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**Counterplan links to politics**

**Dilger 11** (Robert, Senior Specialist in American National Government for the Congressional Research Service, Director of the Institute for Public Affairs at West Virginia University, "Federalism Issues in Surface Transportation Policy: Past and Present," 4-20-11, <http://assets.opencrs.com/rpts/R40431_20110420.pdf> SL)

Congress has debated the federal role in surface transportation policy since the nation’s formation in 1789. A review of the historical record suggests that the debate over the federal role in surface transportation policy has been influenced by factors both internal and external to the institution. Internally, the background, personalities, and ideological preferences of congressional leaders such as Senator Harry Byrd, Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan, and Representative E. G. “Bud” Shuster have had a profound impact on the development of federal-state-local government relationships in surface transportation policy over time. The norms, customs, and traditions of the House and Senate have also had an influence. For example, the decentralized nature of decisionmaking in both the House and the Senate has compartmentalized decisions into more manageable pieces, but, arguably, has made it more difficult for Congress to develop broad-based policies that cut across committee jurisdictions or to enact proposals to consolidate programs or devolve programmatic authority to states as these actions might upset existing power relationships and require the consent of several committees and committee chairs. For example, in the House of Representatives, programmatic and funding distribution issues are under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, but tax and Highway Trust Fund issues are under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. In the Senate, most programmatic and funding distribution issues are under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Environment and Public Works for highways and other aspects of Title 23, but are under the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs for transit. Tax and Highway Trust Fund issues are under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Finance. In the Senate, most safety issues are under the jurisdiction of either the Committee on Environment and Public Works or the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation. The size of the 59-member House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure may also have an impact on federal-state-local relationships in surface transportation policy as each Member has a natural tendency to attempt to maximize surface transportation resources for their home district. Arguably, the committee’s unusually large size could make it more difficult to eliminate congressional earmarks or to achieve committee approval for program consolidations or devolution of programmatic authority because such changes are often viewed as jeopardizing existing funding streams and the ability of Members to claim and receive credit for helping their constituents.128

### 2AC Privatization

**Perm – Do both**

**Perm – Do the counterplan**

**Counterplan links to the net-benefit – it has to use federal processes and funding**

**Gibbs 11** – Subcommittee Chairman (Bob, “Memorandum on the Hearing on “The Economic Importance of Seaports: Is the United States Prepared for 21st Century Trade Realities?”, October 21, 2011, <http://republicans.transportation.house.gov/Media/file/112th/Water/Water%20Briefing%20Memo%20%20%2010-26-11.pdf)>

Infrastructure Investment Investing in ports not only creates jobs during the construction period, but supports wider and long lasting opportunities. Knowing the value of maritime trade, localities and port authorities have invested in the infrastructure of their ports. The AAPA finds that American ports are investing $2 billion annually in marine terminal capital improvements. The Port of New Orleans has spent $400 million in recent years on landside improvements that make it more efficient and attractive to shippers. Acknowledging that 12% of the country's international containers pass under the Bayonne Bridge, The Port Authority of New York and New Jersey have pledged $1 billion toward the bridge retrofit that will allow for Post Panamax ships to sail under it and into the Atlantic Coast's busiest port. The cost benefit analysis of the project estimates that this single project will provide a $3.3 billion dollar annual national benefit. Local investments optimize existing infrastructure and increases port efficiency; however, many projects are **required to utilize Federal funds and processes**. The operation and maintenance of shipping channels is paid for by the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund (HMTF), which is funded from a .125% ad valorum tax levied on cargo imports at American ports. The HMTF is a user fee that grows based on the value of cargo coming to ports. These monies pay for the necessary dredging that keeps navigation channels open for business. In fiscal year 2010, the HMTF grew by $1.3 billion; however, only $828,550,000 was spent in total operations of the fund as the balance was diverted to deficit spending. Because the HMTF is not \_off-'book' on paper there is a balance, however the reality is that all of the balance has been used to offset other government spending. Because of this inequitable allocation, many of the country's most valuable navigation channels are under maintained, reducing the cost effectiveness and efficiency of maritime trade. While some FY 2012 presidential budget requests reflect goals of the NEI, in the areas of navigation there appears to be a disconnect between the production of exports and the transportation of exports overseas. The International Trade Administration request was $526 million towards the administration costs of implementation. Thirty million dollars of Small Business Administration grants are to be disbursed to states to support export activities. Transportation is addressed in the President's budget request with a sweeping surface transportation authorization request and $70.5 billion to fund the Federal Highway Administration. However, maritime trade, the most prevalent form of exportation, does not receive as much funding necessary to support a significant development much less doubling exports. The President's Army Corps of Engineers Civil Works program appropriation request in the Administration's FY 2012 budget submittal is $4.631 billion, which is approximately 6.1% below the annualized Continuing Resolution for FY 2011 of $4.929 billion. These funds are distributed to the many missions of the Corps civil works program including investigations, construction, operations and maintenance, levee safety, flood control and environmental restoration. The Corps budget has a profound effect on waterborne commerce as it shoulders the bulk of coastal infrastructure development and operation and maintenance activities. Unlike surface transportation funding, there is no Federal credit assistance programs for the construction, operation and maintenance of ports' navigation channels. **Even local ports with willing investors are often required to wait on Federal appropriations** to pursue needed projects. Two accounts within the budget of the Corps have significant impact on maritime trade: Construction - The President's budget requests $1.48 billion for the Construction account. This is $210 million less than the FY 2011 annualized Continuing Resolution of $1.69 billion. These funds are used for the construction of river and harbor, flood damage reduction, shore protection, environmental restoration, and related projects specifically authorized or made available for selection by law. Almost half of this budget request is for flood damage reduction projects. However, more alarming is that approximately $470 million are for ecosystem restoration projects that provide Rule or no economic benefits, while navigation projects would only receive $280 million. Operation and Maintenance - The President's budget also requests $2.314 billion for expenses necessary for the preservation, operation, maintenance, and care of existing river and harbor, flood control and related projects. This is $47 million less than the FY 2011 annualized Continuing Resolution of $2.361 billion. The budget would use only $691 million from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund resulting in an increase in the estimated balance from $6.12 billion to $6.93 billion at the end of FY 2012. In addition, while proposing paltry amounts be appropriated from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, the President's budget proposes to expand the authorized purposes of the fund for activities not typically associated with the Corps of Engineers maintenance of navigation channels. Among the persistent barriers to trade, only one-third of the nation's federal navigation projects are currently at their authorized depths and widths, and 8 out of the nation's 10 largest ports are not at their authorized depths and widths. Exporters are required to wait for high tide to get out of port or are forced to ship in lighter loads. This reality is especially burdensome for the many raw material exporters whose products are heavy and whose ships require deeper drafts. Overall, the President's proposal does not address some of the nation's most profound infrastructure needs. It does not direct Congress to pursue multiyear reauthorizations that provide stability and predictable funding to projects. Developing world-class infrastructure cannot be hurried to completion in two years to comply with a truncated funding schedule. Even beyond funding, a transportation infrastructure bill could include no cost policy changes that would support maritime trade. The proposed legislation does not streamline the permitting processes, an action that would expedite valuable projects. Permit backlog delays the timeline for construction and increases costs associated with navigation projects that could promote maritime trade. Also, legislation that would support maritime trade would allow non-federal project sponsors to supply more capital to navigation projects without having to wait on the appropriations process. Re-authorizations, permanent policy changes, and regulatory reduction would unlock private capital and hasten project completion, benefitting maritime trade and the economy as a whole existing river and harbor, flood control and related projects. This is $47 million less than the FY 2011 annualized Continuing Resolution of $2.361 billion.

**Federal leadership is vital to solving trade**

**SCHANK 12** – President and Ceo of the Eno Center for Transportation, was a Transportation Policy Advisor for Hilary Clinton, and holds a Ph.D. in urban planning from Columbia University, a Master of City Planning from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and a B.A. in urban studies from Columbia University. (Joshua,“The Federal Role in Transportation: Four Ideas for Greater Federal Involvement”, Eno Center for Transportation, 5/20/12, <http://www.enotrans.org/eno-brief/the-federal-role-in-transportation-four-ideas-for-greater-federal-involvement>)

Final Thoughts

All of these ideas have a consistent theme – they require **strong federal leadership** to maximize our return on investment. **Our** freight system, airports, highways, and **ports all require some federal coordination in order for the U.S. to effectively compete in the global economy**. While we consider the federal role in transportation given the increasing possibility of diminished federal funding in the coming decades, **these are areas where there not only needs to be a federal presence, but federal leadership**. If local transportation decisions are seen as purely political, with little regard to performance outcomes or national goals, we will fall short of where we need to be as a nation. These transportation investments will require strong federal leadership to ensure that they remain primarily influenced by data, analysis, and desired outcomes.

**Federal signal is key to spur private spending**

**AAPA 09-**American Association of Port Authorities (“The Role of the Federal Government in Maintaining Federal Channels”, AAPA, 2009, http://www.aapa-ports.org/Issues/content.cfm?ItemNumber=1007)

Since 1789, Congress has authorized and funded activities to ensure free and open access of the nation’s waterways to navigation. The General Survey Act of 1824 established the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers as the agency responsible for the Nation’s navigation system. Today, the entire U.S. economy depends on an efficient and reliable transportation system to remain competitive in domestic and international markets. Our ability to trade is a major component of our prosperous economy. U.S. port development and maintenance is a shared responsibility of Federal, state, and local governments, with extensive private sector participation. The Federal government maintains harbor access channels, while individual ports construct and maintain the landside terminal facilities, dredge their own berths, and contribute to channel improvement cost-sharing programs. Relying in good faith on this long-standing partnership, local port authorities have spent over $16.8 billion since World War II and expect to spend an additional $1.3 billion annually to construct and maintain the landside facilities over the next five years. Local ports fund a share of Federal navigation improvement projects, either 35 percent or 60 percent depending on depth. Federal spending for maintenance dredging of navigation channels is about $500 million annually. Investment decisions made by local ports and the private sector have been based on the expectation that the Federal Government will continue to fund maintenance dredging. The benefits of safe and efficient trade provided by our system of water highways are spread throughout the country. Foreign trade activities of each state are supported by a variety of ports; on average, each state relies on between 13 and 15 ports to handle 95 percent of its imports and exports.

**Only the federal government has jurisdiction**

**Sherman 02 –** Director of Research and Information Services American Association of Port Authorities (Rexford, “Seaport Governance in the United States and Canada”, American Association of Port Authorities, <http://www.aapa-ports.org/files/PDFs/governance_uscan.pdf)//MM>

**The U.S. Constitution does grant the federal government exclusive jurisdiction over the navigable waters** of the United States, including its deepdraft channels and harbors--authority delegated primarily to the Coast Guard and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. But federal jurisdiction over harbors stops at the water's edge. Port authorities in the United States are instrumentalities of state or local government established by enactment or grants of authority by the state legislature. Neither Congress nor any federal agency has the power, or even the right, to appoint or dismiss port commissioners or staff members, or to amend, alter or repeal a port authority charter. Certai

**Can’t solve the economy – they lead to taxes**

**Stiglitz 08** – Professor at Columbia University (Joseph E., Privatization, p. XVI)

There is a further problem when privatization occurs in ways that do not maximize government revenues, e.g., in voucher privatizations, in which state wealth is basically given back to citizens. It is equivalent to a negative lump-sum tax. Governments need money to function, and most revenues are raised through distortionary taxation. Had the government continued to own the assets (assuming that it managed them reasonably well), they would have generated income that would have reduced the need for governments to raise distortionary taxes. Privatization results in the necessity of government to impose more distortionary taxation in the future, reducing the economy's efficiency.

### 2AC Links to Politics

#### Counterplan links to politics

**United States Infrastructure Report 12**—“Transportation Infrastructure Outlook and Overview”, 2nd Quarter, pg.32, ProQuest, [www.business](http://www.business)monitor.com

The expansion of the Panama Canal, due to be completed at the end of 2014, is prompting US east coast ports to expand to be able to receive post-Panamax vessels. Major dredging projects are taking place at Norfolk Charleston, while the Port of New York/New Jersey is planning to raise the Bayonne Bridge to allow large ships to reach the port, a project estimated to cost US $1.3bn. At the same time, West Coast ports are investing to improve competitiveness in order to soften the blow when the canal expansion is complete. The Port of Los Angeles is expanding its intermodal links as well as dredging to receive mega-vessels (too large for the Panama Canal even after expansion) and improving export capacity to meet growing Asian demand. However, funding concerns are also a factor in the port sector. Although some ports have won federal grants for investment, many are facing the possibility that they will not be able to afford to expand. Although we have seen a couple of private concessions for ports over recent years, and there is now increased impetus to push forward on this, there is little political will behind a major privatization drive. Therefore, we remain bearish for now, with flat growth anticipated between 2015 and 2016.

# PIC

**Perm – Do Both**

**Perm – Do the counterplan – their evidence doesn’t say the PLAN AVOIDS this port**

**[We’ll specify what ports we dredge for disads, not counterplans, solves their offense]**

**OR**

**[Cross-x checks, they should’ve asked what ports we dredge]**

**None of their evidence is about the word “Expeditious” in the Plan Text, that just means we dredge ports quickly**

**Free Dictionary.com** (http://www.thefreedictionary.com/expeditious)

Acting or done with speed and efficiency. See Synonyms at [fast](http://www.thefreedictionary.com/fast)1.

**Every port is key to solving**

**Williams 12** reporter for GlobalAtlanta, Atlanta's International Business News Source \*\*\*Aleman is a Panama Canal Authority CEO (Trevor, “Panama Canal CEO: Savannah, Charleston Ports Both Needed,” 2/14/12, [http://www.globalatlanta.com/articlevid/25345/1872/)](http://www.globalatlanta.com/articlevid/25345/1872/)//AM)

¶ The canal won't lose business if ports like Savannah aren't ready in 2014, but ports will face pressure from shipping lines and companies that want to get their products to market more quickly and cheaply, Mr. Aleman said.¶ West Coast ports oppose the expansion, reasoning that some ships that would've offloaded their containers in California and trucked cargo across the country will instead take all-water routes to the East Coast.¶ "I don't see that as a direct competition really. **I think every port, and I mean it, every port needs to improve in order to be competitive**. That's actually what should be looked at," Mr. Aleman said.¶ The canal expansion is about creating options, he said, noting that it will benefit shipping routes from the West Coast to Europe, which also make use of the canal. He also welcomed the development of new ports across the Americas. ¶

**Their evidence just says the ENTIRE cruise industry is key to the economy- not this**

#### Free trade is key to tech innovation

Alex Tabarrok 10, professor of economics at George Mason University, 12-16-10, “On The Importance of Trade and New Economic Growth,” The Daily Reckoning, http://dailyreckoning.com/author/kateincontrera

The story of economic growth has changed. But when you say innovation, you also mean change, and that has two sides. Sometimes people are afraid of the change.¶ So during the Great Depression, in that crisis, there was definitely world retrenchment in trade. We had those things like the Smoot Holly Tariff, and trade just declined all over the world. Fortunately, in this last recession, we have not seen that to anywhere near the same extent. So that is an optimistic point. That is a good point. That is something that we have done right. We have not seen a lot of trade wars.¶ It’s something we need to be concerned about because, yes, any time other people start to get rich, people begin to wonder about their own position in the world. They begin to fear. But so far, I think we’ve been – I think we have learned actually some lessons from the past, and we have not cut down on trade as much as we have done in the past.¶ Trade is absolutely critical. Think about it this way. The reason trade is important is because it makes markets much larger, and that increases the incentive to do research and development. So I like to say, you know, if China and India were as rich as the United States is today, then the market for cancer drugs would be five or six times larger than it is now, and that means five or six times the purchasing power, the incentive to do research and develop new drugs.¶ So part of what we have to understand is that when other countries get rich, that is a benefit to us. That is not a cost. When other countries get rich, they start to contribute to the incentive to do research and development – to research and develop new drugs, new computers, new software, all kind of ideas. And this makes us rich as well.¶ Think about the world economy as a massive parallel computer. Well, for most of the last century, most of those processes were offline. We had more than a billion people in China and India not contributing. A processor being offline. Today those processes are coming back online and are finally contributing to the world economy.¶ Well, I’m really very optimistic about the future. And, really, for the very first time, in at least a 1000 years, the world economy is really operating almost on all four cylinders. Think about it this way. For well over a 100 years, most of the world economy has been driven by the United States, Britain, Japan, a few other countries. Today, we have China and India coming online.¶ So what I mean by this is that we have billions of people in these countries who have been cut off from the world economy, whether through communism or whether through abject poverty, they have basically been, simply, producing enough agriculture to feed themselves, sometimes not even that, and that’s it. They haven’t been part of the world economy.¶ Today that’s changing. Today, for the first time, we have billions of people in China and India who are beginning to contribute ideas, innovations, new discoveries, who are beginning to contribute to the world economy.

**Solves extinction**

**Kurzweil 08**—BS in Computer Science and Literature in 1970 from MIT, header of tons of entrepreneurial projects (Ray, 13 April 2008, Making the World A Billion Times Better, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/04/11/AR2008041103326.html>) ellipses in original

This exponential progress in the power of information technology goes back more than a century to the data-processing equipment used in the 1890 census, the first U.S. census to be automated. It has been a smooth -- and highly predictable -- phenomenon despite all the vagaries of history through that period, including two world wars, the Cold War and the Great Depression. I say highly predictable because, thanks to its exponential power, only technology possesses the scale to address the major challenges -- such as energy and the environment, disease and poverty -- confronting society. That, at least, is the major conclusion of a panel, organized by the National Science Foundation and the National Academy of Engineering, on which I recently participated. Take energy. Today, 70 percent of it comes from fossil fuels, a 19th-century technology. But if we could capture just one ten-thousandth of the sunlight that falls on Earth, we could meet 100 percent of the world's energy needs using this renewable and environmentally friendly source. We can't do that now because solar panels rely on old technology, making them expensive, inefficient, heavy and hard to install. But a new generation of panels based on nanotechnology (which manipulates matter at the level of molecules) is starting to overcome these obstacles. The tipping point at which energy from solar panels will actually be less expensive than fossil fuels is only a few years away. The power we are generating from solar is doubling every two years; at that rate, it will be able to meet all our energy needs within 20 years. Nanotechnology itself is an information technology and therefore subject to what I call the "law of accelerating returns," a continual doubling of capability about every year. Venture capital groups and high-tech companies are investing billions of dollars in these new renewable energy technologies. I'm confident that the day is close at hand when we will be able to obtain energy from sunlight using nano-engineered solar panels and store it for use on cloudy days in nano-engineered fuel cells for less than it costs to use environmentally damaging fossil fuels. It's important to understand that exponentials seem slow at first. In the mid-1990s, halfway through the Human Genome Project to identify all the genes in human DNA, researchers had succeeded in collecting only 1 percent of the human genome. But the amount of genetic data was doubling every year, and that is actually right on schedule for an exponential progression. The project was slated to take 15 years, and if you double 1 percent seven more times you surpass 100 percent. In fact, the project was finished two years early. This helps explain why people underestimate what is technologically feasible over long periods of time -- they think linearly while the actual course of progress is exponential. We see the same progression with other biological technologies as well. Until just recently, medicine -- like energy -- was not an information technology. This is now changing as scientists begin to understand how biology works as a set of information processes. The approximately 23,000 genes in our cells are basically software programs, and we are making exponential gains in modeling and simulating the information processes that cracking the genome code has unlocked. We also have new tools, likewise just a few years old, that allow us to actually reprogram our biology in the same way that we reprogram our computers. For example, when the fat insulin receptor gene was turned off in mice, they were able to eat ravenously yet remain slim and obtain the health benefits of being slim. They didn't get heart disease or diabetes and lived 20 percent longer. There are now more than a thousand drugs in the pipeline to turn off the genes that promote obesity, heart disease, cancer and other diseases. We can also turn enzymes off and on, and add genes to the body. I'm an adviser to a company that removes lung cells, adds a new gene, reproduces the gene-enhanced cell a million-fold and then injects it back into the body where it returns to the lungs. This has cured a fatal disease, pulmonary hypertension, in animals and is now undergoing human trials. The important point is this: Now that we can model, simulate and reprogram biology just like we can a computer, it will be subject to the law of accelerating returns, a doubling of capability in less than a year. These technologies will be more than a thousand times more capable in a decade, more than a million times more capable in two decades. We are now adding three months every year to human life expectancy, but given the exponential growth of our ability to reprogram biology, this will soon go into high gear. According to my models, 15 years from now we'll be adding more than a year each year to our remaining life expectancy. This is not a guarantee of living forever, but it does mean that the sands of time will start pouring in rather than only pouring out. What's more, this exponential progression of information technology will affect our prosperity as well. The World Bank has reported, for example, that poverty in Asia has been cut in half over the past decade due to information technologies and that at current rates it will be cut by another 90 percent over the next decade. That phenomenon will spread around the globe.

# Russia DA

Zero risk of Russia war.

Graham 7 - Senior advisor on Russia in the US National Security Council staff 2002-2007, Thomas, " The Dialectics of Strength and Weakness”, Russia in Global Affairs, July, http://eng.globalaffairs.ru/numbers/20/1129.html

An astute historian of Russia, Martin Malia, wrote several years ago that “**Russia has** at different times **been** **demonized** or divinized by Western opinion less because of her real role in Europe than because of the fears and frustrations, or hopes and aspirations, generated within European society by its own domestic problems.” Such is the case today. To be sure, mounting Western concerns about Russia are a consequence of Russian policies that appear to undermine Western interests, but they are also a reflection of declining confidence in our own abilities and the efficacy of our own policies. Ironically, this growing fear and distrust of Russia come **at a time when Russia is** arguably **less** **threatening** to the West, and the United States in particular, **than** it has been at **any time since the end of the** **Second World War. Russia does not champion a totalitarian ideology** intent on our destruction, **its** **military poses no threat** to sweep across Europe, its **economic growth depends on** constructive **commercial relations** with Europe, **and its strategic arsenal** – while still capable of annihilating the United States – **is under** more **reliable control** than it has been in the past fifteen years and **the threat of a strategic** **strike approaches** zero probability. Political gridlock in key Western countries, however, precludes the creativity, risk-taking, and subtlety needed to advance our interests on issues over which we are at odds with Russia while laying the basis for more constructive long-term relations with Russia.

#### Trade deficit destroys US-Sino relations

**Sester and Roubini, Research Associate in the Global Economic Governance Programme at University Collegem Oxford, Professor of Economics at New York University, 8-‘5 ( Council on Foreign Affairs, P.Nexis)**

There is little doubt that U.S. external debt and the current account deficit are eroding the appeal of the U.S. approach to economic policy, an important element of U.S. "soft power." Asian policymakers, in particular, view U.S. economic policy not as a model but as a problem: the United States' "exorbitant privilege"--Charles de Gaulle's term for Washington's ability to finance deficits by printing dollars-comes at their expense. The United States has a particularly delicate relationship with China, which is currently the single biggest buyer of U.S. debt. To date, disagreements on other issues have not prompted China to slow its accumulation of dollar reserves, but that is not to say that it could not happen in the future. The ability to send a "sell" order that roils markets may not give China a veto over U.S. foreign policy, but it surely does increase the cost of any U.S. policy that China opposes. Even if China never plays its financial card, the unbalanced economic relationship between the United States and China could add to the political tensions likely to accompany China's rise. Economic power usually flows to creditors, not debtors. While the United States roams the world looking to sweep up any spare savings to finance its huge deficits, China roams the world looking for new places to invest its surplus savings-including in oil and gas resources and in states that Washington has judged pariahs. This is a far cry from the early days of the Cold War, when the United States used its surplus savings to finance the reconstruction of its allies, cementing political alliances with strong economic ties.

#### Relations solve extinction

**Wenzhong 04, PRC Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2-7-2K4 (Zhou, “Vigorously Pushing Forward the Constructive and Cooperative Relationship Between China and the United States,” http://china-japan21.org/eng/zxxx/t64286.htm)**

China's development needs a peaceful international environment, particularly in its periphery. We will continue to play a constructive role in global and regional affairs and sincerely look forward to amicable coexistence and friendly cooperation with all other countries, the United States included. We will continue to push for good-neighborliness, friendship and partnership and dedicate ourselves to peace, stability and prosperity in the region. Thus China's development will also mean stronger prospect of peace in the Asia-Pacific region and the world at large. China and the US should, and can, work together for peace, stability and prosperity in the region. Given the highly complementary nature of the two economies, China's reform, opening up and rising economic size have opened broad horizon for sustained China-US trade and economic cooperation. By deepening our commercial partnership, which has already delivered tangible benefits to the two peoples, we can do still more and also make greater contribution to global economic stability and prosperity. Terrorism, cross-boundary crime, proliferation of advanced weapons, and spread of deadly diseases pose a common threat to mankind. China and the US have extensive shared stake and common responsibility for meeting these challenges, maintaining world peace and security and addressing other major issues bearing on human survival and development. China is ready to keep up its coordination and cooperation in these areas with the US and the rest of the international community. During his visit to the US nearly 25 years ago, Deng Xiaoping said, "The interests of our two peoples and those of world peace require that we view our relations from the overall international situation and a long-term strategic perspective." Thirteen years ago when China-US relations were at their lowest ebb, Mr. Deng said, "In the final analysis, China-US relations have got to get better." We are optimistic about the tomorrow of China-US relations. We have every reason to believe that so long as the two countries view and handle the relationship with a strategic perspective, adhere to the guiding principles of the three joint communiqués and firmly grasp the common interests of the two countries, we will see even greater accomplishments in China-US relations.

#### Impact is inevitable – Russia is revisionist

#### Chandler 08, (Robert, PhD in political science, former political strategist with the Air Force, Defense Department and the CIA, Shadow World: Resurgent Russia, the Global New Left, and Radical Islam, pg 59- 61)

RUSSIA LOOMS AS A major global geopolitical competitor to establish a one-world government system sometime in the second half of the twenty-first century. Unless the United States allows its deterrent posture to erode over time or a strike by militant Islamists so weakens the country that Americans drop their guard, a Russian nuclear attack will remain unlikely. It is important to remember, however, that not much has changed between yesterday's strategic objectives of the Soviet Union and those of Russia today. One former Soviet KGB officer was quoted by J. R. Nyquist as saying his training identified Soviet geopolitical goals as being "... the vast infiltration of agents all over the globe. The communist plan, based on Lenin's teachings, was to take over the world without physical struggle." Nyquist quoted Cold War defectors as saying Soviet objectives were to extinguish capitalism and "socialize" [Marxize] the United States, separate Europe from America, defeat the U.S. with a superior strategy hacked by propaganda and disinformation, and reconcile with China to develop a "scissors strategy."1 The Andropov Plan put into motion by Mikhail Gorbachev in 1988 maintained these goals but flipped the Soviet-Russian geopolitical strategy from open Marxism-Leninism and confrontation against the West to Antonio Gramsci's stealthy approach of cooperation and promotion of a quiet cultural transformation of capitalist countries. Moreover, reconciliation with China, close relations with Iran and Cuba/Brazil/Venezuela, and engaging "progressive" supporters inside the United States, have collectively positioned Russia for long-term geopolitical competition with the capitalist West and militant Islam. Hidden deeply in the darkness of Russia's shadow world is a Strategy that some in the West have called "The Andropov Plan," named after Yuri Andropov, KGB chief from 1967 to 1982 and General Secretary of the Communist Party froml982 until his death in February 1984. Many in the West remain skeptical about the Plan's existence and label it a "legend." But there is a funny thing about hindsight, especially when seeing the whole of events from the tumultuous 1980s leading to the death of twentieth century Marxism-Leninism, followed by the chaos and mayhem of the 1990s, and finally stumbling into President Vladimir Putin's regressive years in the new millennium. A multitude of new facts have become evident from the writings of numerous journalists, researchers, and commentators of the world scene since the implosion of the Soviet Union. Collectively, when their perspectives are integrated with the (ilasfiost ("openness") and Perestroika ("restrucmring") initiatives of Communist Party chairman Mikhail Gorbachev in the late 1980s, it becomes quite evident that some kind of a plan was in place and that the KGB played a key political role in executing a wide-range of covert operations necessary to implement it. Since the Andropov Plan was born under the cover of great secrecy; the covert actions that put it into motion were shrouded in a shadow world of deception and disinformation. The sheer enormity of the shift in the Soviet Russian long-range deception strategy makes it a difficult story to tell. Yet, by comparing the Andropov Plan's strategic framework with key points of an alleged new disinformation strategy, old facts, as seen through the light of new evidence, make an informed historical interpretation possible. Former KGB officer Anatoliy Golitsyn's Memoranda tor the CIA in the 1980s detailed the bold transformation of Soviet Russia's grand strategy that was designed to bring about a "... convergence of the capitalist West with the Communist Fast on Soviet terms and the creation of a socialist World Government as a solution to the arms race and nuclear confrontation."2 Golitsyn's warnings, however, were largely ignored by CIA analysts and swept under the rug as being useless disinformation. The evolution of the initial ideas rooted in todays Russian grand strategy to achieve global power and influence began as long ago as the late 1950s and 1960s. While striving to put the Stalin years behind them, it had become obvious to Soviet leaders that, despite their substantial industrial and military advances. Western economies would eventually outstrip their troubled economy and frustrate the attainment of the Kremlin's global goals. Something had to give. A new grand strategy was needed. With a boldness characteristic of the Russian character, the strategy developed through the Khrushchev and Brezhnev years in the 1960s and 1970s outlined an approach entailing an enormous realignment of the political and economic systems inside the Soviet Union to strengthen its long-term competition with the West.

**Reliance on the Navy is inevitable  
Whiteneck 2010** (Daniel Whiteneck • Michael Price • Neil Jenkins •Peter Swartz, CNA Analysis & Solutions, “The Navy at a Tipping Point: Maritime Dominance at Stake?” March,<http://www.public.navy.mil/usff/documents/navy_at_tipping_point.pdf>)

In the future, the demand for the Navy will continue to be part of an activist US foreign policy. There is no end in sight for coalition leadership, counter-terrorism on a global scale, or the use of U.S. forces to demonstrate commitment and resolve in areas of interest. The importance of access secured by continuous Department of Defense and Department of State efforts with partners will support this global presence. U.S. interests in securing the global commons (sea, air, space, cyber) will remain in place, and the U.S. will remain the guarantor of security for democratic nations through its near monopoly on high-end military power and defensive systems. Continued demand for active peacetime engagement by the U.S. military will be met by maritime diplomacy to support administration priorities and to support security cooperation activities by COCOMs.

#### The Plan prevents a Iran-Sino alliance

#### Morgana 08, of the Institute for the Study of the Americas at the University of London, (Iwan, “The Indebted Empire: America's Current-Account Deficit Problem,” International Politics, volume 45)

Under the aegis of the Bush Doctrine, the necessity of pre-emptive intervention to safeguard America's security in the war on terror has become a cardinal principle of US foreign policy. In these circumstances, the reluctance of US policymakers to take pre-emptive action against threats to the nation's economic security is difficult to justify. It is far more rational for the United States to avert a potential economic crisis than run the risk of dealing with the consequences of a real one. The vulnerabilities associated with the current account deficit also go beyond domestic economic concerns. The implications for American global power are significant because creditors are usually advantaged over debtors in international politics. Although the Beijing regime has shown no inclination to date to exploit its status as America's creditor, the continuation of their grossly unbalanced financial relationship could exacerbate broader tensions likely to accompany China's rise to global power. The threat of a Chinese dollar-strike would also have to be factored as a possible cost of any US foreign policy that Beijing opposed. Moreover, China can reap the political benefits of the global investor role once played by the United States to forge new relationships with states that are rich in energy and other natural resources, even if their governments — like that of Iran — are outcasts in the eyes of Washington.

#### That causes Middle East war

#### Myers 09, Editor of Energy and Gold Report, (John, October 14, “Unholy Alliance: How China and Iran Threaten Peace and Prosperity—Plus: Your Lucky Charm When it Comes to New Wealth” Personal Liberty, http://www.personalliberty.com/john-myers/unholy-alliance-how-china-and-iran-threaten-peace-and-prosperityplus-your-lucky-charm-when-it-comes-to-new-wealth/)

China now owns 70 percent of this elephant oilfield. All that oil in the heart of Iran will go a long way to satisfying China’s unquenchable thirst for petroleum. Already Iran provides 14 percent of China’s oil demand, but that total will rise sharply as this unholy alliance strengthens. “China is looking for a landline connection to the Persian Gulf or endeavoring to create a ‘string of pearls’ chain of naval facilities between itself and the Strait of Hormuz,” warns Thomas P. M. Barnett in his just published book, Great Powers, America and the World After Bush. By 2030 China will be buying 6 million barrels of oil per day from the Persian Gulf. That is twice what the United States is expected to import from the region. A vast amount of China’s Middle Eastern oil will come from Iran. It is worth noting that just days before the Iran oil buyout, China announced that it will not support increased sanctions on Iran as a way to curb its nuclear program. Surprise, surprise. In fact the Obama administration has been left begging for Beijing’s diplomatic support on Iran’s nuclear ambitions. Without it, the United States faces the unpleasant task of fighting another Middle East war. But Iran won’t be the push-over that Iraq was. “Armed with a vast array of anti-ship and long-range missiles, Iran can target U.S. troop positions throughout the Middle East and strike U.S. Navy ships,” wrote Jephraim P. Gundzik in a 2005 Asia Times article. “Iran can also use its weapons to blockade the Straits of Hormuz through which one-third of the world’s traded oil is shipped. With the help of Beijing and Moscow, Tehran is becoming an increasingly unappealing military target for the U.S.,” concluded Gundzik. Unappealing? Yes. Unavoidable? Probably not. Even the Obama administration understands nuke-toting mullahs in Iran will jeopardize peace in the Middle East and America’s economic security.

**Extinction**

**Steinbach 02 (John, March 3, pg.** [**http://www.converge.org.nz/pma/mat0036.htm**](javascript:ol('http://www.converge.org.nz/pma/mat0036.htm');)**)**

Meanwhile, the existence of an arsenal of mass destruction in such an unstable region in turn has serious implications for future arms control and disarmament negotiations, and even the threat of nuclear war. Seymour Hersh warns, &quot Should war break out in the Middle East again,... or should any Arab nation fire missiles against Israel, as the Iraqis did, a nuclear escalation, once unthinkable except as a last resort, would now be a strong probability."(41) and Ezar Weissman, Israel's current President said &quotThe nuclear issue is gaining momentum (and the) next war will not be conventional."(42) Russia and before it the Soviet Union has long been a major (if not the major) target of Israeli nukes. It is widely reported that the principal purpose of Jonathan Pollard's spying for Israel was to furnish satellite images of Soviet targets and other super sensitive data relating to U.S. nuclear targeting strategy. (43) (Since launching its own satellite in 1988, Israel no longer needs U.S. spy secrets.) Israeli nukes aimed at the Russian heartland seriously complicate disarmament and arms control negotiations and, at the very least, the unilateral possession of nuclear weapons by Israel is enormously destabilizing, and dramatically lowers the threshold for their actual use, if not for all out nuclear war. In the words of Mark Gaffney, &quot... if the familar pattern(Israel refining its weapons of mass destruction with U.S. complicity) is not reversed soon- for whatever reason- the deepening Middle East conflict could trigger a world conflagration.”

# PTX

#### Visas inevitable – republican want them

BEADLE 12 [Amanda Peterson Beadle, Top 10 Reasons Why The U.S. Needs Comprehensive Immigration Reform, <http://thinkprogress.org/justice/2012/12/10/1307561/top-10-reasons-why-the-us-needs-comprehensive-immigration-reform-that-includes-a-path-to-citizenship/?mobile=nc>]

The nation needs a comprehensive immigration plan, and it is clear from a recent poll that most Americans support reforming the U.S.’s immigration system. In a new poll, nearly two-thirds of people surveyed are in favor of a measure that allows undocumented immigrants to earn citizenship over several years, while only 35 percent oppose such a plan. And President Obama is expected to “begin an all-out drive for comprehensive immigration reform, including seeking a path to citizenship” in January. Several top Republicans have softened their views on immigration reform following November’s election, but in the first push for reform, House Republicans advanced a bill last month that would add visas for highly skilled workers while reducing legal immigration overall. Providing a road map to citizenship for the millions of undocumented immigrants living in the U.S. would have sweeping benefits for the nation, especially the economy.

**US-Indian relations low but will never collapse**

**Padukone 12** (Neil Padukone is the Felow for geopolitics at the Takshashila Institution, 6/19/2012, "Natural Allies?", pragati.nationalinterest.in/2012/06/natural-allies/)

In the late 1990s, the United States and India embarked on a partnership based largely on three strategic issues: markets, counter-terrorism, and balancing China. With the opening of India’s economy in 1991, the United States saw India’s billion-strong population as a massive market for its businesses. In the wake of 9/11, Washington came to see India’s travails against Islamist militants in Kashmir and Afghanistan through the lens of its War on Terror and increased counter-terrorism cooperation with New Delhi. And as India’s and China’s strategic spaces began to overlap, managing China’s rise became a common concern for both New Delhi and Washington. With that in mind, the United States and India reversed decades of enmity and, through the 2006 nuclear deal, embarked upon a symbolic commitment to what heads of state of both countries have called a “natural alliance.” Yet with all the fanfare- particularly after U.S. President Barack Obama voiced his support for a permanent Indian seat on the UN Security Council in his 2010 Lok Sabha speech- bilateral ties have recently been marked by considerable drift: India has not fallen in line on the issue of Iran, Washington is only slowly coming around on Pakistani militancy, the countries’ UN voting records do not mesh, and trade disagreements abound. Questions have been raised over why U.S.-India relations have cooled, or whether they were over hyped in the first place. The U.S. Department of Defense’s “strategic pivot” toward Asia is one way to shore up relations and realign the Indo-U.S. partnership. India’s geostrategic location at the centre of the Indian Ocean- along with its naval expansion toward the southern Indian Ocean and its Port Blair naval base at the Andaman Islands- enable New Delhi to manage China’s presence in the region. Indeed, India and America’s navies have been more coordinated than any other bureaucracy since 2000. But the implications of this shared Beijing-centric orientation will only come about in the medium-term. One dimension of these ties, the sale of defence technologies, is another place where India has not yet delivered: the recent Medium Multi-Role Combat Aircraft (MMRCA) competition failed to award contracts to American companies. And in the middle of a global recession in which all countries are hunkering down, and domestic inflation and unemployment- not to mention concerns over doing business in India, such as retroactive taxation and tax avoidance measures- have grown, economic reforms that would further open India’s markets have slowed. U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton’s recent visit to Kolkata was largely an effort to encourage India to increase the speed of its market liberalisation, particularly in the retail sector. This may be a prospect for the future, but is doubtful today given India’s economic slowdown and the attendant drop in employment. Yet perhaps the main reason for this strategic drift is that America’s key concern in South Asia these days is Afghanistan. President Obama delivered on his campaign promise to refocus efforts on the war in that country, and from 2009, his administration’s “AfPak” strategy took a regional perspective that originally sought to bring India into the equation. The thinking behind this, as Amitai Etzioni writes, is that “for Pakistanis, conflict (with India) poses an ominous existential challenge that drives their behaviour on all things,” including “their approach to the West and the war in Afghanistan… If the India-Pakistan confrontation could be settled, chances for progress on other fronts would be greatly enhanced.” The implication was that Washington ought to hyphenate India and Pakistan, to see the two as part of the same regional tussle, and try to settle the Kashmir dispute in order to make progress in Afghanistan. This was something New Delhi vehemently opposed and in fact, it sought de-hyphenation from Pakistan – engagement with New Delhi and Islamabad on separate and unconnected tracks. So when the office of the late US Special Adviser on Pakistan and Afghanistan Richard Holbrooke sought to include India and Kashmir in its purview, New Delhi successfully lobbied against it. This effort served one of India’s aims, insofar as it keeps Kashmir out of America’s area of direct intervention. Yet it also takes India, its assets, and its clout out of the broader Afghan resolution. Among these assets is the Indian-constructed Chabahar Road that connects Iran’s eastern Chabahar Port on the Gulf of Oman to western Afghanistan. The road ends Pakistan’s monopoly on seaborne trade to Afghanistan, which has long allowed Islamabad’s pernicious dominance of Kabul’s economic and political life. In light of America’s confrontation with Iran and efforts to sanction the latter’s energy sector, however, Washington opposes India’s use of Chabahar, particularly to import Iranian oil and natural gas. Indeed another goal of Secretary Clinton’s visit was to try to shore up India’s support for sanctions against Iran- to which end India is reducing its dependence on Iranian energy as it awaits an exemption on sanctions from the US State Department. But when New Delhi recently used its Chabahar road to send 100,000 tons of wheat to Kabul, its full potential vis-à-vis Afghanistan became evident. And this food aid was on top of India’s additional commitments to Afghanistan: constructing the Zaranj-Delaram highway in western Afghanistan that connects Chabahar to the Afghan ring road, the development of the Ayni Air base in Tajikistan (originally designed to treat wounded Afghan soldiers), building Afghanistan’s parliament building, exploring the Hajigak iron mine, and even commitments to train the Afghan National Police and Army- all of which amount to pledges of over $1 billion since 2001. Washington has been wary of encouraging India’s presence in Afghanistan citing Islamabad’s fear of encirclement. But, even without American attention, a refutation of Pakistan’s “India Threat” narrative is already underway. In order to remain focused on strategic horizons beyond South Asia, India is reorienting its defence apparatus away from Pakistan and towards China and the southern Indian Ocean; even the Ayni Base and Chabahar Road can be seen as elements of this strategic shift beyond the subcontinent. Together with Pakistan’s focus on the Durand Line and events within its own borders, political breathing space between Islamabad and New Delhi has opened up. India-Pakistan talks have already produced a number of important breakthroughs that portend better bilateral days to come: the granting of Most-Favoured Nation status, enhanced trade measures, as well as discussions on the specific parameters of a Kashmir peace based on economic integration. Specifically regarding the Indo-Pak dynamic in Afghanistan, things are less zero-sum than they appear. Important as the Chabahar route is, the combination of road, sea, and even rail links still comes with massive transport costs for India-Afghanistan trade. As S Verma, chairman of Steel Authority of India and the head of a consortium of Indian industries engaged in Afghanistan’s Hajigak iron mine, put it, “over the longer term,” transporting Afghan minerals over Pakistani territory “will be a productive investment. Not just for us, but others in the region including Pakistan. There are license fees, logistics, and so forth.” Meanwhile, Kaustav Chakrabarti of the Observer Research Foundation has suggested “deploying joint Indo-Pak nation building teams” in Afghanistan that include advisors, military trainers, bureaucrats, developments experts, medical crews and NGOs. These teams would “provide additional resources, bridge political polarities, foster cooperation between India and Pakistan and devise means to verify each other’s role, and ultimately, present a long-term mechanism,” guaranteed by India and Pakistan’s geographic proximity, “to ensure Afghanistan’s neutrality.” He cites as a precedent the collaboration between Indian and Pakistani armed forces in “UN peacekeeping missions in hot spots like Somalia.” Full realisation of any Indo-Pak promise will require more space, and time, between the two countries. The interim period, meanwhile, may indeed take a cooling period between the United States and India, who are unlikely to become allies in the fullest sense due to differing tactical approaches. But the strategic fundamentals of the Indo-American rapport- balancing China, expanding trade, and stabilising South Asia- remain intact.

**CIR creates a backlog – impossible to solve**

David **North 10**, former Assistant to the U.S. Secretary of Labor and Center for Immigration Studies Fellow, April 7, 2010, “Would Legalization Backlogs Delay Other USCIS Applications? Probably,” Center for Immigration Studies, http://cis.org/north/legalization-backlogs

An interesting question has arisen as a result of a congressional hearing: would a massive legalization program, as many advocates want, slow the processing of applications filed routinely by citizens and legal aliens wanting immigration benefits? The numbers are daunting. U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) currently faces six million applications a year according to one news story. The estimates of the number of illegal aliens in the nation runs to 11 or 12 million. Could USCIS handle both these multi-million caseloads with its current paper-based systems? There are many complaints that the backlogs are currently too long on the normal collection of six million cases a year. The government's expert on such things, Frank W. Deffer, Assistant Inspector General for Information Technology in the Department of Homeland Security, told a congressional committee on March 23: "adding 12 million more people to the system would be the **mother of all backlogs**. Clearly to us the systems **could not handle it** now."

**THERE IS NO connection between the bill their uniqueness evidence is hopeful of and the ideal legislation required to solve the internal link—**

**You should have the same threshold for this connection as you would apply to affirmative solvency evidence—**

**Obama isn’t using political capital, and if he did it would fail**

**Rothman 1-29** (Obama Says Nothing In Presser, Saves Immigration Reform by Noah Rothman, political analyst and journalist, analyst with Mediaite.com, a news and opinion blog covering politics and entertainment in the media industry as well as other issues. It is the flagship blog of Abrams Media, a ring of blogs run by ABC legal analyst Dan Abrams 5:23 pm, January 29th, 2013

CNN reported on Monday that the Congressional Hispanic Caucus specifically requested the White House to stand down and allow Republican Senators and Congressmen, warming to the possibility of a major deal on immigration reform, to entertain the proposals put forward by the Gang of Eight. “It’s a tricky thing. We want him to lead, but Republicans are in a difficult position,” one unnamed Democratic source told CNN. This time, the president complied. This is a major, though underreported, development. It may have preserved the political will that seems to exist in Congress for a broad reform package that includes a pathway to citizenship for many illegal immigrants while strengthening border security: My fears that the president did not truly want progress on immigration reform, but would rather seek to isolate his opponents and preserve their opposition to comprehensive reform as a political cudgel for his party’s electoral purposes, were not unfounded. Obama has set dubious precedent after precedent of wrenching legislative defeat from the jaws of victory. On July 25, 2011, with just days to go before the debt ceiling limit was reached on August 2 of that year, President Barack Obama delivered a prime time address to the nation warning of the consequences of the House Republican plan to avert the catastrophe of default on the nation’s debt. The president did not offer a concrete plan of his own to avert the crisis, but endorsed Sen. Harry Reid’s (D-NV) proposal which he knew was unpalatable to Republicans. The president’s speech hardened the positions of partisan members of Congress. The framework of a bipartisan deal was scuttled. What was ultimately passed was not favorable to the White House and amounted to a Republican victory – one that Obama’s supporters on the left were roiled over. The episode amounted to the most significant defeat of Obama’s presidency to date: The president had learned his lesson.

#### Winners win is key to democratic unity

Reuters 2-7

(<http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/02/07/usa-congress-obama-idUSL1N0B7IQZ20130207>)

Va. Feb 7 (Reuters) - Democrats in Congress have always had some gripes with their president, Barack Obama. He doesn't call. He doesn't schmooze. He's **not tough enough** with Republicans. But this year, the complaints, as well as the complainers, are fewer than ever, with some of his old critics confessing that they're starting to come around. That's the message from the annual retreat in suburban Virginia of Democratic members of the House of Representatives. "I really like this new man," said Democratic Representative Louise Slaughter of New York, one of those who during Obama's first term thought he was too compromising. "I've been a little hard on him, but he finally understands that Republicans really don't like him and tried to destroy him," Slaughter said. "He wants to get things done. So do I." Slaughter was referring to the aggressive agenda Obama has pursued since winning re-election in November, with immigration reform and gun violence, longtime favorites of the progressive base of the Democratic Party, at the top of the list. Liberals were critical of Obama during his first term for lack of action on both these issues as well as on climate change. Fiscally conservative Democrats criticized his nearly $800 billion economic stimulus plan in 2009. Moderates in the Senate - such as then Senators Evan Bayh of Indiana and Ben Nelson of Nebraska - thought him insufficiently attentive to the economy. He faced the broadest barrage from his own party in December 2010, when he **compromised** with Republicans by agreeing to extend the so-called Bush tax cuts, instead of letting them expire. That was the darkest moment for House Democrats, who had lost control of their majority in the mid-term election the month before, in part because of Obama's handling of the economy. Fresh from what Democrats see as an Obama triumph in this January's "fiscal cliff" showdown with Republicans, members gave the president a sustained ovation here on Thursday.

#### Democratic unity key to immigration

AP 2-6-13, Obama presses Senate Democrats on strategy for tough fights ahead at annual retreat, www.washingtonpost.com/business/obama-trying-to-sell-senate-democrats-at-annual-retreat-on-a-strategy-for-tough-fights-ahead/2013/02/06/c6f7ace8-7034-11e2-b3f3-b263d708ca37\_story.html

With a big to-do list at the start of his second term, President Barack Obama is trying to sell Democrats on his strategy for tackling immigration, gun control and a host of fiscal dilemmas. Obama met behind closed doors for more than two hours Wednesday with lawmakers from his own party at the Senate Democrats’ annual retreat at a hotel in Annapolis, Md. House Democrats will hear from Obama at their annual retreat Thursday in Leesburg, Va. Senate Democratic unity will be critical to Obama’s prospects for enacting the ambitious agenda he’s laid out for the start of his second term. Almost all the items he’s seeking face opposition from Senate Republicans — not to mention the even stronger opposition Obama is likely to run up against if and when the GOP-controlled House takes up those items. The White House said Obama spoke briefly, took questions from 10 of the senators assembled, then spent an hour chatting with them in smaller groups. Obama’s spokesman, Jay Carney said the session was focused on coordinating what Democratic senators are doing with the administration’s own efforts to promote Obama’s priorities. High on the agenda was immigration, where Carney said Obama would note the “significant progress” made toward a bipartisan deal. Obama is letting the Senate take the lead on crafting comprehensive immigration legislation, including a path to citizenship for 11 million illegal immigrants. But he is using all the power that the presidency affords to implore lawmakers to act without delay. A bipartisan Senate group has reached agreement on the broad outlines of such an overhaul, but a few thorny issues remain, including a possible guest-worker program and whether to delay steps toward citizenship until certain border-security measures are in place.

**Deal is inevitable – Gang of Eight and Hispanics – PC is irrelevent**

**Brownstein 1-30**-2013 National Journal, Ronald Brownstein “On Immigration, What Obama Can Learn From Bush's Failed Efforts”

[http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/political-connections/on-immigration-what-obama-can-learn-from-bush-s-failed-efforts-20130131]

Even **in 2006**, something like the Senate plan likely could have attracted 218 votes in the House—but not a majority of Republicans. Faced with a collision between his two political imperatives—courting Hispanics and mobilizing conservatives—**Bush blinked, allowing House leaders to replace the Senate bill with enforcement-only legislation**, which he signed that fall. These choices began the GOP’s slide among Hispanics that continues unabated: **Hispanic support for Republican House candidates plummeted** from 44 percent in 2004 **to just 29 percent in 2006**, presaging Mitt Romney’s disastrous 27 percent showing among those voters in 2012.

**That slippage is one of the two most important differences in the political environment around immigration between 2006 and today. Back then**, as Bonjean notes, **hardly any House Republicans argued that the GOP needed to pass a plan attractive to minorities. But many GOP leaders now see that as self-preservation.** **“The political imperative has shifted the tectonic plates,”** says Frank Sharry, a key player in the 2006 debate who remains central as executive director of America’s Voice, which backs full citizenship for immigrants. **“Immigration was viewed as a wedge issue for Republicans in 2006. Now it’s viewed as a wedge issue for Democrats.” The “Gang of Eight”** proposal released this week **makes it likely** that, as in 2006, **the Senate will eventually pass a bipartisan immigration bill.** Once again, **there are probably 218 House votes for such a plan**, but not a majority of the majority Republicans. That raises another key difference from 2006: Hastert faced little pressure to consider the Senate bill, because Bush bit his tongue when the speaker buried it. If House Republicans shelve another bipartisan Senate plan in 2013, they should expect much more public heat, because Obama won’t be as deferential.

Obama losing immigration still results in high-skill reform – solves their turns the case arguments

Matthew Yglesias 1-15, Slate, 1-15-13, How the GOP Can Roll Obama on Immigration, www.slate.com/blogs/moneybox/2013/01/15/immigration\_reform\_will\_obama\_get\_rolled.html

Of the major policy issues under discussion in Washington, "immigration reform" stands out for having unusually undefined content. For the major immigration-advocacy groups, the goal is clear, a comprehensive bill that includes a path to citizenship for the overwhelming majority of unauthorized migrants already living in the United States. But many other aspects of immigration law are in the mix as part of a proposed deal, and it seems to me that there's a fair chance that a nimble Republican Party could essentially roll the Democratic coalition and pass an "immigration reform" bill that doesn't offer the path Latino advocacy groups are looking for. Elise Foley has the key line from her briefing on the administration's thinking about immigration, namely that a piecemeal approach "could result in passage of the less politically complicated pieces, such as an enforcement mechanism and high-skilled worker visas, while leaving out more contentious items such as a pathway to citizenship for undocumented immigrants." And indeed it could. But how can they stop it? The last House GOP effort to split the high-tech visas question from the path to citizenship question was an absurd partisan ploy. If Republicans want to get serious about it they should be able to make it work. The centerpiece would be something on increased immigration of skilled workers. That's something the tech industry wants very much, it's a great idea on the merits, and few influential people have any real beef with it. High tech visas will easily generate revenue to pay for some stepped-up enforcement. Then instead of adding on a poison pill so Democrats will block the bill, you need to add a sweetener. Not the broad path to citizenship, but something small like the DREAM Act. Now you've got a package that falls massively short of what Latino groups are looking for, but that I think Democrats will have a hard time actually blocking. After all, why would they block it? It packages three things—more skilled immigration, more enforcement, and help for DREAMers—they say they want. Blocking it because it doesn't also do the broad amnesty that liberals want and conservatives hate would require the kind of fanaticism that is the exact opposite of Obama's approach to politics.

#### XO solves

Nakamura 1-6 – David Nakamura and Tara Bahrampour, January 6th, 2013 "Obama using authority for immigrant issues," Washington Post, [www.journalgazette.net/article/20130106/NEWS03/301069950/1066/NEWS03](http://www.journalgazette.net/article/20130106/NEWS03/301069950/1066/NEWS03)

WASHINGTON - The Obama administration’s decision this week to ease visa requirements for hundreds of thousands of illegal immigrants represents its latest move to reshape immigration through executive action, even as the White House gears up for an uncertain political fight over a far-more-sweeping legislative package in the months ahead.¶ Immigration advocates on Thursday hailed a rule change at the Department of Homeland Security that would make it easier for many undocumented immigrants to stay in the United States as they seek permanent residency, saying it will improve the lives of relatives who could have been separated for years without the changes.¶ For President Obama – who has called the inability to achieve comprehensive immigration reform among the biggest regrets of his first term – the new policy is among a series of steps his administration has taken over the past year aimed in part at easing the pace of deportations, which have surged during his tenure. The steps also came amid a presidential campaign that included sharp disagreements over immigration policy and strong support among Latinos and Asians for Obama.¶ The centerpiece was Obama’s decision, announced last June, to stop deporting people who were brought to the country as children and have gone on to be productive and otherwise law-abiding residents.¶ “He is checking off every administrative box he can of what he can do with executive authority that comports with his overall view of immigration policy,” said Angela Kelley, an analyst at the Center for American Progress, a liberal think tank allied with the White House.¶ The latest policy change is focused on illegal immigrants who have a spouse, parent or child with U.S. citizenship. Currently, in order to become legal they must leave the United States and apply for a waiver forgiving their unlawful presence in the country. Only then can they apply for an immigrant visa. And if they don’t get a waiver, they are barred from returning to the United States for up to 10 years, depending on the case.¶ The specter of being barred deterred many from applying. But under the rule change finalized Wednesday, those who qualify will be able to apply for waivers from within the United States starting March 4. Applicants must return to their native country for a brief period for the consular immigrant visa process.¶ The new rule greatly reduces the risk inherent in applying for a waiver, as people whose applications are rejected would still be in the United States when they heard the news. Even for those whose applications are approved, the new rule will allow them to spend much less time outside the United States, as they will travel abroad with waivers in hand.

#### Deal inevitable

Allan Wernick 1-25, attorney and director of the City University of New York’s Citizenship Now!, 1-25-13, A look at where key Congressional players stand on immigration indicates reform could come soon, http://www.nydailynews.com/new-york/citizenship-now/immigration-chances-good-sweeping-immigration-reform-article-1.1245988

As expected, President Obama confirmed his support for immigration reform in his inaugural address. It was one of the few specific issues mentioned by the President in setting the program for his coming four years in office. In the last few weeks, some pundits have argued that the debate over debt and budget issues or gun control will sidetrack the President from his commitment to immigrants. That analysis ignores the expectations of Latino voters and their allies. Obama and both parties have no choice but to make immigration reform a priority in the coming year. The doubters are wrong. I am more optimistic than ever that we will see reform this year. To understand why, lets take a look at what some key players on the immigration reform debate have been saying and doing this year: l Charles Schumer — New York Democrat Chuck Schumer will pay a key role in shaping the debate. That’s good news for immigrant rights’ advocates. As chair of the Senate Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security and Citizenship, Sen. Schumer is responsible for leading any reform bill through the Senate. Particularly experienced in dealing with immigration legislation, many credit then-Congressman Schumer with the deal-making that led to passage of the last legalization legislation, the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986. More than 3 million undocumented immigrants were legalized under that act. Schumer is already on the move, organizing his colleagues for the fight to come. l Marco Rubio — Florida Sen. Marco Rubio’s call last spring for a Dream Act for undocumented youth was an historic turning point in the immigration reform debate. A rising Conservative Republican star, Rubio’s proposal forced Obama’s hand. The President’s decision to grant Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals helped him consolidate the Latino vote, a key factor in his victory. Recently, Rubio's position on legalization has moved from supporting just legal status to agreeing that legalization must include a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants. Though many others in the Republican party have yet to adopt the “path to citizenship” position, it will hard for Republican leaders to buck one of their few Latino leaders. Rubio is a key player in the Republicans’ plan to reach out to Latinos. As a possible 2016 Presidential candidate, Rubio can’t afford to anger Latinos. l Luis Gutierrez — Chicago Congressman Luis Gutierrez is the Democratic Party’s conscience on immigration issues. Gutierrez is a tenacious advocate for immigrants’ rights. Though not a member of the party’s leadership, his impact on the debate will be greater than might be expected from his position alone. He has a long history of advocating for immigrants’ rights and he stood up to the Obama administration’s early resistance to the DACA program. Of Puerto Rican ancestry, Gutierrez recognized early in his career the importance of reaching out to his Mexican constituents. To help lead the immigration reform debate in the House of Representatives, Gutierrez is giving up his senior position on the prestigious House Financial Services Committee to join the Subcommittee on Immigration Policy and Enforcement. House Democratic leaders will look to Gutierrez to speak for immigrants about which compromises are acceptable to Latinos and which are not. He has closer ties to the immigrants’ rights movement than any other federal elected official. l Paul Ryan — Former Vice Presidential candidate Paul Ryan has no intention of letting Marco Rubio steal the show on immigration reform. A contender with Rubio for a possible 2016 run for the White House, Ryan reportedly reached out to House colleague Gutierrez regarding possible Tea Party support for a generous immigration bill. Ryan and any other Republicans seeking a national leadership role must be sensitive to the growing Latino vote. Unlike many of his Republican colleagues, Ryan is not a reformed immigrant-basher, reversing his position only after Romney and his defeat in November. Compared to other Republicans, he has been relatively immigrant-friendly much of his career. l John Boehner and Harry Reid — Boehner, as Speaker of the House, and Reid, as Senate Majority Leader, together need to make the system work for immigration reform to become law. Within days of President Obama’s reelection, Republican Boehner made clear his intention to seek common ground with Obama on the issue. As a leading Republican, Boehner knows that his party’s future is bleak if it maintains a restrictionist stance. Reid, as his party's Senate leader, will do what it takes to get Obama and Schumer’s program through the Senate. Reid must also keep his own constituents in mind. In his home state of Nevada, Latinos made up 18% of voters in 2012, up from 15% in 2008, a number that will surely grow going forward. Immigration reform will happen this year. Count on it.

**Rubio supports dredging – Miami proves**

**FL Gov.com 11** (Governor Scott’s website, http://www.flgov.com/governor-rick-scott-announces-funding-plan-for-port-of-miami-dredge-project/)

Flanked by Senator Marco Rubio, Congressman Mario Diaz-Balart, Congressman David Rivera, and Colombian Ambassador Gabriel Silva, the Governor unveiled his intention to invest in the types of infrastructure projects that have long-term, permanent payoffs. The Port of Miami dredge project is projected to result in 30,000 new jobs for the region in the coming years.

#### Rubio’s key to immigration

Drucker and Trygstad 1-30 David M and Kyle, "Rubio Must Sell Immigration Changes to GOP, Grass Roots", 2013, www.rollcall.com/news/rubio\_must\_sell\_immigration\_changes\_to\_gop\_grass\_roots-222044-1.html?pos=hftxt

The fate of an immigration overhaul rests almost exclusively with Sen. Marco Rubio, the Florida Republican whose star power with conservatives is crucial to moving a bill through Congress.¶ President Barack Obama retains veto power, and Democrats hold the Senate floor. But no comprehensive immigration changes are likely to pass Congress without the healthy support of House Republicans. And Florida’s junior senator, perhaps more than any other Republican serving in Washington today, has the political credibility and communication skills to sell such complicated, sensitive legislation to skeptical conservative members, grass-roots voters and influential media commentators.¶ Rubio’s position is all the more unique because congressional Democrats and Obama need him, too, and appear to realize his importance to the legislative endgame.¶ Republicans warn that Obama and congressional Democrats could sink Washington’s immigration policy rewrite by attaching controversial social provisions or watering down the border enforcement and security measures included in the bipartisan Senate framework that Rubio helped negotiate. The Florida lawmaker has said he’ll pull his support from any bill if that occurs, and Republicans say comprehensive policy changes will fail to garner meaningful GOP support without Rubio’s backing.¶ “If Rubio signals any mistrust or misgivings, the whole thing collapses,” GOP pollster Brock McCleary said.

#### **Adding new immigrants not key---immigration and visas are already increasing**

Porter 2-5 – Eduardo Porter, writer for the New York Times, February 5th, 2013, "Immigration Reform Issue: The Effect on the Budget" [www.nytimes.com/2013/02/06/business/immigration-reform-issue-the-effect-on-the-budget.html?pagewanted=all&pagewanted=print](http://www.nytimes.com/2013/02/06/business/immigration-reform-issue-the-effect-on-the-budget.html?pagewanted=all&pagewanted=print)

Yet immigration reform today means something quite different than it did in 2007. Notably, the elements needed to stop the flow of illegal immigrants north are much less important to the enterprise. The Obama administration has already spent huge amounts of money on border enforcement. Today, border policing costs about $18 billion a year — nearly 50 percent more than it did in 2006. And deportations have soared. What’s more, **illegal immigration has slowed to a trickle**, as Mexico has grown more robustly than the United States. The illegal immigrant population has even been shrinking in the last few years. And it may continue to do so as the Mexican population of prime migration-age people stops growing.¶ Also, **many employers have already gotten some of what they wanted: the number of workers entering the United States on temporary visas for low-end jobs in** agriculture **and other industries has increased sharply.**¶ “The discussion is in a different environment,” said Gordon H. Hanson, an **expert on the economics of immigration at the University of California**, **San Diego.** “The flow of new immigrants is not the story anymore.”

#### Boehner will push immigration reform – it’s a republican concession – shields Obama’s cap

Foley & Stein 1-2, writers for the Huffington Post (Elise & Stein, “Obama's Immigration Reform Push To Begin This Month”, *Huffington Post*, January 2, 2013, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/02/obama-immigration-reform\_n\_2398507.html)

Lofgren expressed hope that immigration reform would be able to get past partisan gridlock, arguing that the election was seen as something of a mandate for fixing the immigration system and Republicans won't be able to forget their post-election promises to work on a bill. "In the end, immigration reform is going to depend very much on whether Speaker [John] Boehner wants to do it or not," Lofgren said.

#### Immigration reform doesn’t solve – multiple barriers

Holmes 1-23 former assistant secretary of state, distinguished fellow at the Heritage Foundation (Kim R., “HOLMES: A problem-solving approach to immigration”, *Washington Times*, January 23, 2013, http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2013/jan/23/holmes-a-problem-solving-approach-to-immigration/#ixzz2JJSdNxe0)

Immigration has many moving parts that need to be fixed. As my colleagues Matt Spalding, Jessica Zuckerman and James Carafano argue in a forthcoming Heritage Foundation report, it cannot be solved in a single “comprehensive” bill. The problems are too varied. We need a pragmatic, problem-solving approach, not some back-room political deal that is likely to make matters worse.¶ We need to gain operational control of our borders. We could build actual fences in places where they work. Where they don’t, virtual barriers could be erected by using unmanned aerial vehicles and cameras and sensors to enhance monitoring and detection. We can also do a better job of working with the Mexicans, through the Border Enforcement Security Task Force and the Merida Initiative, for example.¶ Another piece of the puzzle is law enforcement at home. The use of illegal labor here is a huge draw for illegal immigrants, and discouraging it requires telling American employers that there will be consequences for hiring illegal immigrants. All sorts of tools exist to do this, including Social Security No Match, random workplace inspections, E-Verify and checks of I-9 forms. They should be strengthened.¶ Yet another step is to make immigration responsive to the needs of the economy. America actually needs foreign labor. A temporary worker program could supply a rotating, temporary foreign workforce, depending on the demands of the economy. This not only makes economic sense; it would channel foreign workers into a legal system, discouraging them from taking an illegal route.¶ We should also make legal immigration easier. America needs immigrants; the issue is not how to stop immigration, but rather how to make it legal and responsive to the needs of Americans. The inefficiencies of the bureaucratic system that manages immigration today are a major reason why we have so many illegal immigrants in the first place. It’s why the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services should be reformed.¶ Then there is the thorny issue of what to do about illegal immigrants already living here. Whatever we do, we must not penalize legal immigrants who did the right thing. Not only is the rule of law at stake, but so, too, is basic fairness.¶ The child of a Mexican mother who went through the process legally suffers when another child of a mother who entered illegally receives special treatment. It is simply unfair. Whatever is done, compassion for that child and for the mother who followed the law should not be forgotten.¶ A pragmatic, step-by-step approach is needed to solve the whole problem of immigration. We don’t need a proposal that claims to be “comprehensive” but in reality is merely politics as usual.