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#### Comprehensive immigration reform will pass – Obama is pushing.

Elizabeth Liorente, 9-06-2013, politics editor, Fox News Latino, “Already Facing Uphill Battle, Immigration Reform Could Be Doomed By Syrian Conflict,” <http://latino.foxnews.com/latino/politics/2013/09/06/already-facing-uphill-battle-immigration-reform-could-be-doomed-by-syrian/>

“It looks like a lot of excuses for not passing immigration reform,” said Audrey Singer, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, a Washington, D.C., think tank. “But the pressure is on. I don’t think this Congress wants to be blamed for not moving things forward on immigration.” Singer said although immigration efforts have been underway before — such as in 2007, when Bush was heavily involved, and veteran political leaders Sen. John McCain, an Arizona Republican, and Sen. Ted Kennedy, a Massachusetts Democrat, spearheaded the work in Congress — and then failed, this time is different. “We are not seeing a huge push against moving forward with immigration reform like we saw in 2007,” Singer said. “That includes key people in leadership positions, who were talking about immigration reform in 2007 in not a positive way.” Anastasia Mann, a visiting associate for the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University, said that this time, there is too large a groundswell of support for an overhaul to immigration — particularly the aspect that would bring many of the nation’s undocumented immigrants out of the shadows. “Business people need reform to happen, workers need this to happen,” she said. Obama administration officials, meanwhile, adamantly rejected the notion that immigration reform is in peril. They insisted President Obama is not giving up on immigration. “An American president has to be able to walk, chew gum and juggle at the same time,” Dan Pfeiffer, a senior adviser to Obama, told The New York Times. “The president and his team will do everything they can to implement his overall agenda while this [Syria] debate happens.” Frank Sharry, the executive director of America’s Voice, a pro-immigrant lobby group that is regular contact with lawmakers over immigration reform measures, remained optimistic that a comprehensive could still pass before the end of the year.

#### Economic engagement with Mexico kills CIR – sparks mass Republican backlash.

Michael Shear, 5-5-2013, NYT White House correspondent, “In Latin America, US Shifts Focus from Drug War to Economy,” <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/05/05/world/americas/in-latin-america-us-shifts-focus-from-drug-war-to-economy.html?pagewanted=all>

Last week, Mr. Obama returned to capitals in Latin America with a vastly different message. Relationships with countries racked by drug violence and organized crime should focus more on economic development and less on the endless battles against drug traffickers and organized crime capos that have left few clear victors. The countries, Mexico in particular, need to set their own course on security, with the United States playing more of a backing role. That approach runs the risk of being seen as kowtowing to governments more concerned about their public image than the underlying problems tarnishing it. Mexico, which is eager to play up its economic growth, has mounted an aggressive effort to play down its crime problems, going as far as to encourage the news media to avoid certain slang words in reports. “The problem will not just go away,” said Michael Shifter, president of the Inter-American Dialogue. “It needs to be tackled head-on, with a comprehensive strategy that includes but goes beyond stimulating economic growth and alleviating poverty. “Obama becomes vulnerable to the charge of downplaying the region’s overriding issue, and the chief obstacle to economic progress,” he added. “It is fine to change the narrative from security to economics as long as the reality on the ground reflects and fits with the new story line.” Administration officials insist that Mr. Obama remains cleareyed about the security challenges, but the new emphasis corresponds with a change in focus by the Mexican government. The new Mexican president, Enrique Peña Nieto, took office in December vowing to reduce the violence that exploded under the militarized approach to the drug war adopted by his predecessor, Felipe Calderón. That effort left about 60,000 Mexicans dead and appears not to have significantly damaged the drug-trafficking industry. In addition to a focus on reducing violence, which some critics have interpreted as taking a softer line on the drug gangs, Mr. Peña Nieto has also moved to reduce American involvement in law enforcement south of the border. With friction and mistrust between American and Mexican law enforcement agencies growing, Mr. Obama suggested that the United States would no longer seek to dominate the security agenda. “It is obviously up to the Mexican people to determine their security structures and how it engages with other nations, including the United States,” he said, standing next to Mr. Peña Nieto on Thursday in Mexico City. “But the main point I made to the president is that we support the Mexican government’s focus on reducing violence, and we look forward to continuing our good cooperation in any way that the Mexican government deems appropriate.” In some ways, conceding leadership of the drug fight to Mexico hews to a guiding principle of Mr. Obama’s foreign policy, in which American supremacy is played down, at least publicly, in favor of a multilateral approach. But that philosophy could collide with the concerns of lawmakers in Washington, who have expressed frustration with what they see as a lack of clarity in Mexico’s security plans. And security analysts say the entrenched corruption in Mexican law enforcement has long clouded the partnership with their American counterparts. Putting Mexico in the driver’s seat on security marks a shift in a balance of power that has always tipped to the United States and, analysts said, will carry political risk as Congress negotiates an immigration bill that is expected to include provisions for tighter border security. “If there is a perception in the U.S. Congress that security cooperation is weakening, that could play into the hands of those who oppose immigration reform,” said Vanda Felbab-Brown, a counternarcotics expert at the Brookings Institution in Washington. “Realistically, the border is as tight as could be and there have been few spillovers of the violence from Mexico into the U.S.,” she added, but perceptions count in Washington “and can be easily distorted.” “Drugs today are not very important to the U.S. public over all,” she added, “but they are important to committed drug warriors who are politically powerful.” Representative Michael T. McCaul, a Texas Republican who is chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, has warned against the danger of drug cartels forming alliances with terrorist groups. “While these threats exist, you would be surprised to find that the administration thinks its work here is done,” he wrote in an opinion article for Roll Call last month, pressing for more border controls in the bill. The Obama administration has said any evidence of such cooperation is very thin, but even without terrorist connections, drug gangs pose threats to peace and security. Human rights advocates said they feared the United States would ease pressure on Mexico to investigate disappearances and other abuses at the hands of the police and military, who have received substantial American support. The shift in approach “suggests that the Obama administration either doesn’t object to these abusive practices or is only willing to raise such concerns when it’s politically convenient,” said José Miguel Vivanco, director of Human Rights Watch’s Americas division.

#### Political capital is key to immigration reform.

Thomas Barr1 and Iam Bloom2, 8-30-2013, writer and activist whose work has been featured on CNN.com and other locations across the net1, writer for Guardian Express2, “Will Obama Save Immigration Reform?” <http://guardianlv.com/2013/08/will-obama-save-immigration-reform-video/>

Will Obama save immigration reform and issue an executive order to placate the movement? “Some people feel like we need to cut our losses, legalize as many people as we can,” Juanita Molina, of Humane Boarder, told the National Journal. Proponents are now looking to an alternate method to pass some type of legislation to push along the reform movement. “Organizers think long term, so they know that legislation is one way, but that DACA (Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program), has proven that the administration can provide another way,” said Richard Morales, director of deportation prevention for the PICO National Network. He had reached out to faith based organizations by email and cultivated support for an alternative approach. Critics contend that the Republicans are sandbagging the issue and truly would like for the reform issue to fail. “The only solution to this problem is for Congress to fix the broken immigration system by passing comprehensive reform,” a spokesman said. “The White House cuts off the conversation whenever it comes up. They want to keep the pressure on Republicans to pass legislation, as do we,” said Frank Sharry of America’s Voice. “Our goal is legislation that will put the 11 million (current undocumented immigrants) on an eventual path to citizenship. That’s permanent protection for millions of people,” said Sharry. Sharry’s group is intent on winning the legislative fight and pushing for movement on the issue. It is believed that Sharry also supports white house action on the issue if it is called for. Will it come down to White House support and Obama saving immigration reform garnering the support of the growing Hispanic base? Many believe that it may occur, if not the threat could force the hand of the Republicans to take action.

#### Visas are key to cybersecurity preparedness

McLarty 9 (Thomas F. III, President – McLarty Associates and Former White House Chief of Staff and Task Force Co-Chair, “U.S. Immigration Policy: Report of a CFR-Sponsored Independent Task Force”, 7-8, http://www.cfr.org/ publication/19759/us\_immigration\_policy.html)

We have seen, when you look at the table of the top 20 firms that are H1-B visa requestors, at least 15 of those are IT firms. And as we're seeing across industry, much of the hardware and software that's used in this country is not only manufactured now overseas, but it's developed overseas by scientists and engineers who were educated here in the United States.¶ We're seeing a lot more activity around cyber-security, certainly noteworthy attacks here very recently. It's becoming an increasingly dominant set of requirements across not only to the Department of Defense, but the Department of Homeland Security and the critical infrastructure that's held in private hands. Was there any discussion or any interest from DOD or DHS as you undertook this review on the security things about what can be done to try to generate a more effective group of IT experts here in the United States, many of which are coming to the U.S. institutions, academic institutions from overseas and often returning back? This potentially puts us at a competitive disadvantage going forward.¶ MCLARTY: Yes. And I think your question largely is the answer as well. I mean, clearly we have less talented students here studying -- or put another way, more talented students studying in other countries that are gifted, talented, really have a tremendous ability to develop these kind of technology and scientific advances, we're going to be put at an increasingly disadvantage. Where if they come here -- and I kind of like Dr. Land's approach of the green card being handed to them or carefully put in their billfold or purse as they graduate -- then, obviously, that's going to strengthen, I think, our system, our security needs.

#### Cyber-vulnerability causes great power nuclear war

Fritz 9 Researcher for International Commission on Nuclear Nonproliferation and Disarmament [Jason, researcher for International Commission on Nuclear Nonproliferation and Disarmament, former Army officer and consultant, and has a master of international relations at Bond University, “Hacking Nuclear Command and Control,” July, <http://www.icnnd.org/latest/research/Jason_Fritz_Hacking_NC2.pdf>]

This paper will analyse the threat of cyber terrorism in regard to nuclear weapons. Specifically, this research will use open source knowledge to identify the structure of nuclear command and control centres, how those structures might be compromised through computer network operations, and how doing so would fit within established cyber terrorists’ capabilities, strategies, and tactics. If access to command and control centres is obtained, terrorists could fake or actually cause one nuclear-armed state to attack another, thus provoking a nuclear response from another nuclear power. This may be an easier alternative for terrorist groups than building or acquiring a nuclear weapon or dirty bomb themselves. This would also act as a force equaliser, and provide terrorists with the asymmetric benefits of high speed, removal of geographical distance, and a relatively low cost. Continuing difficulties in developing computer tracking technologies which could trace the identity of intruders, and difficulties in establishing an internationally agreed upon legal framework to guide responses to computer network operations, point towards an inherent weakness in using computer networks to manage nuclear weaponry. This is particularly relevant to reducing the hair trigger posture of existing nuclear arsenals. All computers which are connected to the internet are susceptible to infiltration and remote control. Computers which operate on a closed network may also be compromised by various hacker methods, such as privilege escalation, roaming notebooks, wireless access points, embedded exploits in software and hardware, and maintenance entry points. For example, e-mail spoofing targeted at individuals who have access to a closed network, could lead to the installation of a virus on an open network. This virus could then be carelessly transported on removable data storage between the open and closed network. Information found on the internet may also reveal how to access these closed networks directly. Efforts by militaries to place increasing reliance on computer networks, including experimental technology such as autonomous systems, and their desire to have multiple launch options, such as nuclear triad capability, enables multiple entry points for terrorists. For example, if a terrestrial command centre is impenetrable, perhaps isolating one nuclear armed submarine would prove an easier task. There is evidence to suggest multiple attempts have been made by hackers to compromise the extremely low radio frequency once used by the US Navy to send nuclear launch approval to submerged submarines. Additionally, the alleged Soviet system known as Perimetr was designed to automatically launch nuclear weapons if it was unable to establish communications with Soviet leadership. This was intended as a retaliatory response in the event that nuclear weapons had decapitated Soviet leadership; however it did not account for the possibility of cyber terrorists blocking communications through computer network operations in an attempt to engage the system. Should a warhead be launched, damage could be further enhanced through additional computer network operations. By using proxies, multi-layered attacks could be engineered. Terrorists could remotely commandeer computers in China and use them to launch a US nuclear attack against Russia. Thus Russia would believe it was under attack from the US and the US would believe China was responsible. Further, emergency response communications could be disrupted, transportation could be shut down, and disinformation, such as misdirection, could be planted, thereby hindering the disaster relief effort and maximizing destruction. Disruptions in communication and the use of disinformation could also be used to provoke uninformed responses. For example, a nuclear strike between India and Pakistan could be coordinated with Distributed Denial of Service attacks against key networks, so they would have further difficulty in identifying what happened and be forced to respond quickly. Terrorists could also knock out communications between these states so they cannot discuss the situation. Alternatively, amidst the confusion of a traditional large-scale terrorist attack, claims of responsibility and declarations of war could be falsified in an attempt to instigate a hasty military response. These false claims could be posted directly on Presidential, military, and government websites. E-mails could also be sent to the media and foreign governments using the IP addresses and e-mail accounts of government officials. A sophisticated and all encompassing combination of traditional terrorism and cyber terrorism could be enough to launch nuclear weapons on its own, without the need for compromising command and control centres directly.

## T

### 1NC T

#### Economic engagement must be quid-pro-quo

Shinn 96 [James Shinn, C.V. Starr Senior Fellow for Asia at the CFR in New York City and director of the council’s multi-year Asia Project, worked on economic affairs in the East Asia Bureau of the US Dept of State, “Weaving the Net: Conditional Engagement with China,” pp. 9 and 11, google books]

In sum, conditional engagement consists of a set of objectives, a strategy for attaining those objectives, and tactics (specific policies) for implementing that strategy. The objectives of conditional engagement are the ten principles, which were selected to preserve American vital interests in Asia while accommodating China’s emergence as a major power. The overall strategy of conditional engagement follows two parallel lines: economic engagement, to promote the integration of China into the global trading and financial systems; and security engagement, to encourage compliance with the ten principles by diplomatic and military means when economic incentives do not suffice, in order to hedge against the risk of the emergence of a belligerent China. The tactics of economic engagement should promote China’s economic integration through negotiations on trade liberalization, institution building, and educational exchanges. While a carrots-and-sticks approach may be appropriate within the economic arena, the use of trade sanction to achieve short-term political goals is discouraged. The tactics of security engagement should reduce the risks posed by China’s rapid military expansion, its lack of transparency, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and transnational problems such as crime and illegal migration, by engaging in arms control negotiations, multilateral efforts, and a loosely-structured defensive military arrangement in Asia.8 [To footnotes] 8. Conditional engagement’s recommended tactics of tit-for-tat responses are equivalent to using carrots and sticks in response to foreign policy actions by China. Economic engagement calls for what is described as symmetric tit-for-tat and security engagement for asymmetric tit-for-tat. A symmetric response is one that counters a move by China in the same place, time, and manner; an asymmetric response might occur in another place at another time, and perhaps in another manner. A symmetric tit-for-tat would be for Washington to counter a Chinese tariff of 10 percent on imports for the United States with a tariff of 10 percent on imports from China. An asymmetric tit-for-tat would be for the United States to counter a Chines shipment of missiles to Iran with an American shipment of F-16s to Vietnam (John Lewis Gaddis, Strategies of Containment: A critical Appraisal of Postwar American National Security Policy. New York: Oxford University Press, (1982). This is also cited in Fareed Zakaria, “The Reagan Strategy of Containment,” Political Science Quarterly 105, no. 3 (1990), pp. 383-88).
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#### The European Union should substantially increase technical cooperation and investment in Small Modular Reactors with Mexico.

#### CP solves case – EU engages Latin America best.

Barbara Kosny, xx-xx-2009, partial fulfillment of requirements for degree of Master in Political Science in the Department of Political Science @ University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, “The Distinctiveness of the European Union’s Influence on Latin America: European Values, Governance, and Integration,” <https://cdr.lib.unc.edu/indexablecontent?id=uuid:84b38be2-9899-47ae-8d93-6f86f52f4326&ds=DATA_FILE>

Europe must use foreign policy tools, such as regional integration, in order to function in the current political atmosphere in which the brief post-Soviet era of unrivalled American hegemony has been challenged.61 The EU has a distinctive policy and trade influence in Latin America through new regionalism. Latin America was one of the first areas where the E.U. combined its trade and foreign policymaking bodies in order to facilitate the linking of commercial and political norms. The emphasis on new regionalism, as a process of world-wide integration, is the greater capacity and power of the EU’s diplomatic power towards Latin America. The weight of the pressures in favor of global economic integration, and the opening of markets in trade and production regimes led to a global political economy that reflected the trend towards social and economic integration.62 By the 1990s, it became evident that preferential trade deals would no longer be effective. With the rise of European identity and a unified sense of social responsibility, European trade negotiators were driven towards a new and more practical use of diplomacy. The liberalization of European economies and the repositioning of the Europe within a new global political economy prompted a realignment of Europe’s goals, making the old European instruments of engagement with the developing world no longer viable.63 Seen through the theoretical understanding of social constructivism, these trends show the state as no longer the sole influence, but as one under the influence of other actors such as national governments, firms, or trade interests are deeply embedded in and affected by the social institutions in which they act.64 In order to understand the distinctiveness of European regional and economic integration, it is necessary to understand how it differs from U.S. trade and economic policies. The EU uses new regionalism as means of displaying what it perceives to be a more humane governance model for Latin America.65 On the contrary, U.S. views on regional integration stem largely from the justifications of the Breton Woods system. The agreement promoted a progressive harmonization of regulations that included considerable dependency on the external sector. Today, this dependency factor is evident in the regionalist policies of the US. Since the creation of NAFTA in 1994, the negotiations of the U.S. have been mainly ideological —regionalism is seen as a vehicle through which to create a mode of liberal economic governance under the steady hand of Washington.66 Further, one of the most significant differences between the EU and the U.S. concerning new regionalist constructions is the language employed in discussing the role of economic integration. The European model focuses explicitly on terms such as ‘partnership’, rather than ‘economic agreement’ as used by the United States. Within the EU, communicative action acts as a facilitator to the establishment of consensus and agreements. Therefore, partnerships are the best ways to promote change and increase influence in the region as opposed to strict economic trading. Partnership agreements became a crucial aspect to EU development policy beginning in the 1990s.67 Further, the EU recognized the adverse political impact of global financial instability. This economic political linkage is most developed in Latin America than any other regional initiative.
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#### [CP TEXT: The United States federal government ought to offer to significantly increase technical cooperation and investment in Small Modular Reactors with Mexico if, and only if, the government of Mexico instates re-election procedures within the Mexican federal government, establishes and enforces term limits, strengthens the independent electoral system, standardizes electoral practices at state and local levels, and implement an improved law enforcement system to prevent electoral, police and judicial fraud and coercion.]

#### Conditioning economic ties on election and law reform solves the case and eliminates political corruption in Mexico.

Alex Velez-Green et al, 10-19-2012, writer for the Harvard Political Review, author for the Harvard Institute of Politics National Security Student Policy Group, Robin Reyes, graduated from the University of Alabama with a degree in International Business and International Studies, organized the 2011 Emprende tu México summit on creating a climate for investment and entrepreneurship in Mexico, Master’s in the field of Government from Harvard University, studied at Harvard Business School and the Kennedy School of Government, Anthony Ramicone, Institute of Politics @ Harvard University, “Governmental, Judicial and Police Corruption,” <http://www.iop.harvard.edu/sites/default/files_new/research-policy-papers/TheWarOnMexicanCartels.pdf>

One way to reduce political corruption is to instate reelection procedures within the Mexican federal government. Within the current system, politicians are unable to seek a second term in office, and thus make decisions without fear of electoral repercussions. By giving politicians a chance at reelection, these procedures would make politicians more responsive to voters since voters can punish politicians whom they deem corrupt. Given Mexico’s history under the dictator Porfirio Diaz, it would be difficult to convince the Mexican public to support this kind of measure.30 Therefore, for this system to be effective, term limits would have to be established and enforced. Furthermore, Mexico would have to strengthen the independent electoral system (IFE), standardize electoral practices at state and local levels, and implement other mechanisms—including an improved law enforcement system—to prevent electoral fraud and coercion. Altering the mechanisms of funding between the Mexican federal and state governments would decrease corruption as well. Recently, the federal government has begun to provide performance-based funding; money is allocated to states for a specific purpose, and future funding depends on whether states have met said goals. The federal government should attempt to expand this policy. It should prepare counter-drug policies—such as restructuring municipal police forces—as goals for the state; as these goals are met, more money would be allocated to sustain these efforts and accommodate state-chosen projects. The federal government should make it clear that if the goals are met, then, more funding will be provided to states for uses of their choosing as long as they are transparent with the use of these funds. The above-mentioned proposals center upon steps to be taken by the Mexican government. To encourage these changes within Mexico, the United States should use American financial assistance, such as the Merida Initiative, as leverage over the Mexican legislature. Specifically, the U.S. should attach conditions mandating progress towards the above goals with assistance payments. To influence state and local policies in a more direct way, the U.S. should apply targeted funding on a much more individualized and localized basis. It can target funding, stipulating that as certain programs or policies are implemented by municipalities, such as restructuring the local police system, they would receive additional funding. These policies and programs should require independent oversight. This type of direct pressure at a local level should be done, as it will require much less bureaucracy and will produce more direct results.

#### Election reform is key to solve corruption – inaction collapses Mexican democracy.

NYT, 6-24-2009, the New York Times, American daily newspaper, has won 112 Pulitzer Prizes, more than any other news organization, “Crime Threatens Democracy, Mexico’s President Warns,” <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/06/25/world/americas/25mexico.html>

President Felipe Calderón said Wednesday that the future of democracy in Mexico was at stake in the government’s fight against official corruption and organized crime. He also criticized politicians whom he accused of wanting to return to the era when drug gangs were tolerated. Mr. Calderón also called for making legislators more accountable to the public. He proposed reducing the number of federal lawmakers and allowing them to serve more than one term, making them eligible to face the judgment of voters by running for re-election. Speaking at a conference on security, the president gave a scathing appraisal about how far corruption had reached into the Mexican government. “What is at stake today is not just the result of an election, but rather the future of democracy, of representative institutions,” he said. For many years, Mr. Calderón said, “crime was allowed to grow, expand and penetrate.” “Perhaps people thought it was a manageable thing,” he added. Mr. Calderón said that Mexico, where more than 10,800 people have died in violence connected with the illicit drug trade and other forms of organized crime since he took office in December 2006, “is at a historical crossroads.” “To turn one’s head, to act as if you don’t see the crime in front of you, as some politicians want to do, is no option for Mexico,” he said. Midterm elections are scheduled to be held on July 5. Mr. Calderón painted a grim picture of the security situation in some of the most violent parts of the country, noting that crime gangs and drug cartels were carrying out “an interminable recruitment of young people without hope, family, opportunities, future, beliefs or convictions.” He added, “They turn up dead in some morgue, and nobody claims their bodies, as happens with more than 30 percent of the bodies in the most violent cities, like Ciudad Juárez,” across the border from El Paso. In Ciudad Juárez on Wednesday, unidentified assailants tossed gasoline bombs into a billiard hall and a money exchange office. More than 30 businesses were burned in the city last year; threats of arson in Ciudad Juárez are often made by extortionists linked to drug gangs. Mr. Calderón repeated calls he made earlier in his political career as a member of Mexico’s Congress for reducing the number of federal legislators. There are now 500 seats in the Chamber of Deputies and 128 in the Senate. He did not propose specific numbers, but he contended that having fewer lawmakers would make it easier to hold them accountable for the quality of their work. He also said that permitting legislators run for re-election would make them more accountable to their constituents. In the current system, elected officials from the president to federal lawmakers to town officials can serve in a specific post for only a single term, which is generally three or six years. As Mr. Calderón warned about corruption, the authorities in the northern city of Monterrey said Wednesday that soldiers who raided a modest illicit drug lab had found a list suggesting possible links between the police and organized crime.

#### Mexican democracy collapse kills global democracy – effective transition causes modeling.

Shannon K. O’Neal, 4-29-2013, a senior fellow for Latin America Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations, a nonpartisan foreign-policy think tank and membership organization, “Two Nations Indivisible: Mexico, the United States, and the Road Ahead,” <http://mexidata.info/id3609.html>

Diplomatically, we also need to rethink the United States' approach in light of Mexico's ongoing political transformation. A stronger partnership provides the best platform for a prominent U.S. twenty-first century foreign policy priority: democracy promotion. Despite frequent misunderstand¬ings our long shared history, intertwined economies, and strong personal and community links provide the constant multilayered interaction necessary to work together toward the complex goal of strengthening democracy. Joint economic development initiatives, support for local citizen organiza¬tions, and efforts to increase transparency and strengthen courts and police forces will all benefit from the strong links that already exist between our two nations. Mexico, not the Middle East, should be the test case for solidifying market-based democracy. It is not only much more likely to succeed, but also arguably much more likely to hurt the United States if it fails. Mexico's success is more probable because it has already taken many tough steps, all on its own. After seventy years of one-party rule, Mexicans used their votes to usher in an opposition party president. Abandoning a long history of ballot-box stuffing, Mexico's parties now compete in quite clean and trans-parent elections. The country's over 100 million citizens dream of—and are already working hard to create—a vibrant and prosperous political system where their voices can be heard and their hard work rewarded. If successful, Mexico would provide a positive example of a newly consolidated democracy, offering lessons for others worldwide. Nevertheless, it still faces considerable challenges. Many in fact worry that Mexico’s democratic gains may be lost, overcome by political bosses, special interests, and drug-related violence. And Mexico’s failure would lead to disastrous consequences for U.S. foreign policy, not to mention America’s economic, political, and social well-being at home. The United States’ focus elsewhere—particularly in Asia and the Middle East—has distracted us from the game-changing importance of political choices being made just next door.

#### Democracy solves extinction.

Larry Diamond, 1995, senior fellow at the Hoover Institution, December 1995, Promoting Democracy in the 1990s, http://wwics.si.edu/subsites/ccpdc/pubs/di/1.htm

OTHER THREATS This hardly exhausts the lists of threats to our security and well-being in the coming years and decades. In the former Yugoslavia nationalist aggression tears at the stability of Europe and could easily spread. The flow of illegal drugs intensifies through increasingly powerful international crime syndicates that have made common cause with authoritarian regimes and have utterly corrupted the institutions of tenuous, democratic ones. Nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons continue to proliferate. The very source of life on Earth, the global ecosystem, appears increasingly endangered. Most of these new and unconventional threats to security are associated with or aggravated by the weakness or absence of democracy, with its provisions for legality, accountability, popular sovereignty, and openness. LESSONS OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY The experience of this century offers important lessons. Countries that govern themselves in a truly democratic fashion do not go to war with one another. They do not aggress against their neighbors to aggrandize themselves or glorify their leaders. Democratic governments do not ethnically "cleanse" their own populations, and they are much less likely to face ethnic insurgency. Democracies do not sponsor terrorism against one another. They do not build weapons of mass destruction to use on or to threaten one another. Democratic countries form more reliable, open, and enduring trading partnerships. In the long run they offer better and more stable climates for investment. They are more environmentally responsible because they must answer to their own citizens, who organize to protest the destruction of their environments. They are better bets to honor international treaties since they value legal obligations and because their openness makes it much more difficult to breach agreements in secret. Precisely because, within their own borders, they respect competition, civil liberties, property rights, and the rule of law, democracies are the only reliable foundation on which a new world order of international security and prosperity can be built.

## Nuke Power Advantage
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#### Nuclear prolif is stabilizing – prevents conventional conflict and miscalc.

Peter N Madison, Mar 2006, US Navy Lieutenant, “THE SKY IS NOT FALLING: REGIONAL REACTION TO A NUCLEAR-ARMED IRAN,” Naval Postgraduate School Thesis, http://handle.dtic.mil/100.2/ADA445779

Owing to the vast destruction nuclear weapons can generate, they have ironically guaranteed security for the nations that possess them. Any attack against a nuclear state carries the risk of provoking a devastating response. Consequently, the benefits and dangers of nuclear weapon proliferation have been debated for decades. Perhaps the most debatable point is whether more nuclear states advance or weaken world security. Naturally, this issue remains moot. Yet, one must concede that the world has judiciously avoided the use of nuclear weapons for sixty years, suggesting the avoidance is attributable to more than luck. Professor Jan Breemer of the Navy War College asserts that at some point, luck loses its random nature and reflects skill.10 / 1. Nuclear Optimists: “More May Be Better”11 / Nuclear Optimists advocate a gradual increase in the number of nuclear states. They argue that a cautious increase does not correspond to an increased likelihood that nuclear weapons will be used. They further contend that this gradual spread is far better than if it were rapid or nonexistent.12 Supporters point to over sixty years in which deterrence helped prevent nuclear conflict. According to Professor Kenneth Waltz of the University of California at Berkeley, “The world has enjoyed more years of peace since 1945 than had been known in modern history.”13 Indeed, there has been no general war in this period, in spite of a variety of confrontations that could lead to rapid escalation and conflict.14 Instead nuclear weapons made nuclear war an unlikely possibility.15 / Professor Waltz argues that if deterrence produces the ideal, then the opposite must be correct: not having a clear balance of terror preventing a misstep leads to uncertainty of action by a state. He states that defeated countries like Germany following World War II, which fought conventionally, will at the very worst survive with limited suffering. Nuclear deterrence assures a totality of defeat; therefore, no rational actor will risk destruction.16 Instead of instability and uncertainty, nuclear weapons increase stability and certainty, making “miscalculation difficult and politically pertinent predictions easy.”17

#### Preventing spread of nuclear weapons causes global bioweapon shift.

Raymond A. Zilinskas, 2000, frmr clinical microbiologist, director of the Chemical and Biological Weapons Nonproliferation Program, Center for Nonproliferation Studies of Monterey Institute of International Studies, Biological Warfare: Modern Offense and Defense, p. 1-2

There are many who believe that today's bioscientists and chemical engineers working in unison and wielding the techniques of molecular biology developed since the early 1970s could, if so commanded, develop militarily effective biological weapons within a fairly short time. If this supposition is correct, our perception of biological weapons as being undependable, uncontrollable, and unreliable must change. The reason is simple: if these weapons are demonstrated to possess properties that make it possible for commanders to effect controlled, confined mass destruction on command, all governments would be forced to construct defenses against them and some undoubtedly would be tempted to arm their military with these weapons that would be both powerful and relatively inexpensive to acquire. Ironically, as tougher international controls are put into place to deter nations from seeking to acquire chemical and nuclear weapons, leaders may be even more drawn to biological arms as the most accessible form of weapon of mass destruction [WMD].

#### Extinction

Richard J Ochs, 6-9-2002, frmr president of the Aberdeen Proving Ground Superfund Citizens Coalition, member of the Depleted Uranium Task force of the Military Toxics Project and a member of the Chemical Weapons Working Group, “Biological Weapons Must Be Abolished Immediately,” http://www.freefromterror.net/other\_articles/abolish.html

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

#### Barriers check to zero risk

GSN ‘9

(Global Security Newswire, “Experts Debate Threat of Nuclear, Biological Terrorism,” http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw\_20090113\_7105.php)

In even the most likely scenario of nuclear terrorism, there are 20 barriers between extremists and a successful nuclear strike on a major city, said John Mueller, a political science professor at **O**hio **S**tate **U**niversity / The process itself is seemingly straightforward but exceedingly difficult -- buy or steal highly enriched uranium, manufacture a weapon, take the bomb to the target site and blow it up. Meanwhile, variables strewn across the path to an attack would increase the complexity of the effort, Mueller argued / Terrorists would have to bribe officials in a state nuclear program to acquire the material, while avoiding a sting by authorities or a scam by the sellers. The material itself could also turn out to be bad / "Once the purloined material is purloined, [police are] going to be chasing after you. They are also going to put on a high reward, extremely high reward, on getting the weapon back or getting the fissile material back," Mueller said during a panel discussion at a two-day Cato Institute conference on counterterrorism issues facing the incoming Obama administration / Smuggling the material out of a country would mean relying on criminals who "are very good at extortion" and might have to be killed to avoid a double-cross, Mueller said. The terrorists would then have to find scientists and engineers willing to give up their normal lives to manufacture a bomb, which would require an expensive and sophisticated machine shop / Finally, further technological expertise would be needed to sneak the weapon across national borders to its destination point and conduct a successful detonation, Mueller said / Every obstacle is "difficult but not impossible" to overcome, Mueller said, putting the chance of success at no less than one in three for each. The likelihood of successfully passing through each obstacle, in sequence, would be roughly one in 3 1/2 billion, he said, but for argument's sake dropped it to 3 1/2 million / "It's a total gamble. This is a very expensive and difficult thing to do," said Mueller, who addresses the issue at greater length in an upcoming book, Atomic Obsession. "So unlike buying a ticket to the lottery ... you're basically putting everything, including your life, at stake for a gamble that's maybe one in 3 1/2 million or 3 1/2 billion." / Other scenarios are even less probable, Mueller said / A nuclear-armed state is "exceedingly unlikely" to hand a weapon to a terrorist group, he argued: "States just simply won't give it to somebody they can't control." / Terrorists are also not likely to be able to steal a whole weapon, Mueller asserted, dismissing the idea of "loose nukes." Even Pakistan, which today is perhaps the nation of greatest concern regarding nuclear security, keeps its bombs in two segments that are stored at different locations, he said (see GSN, Jan. 12) / Fear of an "extremely improbable event" such as nuclear terrorism produces support for a wide range of homeland security activities, Mueller said. He argued that there has been a major and costly overreaction to the terrorism threat -- noting that the Sept. 11 attacks helped to precipitate the invasion of Iraq, which has led to far more deaths than the original event / Panel moderator Benjamin Friedman, a research fellow at the Cato Institute, said academic and governmental discussions of acts of nuclear or biological terrorism have tended to focus on "worst-case assumptions about terrorists' ability to use these weapons to kill us." There is need for consideration for what is probable rather than simply what is possible, he said. /

#### Terrorists don’t want nukes

Richard A Falkenrath, Autumn 1998, JFK School of Government @ Harvard, Survival 40.3, p MetaPress

The second reason for the rarity of NBC terrorism is that mass destruction, to the extent it is desired, is possible without WMD. The overwhelming majority of organised violence undertaken by terrorist groups has involved only conventional weapons - chemical explosives, guns and knives. Chemical explosives -ranging from the simplest, such as ammonium nitrate mixed with fuel oil, to the most advanced military high explosives, such as C4 and Semtex - can be used to kill up to several hundred people. Third, the acquisition and use of NBC weapons would entail additional risks and challenges to a terrorist group beyond those associated with conventional weapons. Holding other factors constant, a rational attacker will employ the simplest, least costly, and most reliable means of attack available to it. There are of course costs, risks and challenges associated with acquiring conventional weapons as well, but these are less severe than those associated with WMD. With respect to acquisition, NBC weapons are clearly more technologically challenging than conventional weapons, and also generally more expensive. Moreover, work on WMD inevitably involves a heightened hazard to health. Attempts to acquire NBC weapons raise the risk that the group would be found out and crushed by the authorities, especially if individuals with special expertise must be recruited for the NBC-acquisition effort. With respect to the actual use of the device, NBC weapons again present risks and challenges beyond those of their conventional counterparts. Terrorists in particular prefer predictable and reliable forms of attack. The immediate and long-term effects of an NBC weapon will generally be less predictable than a conventional one. NBC weapons may also have a harmful physical or psychological effect on the human operatives charged with handling or delivering them. The final and most controversial explanation for lack of interest in NBC weapons among groups capable of acquiring and using them is that group leaders and members may hold moral objections." This may seem counter-intuitive, given the willingness of most terrorist groups and many states to kill innocent people in order to achieve their political goals. NBC weapons, how-ever, have a special stigma. This norm against NBC use probably is strongest in the case of biological weapons. While it will never be possible to separate the causal impact of self-interest (including group preservation) from that of morality on decisions not to launch NBC weapons attacks, the idea should not be ignored.

## Droughts Advantage

### 1AC Droughts ADV

#### Food scarcity inevitable.

Economist 10 [Climate change How to live with climate change Nov 25th 2010 | from PRINT EDITION http://www.economist.com/node/17575027/print]

Food security will become a crucial issue. Drought-resistant seeds are needed; and, given that the farmers least able to pay will require the hardiest varieties, seed companies’ efforts should be supplemented by state-funded research. Since genetic modification would help with this, it would be handy if people abandoned their prejudice against it. Even with better crops, better soil conservation, better planting patterns and better weather forecasts, all of which are needed, there will still be regional calamities. To ensure that food is always available, the global food market will have to be deeper and more resilient than it is now. That means abandoning the protectionism that bedevils agriculture today.

#### Drought makes US ag collapse inevitable

Farchy and Meyer (staff writers for Financial Times) 12

(Jack and Gregory, “World braced for new food crisis,” July 19, 2012, Financial Times, http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/9989dc80-d1c5-11e1-badb-00144feabdc0.html#ixzz21YSupe9I)

The world is facing a new food crisis as the worst US drought in more than 50 years pushes agricultural commodity prices to record highs. Corn and soyabean prices surged to record highs on Thursday, surpassing the peaks of the 2007-08 crisis that sparked food riots in more than 30 countries. Wheat prices are not yet at record levels but have rallied more than 50 per cent in five weeks, exceeding prices reached in the wake of Russia’s 2010 export ban. The drought in the US, which supplies nearly half the world’s exports of corn and much of its soyabeans and wheat, will reverberate well beyond its borders, affecting consumers from Egypt to China. “I’ve been in the business more than 30 years and this is by far and away the most serious weather issue and supply and demand problem that I have seen by a mile,” said a senior executive at a trading house. “It’s not even comparable to 2007-08.”

#### Alt cause – seaports

**Nagle and Bridges 12** (American Association of Port Authorities, Anerica’s seaports critical to US jobs, economy, 10/05/12, <http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/campaign/260527-americas-seaports-critical-to-us-jobs-economy> >:)

The report, “Failure to Act: The Economic Impact of Current Investment Trends in Airports, Inland Waterways, and Marine Ports,” found that to accommodate growth in waterborne traffic, future spending needs are estimated to total $30 billion by 2020 and $92 billion by 2040—a funding gap of almost $46 billion by 2040 based on current spending levels and a significant discrepancy that will have major implications on our nation’s GDP and ability to remain competitive in a global marketplace. The report concluded that if current investment levels continue, losses will accumulate every year culminating in a total loss of nearly $4 trillion to the national GDP and $7.9 trillion in lost businesses sales through 2040.

#### Food shocks now

ABC Rural 12 (“Food shock warning as global grain deteriorates,” July 24, 2012, <http://www.abc.net.au/rural/content/2012/s3552099.htm>)

It’s just a few years since vast parts of Australia emerged from a decade long drought, so the tales from the United States of wilting crops and ‘dust bowl’ paddocks are enough to bring to mind how devastating weather can be. As Australian farmers know, the repercussions of drought aren’t just the immediate weeks, but the months ahead when grain stocks around the world start to shrink and prices soar for feed and basic food supplies Already some experts are warning of a similar food crisis to that experienced in 2008 when riots in parts of South America, Africa and the Middle East demonstrated just how tenuous the global food situation was. In 2008 it was wheat and rice. In 2012 it’s corn and soybeans. As well, and perhaps the most critical factor, is that global grain stocks are at new lows and many countries have run down their reserves leaving little room to manoeuvre when it comes to grain imports. But as US farmers face their worse drought since 1956, a heat wave is also sweeping across Europe which accounts for around 16 per cent of global corn exports. India is also delaying sowing because of a late monsoon, with many states there also experiencing drought. More than half the United States is now in moderate, or worse drought. And the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Climate Prediction Centre is warning the drought is likely to continue into October. It’s also said the January-June half year was America’s hottest on record. It’s now expecting an El Nino pattern could develop by the end of the year, prolonging drought conditions. The big questions are how small will the crops be, and how high can grain prices go? Already the Chicago Board of Trade has set records for September delivered corn, while soybeans and wheat also surge. And while that’s [good news for Australia’s wheat farmers](http://www.abc.net.au/rural/news/content/201207/s3543336.htm)amidst a high dollar, it’s bad news for those in livestock and food prices generally.

#### Laundry list of things makes the impact inevitable

Tipson 12 (Frederick, Jennings Randolph Senior Fellow special advisor to the Center for Science, Technology and Peacebuilding at the U.S. Institute of Peace, worked previously for the UN Development Programme, Microsoft, the MarkleFoundation, the Council on Foreign Relations, Hongkong Telecom,AT&T, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and the University ofVirginia School of Law “Global Food Insecurity and "Political Malnutrition",” June 2012, Number 7, German Marshall Fund Connections, http://www.gmfus.org/wp-content/blogs.dir/1/files\_mf/1339595984Tipson\_GlobalFoodInsecurity\_Jun12.pdf)

Meanwhile, the political dimensions of “food insecurity” go well beyond our compassion for people in the poorest countries who are most vulnerable to famine and malnutrition. Even during the remainder of this decade, we face a transition from localized food shortages and insecurities toward a more pervasive environment of global “food shocks” that have serious political consequences even for the richer world. 3 The combined effects of population trends, climate changes, water shortages, soil erosion or contamination, increased meat consumption, fisheries depletion, major livestock epidemics, or serious crop failures in overlapping and cascading ripple effects will strain already-vulnerable economies and political systems. Sudden price increases or shortages could prompt volatile popular reactions, especially if citizens even in “well-fed” locations lose trust in markets and governments to assure their access to adequate food supplies.

#### No impact and war turn ag

Ronald Bailey 2k, science correspondent, author of Earth Report 2000: Revisiting the True State of the Planet, former Brookes Fellow in Environmental Journalism at the Competitive Enterprise Institute, member of the Society of Environmental Journalists, adjunct scholar at the Cato Institute, May 2000, Reason Magazine, “Earth Day, Then and Now,” http://reason.com/0005/fe.rb.earth.shtml

The Soylent Green crowd didn’t simply predict mass starvation. They argued that even trying to feed so many people was itself a recipe for disaster. As Lester Brown, a former U.S. Department of Agriculture agronomist who would later become far more prominent as the founder of the Worldwatch Institute, put it in Scientific American, “There is growing doubt that the agricultural ecosystem will be able to accommodate both the anticipated increase of the human population to seven billion by the end of the century and the universal desire of the world’s hungry for a better diet. The central question is no longer `Can we produce enough food?’ but `What are the environmental consequences of attempting to do so?’” Even if somehow famine were avoided, what would the world’s population be in 2000? Peter Gunter predicted 7.2 billion. Ehrlich foresaw that “by the end of the century we’ll have well over 7 billion people if something isn’t done.” Brown agreed that “world population at the end of the century is expected to be twice the 3.5 billion of today.” In the April 21, 1970, Look, Rockefeller University biologist and Pulitzer Prize-winning writer Rene Dubos made the shocking suggestion that, “To some overcrowded populations, the bomb may one day no longer seem a threat, but a release.” Time has not been gentle with these prophecies. It’s absolutely true that far too many people remain poor and hungry in the world--800 million people are still malnourished and nearly 1.2 billion live on less than a dollar a day--but we have not seen mass starvation around the world in the past three decades. Where we have seen famines, such as in Somalia and Ethiopia, they are invariably the result of war and political instability. Indeed, far from turning brown, the Green Revolution has never been so verdant. Food production has handily outpaced population growth and food today is cheaper and more abundant than ever before. Since 1970, the amount of food per person globally has increased by 26 percent, and as the International Food Policy Research Institute reported in October 1999, “World market prices for wheat, maize, and rice, adjusted for inflation, are the lowest they have been in the last century.” According to the World Bank’s World Development Report 2000, food production increased by 60 percent between 1980 and 1997. At the same time, the amount of land devoted to growing crops has barely increased over the past 30 years, meaning that millions of acres have been spared for nature--acres that would have been plowed down had agricultural productivity lagged the way Ehrlich and others believed it would.

#### Won’t go to war over food and constantly improving technology solves

Gordon Chang, 2-21-11, Cornell Law School, “Global Food Wars,” http://blogs.forbes.com/gordonchang/2011/02/21/global-food-wars/

In any event, food-price increases have apparently been factors in the unrest now sweeping North Africa and the Middle East. The poor spend up to half their disposable income on edibles, making rapid food inflation a cause of concern for dictators, strongmen, and assorted autocrats everywhere. So even if humankind does not go to war over bad harvests, Paskal may be right when she contends that climate change may end up altering the global map. This is not the first time in human history that food shortages looked like they would be the motor of violent geopolitical change. Yet amazing agronomic advances, especially Norman Borlaug’s Green Revolution in the middle of the 20th century, have consistently proved the pessimists wrong. In these days when capitalism is being blamed for most everything, it’s important to remember the power of human innovation in free societies—and the efficiency of free markets.

#### There is no link between water scarcity and political tension – your impact is sillyberries

Wolf 99 [Aaron T., Ph.D., works in the Department of GeosciencesOregon State University, “Water and Human Security”, Universities Council on Water Resources, http://ucowr.siu.edu/updates/pdf/V118\_A5.pdf]

<An increasingly prevalent viewpoint about water and security is best summed up by Ismail Serageldin, vice-president of the World Bank: “The wars of the next century will be about water” (quoted in the New York Times 10 August 1995). The view that water will lead to acute international conflict, one that is often tied to causal arguments of environmental security, unfortunately is gaining ground in both academic and popular literature. Someauthors assume a natural link between water scarcity and acute conflict, suggesting that “competition for limited . . . freshwater . . . leads to severe political tensions and even to war” (Westing 1986). Others, often citing examples from the arid and hostile Middle East, assume that “history is replete with examples of violent conflict over water” (Butts 1997). Still others, combining this “natural” connection between water and conflict with assumed historic evidence, forecast: “The renewable resource most likely to stimulate interstate resource war is river water” (Homer-Dixon 1994). There are two major problems with the literature that describes water both as a historic and, by extrapolation, as a future cause of acute international conflict: *1.There is little historic evidence that water has everbeen the cause of international warfare; and 2.War over water seems neither strategically rational, hydrographically effective, nor economically viable.*  One component of the Transboundary Freshwater Dispute Database Project2 at Oregon State University has been an assessment of historic cases of international water conflicts. In order to counter the prevailing anecdotal approach, researchers associated with the project utilized the most systematic collection of international conflict – Brecher and Wilkenfeld’s (1997) International Crisis Behavior data set – and supplemented their investigation with available primary and secondary sources. This search revealed a total of seven cases in which armies were mobilized or shots were fired across international boundaries – in every case, the dispute did *not* degrade into warfare.3 According to our findings, with one exception (now almost 4,500 years old),4 *there has not been a war fought over water*. It is, however, disingenuous to base a discussion about the future solely on history. Part of the basis for predictions of future “water wars,” after all, is that we are reaching unprecedented demand on relatively decreasingclean water supplies. But there are other arguments against the possibility of “water wars.”5They might include: A Strategic Argument If one were to launch a war over water, what would be the goal? Presumably, the aggressor would have to be both downstream and the regional hegemony – an upstream riparian nation would have no cause to launch an attack and a weaker nation would be foolhardy to do so. An upstream riparian nation, then, would have to initiate an action, which decreases either quantity or quality, knowing that doing so will antagonize a stronger down-stream neighbor. The down-stream power would then have to decide whether to launch an attack – if the project were a dam, destroying it would result in a wall of water rushing back on down-stream territory. Were it a quality-related project, either industrial or waste treatment, destroying it would probably result in even worse quality than before. Furthermore, the hegemony would have to weigh not only an invasion, but an occupation and depopulation of the entire watershed in order to forestall any retribution – otherwise, it would be simple to pollute the water source of the invading power. It is unlikely that both countries would be democracies, since the political scientists tell us that democracies do not go to war against each other, and the international community would have to refuse to become involved (this, of course, is the least far-fetched aspect of the scenario). All of this effort would be expended for a resource that costs about one U.S. dollar per cubic meter to create from seawater. >

#### No extinction from ocean collapse

**The Economist, 09** (The Economist, January 15, 2009, “Second life: Biologists debate the scale of extinction in the world’s tropical forests,” http://www.economist.com/node/12926042, Hensel)

A RARE piece of good news from the world of conservation: the global extinction crisis may have been overstated. The world is unlikely to lose 100 species a day, or half of all species in the lifetime of people now alive, as some have claimed. The bad news, though, is that the lucky survivors are tiny tropical insects that few people care about. The species that are being lost rapidly are the large vertebrates that conservationists were worried about in the first place. This new view of the prospects for biodiversity emerged from a symposium held this week at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, DC, but the controversy over how bad things really are has been brewing since 2006. That was when Joseph Wright of the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute in Panama and Helene Muller-Landau of the University of Minnesota first suggested that the damage might not be as grim as some feared. They reasoned that because population growth is slowing in many tropical countries, and people are moving to cities, the pressure to cut down primary rainforest is falling and agriculturally marginal land is being abandoned, allowing trees to grow. This regrown “secondary” forest is crucial to the pair’s analysis. Within a few decades of land being abandoned, half of the original biomass has returned. Depending on what else is nearby, these new forests may then be colonised by animals and additional plants, and thus support many of the species found in the original forest. Dr Wright and Dr Muller-Landau therefore reckon that in 2030 reasonably unbroken tropical forest will still cover more than a third of its natural range, and after that date its area—at least in Latin America and Asia—could increase. Much of this woodland will be secondary forest, but even so they suggest that in Africa only 16-35% of tropical-forest species will become extinct by 2030, in Asia, 21-24% and, in Latin America, fewer still. Once forest cover does start increasing, the rate of extinction should dwindle.

#### Oceans are resilient – BP oil spill proves

**National Geographic, 11** (Brian Handwerk – staff writer, April 19, 2011, “Gulf Oil Spill Anniversary: Resilience Amid Unknowns,” http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2011/04/110420-gulf-oil-spill-anniversary-year-later-science-nation-environment/, Hensel)

On the first anniversary of the Gulf oil spill, scientists caution that it could take years to understand the full scope of the disaster. But many are encouraged because the damage could have been far worse—and nature is already showing signs of **resilience**. On April 20, 2010, a massive explosion rocked the Transocean oil rig Deepwater Horizon, a state-of-the art mobile offshore drilling platform at work on a well in the Gulf of Mexico. Eleven workers were killed by the blast and survivors had just minutes to flee an inferno that would soon burn and sink the rig. The accident unleashed a torrent of oil that began roaring from an underground Macondo reservoir into the Gulf waters. During the first few frantic days of the BP crisis that became the worst oil spill in U.S. history, experts had a hard time determining what was happening—much less what the spill's ultimate environmental and economic consequences might be. As people around the world fixated on oil spewing from a pipe 1 mile (1.6 kilometers) beneath the Gulf's surface, scientists clambered to discern just how much was gushing out. Estimates climbed from 1,000 barrels a day to 12,000 barrels to 62,000 barrels a day. Even less certain was how the damaged wellhead would finally be plugged—and for a while, people feared the leak could continue for years. Authorities finally capped it in July. A spill that started with the tragic loss of life soon wrought major environmental devastation over huge region of the Gulf. Disturbing images appeared daily of oiled wildlife, iridescent surface slicks, overwhelmed cleanup workers, fouled beaches, burning oil fires, and blackened wetlands. The damage from nearly five million barrels of oil was very real, yet many expert predictions missed their marks. Hurricanes didn't drive enormous quantities of oil ashore, giant dead zones didn't materialize, and oil didn't round the tip of Florida to rocket up the East Coast via the Gulf Stream. Fisheries now appear poised to rebound instead of suffering the barren years or decades some feared. And Mother Nature had her own surprises in store, showcasing an ability to fight back against the spill and, later, to bounce back from the damage—at least in the short-term.

#### Alt cause – runoff

Tolman, 95

employee of Environmental and Public Works Committee [Tolman, Jonathan, “A Harvest of Environmental Abuse,” CEI. August 1, 1995, http://cei.org/gencon/025,01427.cfm

For the last decade, taxpayers have footed the bill for farm programs to the tune of $10 billion a year. Despite such tremendous expenditures, the American public has reaped little benefit from this show of federal largess. Farm subsidies are no longer needed to ensure food security. They are no longer needed to support farm income. And they are no longer needed to stabilize agricultural markets. Their sole purpose is to placate special interests. Not only do these farm programs provide little benefit, they also carry considerable costs. Current farm policy, through supply control programs, raises the price of many farm products. These same supply control programs encourage the more intensive use of agricultural land resulting in environmental stress. According to the U.S. **E**nvironmental Protection Agency, agricultural runoff is **the number one** source of pollution in the nation’s rivers, streams, and lakes.1 An analysis of data from six major farm states shows that a fifty percent reduction in subsidies would decrease chemical use by an estimated 17 percent and fertilizer use by and estimated 14 percent. The complete elimination of subsidies could result in a 35 percent reduction in chemical use per acre and a 29 percent reduction in fertilizer use per acre. In addition to commodity programs, other agricultural policies are often responsible for local or regional environmental abuse. It is clear, for example, that the U.S. sugar program is responsible for not only increased sugar production in south Florida but also more intensive sugar cane production, contributing to the increased phosphorus contamination of the Everglades, thus changing the unique nature of the ecosystem. The elimination of the U.S. sugar program would likely have a significant beneficial effect on the environment of the Everglades ecosystem.

#### And, Overfishing

Christie, 7

Donna R. Christie, Professor of Law at Florida State University College of Law, Environmental Law Floundering at Sea, 82 Wash. L. Rev. 533, Lexis

We will likely never know enough about the oceans to anticipate all the ramifications of our actions. We will continue to make mistakes, and we can not always expect the oceans to be resilient enough to rebound. We are aware now, for example, that effects of overfishing are not [\*542] limited to the direct population effects on the target species. A report for the Pew Oceans Commission entitled Ecological Effects of Fishing in Marine Ecosystems of the United States n56 surveyed the direct and indirect effects of overfishing, bycatch, habitat degradation by destructive fishing gear, and fishing-induced food web changes. The consequences of these fishing practices include "changes in the structure of marine habitats that ultimately influence the diversity, biomass, and productivity of the associated biota; removal of predators, which disrupts and truncates trophic relationships; and endangerment of marine mammals, sea turtles, some seabirds, and even some fish." n57 The report concluded that "the weight of evidence overwhelmingly indicates that the unintended consequences of fishing on marine ecosystems are severe, dramatic, and in some cases irreversible." n58

# 2NC

## Conditions CP

### 2NC Say Yes

#### Conditioning aid works – the Nieto administration is willing to comply.

Claire Ribando Seelke, 8-15-2013, Specialist in Latin American Affairs, Congressional Research Service, “Mexico’s Peña Nieto Administration: Priorities and Key Issues in U.S.-Mexican Relations,” <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R42917.pdf>

Congress has expressed ongoing concerns about human rights conditions in Mexico; these concerns have intensified as U.S. security assistance to Mexico has increased. Congress has conditioned U.S. assistance to the Mexican military and police on compliance with certain human rights standards, while simultaneously providing funding to support human rights training for security forces and to protect groups vulnerable to human rights abuses (such as the press and human rights defenders). The primary goal of these efforts has been to ensure that U.S.-funded anticrime efforts are carried out in a way that respects human rights and strengthens the rule of law in Mexico. U.S. assistance to Mexico has increasingly focused on supporting the Mexican government’s efforts to reform its corrupt and inefficient judicial system, both as a means to make anticrime efforts more effective and to strengthen the rule of law in Mexico. Congress has earmarked money to support Mexico’s transition from an inquisitorial justice system to an oral, adversarial, and accusatory system that should strengthen human rights protections for victims and the accused. Congress has also increased funding for rule of law (ROL) programs in Mexico; asked the State Department to report on how U.S. programs are helping to achieve judicial and police reform in Mexico (H.Rept. 112-331), and expressed support for future ROL funding.23 U.S. policymakers are likely to follow how the Peña Nieto government moves to fulfill its pledges to enact a federal criminal procedure code to hasten reform at the federal level and increase support to states transitioning to the new system. Despite concerns about his human rights record as governor, some human rights groups have expressed satisfaction that President Enrique Peña Nieto has adopted a pro human rights discourse and promulgated a law requiring state support for crime victims and their families.24 They have urged U.S. policymakers to monitor the Peña Nieto government’s compliance with conditions on Mérida assistance and to continue rigorous vetting of Mexican individuals and units slated to receive U.S. training as per §620M of the Foreign Assistance Act (FAA) of 1961.25 How the Peña Nieto government moves to improve the ability of Mexico’s civilian institutions to investigate and prosecute cases of human rights abuses by security forces, enhance enforcement of prohibitions against torture and other mistreatment, and strengthen protection for human rights defenders are likely to be closely scrutinized. The 113th Congress may choose to augment Mérida Initiative funding for human rights programs, such as ongoing human rights training programs for military and police, or newer efforts, such as support for human rights organizations. Human rights conditions in Mexico, as well as compliance with conditions on Mérida assistance, are also likely to continue to be important oversight issues. U.S. policymakers may question how the Peña Nieto Administration is moving to punish past human rights abuses, how it intends to prevent new abuses from occurring, and how the police and judicial reforms it is implementing are bolstering human rights protections.

### Elections Key

#### Election reform is make or break for Mexican democracy.

The ACE Electoral Knowledge Network, no date, “Electoral Reform in Mexico,” <http://aceproject.org/main/english/lf/lfy_mx.htm>

One national case that deserves special attention is the reform process of the Mexican political and electoral systems. Setting out from an electoral system whose organisational and material deficiencies contributed to undermining the democratic credibility of the whole of the political system, a highly ambitious legislative and organisational reform was put into operation. The process rests on two main aspects: on the one hand, legislative reform, directed at increasing the number of electoral positions and especially, to guarantee freedom in standing for the elections and transparency; on the other, a complete reform of the Federal Electoral Institute, the organ in charge of administering and controlling the electoral process, which contributes reasonable guarantees of honesty in the material development of the process and promotes changes to the regulations.

## T

### 2NC Limits

#### Here’s proof – they allow tons of random unilateral measures

CSG 13 [Cuba Study Group, a non-profit, non-partisan organization, comprised of business and community leaders of Cuban descent who share a common interest and vision of a free and democratic Cuba, “Restoring Executive Authority Over U.S. Policy Toward Cuba,” Feb 2013, http://www.cubastudygroup.org/index.cfm/files/serve?File\_id=45d8f827-174c-4d43-aa2f-ef7794831032]

4. Additional Steps the U.S. President Can Take to Promote Change in Cuba¶ While we wait for Congress to act, the Executive Branch should exercise its licensing authority to further safeguard the flow of contacts and resources into the Island, encourage independent economic and political activity, and further empower the Cuban people. To that end, the Cuba Study Group proposes that the President pursue the following measures:¶ i) Modify Remittance and Export Limitations: Increase the $3,000 limit on remittances that can be carried to Cuba by authorized travelers and expand the types of goods that travelers may legally take to Cuba to support micro entrepreneurs. Fewer limitations in these areas will make it easier for U.S. travelers to provide seed capital and in-kind contributions for start-ups.¶ ii) Authorize Travel by General License for NGOs and Allow Them to Open Cuban Bank Accounts: Regulations enacted on January 28, 2011 allow U.S. full- and part-time university staff to travel to Cuba by general license. These regulations also allow U.S.-based academic institutions to open accounts in Cuban banks with funds to support their educational programs in Cuba. A similar license for foundations and NGOs whose mission involves support for micro and small businesses would also help support this growing segment of civil society.¶ iii) Establish New Licenses for the Provision of Services to Cuban Private Entrepreneurs: The President could build on existing authorizations that allow U.S. persons and institutions to pay individual Cuban scholars musicians and artists for their work. New licenses could extend to additional groups, such as artisans or farmers, and authorize a greater scope of activities such as recording, publication, distribution, etc.¶ iv) Authorize Imports of Certain Goods and Services to Businesses and Individuals Engaged in Certifiably Independent Economic Activity in Cuba: The President could authorize the importation of limited types of Cuban-origin goods and services under general or specific licenses, particularly when such authorizations could be justified as providing support for the Cuban people or democratic change in Cuba. For example, the President could authorize imports from private producers or allow U.S. persons to directly engage and hire Cuban professionals.¶ v) Authorize Export and Sale of Goods and Services to Businesses and Individuals Engaged in Certifiably Independent Economic Activity in Cuba: Amend existing licensing policy to establish a presumption of approval for specific items deemed to support the U.S.-stated policy goal of promoting independent economic activity on the Island. Since 2000, legislation has allowed the export of a broad range of agricultural products and a limited range of medicines and medical devices. This should be expanded to include other inputs in demand by indepen - dent businesses, including—but not limited to—good such as art supplies, food preparation equipment, bookkeeping materials, and basic electronic equipment and software required for retail sales and business administration.¶ vi) Authorize the Sale of Telecommunications Hardware in Cuba : Current U.S. regulations, as amended by the Obama administration in 2009, allow for donations of some telecommunications equipment, thereby recognizing that these goods by themselves do not violate the embargo. The next step should be to allow for the sales of those same goods inside the Island. Along with those provisions, changes should also allow for the provision of general travel licenses for research, marketing and sale of those goods.¶ vii) Authorize the Reestablishment of Ferry Services to Cuba : Current U.S. regulations allow both “aircraft and vessels” to serve Cuba as an exception to the U.S. embargo against the Island. The use of chartered aircrafts to transport Cuban-Americans and other licensed U.S. travelers to and from Cuba has long been authorized by the U.S. Department of Treasury. The next step should be to reestablish safe and secure chartered ferry services to transport the same categories of passengers to and from Cuba. Ferry service offers an affordable alternative to airline travel to Cuba and would allow an increase in the amount of goods that Cuban-Americans and other licensed travelers may legally take to Cuba to support their families and micro entrepreneurs.¶ viii) Simplify the Provision of Controlled Commodities, such as Computers and Laptops Direct the Department of Commerce to provide more detailed guidance for individuals to determine whether or not controlled commodities, such as laptops and printers, qualify under the general export waiver.¶ ix) Allow Licensed U.S. Travelers Access to U.S.-Issued Debit, Credit, and Pre-Paid Cards and Other Financial Services While on Authorized Travel in Cuba: Currently, U.S. travelers to Cuba have no access to U.S. bank accounts, credit cards, debit cards or other basic financial services. With few exceptions, U.S. travelers are forced to carry cash with them to Cuba. Allowing U.S. travelers access to electronic payment systems would help ensure their safety and security while being on the Island. Moreover, authorizing new electronic payment systems would facilitate the Administration’s goal of promoting people-to-people contacts and facilitating private economic activity by safeguarding the transfer of money from U.S. residents to relatives and independent entrepreneurs on the island.¶ x) Review Cuba’s Designation as a State Sponsor of Terrorism: Cuba’s status on the State Department’s list of state sponsors of terrorism has been subject to debate for more than a decade. The President should order a comprehensive, apolitical review to determine whether this designation reflects the reality of Cuba today.¶ xi) Develop an expanded bilateral agenda with a range of specific topics of mutual interest : Agenda should include topics such as the resolution of property claims to help foster an environment of dialogue, problem- solving and trust building— thereby helping to set the stage for an eventual normalization of relations.

### 2NC Aff Ground

#### Cuba QPQs are predictable in the literature

Haass 00 – Richard Haass & Meghan O’Sullivan, Brookings Institution Foreign Policy Studies Program, “Terms of Engagement: Alternatives to Punitive Policies”, Survival, 42(2), Summer, p. 15-16

Rather than maintaining the status quo, the US should simultaneously pursue two forms of engagement with Cuba. First, it should actively seek out Castro’s willingness to engage in a conditional relationship and to chart a course towards more satisfactory relations. It should attempt to strike a dialogue with Castro in which reasonable benefits are offered to him in return for reasonable changes. Rather than accentuating the desire for a regime change or immediate democratic elections, US policy-makers should make lesser goals the focus of their policy, as the more ambitious the demands, the less likely Castro is to enter into a process of engagement. For instance, the release of political prisoners and the legitimisation of political parties might be offered in exchange for the selected lifting of elements of the embargo. Regardless of Castro’s reaction to such an approach, benefits would accrue to the United States. If Castro accepted this dialogue, US policy would be seen as pushing forward real political liberalisation on the island; if Castro rejected these attempts, America would still ease tensions with its European allies by demonstrating it was willing to take a more flexible line towards Cuba.

#### Venezuela QPQs are predictable

**Christy 3/15**, [*Patrick Christy is a senior policy analyst at the Foreign Policy Initiative,* http://www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/world-report/2013/03/15/after-chavez-us-must-encourage-democratic-venezuela](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CNirav%20Ilango%5CDropbox%5Ccamp%202013%21%5CPatrick%20Christy%20is%20a%20senior%20policy%20analyst%20at%20the%20Foreign%20Policy%20Initiative%2C%20http%3A%5Cwww.usnews.com%5Copinion%5Cblogs%5Cworld-report%5C2013%5C03%5C15%5Cafter-chavez-us-must-encourage-democratic-venezuela)

What's perverse is how the Obama administration's move to "reset" relations with Maduro is doing more to legitimize him as the rightful heir to Venezuela's presidency than to resuscitate relations between the two governments. The move showed itself to be even more naive after Maduro accused the United States of plotting to poison Chavez shortly after the strongman's death.Washington must realize that a strategy of engagement alone will not ensure a renewed and improved partnership with Caracas. Failure to realize this will not only undermine whatever influence America has in the months ahead, but also send a troubling signal to Venezuela's increasingly united political opposition. The Obama administration should instead pursue a more principled policy towards a post-Chavez Venezuela. In particular, it should:Pressure Caracas to implement key election reforms.Venezuela's opposition faces formidable obstacles. Interim President Maduro will use the government's near-monopoly control of public airwaves, its established networks of political patronage and last-minute public spending programs to bolster his populist agenda.Washington should stress publicly and privately that any attempts to suppress or intimidate the opposition runs contrary to Venezuela's constitution and the principles defined in the Inter-American Democratic Charter, which was adopted by Venezuela in 2001. To this point, José Cárdenas, a former USAID acting assistant administrator for Latin America, [writes](http://shadow.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2013/03/06/the_struggle_for_venezuela_s_future),The Venezuelan opposition continues to insist that the constitution (which is of Chavez's own writing) be followed and have drawn up a list of simple electoral reforms that would level the playing field and better allow the Venezuelan people to chart their own future free of *chavista* and foreign interference.Demand free, fair and verifiable elections. Although Venezuela announced that a special election to replace Chavez will be held next month, it is important to remember that elections alone do not make a democracy. Indeed, Chavez long embraced the rhetoric of democracy as he, in reality, consolidated executive power, undermined Venezuela's previously democratic political system and altered the outcomes of election through corruption, fraud and intimidation.The Obama administration should make clear that free and fair elections,[properly monitored](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2012/09/the-chavez-plan-to-steal-venezuelas-presidential-election-what-obama-should-do) by respected international election observers, are essential to Venezuela's future standing in the hemisphere and the world. Likewise, Secretary of State John Kerry should work with regional partners—including (but not limited to) Brazil, Canada, Colombia and Mexico—to firmly encourage Maduro's interim government. A unified regional voice would send a powerful signal to Chavez's cronies in Caracas and longtime enablers in China, Iran and Russia.Condition future diplomatic and economic relations**.** Corruption and criminality were widespread under the Chavez regime, as high-level government and military officials benefited from close ties to corrupt businesses and international drug traffickers. Yet to date, the Obama administration has done little to hold Venezuela's leaders accountable. Washington should make clear that full diplomatic relations with the United States will be contingent upon Venezuela ending ties to international terrorist groups and rogue regimes like Iran. If Venezuela takes meaningful steps to end these ties and ensure future elections, the United States should work with Caracas and the private sector to reform Venezuela's energy industry and identify key development projects and reforms to improve the country's economic future.The United States can play an important role in shaping Venezuela's post-Chavez future. But to do so, the Obama administration will need to stand with the people of Venezuela by publicly defending democratic principles and the impartial rule of law in Latin America.

## EU CP

### 2NC Mexico Solvency

#### That’s especially true for Mexico

Carlo Secchi, spring-xx-2008, Professor Senior, Department of Policy Analysis and Public Management @ Bocconi University, “Latin America is Europe’s next big missed business opportunity,” http://www.europesworld.org/NewEnglish/Home\_old/Article/tabid/191/ArticleType/ArticleView/ArticleID/21072/language/en-US/Default.aspx

Brazil and Mexico are the key Latin American countries. The EU’s association agreement with Mexico is 10 years old, but it doesn’t yet have a strategic partnership with Brazil. This is partly because of the never-ending negotiation process with Mercosur, the troubled Latin American customs union that is still incomplete. The EU is currently negotiating trade liberalisation deals with all of Latin America’s regional blocs; as well as Mercosur, these are the Caribbean Community, the Central America Common Market and the Andean Community. The EU therefore needs to urge its Latin American partners towards further integration. If they were to adopt a common “rule of origin” for their products this would be an incentive to further liberalise their international trade, and thus increase it. Full trade liberalisation in Latin America, although difficult to achieve, must be made central to the European strategy. Greater trade openness would be beneficial for economic growth. But even if tariffs and quotas are progressively reduced, trade flows may remain low if other trade costs remain high. EU co-operation should be directed to lowering trade costs. The crucial issue is market access. Most Latin American countries still get poor results from their export efforts towards Europe, the exceptions being raw materials and energy sources. After the establishment of the EU-Chile free trade area, Chilean exports to the EU were substantially increased. But in the case of EU-Mexico trade liberalisation, the growth of imports from the EU has exceeded the growth of exports to Europe, resulting in a widening Mexican trade deficit with the EU. Ever since the 1999 Rio summit, the European Union has proclaimed that Latin America is a vital strategic political and economic partner. But a huge gap has remained between its words and its actions. An abrupt change in the European approach is now needed if a strategic bi-regional partnership is to be created. The European Commission apparently understands this. Although the EU does not have a strategic partnership with Brazil, its intention is to push ahead with one as fast as possible. In mid-2007 the Commission confirmed that it will be revisiting the EU’s 10-year dialogue with Mercosur, with the aim of giving new impetus to the negotiations. But there is also a keen awareness that the EU’s hope for a special relationship with Brazil must not be allowed to hinder regional integration in South America, or worsen asymmetries and imbalances within the bloc. If Latin America is to become more important as a strategic partner for the EU in the global economy, and as a more attractive market for European companies, European institutions must become more open to the needs of countries in the region. The new start by the EU, focused on the two most important players, Brazil and Mexico, could prove a promising one, because of the “pull” effect it might have on the other countries. However, this must be accompanied by measures to keep all Latin American countries on board. Otherwise, Latin America may well prove to be Europe’s next missed business opportunity.

# 1NR

## Nuke Leadership

### Prolif Good

#### Empirics outweigh predictions – their impacts are unsupported speculation.

Richard I. Hofferbert, Professor of Political Science @ SUNY Binghamton, 1990, The reach and grasp of policy analysis, p. 38-40

Reports of social research usually become self-consciously theoretical at about the point at which the author runs out of data. And the result is more rhetoric than science. Why? I am not sure. But I suspect it is because of the partiality and artificiality of the way social scientists denote their domains (or "guilds"). To expect a "theory of public policy" is probably about as sensible as to expect a "theory of eating." The acts studied are not suitable to self-standing, coherent theory, in the proper philosophy of science sense. But the form and consequences of eating habits are interesting as they fit into the larger biological system. So are the patterns and consequences of public programs interesting as they fit into the larger social system. / What does empirical policy research do that is respectable if it does not deliberately or directly build "theory"? It tests common sense, and it aids pattern recognition. / The testing of common sense by empirical research occasionally shows that conventional wisdom is right. Sometimes it shows that common sense is simply wrong. More often, however, empirical research reveals a world that is much more complex than one is led by accepted explanations to believe. Likewise, once complexity is perceived, it is helpful to have a map, some means to recognize patterns, to help the wise policy maker approach goals more efficiently. / These are important but modest mandates for empirical policy research. But they are eminently more realistic and useful than pretending to "build theory" or to "explain" to the ill-informed how the world actually works, especially when the "ill-informed" are seasoned policy makers and program managers. Testing Common Sense / The "easy" sciences (e.g., physics and chemistry) are able to create, in the laboratory, circumstances that exclude impurities that would con-ruse observations. One or a few tests of expectations with purified chemicals or physical material are sufficient to deal with a hypothesis. Unfortunately, such purity of conditions is rare in the "hard" (i.e., difficult) sciences (e.g., political science, anthropology, economics, sociology). There, we often compensate for impurity by examining very large numbers of cases, which allows us to control for alternative causes or impurities. That accounts for the frequency with which policy evaluators use survey research or other information resources to produce large numbers of observations.

#### Nuclear fear scenarios cloud calculation.

Jonathan Tepperman, 8-29-2009, Newsweek International's Deputy Editor, was Deputy Managing Editor of Foreign Affairs and wrote frequently on international affairs for Newsweek, The New York Times, the Wall Street Journal, the Washington Post, The Los Angeles Times, The New Republic, The Jerusalem Post and The Forward, and is a Fellow of the New York Institute of Humanities, “Why Obama Should Learn to Love the Bomb,” Newsweek, http://www.newsweek.com/2009/08/28/why-obama-should-learn-to-love-the-bomb.html

Put this all together and nuclear weapons start to seem a lot less frightening. So why have so few people in Washington recognized this? Most of us suffer from what Desch calls a nuclear phobia, an irrational fear that's grounded in good evidence—nuclear weapons are terrifying—but that keeps us from making clear, coldblooded calculations about just how dangerous possessing them actually is. The logic of nuclear peace rests on a scary bargain: you accept a small chance that something extremely bad will happen in exchange for a much bigger chance that something very bad—conventional war—won't happen. This may well be a rational bet to take, especially if that first risk is very small indeed. But it's a tough case to make to the public.

#### Deterrence works in every possible instance.

Kenneth Waltz Interview by Harry Kreisler, 2-10-2003, Professor, Political Science, UC Berkeley, “Theory and International Politics,” http://globetrotter.berkeley.edu/people3/Waltz/waltz-con6.html

One of the striking things about nuclear deterrence is that it has worked, no matter what country we're talking about, no matter what kind of government the country has, no matter what kind of ruler the country has had. The most striking case, of course, is Mao Zedong and the Cultural Revolution. It lasted from 1966 to 1976 in China, where China was in seemingly unheard-of chaos. And yet China, a country with a fair number of nuclear weapons at the time, managed to take care of those weapons very well indeed! The government separated foreign policy to a certain extent, and nuclear policy completely, from the Cultural Revolution. / The one thing about those governments -- millenarian or whatever they may be like -- is that they almost surely will want to stay in power. If they come to power, they will be deterrable. The difficulty is if irregular groups, terrorists, get control of weapons of mass destruction. Something like biologicals are much more of a worry (and chemicals to a certain extent, but biologicals, especially) than nuclear weapons, I think. Then they are not deterrable. We've always known that deterrence does not cover this kind of situation.

#### Historical solvency applies even more today.

Philip E. Auerswald, May - June 2007, Director of the Center for Science and Technology Policy, Assistant Professor, School of Public Policy, George Mason University, frmr Assistant Director of the Science, Technology, and Public Policy Program, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard, “The Irrelevance of the Middle East,” The American Interest, the-american-interest.com/ai2/article.cfm?Id=269&MId=13

It is perfectly legitimate to worry about an Iranian bomb, but not more so than a bomb in North Korea. In either case, if the threat is the use of nuclear weapons by a state actor, it is not clear why a strategy of conventional nuclear deterrence, as employed for more than forty years throughout the Cold War, should be any less effective today than it was in the past. Indeed, there is reason to think that deterrence would be more effective against a weaker nuclear adversary than a stronger one—destruction in such a case is no longer mutual, but for the disadvantaged party it is still very much assured.