s mandate," Obama said. Obama argued that unless the 12-year-old rules are rewritten, Congress risked giving future presidents unbound powers. “Unless we discipline our thinking and our actions, we may be drawn into more wars we don’t need to fight, or continue to grant presidents unbound powers more suited for traditional armed conflicts between nation states,” Obama said in arguing for the AUMF’s change. “So I look forward to engaging Congress and the American people in efforts to refine, and ultimately repeal, the AUMF’s mandate,” he said. “And I will not sign laws designed to expand this mandate further. Our systematic effort to dismantle terrorist organizations must continue. But this war, like all wars, must end. That’s what history advises. That’s what our democracy demands.” It seems unlikely Congress will approve legislation to change the rules of engagement, however, and it is unclear how hard Obama — already focused on immigration reform and distracted by a trio of controversies — will push on the issue. Some Republicans argued Obama was weakening the U.S. war on terror with his proposals. “I believe we are still in a long, drawn-out conflict with al Qaeda. To somehow argue that al Qaeda is ‘on the run,’ comes from a degree of un-reality to me that is really incredible,” said Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.). Violent al Qaeda affiliates in Yemen, West Africa, Libya and elsewhere that continue to plot attacks against the United States are proof positive the rules of engagement must remain intact, he said. "To somehow think we can bring the [AUMF] to a complete closure contradicts the reality of the facts on the ground," McCain said. "Al Qaeda will be with us for a long time." A former CIA officer argued the White House simply does not have the political capital to burn in order to get the counterterrorism rules changed. "Congress is not going to allow [Obama] to move" on the rules changes or any of the other initiatives laid out by the president during Thursday's speech, Frederick Fleitz, a former CIA official, told The Hill on Thursday. "I do not think the president is going to spend a lot of political capital on this," said Fleitz, who described Thursday's speech as being geared more toward preserving Obama's foreign policy legacy than actual changes in counterterrorism strategy.