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### 2ac prolif slow

#### Slow proliferation still causes our impacts – prevents crisis stability

Tellis 02 (Ashley Tellis, senior advisor to the U.S. Ambassador in New Delhi, “The Strategic Implications of a Nuclear India,” Orbis, Volume 46, Issue 1)

While this posture augurs well for crisis stability where sudden emergencies are concerned, it becomes less relevant when long intervals of strategic warning are available or when a crisis evolves slowly. Under these circumstances, the nuclear capabilities in all the relevant states would progressively increase in readiness depending on the rate at which strategic components are alerted, integrated (if necessary), and mobilized in accordance with preplanned contingency procedures. Once such activities are under way, the relatively low peacetime readiness of the various strategic forces would no longer provide crisis stability, because operational dormancy disappears irrevocably once the process of strategic alerting is completed.

#### Bad intel causes U.S. preemptive war

Debs & Monteiro 13 (Alexandre Debs, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Yale University, Ph.D. Economics, M.I.T., M.Phil. Oxford University, B.Sc. Universite de Montreal; and Nuno P. Monteiro, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Yale University, A.M., Ph.D. Political Science, University of Chicago, M.A. Political Theory and Science, Catholic University of Portugal, B.A. International Relations, University of Minho; “Known Unknowns: Power Shifts, Uncertainty, and War,” International Organization, 7-30-2013, http://www.nunomonteiro.org/wp-content/uploads/Debs-Monteiro-2012-Known-Unknowns.pdf)

Abstract¶ Large and rapid power shifts resulting from exogenous economic growth are considered¶ sufficient to cause preventive wars. Such power shifts are rare, however. Most large and rapid¶ shifts result from endogenous military investments. In this case, preventive war requires¶ uncertainty about a state’s investment decision. When this decision is perfectly transparent,¶ peace always prevails. A state’s investment that would produce a large and rapid power shift¶ would prompt its adversaries to launch a preventive war. Internalizing this, the state is¶ deterred from investing. When investments may remain undetected, however, states may be¶ tempted to introduce large and rapid shifts in military power as a fait accompli. Knowing this,¶ their adversaries may strike preventively even without unambiguous evidence about¶ militarization. In fact, the more effective preventive wars are, the more likely they will be¶ launched against states that are not militarizing. Our argument restricts the role of¶ commitment problems and emphasizes the role of imperfect information as causes of war. It¶ also provides an account of why powerful states may attack weaker targets suspected of¶ military investments even in the absence of conclusive information. We illustrate our theory¶ through an account of the 2003 U.S.-led invasion of Iraq.

### 2ac t no migration

#### Economic engagement is determined by means, not ends – agreeing to ease financial restrictions is distinct from travel promotion

Resnick 1 (Dr. Evan Resnick, Ph.D. in Political Science from Columbia University, Assistant Professor of Political Science at Yeshiva University, M.A. in Political Science from Columbia University, “Defining Engagement”, Journal of International Affairs, Spring, 54(2), Ebsco | Danco)

Scholars have limited the concept of engagement in a third way by unnecessarily restricting the scope of the policy. In their evaluation of post-Cold War US engagement of China, Paul Papayoanou and Scott Kastner define engagement as the attempt to integrate a target country into the international order through promoting "increased trade and financial transactions."(n21) However, limiting engagement policy to the increasing of economic interdependence leaves out many other issue areas that were an integral part of the Clinton administration's China policy, including those in the diplomatic, military and cultural arenas. Similarly, the US engagement of North Korea, as epitomized by the 1994 Agreed Framework pact, promises eventual normalization of economic relations and the gradual normalization of diplomatic relations.(n22) Equating engagement with economic contacts alone risks neglecting the importance and potential effectiveness of contacts in noneconomic issue areas.¶ Finally, some scholars risk gleaning only a partial and distorted insight into engagement by restrictively evaluating its effectiveness in achieving only some of its professed objectives. Papayoanou and Kastner deny that they seek merely to examine the "security implications" of the US engagement of China, though in a footnote, they admit that "[m]uch of the debate [over US policy toward the PRC] centers around the effects of engagement versus containment on human rights in China."(n23) This approach violates a cardinal tenet of statecraft analysis: the need to acknowledge multiple objectives in virtually all attempts to exercise inter-state influence.(n24) Absent a comprehensive survey of the multiplicity of goals involved in any such attempt, it would be naive to accept any verdict rendered concerning its overall merits.¶ A REFINED DEFINITION OF ENGAGEMENT¶ In order to establish a more effective framework for dealing with unsavory regimes, I propose that we define engagement as the attempt to influence the political behavior of a target state through the comprehensive establishment and enhancement of contacts with that state across multiple issue-areas (i.e. diplomatic, military, economic, cultural). The following is a brief list of the specific forms that such contacts might include:¶ DIPLOMATIC CONTACTS¶ Extension of diplomatic recognition; normalization of diplomatic relations¶ Promotion of target-state membership in international institutions and regimes¶ Summit meetings and other visits by the head of state and other senior government officials of sender state to target state and vice-versa¶ MILITARY CONTACTS¶ Visits of senior military officials of the sender state to the target state and vice-versa¶ Arms transfers¶ Military aid and cooperation¶ Military exchange and training programs¶ Confidence and security-building measures¶ Intelligence sharing¶ ECONOMIC CONTACTS¶ Trade agreements and promotion¶ Foreign economic and humanitarian aid in the form of loans and/or grants¶ CULTURAL CONTACTS¶ Cultural treaties¶ Inauguration of travel and tourism links¶ Sport, artistic and academic exchanges (n25)¶ Engagement is an iterated process in which the sender and target state develop a relationship of increasing interdependence, culminating in the endpoint of "normalized relations" characterized by a high level of interactions across multiple domains. Engagement is a quintessential exchange relationship: the target state wants the prestige and material resources that would accrue to it from increased contacts with the sender state, while the sender state seeks to modify the domestic and/or foreign policy behavior of the target state. This deductive logic could adopt a number of different forms or strategies when deployed in practice.26 For instance, individual contacts can be established by the sender state at either a low or a high level of conditionality.27 Additionally, the sender state can achieve its objectives using engagement through any one of the following causal processes: by directly modifying the behavior of the target regime; by manipulating or reinforcing the target states' domestic balance of political power between competing factions that advocate divergent policies; or by shifting preferences at the grassroots level in the hope that this will precipitate political change from below within the target state.¶ This definition implies that three necessary conditions must hold for engagement to constitute an effective foreign policy instrument. First, the overall magnitude of contacts between the sender and target states must initially be low. If two states are already bound by dense contacts in multiple domains (i.e., are already in a highly interdependent relationship), engagement loses its impact as an effective policy tool. Hence, one could not reasonably invoke the possibility of the US engaging Canada or Japan in order to effect a change in either country's political behavior. Second, the material or prestige needs of the target state must be significant, as engagement derives its power from the promise that it can fulfill those needs. The greater the needs of the target state, the more amenable to engagement it is likely to be. For example, North Korea's receptivity to engagement by the US dramatically increased in the wake of the demise of its chief patron, the Soviet Union, and the near-total collapse of its national economy.28¶ Third, the target state must perceive the engager and the international order it represents as a potential source of the material or prestige resources it desires. This means that autarkic, revolutionary and unlimited regimes which eschew the norms and institutions of the prevailing order, such as Stalin's Soviet Union or Hitler's Germany, will not be seduced by the potential benefits of engagement.¶ This reformulated conceptualization avoids the pitfalls of prevailing scholarly conceptions of engagement. It considers the policy as a set of means rather than ends, does not delimit the types of states that can either engage or be engaged, explicitly encompasses contacts in multiple issue-areas, allows for the existence of multiple objectives in any given instance of engagement and, as will be shown below, permits the elucidation of multiple types of positive sanctions.

#### Economic engagement includes offers to remove financial restrictions – distinct from travel promotion

Haass and O’Sullivan 2K (Richard Haass, president of the Council on Foreign Relations, previously Director of Policy Planning for the United States Department of State and close advisor to Secretary of State Colin Powell, received the State Department's Distinguished Service Award, and Meghan O’Sullivan, former deputy national security adviser on Iraq and Afghanistan, Jeane Kirkpatrick Professor of the Practice of International Affairs, adjunct senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, and senior fellow at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, “Honey and Vinegar: Incentives, Sanctions, and Foreign Policy,” Brookings Institution, 2000, pp. 5-6, Google Book)

As is evident from the fairly small existing literature on the use of incentives in foreign policy, many different engagement strategies exist, depending¶ on such variables as the actors engaged, the incentives employed, and the objectives pursued. The first important distinction to be made in any typology¶ of engagement is whether the strategy is conditional or unconditional. A strategy of unconditional engagement would offer certain changes in U.S. policy¶ toward the country without the explicit agreement that a reciprocal act would¶ follow. Depending on the intention behind these unconditional initiatives—¶ and, of course, the reaction of the target country—this form of engagement¶ may be short-lived. Charles Osgood, in his GRIT (graduated and reciprocated initiatives in tension reduction) theory offers a model of cooperation¶ that stems from an uninvited, opening initiative by one country.8¶ Although¶ the act in itself is unconditional, the failure of the target country to reciprocate with meaningful gestures soon leads to the abandonment of the strategy; alternatively, if the initial accommodating steps are met with positive¶ moves, cooperation ensues. President George Bush’s 1991 nuclear reduction initiative, which was reciprocated by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev,¶ is one instance of a GRIT approach spurring cooperation. Conciliatory gestures made by the United States to Iran in March 2000 may be another.¶ Another form of unconditional engagement takes a broader perspective,¶ by regarding inducements offered to civil society and the private sector over¶ time as playing an important role in creating openings for cooperation further down the road. In these unconditional strategies, certain initiatives or¶ changes in U.S. policy toward the country are made without necessarily expecting, or even soliciting, reciprocal acts from the regime. This form of¶ engagement may be implemented by nongovernmental actors, such as the¶ programs sponsored by the National Endowment for Democracy that promote democracy and the development of institutions in many authoritarian regimes. Alternatively, this engagement may entail explicit modifications¶ to U.S. policy, as occurred with Cuba in March 1998 and January 1999. By¶ allowing licensed sales of food and agricultural inputs to independent entities in Cuba, by easing travel and financial restrictions, and by promoting¶ communication between America and the island, the United States sought¶ to buttress the development of civil society and the private sector in Cuba.9¶ In doing so, the United States hoped to build momentum leading to greater¶ political changes, which would facilitate U.S.-Cuban cooperation in the future, perhaps many years down the road.¶ In contrast, the expectations surrounding conditional engagement strategies are more contractual; in its most narrow form of the tit-for-tat process¶ explored by Robert Axelrod, cooperation is based on a strict cycle of reciprocity.10 However, conditional engagement can also refer to a much less¶ tightly orchestrated series of exchanges in which the United States extends¶ inducements for changes undertaken by the target country. These desired¶ alterations in the behavior of the target country may be particular, welldefined policy stances, or as in the case of Alexander George’s conditional¶ reciprocity, they may refer to more vague changes in attitudes and the overall orientation of regimes.11 While recognizing the subtle differences among¶ the various concepts of conditional engagement, this book uses the term¶ largely to refer to strategies of reciprocity with focused, policy objectives in¶ mind. The Agreed Framework struck between the United States and North¶ Korea in 1994 is one such example. In a specific effort to curtail nuclear¶ proliferation, America linked the provision of economic incentives to the¶ fulfillment of North Korean commitments to halt Pyongyang’s development¶ of nuclear weapons.¶ Architects of engagement strategies have a wide variety of incentives from¶ which to choose. Economic engagement might offer tangible incentives such¶ as export credits, investment insurance or promotion, access to technology,¶ loans, and economic aid.12 Other equally useful economic incentives involve¶ the removal of penalties, whether they be trade embargoes, investment bans,¶ or high tariffs that have impeded economic relations between the United¶ States and the target country. In addition, facilitated entry into the global¶ economic arena and the institutions that govern it rank among the most¶ potent incentives in today’s global market.13¶ Similarly, political engagement can involve the lure of diplomatic recognition, access to regional or international institutions, or the scheduling of¶ summits between leaders—or the termination of these benefits. Military¶ engagement could involve the extension of International Military Educational Training (IMET) both to strengthen respect for civilian authority and¶ human rights among a country’s armed forces and, more feasibly, to establish relationships between Americans and young foreign military officers.14¶ These areas of engagement are likely to involve working with state institutions, while cultural or civil society engagement is likely to entail building¶ people-to-people contacts. Funding nongovernmental organizations, facilitating the flow of remittances, establishing postal and telephone links between the United States and the target country, and promoting the exchange¶ of students, tourists, and other nongovernmental people between the countries are some of the incentives that might be offered under a policy of cultural engagement.

### 2ac farm bill

#### Won’t pass – time, momentum, commodity title, and food stamps

Rogers 11-21-13 (David, “Farm bill talks stumble,” <http://www.politico.com/story/2013/11/farm-bill-update-100217.html>)

Farm bill talks stumbled badly Thursday and House Agriculture Committee Chairman Frank Lucas (R-Okla.) said it would be “very challenging” now for him to meet the Republican leadership’s schedule of having a final agreement back on the House floor by Dec. 13. The Oklahoma Republican had been pressing hard for some framework of a deal before the Thanksgiving recess. But after three face-to-face meetings between House and Senate negotiators in less than 24 hours, the upshot seemed more a picture of frustration. “Anything is possible but it is very challenging,” Lucas said. He added that it was a “fair assessment” that he had not made the progress he had hoped for this week. ([Also on POLITICO: Full agriculture policy coverage](http://href.li/?http://www.politico.com/agriculture/)) “On a member-on-member level, we are done for the week,” Lucas said. Staff discussions will continue, but it appears the commodity title remains an open issue as well as the always divisive question of food stamp cuts demanded by House Republicans. “Everything is a work in progress,” Lucas said with some exasperation. Indeed, the last meeting Thursday afternoon was marked by testy exchanges with Senate Agriculture Committee Chairwoman Debbie Stabenow (D-Mich.) who vented her frustration with the inability to reach some lasting compromise on the House’s position linking target prices to planted acres in the commodity title. It was agreed that negotiators would talk by phone Monday and there is the possibility that the full House-Senate conference will meet December 4. But the mood was grim. ([PHOTOS: Pro Agriculture launch event](http://href.li/?http://www.politico.com/gallery/2013/11/pro-agriculture-launch-event/001441-020336.html)) Failure to meet the Dec. 13 deadline means that the farm bill will be kicked over into a third year of debate after Congress failed to act in 2012 and is now at risk of doing the same for 2013. Not all is lost: real progress has been made and the process has advanced much further in this Congress. But it raises the prospect that lawmakers will need to adopt a short-term extension into January of at least dairy program provisions. Lucas and Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) had hoped to avoid this choice, but the chairman did not rule it out Thursday. “I don’t know that I can answer that question yet,” he said. Lucas’ comments came after a series of meetings Wednesday and Thursday between himself, Stabenow and their respective ranking members, Rep. Collin Peterson (D-Minn.) and Sen. Thad Cochran (R-Miss.). ([Earlier on POLITICO: Lucas: This week key to farm deal](http://www.politico.com/story/2013/11/frank-lucas-farm-bill-100086.html)) Both Peterson and Cochran have themselves chaired the Agriculture committees in the past so the level of political and negotiating talent among the four lawmakers is high. But after all the delays getting to conference, they haven’t made the level of progress many had expected. Wednesday’s evening session ran for about 90 minutes in the House committee’s offices with both sides sounding hopeful. The four were back at it Thursday morning for about an hour. This second session was punctuated by the fact that for the last 15 minutes, staff were kicked out so the four principals could talk alone. (Earlier on POLITICO: Lucas: This week key to farm deal) After being interrupted by floor votes, the four reconvened with some commodity staff in the early afternoon in a Capitol basement hideaway office belonging to Stabenow. But that session broke up less an hour later with Lucas and a long chain of aides walking rapidly back to the House. “It’s slow going. We’re making progress,” Cochran told POLITICO off the Senate floor after the morning meeting. Stabenow seemed to take the same, more philosophical approach, but to Lucas’s frustration, she has also dug in more against the level of food stamp savings demanded by the House. In a brief interview with POLITICO, she confirmed that the issue has become “much tougher” since a 7 percent rollback in benefits took effect this month. The cut had been long scheduled and was inevitably part of the calculus when President Barack Obama first increased benefits in 2009 temporarily to boost the economy. But the timing could not be worse for the farm bill. And Stabenow will argue now that the multi-year savings of $11 billion should be counted by Lucas in the calculations now. Watching from the sidelines Thursday was Sen. John Hoeven (R-N.D.), a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee and past ally for Stabenow. The two talked at length on the Senate floor between the meeting with the House negotiators, and all the partisan discord in the Senate Thursday. Hoeven said the farm bill was a shared priority. “I believe we are making progress. We’re going to keep working on it,” he told POLITICO. “The farm bill is one of those things we can do together.” “I am a very flexible person and I have been very flexible in this whole process,” Stabenow told POLITICO after the talks broke. “But we have to have something that everybody thinks is fair. It’s a Rubik’s Cube. You can put that together a lot of ways. But in the end it has to be fair regionally.”

#### Filibuster reform thumps

Berger 11-22 (Judson Berger, “Filibuster Fallout: Reid maneuver could send ‘wrecking ball’ through talks on key legislation,” Fox News, 11-22-2013, http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/11/22/filibuster-fallout-reid-maneuver-could-send-wrecking-ball-through-talks-on-key/)

Democrats who claimed victory -- including President Obama -- in stripping the Senate minority of its power to block nominations may have done so at the sacrifice of the president's legislative agenda. ¶ Before Thursday, trust on Capitol Hill was frayed yet there was tentative hope following the bruising fight over the partial shutdown that Republicans and Democrats could find some spectrum of common ground for the rest of Obama's term. Maybe pass a few budgets, maybe do something lasting about that pesky deficit. ¶ But the move to use a rare parliamentary tactic and overhaul Senate procedure making it easier for the majority party to approve presidential nominees has poisoned an already tainted well. Any prospect for compromise on items ranging from immigration legislation to a fiscal deal to tax reform is now that much fainter. ¶ "There's no question that the move by Harry Reid will make it much tougher to get anything done between now and 2014," GOP strategist and former long-time Senate aide John Ullyot told FoxNews.com. ¶ "In the short-term, it's a wrecking ball through any efforts that were underway previously to have both parties work together on key bills." ¶ Because of the rule change, non-Supreme Court judicial nominees and executive-office nominees can now be approved with just 51 votes, as opposed to 60. ¶ In the first test of Senate relations following the filibuster change, Republicans united to block a critical defense policy bill. The bill failed in a vote late Thursday, nine votes short of the number needed to advance. ¶ Republicans were angry over Democrats' move to limit amendments, but the vote could also reflect new tensions over Reid deploying what's known as the "nuclear option." ¶ The Senate is now adjourning for the Thanksgiving break, and lawmakers will have time to stew over what just happened. ¶ The docket, though, is not getting any thinner. Under the terms of the budget resolution in late October, a bipartisan committee is supposed to be hammering out a new deal to keep the government operating into early 2014. The committee is charged with coming up with a plan by Dec. 13, and Congress is facing a January deadline to approve it. Plus they're facing a Feb. 7 deadline to raise the debt ceiling. ¶ Several lawmakers had already indicated there will be no "grand bargain" this time around, but now the question is whether lawmakers can avoid another partial shutdown.

#### Current fights over Cuba engagement and travel thump

Sullivan 13 (Mark P. Sullivan, Specialist in Latin American Affairs, Congressional Research Service, “Cuba: U.S. Policy and Issues for the 113th Congress,” CRS Report for Congress R43024, 6-12-2013, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R43024.pdf)

Legislative Activity¶ Strong interest on Cuba is expected to continue in the 113th Congress with attention focused on¶ economic and political developments, especially the human rights situation, and U.S. policy¶ toward the island nation. The continued imprisonment of Alan Gross remains a key concern for¶ many Members. Now that Congress has completed action on FY2013 appropriations, it will soon¶ be considering the Administration’s FY2014 request for the State Department and Foreign¶ Operations, which includes funding for Cuba democracy programs and Cuba broadcasting. For¶ many years, U.S. sanctions, particularly restrictions on travel, remittances, and agricultural¶ exports to Cuba, have been topics of congressional debate, and this could be possible again in the¶ 113th Congress.¶ To date in the 113th Congress, eight initiatives on Cuba have been introduced. Several would lift¶ or ease U.S. economic sanctions on Cuba: H.R. 214 and H.R. 872 (overall embargo); H.R. 871¶ (travel); and H.R. 873 (travel and agricultural exports). H.R. 215 would allow Cubans to play¶ organized professional baseball in the United States. H.R. 1917, among its provisions, would lift¶ the embargo and extend nondiscriminatory trade treatment to the products of Cuba after Cuba¶ releases Alan Gross from prison. Identical initiatives, H.R. 778/S. 647 would modify a 1998¶ trademark sanction; in contrast, H.R. 214, H.R. 872, H.R. 873, and H.R. 1917 each have a¶ provision that would repeal the trademark sanction. H.Res. 121 would honor the work of Cuban¶ blogger Yoani Sánchez in challenging the oppression of the Castro regime. In addition, in March¶ 2013, Congress completed action on full-year FY2013 appropriations with the approval of H.R.¶ 933 (P.L. 113-6), which continues to provide funding for Cuba democracy and human rights¶ projects and Cuba broadcasting (Radio and TV Martí).

#### No congressional action means ZERO PC required – AND, secrecy shields blame

Pascual, et al 9 (Carlos Pascual, State Department Special Envoy and Coordinator for International Energy Affairs, former Ambassador to Mexico, former Vice President and Director of Foreign Policy, Brookings Institution, M.P.P Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, B.A. Stanford University; and Vicki Huddleston, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Africa, former Ambassador to Mali, former Principal Officer of the U.S. Interests Section in Havana (equivalent of Ambassador to a state with no official diplomatic relations), former Visiting Fellow, Brookings Institution; Co-Directors, Brookings Project on U.S. Policy Toward a Cuba in Transition, “CUBA: A New Policy of Critical and Constructive Engagement,” Report of the Brookings Project on U.S. Policy Toward a Cuba in Transition, April 2009, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/reports/2009/4/cuba/0413\_cuba.pdf)

Given the strong sentiments and expectations¶ that Cuba engenders, it would be preferable for¶ the Executive Branch to proceed discreetly. The¶ president might first announce the principles he¶ hopes to achieve in Cuba through a policy of en¶ -¶ gagement that promotes human rights, the well-¶ being of the Cuban people, and the growth of¶ civil society. To carry out the president’s vision,¶ the Secretary of the Treasury will then have the¶ responsibility to write and publish the changes¶ to the Cuban Assets Control Regulations by li¶ -¶ censing activities designed to achieve these ends.¶ The Secretary of State can quietly accomplish¶ many diplomatic initiatives on a reciprocal basis¶ without any need to publicize them. This quiet¶ diplomacy might be complemented by a refusal¶ to engage in what some refer to as megaphone¶ diplomacy, in which our governments trade in¶ -¶ sults across the Straits of Florida, and which only¶ contributes to making the United States appear¶ to be a bully.¶ The president’s leadership in carrying out a new¶ Cuba policy is essential because by law and prac¶ -¶ tice it is his responsibility to determine the over¶ -¶ all conduct of U.S. foreign policy.¶ In the case of¶ Cuba, he has ample executive authority to put¶ in place a policy of engagement. If he wishes,¶ he can expand bilateral diplomatic relations, re¶ -¶ move Cuba from the list of terrorist countries,¶ and rescind the current policy that grants im¶ -¶ mediate legal residency to Cubans who enter the¶ United States without visas. Should bilateral re¶ -¶ lations improve, he could choose to negotiate the¶ unresolved expropriated property claims of U.S.¶ citizens and review the status of Guantanamo¶ Bay Naval Base. ¶ Despite the myth that Congress must legislate¶ to change U.S. policy toward Cuba, history has¶ shown that presidents routinely take actions to¶ strengthen or loosen the embargo as they see fit.¶ Thus, like his predecessors,¶ p¶ resident Obama can¶ change regulations in order to modify the Cuban¶ embargo without the need for an act of Congress.¶ He will, however, ultimately require Congress to¶ legislate in order to remove the embargo and lift¶ all restrictions on travel.

#### Winners win – fractures the Republican Party

Dickerson 1/18 (John, Slate, Go for the Throat!, www.slate.com/articles/news\_and\_politics/politics/2013/01/barack\_obama\_s\_second\_inaugural\_address\_the\_president\_should\_declare\_war.single.html)

On Monday, President Obama will preside over the grand reopening of his administration. It would be altogether fitting if he stepped to the microphone, looked down the mall, and let out a sigh: so many people expecting so much from a government that appears capable of so little. A second inaugural suggests new beginnings, but this one is being bookended by dead-end debates. Gridlock over the fiscal cliff preceded it and gridlock over the debt limit, sequester, and budget will follow. After the election, the same people are in power in all the branches of government and they don't get along. There's no indication that the president's clashes with House Republicans will end soon. Inaugural speeches are supposed to be huge and stirring. Presidents haul our heroes onstage, from George Washington to Martin Luther King Jr. George W. Bush brought the Liberty Bell. They use history to make greatness and achievements seem like something you can just take down from the shelf. Americans are not stuck in the rut of the day. But this might be too much for Obama’s second inaugural address: After the last four years, how do you call the nation and its elected representatives to common action while standing on the steps of a building where collective action goes to die? That bipartisan bag of tricks has been tried and it didn’t work. People don’t believe it. Congress' approval rating is 14 percent, the lowest in history. In a December Gallup poll, 77 percent of those asked said the way Washington works is doing “serious harm” to the country. The challenge for President Obama’s speech is the challenge of his second term: how to be great when the environment stinks. Enhancing the president’s legacy requires something more than simply the clever application of predictable stratagems. Washington’s partisan rancor, the size of the problems facing government, and the limited amount of time before Obama is a lame duck all point to a single conclusion: The president who came into office speaking in lofty terms about bipartisanship and cooperation can only cement his legacy if he destroys the GOP. If he wants to transform American politics, he must go for the throat. President Obama could, of course, resign himself to tending to the achievements of his first term. He'd make sure health care reform is implemented, nurse the economy back to health, and put the military on a new footing after two wars. But he's more ambitious than that. He ran for president as a one-term senator with no executive experience. In his first term, he pushed for the biggest overhaul of health care possible because, as he told his aides, he wanted to make history. He may already have made it. There's no question that he is already a president of consequence. But there's no sign he's content to ride out the second half of the game in the Barcalounger. He is approaching gun control, climate change, and immigration with wide and excited eyes. He's not going for caretaker. How should the president proceed then, if he wants to be bold? The Barack Obama of the first administration might have approached the task by finding some Republicans to deal with and then start agreeing to some of their demands in hope that he would win some of their votes. It's the traditional approach. Perhaps he could add a good deal more schmoozing with lawmakers, too. That's the old way. He has abandoned that. He doesn't think it will work and he doesn't have the time. As Obama explained in his last press conference, he thinks the Republicans are dead set on opposing him. They cannot be unchained by schmoozing. Even if Obama were wrong about Republican intransigence, other constraints will limit the chance for cooperation. Republican lawmakers worried about primary challenges in 2014 are not going to be willing partners. He probably has at most 18 months before people start dropping the lame-duck label in close proximity to his name. Obama’s only remaining option is to pulverize. Whether he succeeds in passing legislation or not, given his ambitions, his goal should be to delegitimize his opponents. Through a series of clarifying fights over controversial issues, he can force Republicans to either side with their coalition's most extreme elements or cause a rift in the party that will leave it, at least temporarily, in disarray.

#### Lifting the travel ban boosts the US agriculture industry

CPF 3 Cuba Policy Foundation. February 5, 2003 . “LIFTING CUBA TRAVEL BAN BENEFITS

AMERICA’S FARMERS

BETWEEN $126 AND $252 MILLION IN ADDITIONAL ANNUAL U.S. AGRICULTURAL SALES TO CUBA EXPECTED ABOVE CURRENT LEVELS” CPF Online. http://www.cubafoundation.org/CPF%20Travel-Ag%20Study/Release-Cuba-Travel-Ag-0302.04.htm

Washington, DC, February 5, 2003 - An end to the ban on American travel to Cuba would provide a boost for America’s farmers, according to a new report produced for the Cuba Policy Foundation by one of America’s leading agricultural economists, Parr Rosson of Texas A&M University. Lifting the travel ban would produce between $126 million and $252 million in annual U.S. agricultural exports to Cuba, above current levels of farm sales to the island, the report concludes, and such sales would create between 3,490 and 6,980 jobs for Americans. ¶ ¶ The full report, “Estimated Agricultural Economic Impacts of Expanded U.S. Tourism to Cuba,” is available at www.cubafoundation.org. The report is premised on a forecast of 1.5 million annual American visitors to Cuba on one-week stays. Some forecasts project annual U.S. travel to Cuba would be as high as 4 million visitors in the first year, but more conservative estimates suggest that 1.5 million on seven day stays would be reached by year three after lifting the ban. Current U.S. law forbids most Americans from traveling to Cuba.¶ ¶ “This report shows that there is a clear link between lifting the travel ban and helping the U.S. farm economy. Lifting the Cuba travel ban would be a significant boost for America’s farmers,” according to Brian Alexander, Executive Director of the Cuba Policy Foundation. ¶ ¶ Farmers in America already have begun to see some benefits of trade with Cuba. Since December 2001, over $150 million in U.S. farm products have been sold to Cuba, sourced from at least 30 states, under an exception in the in the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000 (TSRA) that allows Americans to export agricultural products to Cuba. Based on this figure, Cuba grew in 2002 to one of the United States’ top 50 agricultural export markets, up from dead last of 228 countries in 2000. Cuban contracts for American food in 2002 reportedly topped $230 million, the delivery of some of which is still occurring. Statements by the Cuban buyers indicate that agricultural purchases from the United States in 2003 would be at least at 2002 levels. ¶ ¶ In a separate study produced for the Cuba Policy Foundation, it is demonstrated that the total potential Cuban market for American agricultural goods is $1.24 billion annually, if the embargo were completely lifted. “Lifting the travel ban would put the U.S. one-step closer toward this figure,” Mr. Alexander said. ¶ ¶ In addition to benefiting America’s farmers, lifting the travel ban would produce major gains for the U.S. travel sector, particularly airlines, hotels and tour operators. A July 2002 study produced by the University of Colorado at Boulder for the Cuba Policy Foundation concludes that lifting the travel ban would produce over $1.7 billion and create 10,000 jobs for the U.S. travel sector.

### 2ac courts cp

#### No usable test case – turns solvency

Llorens 09 (Armando Llorens, litigation attorney, “Do the Restrictions on Cuba Travel Violate the Constitution,” TalkLeft Foreign Affairs, 4-14-09)

In the wake of President Obama's announced initiatives on Cuba, I've been reading some commentary that the restrictions on travel to Cuba are unconstitutional. As a general matter, travel restrictions imposed by the Executive and the Congress (see the Helms Burton Act (PDF)) are constitutional. See Zemel v. Rusk and Regan v. Wald. In Regan, the court held:¶ [A]lthough the ban in question effectively prevented travel to Cuba, and thus diminished the right to gather information about foreign countries, no First Amendment rights of the sort that controlled in Kent and Aptheker were implicated by the across-the-board restriction in Zemel. And the Court found the Fifth Amendment right to travel, standing alone, insufficient to overcome the foreign policy justifications supporting the restriction. . . . We see no reason to differentiate between the travel restrictions imposed by the President in the present case and the passport restrictions imposed by the Secretary of State in Zemel. Both have the practical effect of preventing travel to Cuba by most American citizens, and both are justified by weighty concerns of foreign policy.¶ Thus, a general ban on travel to Cuba is constitutional. The question now being raised (though it is not new) is whether allowing persons with family in Cuba to travel (and presumably also to send money to relatives) to Cuba violates the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment. I'll discuss that theory on the flip.¶ In essence, the proponents of this argument would assert that the allowance of persons with family in Cuba to travel to Cuba will prohibiting persons who do not have family in Cuba from traveling to Cuba creates a class of persons - those with no family in Cuba - and that this class of persons are being unconstitutionally discriminated against. I cannot conjure a case that has accepted this type of classification.¶ Perhaps it could be argued that the classifications was national in origin - that is, that it favored Cuban-Americans over non-Cuban Americans. Thus the "suspect class" would be non-Cuban Americans. That would be a pretty broad class. While it is true that the Supreme Court has by rote stated that "that classifications based on alienage . . . are inherently suspect and subject to close scrutiny," and thus struck down state restriction on education, state assistance, professional licensing and the like, that seems a far cry from the case proposed.¶ The problem is exacerbated by the wide berth the Court has given the government with regard to foreign policy. In addition, the fact the Congress has concurred in these restrictions makes it difficult to imagine a court recognizing the rather amorphous class of "non-Cuban Americans." As noted, generally alienage has been used to restrict privileges, not grant them.¶ It would be amusing to see the assault on affirmative action thrown in conservative jurists' face on this, but I think they have an easy out - 'its foreign policy.' My view is that this argument would not gain traction.

#### Links to politics

Canon and Johnson 99 — professor of polisci at UK and vice-presiding judge on the Oklahoma court of appeals, 99- (Bradley C. Canon and Charles A. Johnson, Judicial Policies: Implementation and Impact, 1999, p. 1)

President Andrew Jackson, unhappy with a Supreme Court decision, is said to have retorted: “John Marshall has made his decision, now let him enforce it.” His remark reminds us of a central fact of American democracy: judicial policies do not implement themselves. In virtually all instances, courts that formulate policies must rely on other courts or on nonjudicial actors to transform these policies into action. Inevitably, just as making judicial policies is a political process, so too is the implementation of the policies- the issues are essentially political, and the actors are subject to political pressures.

### 2ac reparations

#### Extinction comes first – no other prior questions

Bostrom 12 – Professor of Philosophy at Oxford, directs Oxford's Future of Humanity Institute, Interview with Ross Andersen, correspondent at The Atlantic, 3/6, “We're Underestimating the Risk of Human Extinction”, http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2012/03/were-underestimating-the-risk-of-human-extinction/253821/)

Bostrom, who directs Oxford's Future of Humanity Institute, has argued over the course of several papers that human extinction risks are poorly understood and, worse still, severely underestimated by society. Some of these existential risks are fairly well known, especially the natural ones. But others are obscure or even exotic. Most worrying to Bostrom is the subset of existential risks that arise from human technology, a subset that he expects to grow in number and potency over the next century.¶ Despite his concerns about the risks posed to humans by technological progress, Bostrom is no luddite. In fact, he is a longtime advocate of transhumanism---the effort to improve the human condition, and even human nature itself, through technological means. In the long run he sees technology as a bridge, a bridge we humans must cross with great care, in order to reach new and better modes of being. In his work, Bostrom uses the tools of philosophy and mathematics, in particular probability theory, to try and determine how we as a species might achieve this safe passage. What follows is my conversation with Bostrom about some of the most interesting and worrying existential risks that humanity might encounter in the decades and centuries to come, and about what we can do to make sure we outlast them.¶ Some have argued that we ought to be directing our resources toward humanity's existing problems, rather than future existential risks, because many of the latter are highly improbable. You have responded by suggesting that existential risk mitigation may in fact be a dominant moral priority over the alleviation of present suffering. Can you explain why? ¶ Bostrom: Well suppose you have a moral view that counts future people as being worth as much as present people. You might say that fundamentally it doesn't matter whether someone exists at the current time or at some future time, just as many people think that from a fundamental moral point of view, it doesn't matter where somebody is spatially---somebody isn't automatically worth less because you move them to the moon or to Africa or something. A human life is a human life. If you have that moral point of view that future generations matter in proportion to their population numbers, then you get this very stark implication that existential risk mitigation has a much higher utility than pretty much anything else that you could do. There are so many people that could come into existence in the future if humanity survives this critical period of time---we might live for billions of years, our descendants might colonize billions of solar systems, and there could be billions and billions times more people than exist currently. Therefore, even a very small reduction in the probability of realizing this enormous good will tend to outweigh even immense benefits like eliminating poverty or curing malaria, which would be tremendous under ordinary standards.

#### Inclusion of pragmatic, reformist coalitions is the only way to make their rejection politically effective---the alt alone fails and generates backlash

**Winant, UC Santa Barbara sociology professor, 1997**

(Howard, “Behind Blue Eyes: Contemporary White Racial Politics”, <http://www.soc.ucsb.edu/faculty/winant/whitness.html>, DOA: 10-13-11, ldg)

Although the differences and indeed the hostility -- between the neoliberal and abolitionist projects, between the reform-oriented and radical conceptions of whiteness -- are quite severe, we consider it vital that adherents of each project recognize that they hold part of the key to challenging white supremacy in the contemporary US, and that their counterpart project holds the other part of the key. Neoliberals rightfully argue that a pragmatic approach to transracial politics is vital if the momentum of racial reaction is to be halted or reversed. Abolitionists properly emphasize challenging the ongoing commitment to white supremacy on the part of many whites. Both of these positions need to draw on each other, not only in strategic terms, but in theoretical ones as well. The recognition that racial identities -- all racial identities, including whiteness -- have become implacably dualistic, could be far more liberating on the left than it has thus far been. For neoliberals, it could permit and indeed justify an acceptance of race-consciousness and even nationalism among racially-defined minorities as a necessary but partial response to disenfranchisement, disempowerment, and superexploitation. There is no inherent reason why such a political position could not coexist with a strategic awareness of the need for strong, class-conscious, transracial coalitions. We have seen many such examples in the past: in the anti-slavery movement, the communist movement of the 1930s (Kelley 1994), and in the 1988 presidential bid of Jesse Jackson, to name but a few. This is not to say that all would be peace and harmony if such alliances could come more permanently into being. But there is no excuse for not attempting to find the pragmatic "common ground" necessary to create them. Abolitionists could also benefit from a recognition that on a pragmatic basis, whites can ally with racially-defined minorities without renouncing their whiteness. If they truly agree that race is a socially constructed concept, as they claim, abolitionists should also be able to recognize that racial identities are not either-or matters, not closed concepts that must be upheld in a reactionary fashion or disavowed in a comprehensive act of renunciation. To use a postmodern language I dislike: racial identities are deeply "hybridized"; they are not "sutured," but remain open to rearticulation. "To be white in America is to be very black. If you don't know how black you are, you don't know how American you are" (Thompson 1995, 429).

#### Modern democratic structures check why action based on status quo economy is bad

**Dickinson ‘4** (Edward Ross Dickinson, professor of modern history, University of Cincinnati, “Biopolitics, Fascism, Democracy”, Central European History, 37(1), 2004, ejournals)

In short, the **continuities between early twentieth-century biopolitical discourse and the practices of the welfare state in our own time** are unmistakable. Both are instances of the "disciplinary society" and of biopolitical, regulatory, social-engineering modernity, and they share that genealogy with more authoritarian states, including the National Socialist state, but also fascist Italy, for example. And it is certainly fruitful to view them from this very broad perspective. But that analysis **can easily become superficial and misleading, because it obfuscates the profoundly different** strategic and local **dynamics of power in the two kinds of regimes**. **Clearly the democratic welfare state is not only formally but also substantively quite different from totalitarianism**. Above all, again, **it has nowhere developed the** fateful, **radicalizing dynamic** that characterized National Socialism (or for that matter Stalinism), the psychotic logic **that leads from economistic population management to mass murder**. Again, there is always the potential for such a discursive regime to generate coercive policies. In those cases in which the regime of rights does not successfully produce "health," such a system can -- and historically does -- create compulsory programs to enforce it. But again, **there are political and policy** potentials and **constraints** in such a structuring of biopolitics that are very different from those of National Socialist Germany. **Democratic biopolitical regimes require, enable, and incite a degree of** self-direction and **participation that is functionally incompatible with** authoritarian or **totalitarian structures**. And **this pursuit of biopolitical ends through** a regime of **democratic citizenship** **does appear, historically, to have imposed increasingly narrow limits on coercive policies**, and to have generated a "logic" or imperative of increasing liberalization. Despite limitations imposed by political context and the slow pace of discursive change, I think this is the unmistakable message of the really very impressive waves of legislative and welfare reforms in the 1920s or the 1970s in Germany.(n90) Of course it is not yet clear whether this is an irreversible dynamic of such systems. Nevertheless, such regimes are characterized by sufficient degrees of autonomy (and of the potential for its expansion) for sufficient numbers of people that I think it becomes useful to conceive of them as productive of a strategic configuration of power relations that might fruitfully be analyzed as a condition of "liberty," just as much as they are productive of constraint, oppression, or manipulation. At the very least, **totalitarianism cannot be the sole orientation point for our understanding of biopolitics**, the only end point of the logic of social engineering. This notion is not at all at odds with the core of Foucauldian (and Peukertian) theory. Democratic welfare states are regimes of power/knowledge no less than early twentieth-century totalitarian states; these systems are not "opposites," in the sense that they are two alternative ways of organizing the same thing. But they are two very different ways of organizing it. The concept "power" should not be read as a universal stifling night of oppression, manipulation, and entrapment, in which all political and social orders are grey, are essentially or effectively "the same." Power is a set of social relations, in which individuals and groups have varying degrees of autonomy and effective subjectivity. And discourse is, as Foucault argued, "tactically polyvalent." Discursive elements (like the various elements of biopolitics) can be combined in different ways to form parts of quite different strategies (like totalitarianism or the democratic welfare state); they cannot be assigned to one place in a structure, but rather circulate. The varying possible constellations of power in modern societies create "multiple modernities," modern societies with quite radically differing potentials.(n91)

### 2ac cap

#### Perm – do the plan and \_\_\_\_\_\_. If the ALT is true, AFF facilitates their travel and diversification of resistance. Empirics prove – narrow easing in 09 and 11 was successful.

Wolfenstein 2k (PhD in politics from Princeton, professor of political science at UCLA, PhD in psychoanalysis, Victor, Inside/outside Nietzsche, p 235-6, AG)

As to the matter of political aims, we have no choice but to live with the disjunction between the potential for realizing the project of human emancipation and the recognition that this potential is not going to be realized any time soon. In the foreseeable future, we are not going to be able to go beyond capitalism. We cannot hope for the emergence of a society in which the free development of each individual is a condition for the free development of all. Capitalism is a system of structurally determined inequality; its normal and necessary operations preclude genuine social democracy. This is the sobering premise of contemporary emancipatory politics. Yet from its inception, capitalism has combined emancipatory and oppressive tendencies. We must resist the temptation of one-dimensionalizing it one way or the other. Putting the point **pragmatically**, we can hope and work for the realization of **progressive policy aims** so long as these do not (unduly?) inhibit the process of capital accumulation or **threaten the power relationships** that maintain them. This defines a **substantial field for political action**, one in which outcomes are contingent and not determinable in advance. It is an abnegation of political responsibility not to take advantage of these potentialities, even if social injustices and metabolic imbalances **cannot be altogether eliminated**. To carry the argument a bit further, the realization of progressive political aims depends on collective action, ultimately at national or even international levels. Local action, vital as it may be, **just is not enough**. We critical theorists—must be prepared for a war on two fronts: against the hegemonic power of capitalist ruling classes, on the one side, and against sometimes diffuse, sometimes organizationally embodied, ur-fascistic tendencies, on the other. The fissiparous tendency in leftist politics, sometimes celebrated in postmodern discourse, puts us at a **terrible strategic and tactical disadvantage**. The dangers of a dissent-stiffling leftist hegemony, although not a mere phantasy, are far less pressing than the risks of self-fragmentation and political incoherence. In this regard, the more things change, the more they stay the same: resistance politics must be both dialectically self-unifying and perspectivally self-differentiating.

#### Empirically maximizes value to life

Cudd 10 – Dean of Humanities and Professor of Philosophy @ KU Anne Cudd, “Capitalism for and Against: A Feminist Debate,” pg. 49

The average quality of life for humans, particularly for women and children, has improved in the past hundred years, and many of the advances are **causally related to capitalism**. There are three categories of objective improvement of quality of life: material, moral, and political. Material Improvements Include physical changes in life and work, such as changes in the amount and strenuousness of physical labor, the availability of food, clean water, and decent shelter the degree of violence suffered, as well as the disease burden. By moral advances I mean the degree to which human individuals are **treated in a dignified and decent manner**, as worthy of respect in their own right, and as responsible, autonomous self-owners. By political advances I mean the degree to which individuals have a voice in the government of their communities and nations. These three categories encompass the objective list of interests that I claim all humans have. While it is not possible to quantify or measure each of these categories, I can make some generalizations about the progress m quality of life over the past century. For virtually every interest, the **quality of life has improved under capitalism**.

#### Cap’s not a root cause

Larrivee 10 (PF ECONOMICS AT MOUNT ST MARY’S UNIVERSITY – MASTERS FROM THE HARVARD KENNEDY SCHOOL AND PHD IN ECONOMICS FROM WISCONSIN, 10 [JOHN, A FRAMEWORK FOR THE MORAL ANALYSIS OF MARKETS, 10/1, <http://www.teacheconomicfreedom.org/files/larrivee-paper-1.pdf>])

The Second Focal Point: Moral, Social, and Cultural Issues of Capitalism Logical errors abound in critical commentary on capitalism. Some critics observe a problem and conclude: “I see X in our society. We have a capitalist economy. Therefore capitalism causes X.” They draw their conclusion by looking at a phenomenon as it appears only in one system. Others merely follow a host of popular theories according to which capitalism is particularly bad. 6 The solution to such flawed reasoning is to be comprehensive, to look at the good and bad, in market and non-market systems. Thus the following section considers a number of issues—greed, selfishness and human relationships, honesty and truth, alienation and work satisfaction, moral decay, and religious participation—that have often been associated with capitalism, but have also been problematic in other systems and usually in more extreme form. I conclude with some evidence for the view that markets foster (at least some) virtues rather than undermining them. My purpose is not to smear communism or to make the simplistic argument that “capitalism isn’t so bad because other systems have problems too.” The critical point is that certain people thought various social ills resulted from capitalism, and on this basis they took action to establish alternative economic systems to solve the problems they had identified. That they failed to solve the problems, and in fact exacerbated them while also creating new problems, implies that capitalism itself wasn’t the cause of the problems in the first place, at least not to the degree theorized.

#### Our scholarship is best – it’s empirically valid and falsifiable – reject their isolated analysis of the psyche of cap

Weede 4 (professor of sociology at the University of Bonn, Germany, In Winter 1986-87, he was Visiting Professor of International Relations at the Bologna Center of The Johns Hopkins University. (Erich, “BALANCE OF POWER, GLOBALIZATION, AND THE CAPITALIST PEACE,” http://www.fnf.org.ph/downloadables/Balance%20of%20Power,%20Globalization%20and%20Capitalist%20Peace.pdf)

If one does research or su*m*marize the research of others – of course, most of the ideas, theories, and evidence discussed below have been produced by others – **one cannot avoid some epistemological commitments**. In the social sciences the fundamental choice is whether to pursue an ideographic or a nomothetic approach. Almost all historians choose the ideographic approach and focus on the description of structures or events, whereas most economists and psychologists choose the nomothetic approach and focus on the search for law-like general statements. Sociologists and political scientists are still divided – sometimes even by the Atlantic Ocean. In American political science the nomothetic approach dominates the flagship journal of the profession, the American Political Science Review, as well as more specialized journals, such as International Studies Quarterly, the Journal of Conflict Resolution, or World Politics. In German political science, however, the nomothetic approach has advanced little beyond electoral studies.¶ **My own approach is definitely nomothetic**. This is related to my training in psychology at one of the first German universities focusing on quantitative research methods in the early 1960s, the University of Hamburg. This epistemological orientation has been reinforced by graduate training in international politics at one of the first American universities emphasizing quantitative research in the late 1960s, Northwestern University, which is located in a suburb of Chicago.¶ **Nomothetic research focuses on hypothesizing, testing and establishing law-like general statements or nomological propositions**. **Examples of such propositions are:** The higher average incomes in a nation are, the more likely is democratic government. Or, **the more economic freedom in a nation prevails, the less frequently it is involved in war. One characteristic of such propositions is that they say something about observable reality**. Whenever you say something about reality, you risk that others find out that you are wrong. If we observed that most poor countries were democracies, but most rich countries were autocracies, then we should reject or, at least, modify the proposition about prosperity and democracy mentioned above.1 **Nomothetic researchers look for refutations. They try to falsify their propositions or theories** (Popper 1934/1959). If the empirical evidence is compatible with one's theory, then one keeps the hypothetical propositions and regards them as supported – until negative evidence turns up. **Although certitude about possession of the truth is beyond the capabilities of human inquiry, growth of knowledge is conceivable by the successive elimination of errors**.¶ This epistemological approach borrowed from Popper were easily applicable, if most of our propositions were deterministic, if they claimed to be valid without exceptions. Then, finding a single exception to a general statement – say, about prosperity and democracy – would suffice to falsify the proposition. Looking at poor India nevertheless being democratic, or at fairly rich Kuwait nevertheless being autocratic, would suffice to reject the theory.2 Unfortunately, **almost no theory in macroeconomics, macrosociology, or international relations delivers deterministic propositions. Instead we have only probabilistic statements of the type that** more prosperous countries are more likely to be democratic than others, or that **economically freer countries are more likely to avoid war involvement than others**. **Probabilistic assertions never can be falsified by pointing to single events which do not fit with theoretical expectations. Instead we have to look at relative frequencies, at correlations or regression coefficients**. **We need statistical tools to evaluate such propositions**. We typically ask the question whether a hypothesized relationship is so strong that it could only rarely occur because of random measurement or sampling error. Probabilistic propositions are regarded as supported only if they jump certain thresholds of significance which are ultimately defined by mere conventions. Researchers are interested in causal propositions, that is, in statements about causes and effects, or determinants and consequences. Such statements can be used for explanation, forecasting, or policy interventions. We need to know more than the mere existence of some association or correlation between, say, prosperity and democracy, or economic freedom and the avoidance of military conflict. We need to know whether prosperity promotes democracy, or whether democracy promotes growth, or whether, possibly, both statements might be defensible or, for the time being, taken for 'true'.¶ While a correlation between two variables, like prosperity and democracy, is equally compatible with the simple alternative causal propositions that prosperity causes democracy, and that democracy causes prosperity, this ambiguity no longer necessarily applies in more complex theoretical models. There, we tend to explain a single effect by a number of causes. For example, one may contend that democracy is promoted by prosperity as well as by a capitalist economic order (or economic freedom). We can take such a theoretical contention – which may be true or false, compatible with the data or not – as a starting point for specifying a regression equation.3 If both theoretical statements – about the democratizing effects of prosperity and capitalism – were true, then the regression coefficients of both variables should be positive and significant. If this is what we find in empirical research, then we regard the two propositions as provisionally supported. But final proofs remain impossible in empirical research. It is conceivable that some nonbeliever in the two propositions suggests a third measurable determinant of democracy. Before it actually is included in the regression equation, one never knows what its inclusion results in. Possibly, the previously significant and positive regression coefficients of prosperity and capitalism might be reduced to insignificance or even change signs. Then a previously supported causal proposition would have to be overturned and rejected.¶ The claim of causality implies more than observable association or correlation. It also implies temporal precedence of causes before effects. If one wants to test the causal proposition that prosperity contributes to democratic government, or that economic freedom contributes to the avoidance of military conflict, then one should measure prosperity or economic freedom before their hypothesized effects occur – certainly not later. If there is doubt about the direction of causality, as there frequently is, one might also look at the relationships between, say, earlier prosperity and later democracy as well as between earlier democracy and later prosperity. Although such investigations may become technically complicated, it might suffice here to keep the general principles in mind. From causal propositions we derive expectations about correlation or regression coefficients. But conclusions from correlations to causal propositions are not justified. One simply can never 'verify' causal statements by correlations. From causal propositions we also derive expectations about temporal precedence. As long as empirical evidence fits one's theoretical expectations, one regards the propositions or theory as provisionally supported and works with them. There is another complication. As illustrated by the debate about the effects of trade and economic interdependence on the avoidance of military conflict below, full accordance of empirical studies and verdicts with theories is the exception rather than the rule – if it ever happens at all. That is why some philosophers of science (for example, Kuhn 1962; Lakatos 1968-69) have been critical of the idea of falsification and warned against premature rejection of propositions. If 'anomalies' or 'falsification' are more or less ubiquitous, then our task is no longer so easy as to choose between theories which have been falsified and therefore deserve rejection and those which are compatible with the facts and therefore deserve to be accepted until negative evidence turns up. Then our task becomes to choose between competing theories, for example about the conflict reinforcing or pacifying impact of trade, and to pick those which fit the data relatively better than others. So, **the claim advanced in this review of the literature cannot be that the empirical evidence fits the capitalist peace idea perfectly, but merely that the evidence fits [the capital peace idea] much better than competing explanations of military conflict and notions about the negative impact of capitalism on the avoidance of conflict and war or the irrelevance of democracy do**. The epistemological discussion above could provide no more than a crude 'feel' for empirical research in the social sciences and its pitfalls. **Although certitude is beyond reach, it is better to rely on testable, tested and so far supported propositions than on a hodgepodge of ambiguous hunches, contradictory thinking, and unsystematically evaluated empirical evidence**.

# 1AR

## Case

### Cap no rc prolif

#### Cap key to prevent prolif – ALT causes it

Solingen 95 (Etel Solingen, Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of California, Irvine, Faculty Fellow of the Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation, "The Political Economy of Nuclear Restraint," reprinted in abridged form from International Security, Fall 1994, pp.126-159, Global Issues in Transition, No. 12, 2-13-1995, <http://www.fas.org/irp/threat/950213-nuke-usia.htm>)

SUMMARY: In countries sitting on the fence between nonproliferation and development of nuclear weapons, ruling coalitions pursuing economic liberalization are more likely to embrace regional nuclear regimes than are inward-looking, nationalist and radical-confessional coalitions. A review of developments on the Korean Peninsula, in South Asia, in the Middle East, and in Latin America provides impressive empirical support for this proposition. Liberalizing coalitions tend to oppose nuclear weapons programs both because of the favorable impact of this stance on efforts to garner international trade, aid, technology and investment, and because of potential reduction in government regulations and bloated budgets related to nuclear weapons programs. (Length: 14,400 words.)

## K

### 1ar consequentialism

#### Capitalism is ethical

Nash 02 (PhD, Professor of Philosophy, Southern Baptists Theological Seminary, "Government is too big and it's costing you!" 02 http://www.summit.org/resources/govistoobig.htm)

Among all of our economic options, Arthur Shenfield writes:¶ "Only capitalism operates on the basis of respect for free, independent, responsible persons. All other systems in varying degrees treat ~~men~~ as less than this. Socialist systems above all treat ~~men~~[people] as pawns to be moved about by the authorities, or as children to be given what the rulers decide is good for them, or as serfs or slaves. The rulers begin by boasting about their compassion, which in any case is fraudulent, but after a time they drop this pretense which they find unnecessary for the maintenance of power. In all things they act on the presumption that they know best. Therefore they and their systems are morally stunted. Only the free system, the much assailed capitalism, is morally mature."¶ The alternative to free exchange is coercion and violence. Capitalism is a mechanism that allows natural human desires to be satisfied in a nonviolent way.¶ Little can be done to prevent people from wanting to be rich, Shenfield says. That’s the way things often are in a fallen world. But what capitalism does is channel that desire into peaceful means that benefit many besides those who wish to improve their own situation in life.¶ “The alternative to serving other men’s wants,” Shenfield concludes, “is seizing power of them, as it always has been. Hence it is not surprising that wherever the enemies of capitalism have prevailed, the result has been not only the debasement of consumption standards for the masses but also their reduction to serfdom by the new privileged class of Socialist rulers.”