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#### Restrictions are mandates of the quantity of energy produced- that’s the best lexicographical definition

Schackleford 17 J. is a justice of the Supreme Court of Florida. “Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, a corporation, et al., Plaintiff in Error, v. The State of Florida, Defendant in Error,” 73 Fla. 609; 74 So. 595; 1917 Fla., Lexis

There would seem to be no occasion to discuss whether or not the Railroad Commissioners had the power and authority to make the order, requiring the three specified railroads running into the City of Tampa to erect a union passenger station in such city, which is set out in the declaration in the instant case and which we have copied above. [\*\*\*29] It is sufficient to say that under the reasoning and the authorities cited in State v. Atlantic Coast Line R. Co., 67 Fla. 441, 458, 63 South. Rep. 729, 65 South. Rep. 654, and State v. Jacksonville Terminal [\*631] Co., supra, it would seem that HN14the Commissioners had power and authority. The point which we are required to determine is whether or not the Commissioners were given the authority to impose the fine or penalty upon the three railroads for the recovery of which this action is brought. In order to decide this question we must examine Section 2908 of the General Statutes of 1906, which we have copied above, in the light of the authorities which we have cited and from some of which we have quoted. It will be observed that the declaration alleges that the penalty imposed upon the three railroads was for the violation of what is designated as "Order No. 282," which is set out and which required such railroads to erect and complete a union depot at Tampa within a certain specified time. If the Commissioners had the authority to make such order, it necessarily follows that they could enforce a compliance with the same by appropriate proceedings in the courts, but [\*\*\*30] it does not necessarily follow that they had the power and authority to penalize the roads for a failure to comply therewith. That is a different matter. HN15Section 2908 of the General Statutes of 1906, which originally formed Section 12 of Chapter 4700 of the Laws of Florida, (Acts of 1899, p. 86), expressly authorizes the imposition of a penalty by the Commissioners upon "any railroad, railroad company or other common carrier doing business in this State," for "a violation or disregard of any rate, schedule, rule or regulation, provided or prescribed by said commission," or for failure "to make any report required to be made under the provisions of this Chapter," or for the violation of "any provision of this Chapter." It will be observed that the word "Order" is not mentioned in such section. Are the other words used therein sufficiently comprehensive to embrace an order made by the Commissioners, such as the one now under consideration? [\*632] It could not successfully be contended, nor is such contention attempted, that this order is covered by or embraced within the words "rate," "schedule" or "any report,' therefore we may dismiss these terms from our consideration and [\*\*\*31] direct our attention to the words "rule or regulation." As is frankly stated in the brief filed by the defendant in error: "It is admitted that an order for the erection of a depot is not a 'rate' or 'schedule' and if it is not a 'rule' or 'regulation' then there is no power in the Commissioners to enforce it by the imposition of a penalty." It is earnestly insisted that the words "rule or regulation" are sufficiently comprehensive to embrace such an order and to authorize the penalty imposed, and in support of this contention the following authorities are cited: Black's Law Dictionary, defining regulation and order; Rapalje & Lawrence's Law Dictionary, defining rule; Abbott's Law Dictionary, defining rule; Bouvier's Law Dictionary, defining order and rule [\*\*602] of court; Webster's New International Dictionary, defining regulation; Curry v. Marvin, 2 Fla. 411, text 515; In re Leasing of State Lands, 18 Colo. 359, 32 Pac. Rep. 986; Betts v. Commissioners of the Land Office, 27 Okl. 64, 110 Pac. Rep. 766; Carter V. Louisiana Purchase Exposition Co., 124 Mo. App. 530, 102 S.W. Rep. 6, text 9; 34 Cyc. 1031. We have examined all of these authorities, as well as those cited by the [\*\*\*32] plaintiffs in error and a number of others, but shall not undertake an analysis and discussion of all of them. While it is undoubtedly true that the words, rule, regulation and order are frequently used as synonyms, as the dictionaries, both English and law, and the dictionaries of synonyms, such as Soule's show, it does not follow that these words always mean the same thing or are interchangeable at will. It is well known that the same word used in different contexts may mean a different thing by virtue of the coloring which the word [\*633] takes on both from what precedes it in the context and what follows after. Thus in discussing the proper constructions to be placed upon the words "restrictions and regulations" as used in the Constitution of this State, then in force, Chap. 4, Sec. 2, No. 1, of Thompson's Digest, page 50, this court in Curry v. Marvin, 2 Fla. 411, text 415, which case is cited to us and relied upon by both the parties litigant, makes the following statement: "The word restriction is defined by the best lexicographers to mean limitation, confinement within bounds, and would seem, as used in the constitution, to apply to the amount and to the time [\*\*\*33] within which an appeal might to be taken, or a writ of error sued out. The word regulation has a different signification -- it means method, and is defined by Webster in his Dictionary, folio 31, page 929, to be 'a rule or order prescribed by a superior for the management of some business, or for the government of a company or society.' This more properly perhaps applies to the mode and form of proceeding in taking and prosecuting appeals and writs of error. By the use of both of those terms, we think that something more was intended than merely regulating the mode and form of proceedings in such cases." Thus, in Carter v. Louisiana Purchase Exposition Co., 124 Mo. App. 530, text 538, 102 S.W. Rep. 6, text 9, it is said, "The definition of a rule or order, which are synonymous terms, include commands to lower courts or court officials to do ministerial acts." In support of this proposition is cited 24 Amer. & Eng. Ency. of Law 1016, which is evidently an erroneous citation, whether the first or second edition is meant. See the definition of regulate and rule, 24 amer. & Eng. Ency. of Law (2nd Ed.) pages 243 to 246 and 1010, and it will be seen that the two words are not always [\*\*\*34] synonymous, much necessarily depending upon the context and the sense in which the words are used. Also see the discussion [\*634] of the word regulation in 34 Cyc. 1031. We would call especial attention to Morris v. Board of Pilot Commissioners, 7 Del. chan. 136, 30 Atl. Rep. 667, text 669, wherein the following statement is made by the court: "These words 'rule' and the 'order,' when used in a statute, have a definite signification. They are different in their nature and extent. A rule, to be valid, must be general in its scope, and undiscriminating in its application; an order is specific and not limited in its application. The function of an order relates more particularly to the execution or enforcement of a rule previously made." Also see 7 Words & Phrases 6271 and 6272, and 4 Words & Phrases (2nd Ser.) 419, 420. As we held in City of Los Angeles v. Gager, 10 Cal. App. 378, 102 Pac. Rep. 17, "The meaning of the word 'rules' is of wide and varied significance, depending upon the context; in a legal sense it is synonymous with 'laws.'" If Section 2908 had contained the word order, or had authorized the Commissioners to impose a penalty for the violation of any order [\*\*\*35] made by them, there would be no room for construction. The Georgia statute, Acts of 1905, p. 120, generally known as the "Steed Bill," entitled "An act to further extend the powers of the Railroad Commission of this State, and to confer upon the commission the power to regulate the time and manner within which the several railroads in this State shall receive, receipt for, forward and deliver to its destination all freight of every character, which may be tendered or received by them for transportation; to provide a penalty for non-compliance with any and all reasonable rules, regulations and orders prescribed by the said commission in the execution of these powers, and for other purposes," expressly authorized the Railroad Commissioners "to provide a penalty for non-compliance with any and all reasonable rules, regulations and orders prescribed by the said Commision." [\*635] See Pennington v. Douglas, A. & G. Ry. Co., 3 Ga. App. 665, 60 S.E. Rep. 485, which we cited with approval in State v. Atlantic Coast Line R. Co., 56 fla. 617, text 651, 47 South. Rep. 969, 32 L.R.A. (N.S.) 639. Under the reasoning in the cited authorities, especially State v. Atlantic Coast Line R. Co., [\*\*\*36] supra, and Morris v. Board of Pilot Commissioners, we are constrained to hold that the fourth and eighth grounds of the demurrer are well founded and that HN16the Railroad Commissioners were not empowered or authorized to impose a penalty upon the three railroads for failure to comply with the order for the erection of a union depot.

#### Vote Negative

#### Limits and ground – regulations is Pandora’s box – 40 agencies

William O. Daub ¶ LeBoeuf, Lamb, Leiby & MacRae, 1757 N Street NW, Washington, DC 20036, 1976.¶ ENERGY REGULATION: ¶ A QUAGMIRE FOR ENERGY ¶ POLICY, http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/pdf/10.1146/annurev.eg.01.110176.003435

FERS began with the recognition that federal energy policy must result from ¶ concerted efforts in all areas dealing with energy, not the least of which was the ¶ manner in which energy is regulated by the federal government. Energy self­¶ sufficiency is improbable, if not impossible, without sensible regulatory processes, ¶ and effective regulation is necessary for public confidence. Thus, the President ¶ directed that "a comprehensive study be undertaken, in full consultation with ¶ Congress, to determine the best way to organize all energy-related regulatory ¶ activities of the government." An interagency task force was formed to study this ¶ question. ¶ With 19 different federal departments and agencies contributing, the task force ¶ spent seven months deciphering the present organizational makeup of the federal energy regulatory system, studying the need for organizational improvement, and ¶ evaluating alternatives. ¶ More than 40 agencies were found to be involved with making regulatory ¶ decisions on energy. Although only a few deal exclusively with energy, most of the ¶ 40 could significantly affect the availability and/or cost of energy. For example, ¶ in the field of gas transmission, there are five federal agencies that must act on ¶ siting and land-use issues, seven on emission and effluent issues, five on public ¶ safety issues, and one on worker health and safety issues-all before an onshore ¶ gas pipeline can be built. The complexity of energy regulation is also illustrated ¶ by the case of Standard Oil Company (Indiana), which reportedly must file about ¶ 1000 reports a year with 35 different federal agencies. Unfortunately, this example ¶ is the rule rather than the exception.

#### Precision-Lexicography is key to understanding the resolution

Dash No Date [Nilardi Sekhar Dash Linguistic Research Unit, Indian Statistical Institute, worked in the area of corpus linguistics and language technology for more than 15 years No Date “Linguistics- The Art of Lexicography” Encyclopedia of Life Support Systems http://www.eolss.net/Sample-Chapters/C04/E6-91-16.pdf]

Lexicography also studies lexicon but from a different angle. While lexicology concentrate on the general properties and features that can be viewed as systematic, lexicography typically deals with the individuality of each lexical unit (Zgusta 1973: 14). Lexicography is thus defined as the art of writing a dictionary or the science of compiling a dictionary. While lexicology studies words as elements of a system, lexicography approaches words as individual units with respect to their meaning and usage. We use a dictionary in order to learn about words in the process of language learning, comprehending a text in a better way or checking correct spellings and pronunciations of words, etc.
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#### Text: The U.S. Supreme Court should rule that the cap for the Green Technology Pilot Program is unconstitutional and find that delays in approval of all eligible carbon-based solar power patent applications are in violation of this ruling.

#### Supreme court can rule against restrictions on energy production

Craig 2010 (Robin Kundis Craig, Attorneys' Title Professor and Associate Dean for Environmental Programs at Florida State University College of Law, Summer 2010, “MULTISTATE DECISION MAKING FOR RENEWABLE ENERGY AND TRANSMISSION: SPOTLIGHT ON COLORADO, NEW MEXICO, UTAH, AND WYOMING: Constitutional Contours for the Design and Implementation of Multistate Renewable Energy Programs and Projects,” University of Colorado Law Review, Lexis)

A number of dormant Commerce Clause cases have involved energy production, and they systematically conclude that states cannot create legal requirements or preferences based on the source of the fuel or energy. In Wyoming v. Oklahoma, for example, the U.S. Supreme Court struck down an Oklahoma statute that required Oklahoma coal-fired electric power plants producing power for sale in Oklahoma to burn a mixture of coal containing at least ten percent Oklahoma-mined coal. 121 Moreover, the "savings clause" of the Federal Power Act did not prevent the conclusion that the Oklahoma statute was unconstitutional. 122 Similarly, the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois concluded that a Clean Air Act compliance plan that favored Illinois coalviolated the dormant Commerce Clause. 123¶ Nor can states "hoard" state-created energy within their borders. Thus, in 1982, the U.S. Supreme Court concluded that New Hampshire could not constitutionally restrict interstate transportation of hydroelectric power generated in New Hampshire. 124

#### The counterplan is not a *reduction*—it requires executive/congressional acquiescence.

Spiro, 2001 (Peter J. Spiro, Professor, Hofstra University School of Law; Visiting Professor, University of Texas School of Law, Texas Law Review, April, lexis)

The increments approach answers these objections, at the same time that it affirms the value of constitutionalism. It presents, first of all, a determinate method of constitutional location. Unlike translation exercises, the increments model substantially confines the possible discretion of individual constitutional actors, including the judiciary. Working from a premise of historical situatedness, the theory denies the possibility of independent constitutional determination. That is not to deny the inevitability of constitutional change. But all constitutional actors work from a baseline, departures from which can be challenged and rejected by other constitutional actors. Constitutional norms are resolved only by the interplay of those actors. The content of constitutional norms will usually be reflected in institutional action, but one cannot necessarily find the law by reference to the action of any single institution alone. Even if the Supreme Court attempted to exploit the discretion afforded it by a translation model, its pronouncements amount to mere artifacts in the absence of acceptance by other actors. The increments model thus answers the primary volley of the originalists against countermajoritarian judicial adaptation of the constitutional text. Such adaptation will not prevail where it is rejected by other actors.
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#### Electricity prices are dropping and will stay low

Dallas Burtraw, one of the nation’s foremost experts on environmental regulation in the electricity sector, and studies electricity restructuring, competition, and economic deregulation, “Falling Emissions and Falling Prices: Expectations for the Domestic Natural Gas Boom,” Common Resources, August 21, 2012, <http://common-resources.org/2012/falling-emissions-and-falling-prices-expectations-for-the-domestic-natural-gas-boom/>, accessed 10-25-2012.

Moreover, the boom in domestic natural gas production could have even more immediate affects for U.S. electricity consumers. The increased supply of gas is expected to lower natural gas prices and retail electricity prices over the next 20 years, according to a [new RFF Issue Brief](http://www.rff.org/Publications/Pages/PublicationDetails.aspx?PublicationID=22019). These price decreases are expected to be even larger if demand for electricity continues on a slow-growth trajectory brought on by the economic downturn and the increased use of energy efficiency. For example, RFF analysis found that delivered natural gas prices would have been almost 35% higher in 2020 if natural gas supply projections had matched the lower estimates released by the U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA) in 2009. Instead, with an increased gas supply, consumers can expect to pay $4.9 per MMBtu for delivered natural gas in 2020 instead of $6.6 per MMBtu. These trends are even more exaggerated if demand for electricity were to increase to levels projected by the EIA just three years ago, in 2009.This decrease in natural gas prices is expected to translate into a decrease in retail electricity prices for most electricity customers in most years out to 2020. Compared to the world with the lower gas supply projections, average national electricity prices are expected to be almost 6% lower, falling from 9.25 cents to 8.75 cents per kilowatt-hour in 2020. Residential, commercial, and industrial customers are all expected to see a price decrease, with the largest price changes occurring in parts of the country that have competitive electricity markets. All of these prices decreases translate into real savings for most electricity customers. The savings are largest for commercial customers, who stand to save $33.9 Billion (real $2009) under the new gas supply projections in 2020. Residential customers also stand to save big, with estimates of $25.8 Billion (real $2009) in savings projected for 2020.

#### Decentralized solar jacks up electricity prices and hurts the most vulnerable

**Burr, 12** – editor in chief of Public Utilities Fortnightly (Michael, “Rooftop Tsunami; Utilities sound the alarm as PV nears grid parity” PUBLIC UTILITIES FORTNIGHTLY, July, lexis)

From the utility's point of view, a growing wave of rooftop PV projects is starting to look ominous. And now, some utilities are taking action to shore up their defenses--advocating legislative and regulatory changes that pull back net metering policies and other solar incentives. Concerns focus in part on operational challenges from integrating dispersed generation that's variable, non-dispatchable, and sometimes beyond the utility's ability to control. But the biggest worry seems to involve the prospect of a fixed-costs dilemma, which I addressed in this column last issue. (see "Facing Facts," Fortnightly, June 2012). The shorthand is this: As PV gets cheaper, an increasing number of PV-owning customers will pay less than their fair share of utility system costs, leaving a shrinking number of non-solar customers to pick up the tab for keeping the lights on. Although PV's market penetration is tiny today, it's growing rapidly enough to raise real concerns for many utilities.¶ "Distributed generation is becoming one of the largest subsidies on our system," said Ron Litzinger, president of Southern California Edison, during a panel discussion at this year's Edison Electric Institute Annual Convention. "That subsidy tends to go from low-income to higher-income customers. We need to make sure all the costs of distributed generation are known before decisions are made.¶ "Left unchecked, we could see rates increase by 40 to 50 percent by 2020, which we know isn't sustainable."

#### This causes a depression

**Entine, 9** – adjunct fellow at the American Enterprise Institute (Jon, “U.S. and Climate Change--Rescue of the Planet Postponed?”, 2/24, <http://aei.org/publications/filter.all,pubID.29333/pub_detail.asp>)

The correlation between economic growth and energy costs is high and negative; when energy costs go up, productivity takes a nosedive. In these extraordinary times, arguably the top priority must be to ensure that a secular financial downturn doesn't turn into a worldwide structural depression. If that happens, both the economy and the environment will be losers.

#### Global war

Harris and Burrows, 9 – \*counselor in the National Intelligence Council, the principal drafter of Global Trends 2025, \*\*member of the NIC’s Long Range Analysis Unit “Revisiting the Future: Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis”, Washington Quarterly, http://www.twq.com/09april/docs/09apr\_burrows.pdf)

Increased Potential for Global Conflict¶ Of course, the report encompasses more than economics and indeed believes the future is likely to be the result of a number of intersecting and interlocking forces. With so many possible permutations of outcomes, each with ample opportunity for unintended consequences, there is a growing sense of insecurity. Even so, history may be more instructive than ever. While we continue to believe that the Great Depression is not likely to be repeated, the lessons to be drawn from that period include the harmful effects on fledgling democracies and multiethnic societies (think Central Europe in 1920s and 1930s) and on the sustainability of multilateral institutions (think League of Nations in the same period). There is no reason to think that this would not be true in the twenty-first as much as in the twentieth century. For that reason, the ways in which the potential for greater conflict could grow would seem to be even more apt in a constantly volatile economic environment as they would be if change would be steadier.¶ In surveying those risks, the report stressed the likelihood that terrorism and nonproliferation will remain priorities even as resource issues move up on the international agenda. Terrorism’s appeal will decline if economic growth continues in the Middle East and youth unemployment is reduced. For those terrorist groups that remain active in 2025, however, the diffusion of technologies and scientific knowledge will place some of the world’s most dangerous capabilities within their reach. Terrorist groups in 2025 will likely be a combination of descendants of long established groups inheriting organizational structures, command and control processes, and training procedures necessary to conduct sophisticated attacks and newly emergent collections of the angry and disenfranchised that become self-radicalized, particularly in the absence of economic outlets that would become narrower in an economic downturn.¶ The most dangerous casualty of any economically-induced drawdown of U.S. military presence would almost certainly be the Middle East. Although Iran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons is not inevitable, worries about a nuclear-armed Iran could lead states in the region to develop new security arrangements with external powers, acquire additional weapons, and consider pursuing their own nuclear ambitions. It is not clear that the type of stable deterrent relationship that existed between the great powers for most of the Cold War would emerge naturally in the Middle East with a nuclear Iran. Episodes of low intensity conflict and terrorism taking place under a nuclear umbrella could lead to an unintended escalation and broader conflict if clear red lines between those states involved are not well established. The close proximity of potential nuclear rivals combined with underdeveloped surveillance capabilities and mobile dual-capable Iranian missile systems also will produce inherent difficulties in achieving reliable indications and warning of an impending nuclear attack. The lack of strategic depth in neighboring states like Israel, short warning and missile flight times, and uncertainty of Iranian intentions may place more focus on preemption rather than defense, potentially **leading to escalating crises**.¶ Types of conflict that the world continues to experience, such as over resources, could reemerge, particularly if protectionism grows and there is a resort to neo-mercantilist practices. Perceptions of renewed energy scarcity will drive countries to take actions to assure their future access to energy supplies. In the worst case, this could result in interstate conflicts if government leaders deem assured access to energy resources, for example, to be essential for maintaining domestic stability and the survival of their regime. Even actions short of war, however, will have important geopolitical implications. Maritime security concerns are providing a rationale for naval buildups and modernization efforts, such as China’s and India’s development of blue water naval capabilities. If the fiscal stimulus focus for these countries indeed turns inward, one of the most obvious funding targets may be military. Buildup of regional naval capabilities could lead to increased tensions, rivalries, and counterbalancing moves, but it also will create opportunities for multinational cooperation in protecting critical sea lanes. With water also becoming scarcer in Asia and the Middle East, cooperation to manage changing water resources is likely to be increasingly difficult both within and between states in a more dog-eat-dog world.
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#### Immigration reform will pass now but political capital key

Gary Martin Published 7:40 pm, Thursday, March 28, 2013 Immigration reform gaining support in Congress Read more: <http://www.ctpost.com/local/article/Immigration-reform-gaining-support-in-Congress-4393187.php#ixzz2OtaMmqbj>

A Republican Party in desperate search for relevance to Latino voters. An expanded Democratic advantage in the Senate. A second-term President with his legacy on the line.¶ Does all that add up to enough to break decades of impasse and produce comprehensive immigration reform? As expectations -- and tensions -- rise, the answer won't be long in coming.¶ A bipartisan bill could be filed in the Senate as early as next week, followed in relatively short order by a House bill, also crafted by a bipartisan group, aiming at a compromise on the key issue of citizenship.¶ The efforts are being applauded by President Barack Obama, who is using every ounce of his political clout to try to get comprehensive reform.¶ Obama said the time has come "to work up the political courage to do what's required to be done."¶ "I expect a bill to be put forward. I expect a debate to begin next month. I want to sign that bill into law as soon as possible," Obama said at a White House naturalization ceremony.¶ In addition to the issue of eventual citizenship for 11 million undocumented immigrants, Congress is expected to address the need for temporary or guest worker programs.¶ Congress last passed comprehensive bipartisan reform legislation in 1986, when President Ronald Reagan signed a law that granted citizenship to several million undocumented immigrants and created a guest worker program.¶ Up until now, Republicans have opposed citizenship programs as an "amnesty" for lawbreakers who entered the country illegally, and labor has chafed at guest worker programs.¶ But Republican losses in the 2012 elections and increased public support for reform have many in the GOP talking compromise.¶ "If there is one issue that the two parties could produce something meaningful on in this Congress, it would be immigration," said Stephen Hess, a political expert at The Brookings Institution.¶ Hess said an eventual bill "will have lots of provisos, and it will go back and forth, but it would be hard not to produce something given the general feeling that something has to be produced."¶ More and more Republicans are moving toward immigration-reform measures as the party seeks to reach out to Latinos, the nation's largest -- and growing -- minority voting bloc.¶ Public opinion is behind them.¶ A recent poll showed 63 percent of Americans supported a path to citizenship for undocumented workers provided they meet certain requirements, according to a survey by the Public Religion Research Institute.¶ Notable Republicans who have recently spoken in favor of compromise on citizenship proposals include Sen. Rand Paul, R-Ky.; former Mississippi Gov. Haley Barbour; and Rep. Paul Ryan, R-Wis.¶ And a March report by the National Republican Committee, considered a "post mortem" on the 2012 elections, recommended the GOP embrace comprehensive immigration reform to shore up its shaky standing with minorities -- Latinos, in particular.¶ Roy Beck, executive director of Numbers USA, which advocates lower numerical numbers on immigration, predicted a majority of Republican senators would oppose citizenship.¶ Groups like Numbers USA are working to hold GOP senators in line. They sent 13,000 emails to Kentucky voters that claimed Paul's position was "more radical and pro-immigration than anything proposed by President Obama."¶ The group has targeted Sen. Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., one of the "Gang of Eight" senators writing the Senate bipartisan bill, as a lawmaker who favors foreign workers over unemployed South Carolinians.¶ Democrats from conservative-leaning states could also feel political heat.¶ Beck said if five to 10 Democrats in the Senate oppose a bill, proponents would need 10 to 15 Republicans to reach the 60 votes needed to cut off debate and vote on legislation.¶ "You do the math," Beck said.¶ In 2007, an effort to cut off debate on a Senate immigration reform bill died on a 46-53 vote.¶ But immigrant reform proponents, such as America's Voice, say there is a "tectonic shift" in the GOP, and the Democrats also have expanded their Senate majority to 53-45, plus two independents who caucus with them. They predict the Senate will muster the votes necessary to pass a reform bill.¶ Still, it won't be easy.¶ "We will have not only a few potholes, but a few near-death experiences along the way," said Frank Sharry, America's Voice executive director.¶ All eyes are on Texas Sen. Ted Cruz, a Republican who like Paul was elected with Tea Party support.¶ Cruz joined Sen. John Cornyn, R-Texas, who is up for re-election in 2014, in a measure to stall the fast-moving process in the Senate. Both say they oppose "amnesty."¶ In a letter to Sen. Patrick Leahy, D-Vt., the Texas Republicans urged the chairman of the Judiciary Committee to open up the legislative process with hearings.¶ The "Gang of Eight" senators -- four Democrats and four Republicans -- are expected to introduce their bill when Congress returns from Easter recess.¶ Overall, the new Senate bill is expected to grant undocumented immigrants a path to citizenship within 13 years, similar to a proposal put forth by the White House, according to those familiar with the discussions.¶ Undocumented immigrants would have to pay fines, back taxes, learn English and have no criminal record to work legally and become eligible for naturalization.¶ Although no specific details have been released, senators involved in the process say the citizenship proposals would be contingent upon border-security benchmarks and high-tech measures to curb illegal crossings.¶ Congress will return to an expected throng of thousands of immigrants, labor and immigrant rights supporters on the West Lawn of the Capitol next week.¶ Advocates are also holding more than 200 events in 35 states during the congressional recess to rally support, said Sue Chinn, campaign manager for Alliance for Citizenship.

#### Plan costs capital – Grant program is controversial in congress; extensions have been contentious votes

Rodman Admin, March 22 2012 http://www.rodmancpa.com/refusal-to-extend-1603-grants-will-hit-smaller-projects-hard/

Earlier this month, Congress had an opportunity to boost the renewables economy by passing an amendment that would extend the 1603 Grant Program for another year.  The failure of this legislation to pass (by a 49-49 Senate vote) is disappointing to all who are involved in the renewable energy arena.  The loss of this source of grant money will create new challenges for the future.  The renewable energy economy is not completely felled by the expiration of the 1603.  The program reverts back to the Investment Tax Credit (ITC) through 2016, which allows for a 30% tax credit (instead of the cash grant) for certain renewable energy projects.

#### Solves US-India relations

**LA Times**, 11/9/**20**12 (Other countries eagerly await U.S. immigration reform, p. http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/world\_now/2012/11/us-immigration-reform-eagerly-awaited-by-source-countries.html)

"Comprehensive immigration reform will see expansion of skilled labor visas," predicted B. Lindsay Lowell, director of policy studies for the Institute for the Study of International Migration at Georgetown University. A former research chief for the congressionally appointed Commission on Immigration Reform, Lowell said he expects to see at least a fivefold increase in the number of highly skilled labor visas that would provide "a significant shot in the arm for India and China." There is widespread consensus among economists and academics that skilled migration fosters new trade and business relationships between countries and enhances links to the global economy, Lowell said. "Countries like India and China weigh the opportunities of business abroad from their expats with the possibility of brain drain, and I think they still see the immigration opportunity as a bigger plus than not," he said.

#### US/India relations averts South Asian nuclear war

Schaffer, Spring 2002 (Teresita – Director of the South Asia Program at the Center for Strategic and International Security, Washington Quarterly, p. Lexis)

Washington's increased interest in India since the late 1990s reflects India's economic expansion and position as Asia's newest rising power. New Delhi, for its part, is adjusting to the end of the Cold War. As a result, both giant democracies see that they can benefit by closer cooperation. For Washington, the advantages include a wider network of friends in Asia at a time when the region is changing rapidly, as well as a stronger position from which to help calm possible future nuclear tensions in the region. Enhanced trade and investment benefit both countries and are a prerequisite for improved U.S. relations with India. For India, the country's ambition to assume a stronger leadership role in the world and to maintain an economy that lifts its people out of poverty depends critically on good relations with the United States.

## \*\*\*Food Advantage\*\*\*

#### Shortages don’t cause conflict

Idean Salehyan (Professor of Political Science at the University of North Texas) May 2008 “From Climate Change to Conflict? No Consensus Yet\*” Journal of Peace Research, vol. 45, no. 3 http://emergingsustainability.org/files/resolver%20climate%20change%20and%20conflict.pdf

First, the deterministic view has poor predictive power as to where and when conflicts will break out. For every potential example of an environmental catastrophe or resource shortfall that leads to violence, there are many more counter-examples in which conflict never occurs. But popular accounts typically do not look at the dogs that do not bark. Darfur is frequently cited as a case where desertification led to food scarcity, water scarcity, and famine, in turn leading to civil war and ethnic cleansing.5 Yet, food scarcity and hunger are problems endemic to many countries – particularly in sub-Saharan Africa – but similar problems elsewhere have not led to large-scale violence. According to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, food shortages and malnutrition affect more than a third of the population in Malawi, Zambia, the Comoros, North Korea, and Tanzania,6 although none of these countries have experienced fullblown civil war and state failure. Hurricanes, coastal flooding, and droughts – which are all likely to intensify as the climate warms – are frequent occurrences which rarely lead to violence. The Asian Tsunami of 2004, although caused by an oceanic earthquake, led to severe loss of life and property, flooding, population displacement, and resource scarcity, but it did not trigger new wars in Southeast Asia. Large-scale migration has the potential to provoke conflict in receiving areas (see Reuveny, 2007; Salehyan & Gleditsch, 2006), yet most migration flows do not lead to conflict, and, in this regard, social integration and citizenship policies are particularly important (Gleditsch, Nordås & Salehyan, 2007). In short, resource scarcity, natural disasters, and long-term climatic shifts are ubiquitous, while armed conflict is rare; therefore, environmental conditions, by themselves, cannot predict violent outbreaks. Second, even if local skirmishes over access to resources arise, these do not always escalate to open warfare and state collapse. While interpersonal violence is more or less common and may intensify under resource pressures, sustained armed conflict on a massive scale is difficult to conduct. Meier, Bond & Bond (2007) show that, under certain circumstances, environmental conditions have led to cattle raiding among pastoralists in East Africa, but these conflicts rarely escalate to sustained violence. Martin (2005) presents evidence from Ethiopia that, while a large refugee influx and population pressures led to localized conflict over natural resources, effective resource management regimes were able to ameliorate these tensions. Both of these studies emphasize the role of local dispute-resolution regimes and institutions – not just the response of central governments – in preventing resource conflicts from spinning out of control. Martin’s analysis also points to the importance of international organizations, notably the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, in implementing effective policies governing refugee camps. Therefore, local hostilities need not escalate to serious armed conflict and can be managed if there is the political will to do so. Third, states often bear responsibility for environmental degradation and resource shortfalls, either through their own projects and initiatives or through neglect of the environment. Clearly, climate change itself is an exogenous stressor beyond the control of individual governments. However, government policies and neglect can compound the effects of climate change. Nobel Prizewinning economist Amartya Sen finds that, even in the face of acute environmental scarcities, countries with democratic institutions and press freedoms work to prevent famine because such states are accountable to their citizens (Sen, 1999). Others have similarly shown a strong relationship between democracy and protection of the environment (Li & Reuveny, 2006). Faced with global warming, some states will take the necessary steps to conserve water and land, redistribute resources to those who need them most, and develop disaster-warning and -response systems. Others will do little to respond to this threat. While a state’s level of income and technological capacity are certainly important, democracy – or, more precisely, the accountability of political leaders to their publics – is likely to be a critical determinant of how states respond to the challenge. Fourth, violent conflict is an inefficient and sub-optimal reaction to changes in the environment and resource scarcities. As environmental conditions change, several possible responses are available, although many journalists and policymakers have focused on the potential for warfare. Individuals can migrate internally or across borders, or they can invest in technological improvements, develop conservation strategies, and shift to less climate-sensitive livelihoods, among other adaptation mechanisms. Engaging in armed rebellion is quite costly and risky and requires large-scale collective action. Individuals and households are more likely to engage in simpler, personal, or smallscale coping strategies. Thus, organized violence is inefficient at the individual level. But, more importantly, armed violence against the state is used as a means to gain leverage over governments so as to gain some form of accommodation, namely, the redistribution of economic resources and political power. Organized armed violence rarely (if ever) arises spontaneously but is usually pursued when people perceive their government to be unwilling to listen to peaceful petitions. As mentioned above, rebellion does not distribute resources by itself, and protracted civil wars can have devastating effects on the economy and the natural environment, leaving fewer resources to bargain over. Thus, organized violence is inefficient at the collective level. Responsive, accountable political leaders – at all levels of government – are more likely to listen to citizen demands for greater access to resources and the means to secure their livelihoods. Political sensitivity to peaceful action can immunize states from armed insurrection.

#### Pakistan collapse exaggerated – no loose nukes

John Mueller (Woody Hayes Chair of National Security Studies, Mershon Center, and is professor of Political Science, at Ohio State University) 2010 “Atomic Obsession: Nuclear Alarmism from Hiroshima to Al Qaeda” p. 167

Returning closer to reality, there could be dangers in the chaos that would emerge if a nuclear state were utterly to fail, collapsing in full disarray-Pakistan's troubles with the Taliban are frequently brought up in this context. The notion that a few thousand Taliban combatants based in a small, distant, and backward area of Pakistan could terminally disrupt-or even manage to take over and control-the rest of a country with a population of over 150 million that is hostile to them and possessed of a large army does seem to be a considerable stretch. However, even under chaotic conditions, nuclear weapons would likely remain under heavy guard by people who know that a purloined bomb would most likely end up going off in their own territory, would still have locks (and, in the case of Pakistan would be disassembled), and could probably be followed, located, and hunted down by an alarmed international community. The worst-case scenario in this instance requires not only a failed state but a considerable series of additional conditions, including consistent (and perfect) insider complicity and a sequence of hasty, opportunistic decisions or developments that click flawlessly in a manner far more familiar in Hollywood scripts than in real life.

#### Pakistan nukes are secure – even if government collapses

AFP 12/28/2007 “Pakistan's nuclear weapons safe, despite unrest: analysts”,

http://www.spacewar.com/reports/Pakistans\_nuclear\_weapons\_safe\_despite\_unrest\_analysts\_999.html

The chance of Pakistan's nuclear weapons falling into the hands of Islamic militants is slight, even if unrest persists in the wake of former prime minister Benazir Bhutto's death, US analysts said. The security of Pakistan's estimated 50 nuclear warheads has been under global scrutiny since President Pervez Musharraf imposed a state of emergency in November and concern has only risen since Bhutto's assassination Thursday. But analysts said Pakistan's military was firmly in control of the nuclear arsenal and that it was unlikely Al-Qaeda or Taliban Pakistan nuclear weapons are secure even if government collapses militants could get hold of the weapon components and missiles, which are kept separately. Leonard Spector, deputy director of the James Martin Center for Non-Proliferation Studies at the Monterey Institute of International Studies, said he thought the risk of weapons falling into rogue hands was slight. "Pakistan's weapons are under the control of the military and by and large that will remain unchanged, I think. From a standpoint of security we'll probably have continuity and relatively satisfactory control," he told AFP. Even if the country descended into chaos, leaving the government unable to govern, the military's line of authority would remain in place, he said.

## \*\*\*Heg Advantage\*\*\*

### Heg Causes Conflict 1NC

#### Unipolarity fosters conflict

Nuno P. Monteiro is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Yale University “Unrest Assured Why Unipolarity Is Not Peaceful” International Security Volume 36, Number 3, Winter 2011/12 Project Muse

Wohlforth further argued that a durable unipolar world is also a peaceful world. In his view, “the existing distribution of capabilities generates incentives for cooperation.”13 U.S. power preponderance not only ends hegemonic rivalry but gives the United States incentives to manage security globally, limiting competition among major powers.14 This benevolent view of unipolarity, which Wohlforth developed further in World Out of Balance: International Relations and the Challenge of American Primacy with his coauthor, Stephen Brooks, emerged as one of the most influential perspectives in debates about current international politics, echoing Francis Fukuyama’s popular view of the “end of history” and the universalization of Western liberal democracy.15 The question of unipolar durability remains the subject of spirited debate. Many analysts, such as Robert Kagan, continue to argue that “American predominance is unlikely to fade any time soon.”16 Others, however, believe that it is in serious decline.17 Potential peer competitors, especially China, are on the [End Page 10] rise.18 U.S. travails in Afghanistan and Iraq seem to confirm Paul Kennedy’s argument on the inevitability of imperial overstretch,19 and some see the financial crisis that began in 2008 as the death knell of U.S. predominance.20 Given all of these factors, Robert Pape argues that “the unipolar world is indeed coming to an end.”21 In contrast, the question of unipolar peacefulness has received virtually no attention. Although the past decade has witnessed a resurgence of security studies, with much scholarship on such conflict-generating issues as terrorism, preventive war, military occupation, insurgency, and nuclear proliferation, no one has systematically connected any of them to unipolarity. This silence is unjustified. The first two decades of the unipolar era have been anything but peaceful. U.S. forces have been deployed in four interstate wars: Kuwait in 1991, Kosovo in 1999, Afghanistan from 2001 to the present, and Iraq between 2003 and 2010.22 In all, the United States has been at war for thirteen of the twenty-two years since the end of the Cold War.23 Put another way, the first two decades of unipolarity, which make up less than 10 percent of U.S. history, account for more than 25 percent of the nation’s total time at war.24 And yet, the theoretical consensus continues to be that unipolarity encourages peace. Why? To date, scholars do not have a theory of how unipolar systems operate.25 The debate on whether, when, and how unipolarity will end (i.e., the debate on durability) has all but monopolized our attention. [End Page 11]

#### Hegemony doesn’t solve war – causes instability and prolif – drags US in causes bigger conflicts

Ben Friedman (research fellow in defense and homeland security, Cato. PhD candidate in political science, MIT) July 2010 “Military Restraint and Defense Savings” 20 July 2010, http://www.cato.org/testimony/ct-bf-07202010.html

Another argument for high military spending is that U.S. military hegemony underlies global stability. Our forces and alliance commitments dampen conflict between potential rivals like China and Japan, we are told, preventing them from fighting wars that would disrupt trade and cost us more than the military spending that would have prevented war. The theoretical and empirical foundation for this claim is weak. It overestimates both the American military's contribution to international stability and the danger that instability abroad poses to Americans. In Western Europe, U.S. forces now contribute little to peace, at best making the tiny odds of war among states there slightly more so.7 Even in Asia, where there is more tension, the history of international relations suggests that without U.S. military deployments potential rivals, especially those separated by sea like Japan and China, will generally achieve a stable balance of power rather than fight. In other cases, as with our bases in Saudi Arabia between the Iraq wars, U.S. forces probably create more unrest than they prevent. Our force deployments can also generate instability by prompting states to develop nuclear weapons. Even when wars occur, their economic impact is likely to be limited here.8 By linking markets, globalization provides supply alternatives for the goods we consume, including oil. If political upheaval disrupts supply in one location, suppliers elsewhere will take our orders. Prices may increase, but markets adjust. That makes American consumers less dependent on any particular supply source, undermining the claim that we need to use force to prevent unrest in supplier nations or secure trade routes.9 Part of the confusion about the value of hegemony comes from misunderstanding the Cold War. People tend to assume, falsely, that our activist foreign policy, with troops forward supporting allies, not only caused the Soviet Union's collapse but is obviously a good thing even without such a rival. Forgotten is the sensible notion that alliances are a necessary evil occasionally tolerated to balance a particularly threatening enemy. The main justification for creating our Cold War alliances was the fear that Communist nations could conquer or capture by insurrection the industrial centers in Western Europe and Japan and then harness enough of that wealth to threaten us — either directly or by forcing us to become a garrison state at ruinous cost. We kept troops in South Korea after 1953 for fear that the North would otherwise overrun it. But these alliances outlasted the conditions that caused them. During the Cold War, Japan, Western Europe and South Korea grew wealthy enough to defend themselves. We should let them. These alliances heighten our force requirements and threaten to drag us into wars, while providing no obvious benefit.

### Balancing 1NC

#### Hegemony causes balancing- also prevents regional regimes from being created to share burdens

Barry R. Posen is Ford International Professor of Political Science and director of the security studies program at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. The American Interest November/December 2007 “The Case for Restraint” http://www.the-american-interest.com/article.cfm?piece=331

Whatever else it may achieve, U.S. activism is bound to discomfit other states. The great preponderance of U.S. power makes direct opposition to the United States difficult and dangerous, but other states are doing what they can to put themselves in a better position. Some fear U.S. freedom of action, worry about the possibility of being drawn into policies inimical to their interests, and so wish to distance themselves from the United States—even as they free-ride within the broader U.S. security umbrella. The European Union has gradually strengthened its military capabilities so that it can get along without the United States if it must. Others fear that U.S. policies will harm their interests indirectly, and look for ways to concert their power, as Russia and China have done in the Shanghai Cooperation Organization. Still others expect U.S. attentions to be directed straight at them, and so they seek to improve their abilities to deter U.S. military action or fight the United States directly if they must. North Korea and Iran pursue nuclear weapons for those purposes. Iran also has developed a conventional capability to inflict costs on U.S. forces in the Gulf and has been implicated in inflicting such costs in Iraq. To the extent that the United States continues its current activist policy path, these reactions will continue and will slowly increase the costs of future U.S. activism. They will also reduce the propensity of others to share these costs.

### 1NC Transition Card

#### States are willing to retrench- the transition is smooth even if it’s a fast collapse

Paul K. MacDonald is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Williams College and Joseph M. Parent is Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Miami Spring 2011 International Security “Graceful Decline? The Surprising Success of Great Power Retrenchment” Volume 35 Number 4 pg 7-44

This article has advanced three main arguments. First, retrenchment pessimists are incorrect when they suggest that retrenchment is an uncommon policy response to great power decline. States often curtail their commitments and mellow their ambitions as they fall in the ranks of great powers. Second and related, declining great powers react in a prompt and proportionate manner to their dwindling fortunes. They do this for the same reason that they tend to seize opportunities to expand: international incentives are strong inducements. [End Page 43] In the high-stakes world of great power politics, states can seldom afford to fool themselves or pamper parochial interests when relative power is perilously slipping away. Third, the rate of relative decline explains not only the extent of retrenchment but also the form. The faster the rate of decline, the more likely states are to reform their militaries, increase reliance on allies, and refrain from using force in international disputes. Taken together, these findings suggest that retrenchment is an attractive strategy for dealing with great power decline. Although we make no claim that the rate of relative decline explains everything, we suggest that our study represents a solid first cut and that domestic political factors loom too large in discussions of power transitions and hegemonic change. Retrenchment has a bad reputation, but our findings suggest its benefits are overlooked. Competition spurs states to improve themselves, and if done intelligently this makes states better. The historical record gives little cause for despair; spending can be curbed, interest groups controlled, and innovation fostered. And there is a fair chance of rebound; declining powers rise to the challenge of decline so well that they recapture their former glory with some regularity. Of course, it may be unwise to speak these conclusions too loudly. Some of the invigorating effects of decline may depend on the pervasive pessimism it arouses. [End Page 44]

#### Smooth decline now- fighting to maintain power causes more conflict

Adam Quinn Lecturer in International Politics at the University of Birmingham International Affairs 87:4 (2011) 803–824 “The art of declining politely: Obama’s prudent presidency and the waning of American power” http://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/default/files/87\_4quinn.pdf

As noted in the opening passages of this article, the narratives of America’s decline and Obama’s restraint are distinct but also crucially connected. Facing this incipient period of decline, America’s leaders may walk one of two paths. Either the nation can come to terms with the reality of the process that is under way and seek to finesse it in the smoothest way possible. Or it can ‘rage against the dying of the light’, refusing to accept the waning of its primacy. President Obama’s approach, defined by restraint and awareness of limits, makes him ideologically and temperamentally well suited to the former course in a way that, to cite one example, his predecessor was not. He is, in short, a good president to inaugurate an era of managed decline. Those who vocally demand that the President act more boldly are not merely criticizing him; in suggesting that he is ‘weak’ and that a ‘tougher’ policy is needed, they implicitly suppose that the resources will be available to support such a course. In doing so they set their faces against the reality of the coming American decline. 97 If the United States can embrace the spirit of managed decline, then this will clear the way for a judicious retrenchment, trimming ambitions in line with the fact that the nation can no longer act on the global stage with the wide latitude once afforded by its superior power. As part of such a project, it can, as those who seek to qualify the decline thesis have suggested, use the significant resources still at its disposal to smooth the edges of its loss of relative power, preserving influence to the maximum extent possible through whatever legacy of norms and institutions is bequeathed by its primacy. The alternative course involves the initiation or escalation of conflictual scenarios for which the United States increasingly lacks the resources to cater: provocation of a military conclusion to the impasse with Iran; deliberate escalation of strategic rivalry with China in East Asia; commitment to continuing the campaign in Afghanistan for another decade; a costly effort to consistently apply principles of military interventionism, regime change and democracy promotion in response to events in North Africa. President Obama does not by any means represent a radical break with the traditions of American foreign policy in the modern era. Examination of his major foreign policy pronouncements reveals that he remains within the mainstream of the American discourse on foreign policy. In his Nobel Peace Prize acceptance speech in December 2009 he made it clear, not for the first time, that he is no pacifist, spelling out his view that ‘the instruments of war do have a role to play in preserving the peace’, and that ‘the United States of America has helped underwrite global security for more than six decades with the blood of our citizens and the strength of our arms’. 98 In his Cairo speech in June the same year, even as he sought distance from his predecessor with the proclamation that ‘no system of government can or should be imposed by one nation on any other’, he also endorsed with only slight qualification the liberal universalist view of civil liberties as transcendent human rights. ‘I … have an unyielding belief that all people yearn for certain things,’ he declared. ‘The ability to speak your mind and have a say in how you are governed; confidence in the rule of law and the equal administration of justice; government that is transparent and doesn’t steal from the people; the freedom to live as you choose. These are not just American ideas.’ 99 His Westminster speech repeated these sentiments. Evidently this is not a president who wishes to break signally with the mainstream, either by advocating a radical shrinking of America’s military strength as a good in itself or by disavowing liberal universalist global visions, as some genuine dissidents from the prevailing foreign policy discourse would wish. 100 No doubt sensibly, given the likely political reaction at home, it is inconceivable that he would explicitly declare his strategy to be one of managed American decline. Nevertheless, this is a president who, within the confines of the mainstream, embraces caution and restraint to the greatest extent that one could hope for without an epochal paradigm shift in the intellectual framework of American foreign policy-making. 101 In contemplating the diminished and diminishing weight of the United States upon the scales of global power, it is important not to conflate the question of what will be with that of what we might prefer. It may well be, as critics of the decline thesis sometimes observe, that the prospect of increased global power for a state such as China should not, on reflection, fill any westerner with glee, whatever reservations one may have held regarding US primacy. It is also important not to be unduly deterministic in projecting the consequences of American decline. It may be a process that unfolds gradually and peacefully, resulting in a new order that functions with peace and stability even in the absence of American primacy. Alternatively, it may result in conflict, if the United States clashes with rising powers as it refuses to relinquish the prerogatives of the hegemon, or continues to be drawn into wars with middle powers or on the periphery in spite of its shrinking capacity to afford them. Which outcome occurs will depend on more than the choices of America alone. But the likelihood that the United States can preserve its prosperity and influence and see its hegemony leave a positive legacy rather than go down thrashing its limbs about destructively will be greatly increased if it has political leaders disposed to minimize conflict and consider American power a scarce resource—in short, leaders who can master the art of declining politely. At present it seems it is fortunate enough to have a president who fits the bill.

#### Transition smooth now – solves war, terrorism, climate change, disease, prolif

Barry Buzan (Professor of International Relations at the London School of Economics) 2011 "The Inaugural Kenneth N. Waltz Annual Lecture A World Order Without Superpowers Decentred Globalism," International Relations, 4-1, vol. 25 no. 1 3-25]

There are many reasons to think that a regionalized international order would work quite well. The generic worry about such an order stems from the experience of most of the 20th century, when imperial powers competed with each other either over their spheres of influence or over whether one of them could dominate the whole world, and the 1930s’ experience is often cited as a warning against going down this route. 45 For several reasons the danger of a struggle for global hegemony seems no longer very salient. First, the West is in relative decline, and other regions are mainly defensive in outlook, trying to maintain their political and cultural characteristics, and find their own route to modernization, against Western pressure. Nobody else obviously wants the job of global leader. Second any potential global hegemon will be constrained both by the breadth and depth of anti-hegemonism, and by the difficulty of acquiring the necessary material preponderance and social standing. Third, there are no deep ideological or racist differences to fuel conflict like those that dominated the 20th century. Fourth, all the great powers fear both war and economic breakdown, and have a commitment to maintaining world trade. Nobody wants to go back to the autarchic, empire-building days of the 1930s. In addition, a good case can be made that sufficient shared values exist to underpin a reasonable degree of global-level coexistence and cooperation even in a more regionalized international order. Logics additional to Waltz’s unit veto ideas about the proliferation of nuclear weapons 46 are in play: cultural, political and economic factors can also work to produce a stable international order. The world will certainly divide on whether the move towards such an order is a good thing or not. Liberals, both in the West and elsewhere, will lament the weakening of their universalist project, and fear the rise of various parochialisms, some possibly quite nasty. Whatever its merits, a more regionalized world order would mark a retreat from universalist liberal agendas of both a political and an economic sort. The loss of hegemonic leadership would probably mean a reduction in the overall management capacity of the system, though even that is not a given. One should not underestimate the possibilities for innovation on this front once the now in-built habit of dependence on US leadership is broken. On the economic side, regions would still provide a halfway house for economies of scale, and there would still be a lot of global trade and cooperation on many functional matters from big science to environmental management. It is not without significance that even during the depths of the Cold War, the Americans and the Soviets were able to negotiate on common survival issues such as nuclear testing, non-proliferation and arms control. However, there would no longer be an attempt to run a financially integrated global economy. Some in the West would be relieved to end an increasingly outdated, unsuccessful, unpopular and costly hegemony, and many in other parts of the world would be equally glad to get the West off their backs. For those who think that the tensions among a rampant global economy, a thin interstate society and a humankind still deeply divided by identities laid down centuries or millennia ago are becoming too great to handle, some retreat from the overambitions of global governance might be welcome. Perhaps the premature attempt at global governance has created more management problems than current human social and political capacities are able to solve. A less ambitious world order, with regions looking after themselves more, might well remain peaceful and involve fewer frictions and failures. A consensus might emerge that a period of regionalscale experiments in organizing a capitalist political economy is desirable before any return to global governance is attempted. The big question would be whether a world regionalized in this way could still come up with the level of global management necessary to deal with collective problems such as climate change, crime, terrorism, trade, migration and arms control. Grounds for confidence here can be found in the degree to which a number of key institutions have been naturalized across nearly all of international society. Some of the more liberal institutions (democracy, human rights) are of course contested even at the elite level. Yet quite a few other institutions have become substantially naturalized across many populations. At the level of state elites, sovereignty, territoriality, non-intervention, diplomacy, international law, great power management, nationalism, self-determination (not all versions), popular sovereignty, progress, equality of people(s) and, up to a point, the market (more for trade and production than finance) are all pretty deeply internalized and not contested as principles. Particular instances or applications may excite controversy, but the basic institutions of a pluralist, coexistence, interstate society have wide support among states, and pretty wide support amongst peoples and transnational actors. Most liberation movements seek sovereignty. Most peoples are comfortable with nationalism, territoriality, sovereignty and the idea of progress. Most transnational actors want and need a stable legal framework. Even as Western power declines, it does not seem unreasonable to think that most of these pluralist institutions will remain in place, as too might the modest, and hopefully increasing, level of commitment to environmental stewardship. These shared institutions provide an important foundation for the maintenance of international order among regional international societies. The reduced management capacity caused by weaker leadership and the removal of hegemony at the global level would to some extent be balanced by a reduced agenda of things to be managed. A world without a central hegemony would have much less Western interference in other parts of the world, and therefore might well have fewer of the type of global problems that arise from such interference, such as al Qaeda. Tensions over hegemonic interventions would decline if regions were, for better or worse, left more to handle their own affairs. There might also be a considerably more modest view of how much economic integration was desirable at the global level. A regionalized world under contemporary conditions would not look like the 1930s. Its interaction culture 47 would be one of friends and rivals, not one of rivals and enemies.

### 1NC Sustainability

#### Heg unsustainable- budget- even those who thought it was sustainable last time- it’s collapsing now

Adam Quinn Lecturer in International Politics at the University of Birmingham International Affairs 87:4 (2011) 803–824 “The art of declining politely: Obama’s prudent presidency and the waning of American power” http://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/default/files/87\_4quinn.pdf

In addition to the strides being made by other nations, however, the United States is afflicted with serious internal problems. The central ingredient feeding the prospect of decline is a dire fiscal outlook. Several scholars have noted the disturbing facts and figures emanating from the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) which serve to support this analysis, but an especially instructive instance is perhaps that of Altman and Haass, since the latter was something of a sceptic during the last, Kennedy-inspired wave of declinism, warning against embracing self-fulfilling prophecies proffered by overreaching historians. 15 Altman and Haass note that the US fiscal outlook consists of three pieces of bad news, each worse than the last. In the short term, the situation is poor, with deficits of US$1.6 trillion and US$1.3 trillion in 2009 and 2010 respectively. In the medium term, it looks grimmer still, with CBO estimates suggesting that the accumulated total debt of US$9 trillion (62 per cent of GDP) in 2010 will have risen to 90 per cent of GDP by 2020, taking to US$5 trillion the annual cost to the Treasury simply of financing the deficit and refinancing mature debt (presumably through new borrowing). Worse, this takes no account of the approximately US$3 trillion in liabilities owed by state and local governments. And as for the long-term scenario, that is, after 2020, when the costs of rising public health-care commitments, social security liabilities and increased borrowing costs are taken into account, at that point the fiscal outlook becomes ‘downright apocalyptic’. 16

#### Hegemony is unsustainable- rise of the rest

Christopher Layne Professor of International Relations Texas A&M University International Studies Quarterly Volume 56, Issue 1, pages 203–213, March 2012 “This Time It’s Real: The End of Unipolarity and the Pax Americana”

American decline is part of a broader trend in international politics: the shift of economic power away from the Euro-Atlantic core to rising great and regional powers (what economists sometimes refer to as the “emerging market” nations). Among the former are China, India, and Russia. The latter category includes Indonesia, Turkey, South Korea, Brazil, and South Africa. In a May 2011 report, the World Bank predicted that six countries—China, India, Brazil, Russia, Indonesia, and South Korea—will account for one-half of the world’s economic growth between 2011 and 2025 (Politi 2011; Rich 2011). In some respects, of course, this emergence of new great powers is less about rise than restoration. As Figure 1 indicates, in 1700 China and India were the world’s two largest economies. From their perspective—especially Beijing’s—they are merely regaining what they view as their natural, or rightful, place in the hierarchy of great powers. The ascent of new great powers is the strongest evidence of unipolarity’s end. The two most important indicators of whether new great powers are rising are relative growth rates and shares of world GDP (Gilpin 1981; Kennedy 1987). The evidence that the international system is rapidly becoming multipolar—and that, consequently, America’s relative power is declining—is now impossible to deny, and China is Exhibit A for the shift in the world’s center of economic and geopolitical gravity. China illustrates how, since the Cold War’s end, potential great powers have been positioning themselves to challenge the United States.

### Protectionism

#### No protectionism

Dani Rodrik (professor of political economy at Harvard, recipient of the Social Science Research Council’s Hirschman Prize) 2009 “The myth of rising protectionism”, http://www.business-standard.com/india/news/dani-rodrikmythrising-protectionism/373102/

There was a dog that didn’t bark during the financial crisis: protectionism. Despite much hue and cry about it, governments have, in fact, imposed remarkably few trade barriers on imports. Indeed, the world economy remains as open as it was before the crisis struck. Protectionism normally thrives in times of economic peril. Confronted by economic decline and rising unemployment, governments are much more likely to pay attention to domestic pressure groups than to upholding their international obligations. As John Maynard Keynes recognised, trade restrictions can protect or generate employment during economic recessions. But what may be desirable under extreme conditions for a single country can be highly detrimental to the world economy. When everyone raises trade barriers, the volume of trade collapses. No one wins. That is why the disastrous free-for-all in trade policy during the 1930’s greatly aggravated the Great Depression. Many complain that something similar, if less grand in scope, is taking place today. An outfit called the Global Trade Alert (GTA) has been at the forefront, raising alarm bells about what it calls “a protectionist juggernaut”. The GTA’s latest report identifies no fewer than 192 separate protectionist actions since November 2008, with China as the most common target. This number has been widely quoted in the financial press. Taken at face value, it seems to suggest that governments have all but abandoned their commitments to the World Trade Organization and the multilateral trade regime. But look more closely at those numbers and you will find much less cause for alarm. Few of those 192 measures are, in fact, more than a nuisance. The most common among them are the indirect (and often unintended) consequences of the bailouts that governments mounted as a consequence of the crisis. The most frequently affected sector is the financial industry. Moreover, we do not even know whether these numbers are unusually high when compared to pre-crisis trends. The GTA report tells us how many measures have been imposed since November 2008, but says nothing about the analogous numbers prior to that date. In the absence of a benchmark for comparative assessment, we do not really know whether 192 “protectionist” measures is a big or small number. What about the recent tariffs imposed by the United States on Chinese tires? President Barack Obama’s decision to introduce steep duties (set at 35 per cent in the first year) in response to a US International Trade Commission (USITC) ruling (sought by US labour unions) has been widely criticised as stoking the protectionist fires. But it is easy to overstate the significance of this case, too. The tariff is fully consistent with a special arrangement negotiated at the time of China’s accession to the WTO, which allows the US to impose temporary protection when its markets are “disrupted” by Chinese exports. The tariffs that Obama imposed were considerably below what the USITC had recommended. And, in any case, the measure affects less than 0.3 per cent of China’s exports to the US. The reality is that the international trade regime has passed its greatest test since the Great Depression with flying colours. Trade economists who complain about minor instances of protectionism sound like a child whining about a damaged toy in the wake of an earthquake that killed thousands. Three things explain this remarkable resilience: ideas, politics and institutions. Economists have been extraordinarily successful in conveying their message to policymakers—even if ordinary people still regard imports with considerable suspicion. Nothing reflects this better than how “protection” and “protectionists” have become terms of derision. After all, governments are generally expected to provide protection to their citizens. But if you say that you favour protection “from imports”, you are painted into a corner with Reed Smoot and Willis C. Hawley, authors of the infamous 1930 US tariff bill. But economists’ ideas would not have gone very far without significant changes in the underlying configuration of political interests in favour of open trade. For every worker and firm affected by import competition, there is one or more worker and firm expecting to reap the benefits of access to markets abroad. The latter have become increasingly vocal and powerful, often represented by large multinational corporations. In his latest book, Paul Blustein recounts how a former Indian trade minister once asked his American counterpart to bring him a picture of an American farmer: “I have never actually seen one,” the minister quipped. “I have only seen US conglomerates masquerading as farmers.” But the relative docility of rank-and-file workers on trade issues must ultimately be attributed to something else altogether: the safety nets erected by the welfare state. Modern industrial societies now have a wide array of social protections – unemployment compensation, adjustment assistance, and other labour-market tools, as well as health insurance and family support — that mitigate demand for cruder forms of protection.

# 2NC

## \*\*\*Food\*\*\*

### Resource Wars

#### No conflict over resources – cooperation more likely

Simon Dalby (Dept. Of Geography, Carleton University) 2006 "Security and environment linkages revisited" in Globalisation and Environmental Challenges: Reconceptualising Security in the 21st Century, www.ntu.edu.sg/idss/publications/SSIS/SSIS001.pdf)

In parallel with the focus on human security as a necessity in the face of both natural and artificial forms of vulnerability, recent literature has emphasised the opportunities that environmental management presents for political cooperation between states and other political actors, on both largescale infrastructure projects as well as more traditional matters of wildlife and new concerns with biodiversity preservation (Matthew/Halle/Switzer 2002). Simultaneously, the discussion on water wars, and in particular the key finding the shared resources frequently stimulate cooperation rather than conflict, shifted focus from conflict to the possibilities of environmental action as a mode of peacemaking. Both at the international level in terms of environmental diplomacy and institution building, there is considerable evidence of cooperative action on the part of many states (Conca/Dabelko 2002). Case studies from many parts of the world suggest that cooperation and diplomatic arrangements can facilitate peaceful responses to the environmental difficulties in contrast to the pessimism of the 1990’s where the focus was on the potential for conflicts. One recent example of the attempts to resolve difficulties in the case of Lake Victoria suggests a dramatic alternative to the resource war scenarios. The need to curtail over-fishing in the lake and the importance of remediation has encouraged cooperation; scarcities leading to conflict arguments have not been common in the region, and they have not influenced policy prescriptions (Canter/Ndegwa 2002). Many conflicts over the allocations of water use rights continue around the world but most of them are within states and international disputes simply do not have a history of leading to wars.

#### Your lit base is rigged to come to the conclusion that scarcity leads to conflict

David G. Victor, Adjunct Senior Fellow for Science and Technology professor of law at Stanford Law School and the director of the Program on Energy and Sustainable Development. He is also a senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations 1-2-08 Smoke and Mirrors The National Interest.

Nearly all of the vast literature that Homer-Dixon applauds suffers from the affliction of severe selection bias and failure to assign proper weights to causal factors. Put a microscope on any big conflict looking for resources, and you’re sure to find exactly what you’re looking for. Nobody doubts that causation is complex; the dispute is on the central forces. And to Klare’s point about methodology, my article focuses narrowly on hot conflict—that is, “war”—because the best way to get causation right usually requires starting narrowly. However, technological change and economic shifts away from resource-intensive industries and the globalization of most resources into commodities implies that a broader version of my hypothesis probably also holds—natural resources matter less and thus are less important for conflict, except where lootable resources coincide with exceptionally poor governance.

#### Ensures no escalation – these conflicts have never escalated beyond local levels. The only way they escalate is getting highly developed countries involved

Nils Petter Gleditsch (International Peace Research Institute, Oslo (PRIO) & Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim) 1998 “Armed Conflict and the Environment: A Critique of the Literature” JSTOR

A similar point holds for economic variables. Much of the environmental literature lacks explicit recognition of the fact that material deprivation is one of the strongest predictors of civil war. Moreover, economically highly developed countries rarely fight one another (Mueller, 1989), although this regularity is less absolute than the democratic peace. Finally, while economic development does tend to exacerbate certain environmental problems (such as pollution and excessive resource extraction) up to a point, the most advanced industrial economies also tend to be relatively more resource-friendly. Hence, resource competition is likely to be less fierce domestically as well as externally among the most highly developed countries. Going back to the example of shared water re- sources, highly developed countries have very strong economic motives for not fighting over scarce water resources; instead, they use technology to expand the resources or find cooperative solutions in exploiting them. Poor countries generate more local environmental problems, which in turn may exacerbate their poverty and which is also conducive to conflict. Certain types of environmental degradation - like deforestation, lack of water and sanitation, and soil erosion - are part and parcel of underdevelopment.

### Pakistan

#### Pakistani arsenal is safe

CNN November 11 2007 “Experts weigh in on security of Pakistan's nukes,” http://www.cnn.com/2007/WORLD/meast/11/11/pakistan.nuclear/?iref=mpstoryview

But former Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage said Pakistan's nuclear weapons are secure, and cautioned against overreacting. "That nuclear arsenal is, one, dispersed, and second, carefully guarded by the army," he told CNN. "I think -- in the short or even medium term -- should things turn badly, we are not going to worry about nuclear weapons in the first instance."

#### Pakistan arsenal is secure- verified by intelligence community

AFP 12/28/2007 “White House confident Pakistan nuclear arsenal is secure”,

http://www.spacewar.com/reports/White\_House\_confident\_Pakistan\_nuclear\_arsenal\_is\_secure\_999.html

The White House on Friday said it was confident that Pakistan's nuclear arsenal was secure and did not risk falling into extremists' hands after the assassination Thursday of Benazir Bhutto. "At this time, as far as I know, it is the assessment of the intelligence community that Pakistan's weapons arsenal is secure," spokesman Scott Stanzel told reporters near the president's ranch in Crawford, Texas.

#### Pakistan military provides stability to nuclear weapon safety—Cadres are well trained and lack Islamic terrorist ties

AFP 12/28/2007 “Pakistan's nuclear weapons safe, despite unrest: analysts”,

http://www.spacewar.com/reports/Pakistans\_nuclear\_weapons\_safe\_despite\_unrest\_analysts\_999.html

"This is not a reassuring set of changes that we're experiencing, but on the other hand I think the military for the moment has a lot of coherence and solidarity. I think we'll see that continue," Spector said. "I think the cadres that actually protect the weapons and guard the sites are fairly disciplined and for the last five years or so I think they've been better trained and individuals with Islamist leanings have been called out.

## \*\*\*hegemony\*\*\*

### Heg Wars Outweigh

#### U.S. hegemony pushes conflicts into nuclear territory – only scenario for global escalation.

Eugene Gholz and Daryl G. Press (doctoral candidates in the Department of Political Science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology) and Harvey M. Sapolsky (Professor of Public Policy and Organization in the Department of Political Science at M.I.T. and Director of the M.I.T. Defense and Arms Control Studies (DACS) Program Spring 1997 “come home America – the strategy of restraint in the face of temptation” International Security, Vol. 21, No. 4

The larger long-term cost of selective engagement is the risk of involvement in faraway great power wars. Great power conflicts will continue to be a rare occurrence, but when they happen, the United States is much better off staying as far away from the combatants as possible. World War II resulted in the deaths of 400,000 Americans, many times that number wounded, and nearly 40 percent of GDP devoted to defense (compared to 4 percent today).76 A new great power conflict, with the possibility of nuclear use, might exact even higher costs from the participants. World War II was fought to prevent the consolidation of Europe and Asia by hostile, fanatical adversaries, but a new great power war would not raise that specter. The biggest cost of selective engagement is the risk of being drawn into someone else’s faraway great power war. The global economy may be disrupted by war, depending on who is involved, but even in the worst case, the costs would be manageable. Trade accounts for roughly 20 percent of the American economy,77 and sudden, forced autarky would be devastating for American prosperity. But no great power war could come close to forcing American autarky: essentially all goods have substitute sources of supply at varying marginal increases in cost. Furthermore, wars never isolate the fighting countries completely from external trade. Some dislocation is a real possibility, but these short-term costs would not justify the risks of fighting a great power war. The risk of nuclear escalation is a reason to worry about great power war, but it is a highly suspect reason to favor a military policy that puts U.S. forces between feuding great powers. Nuclear weapons may not be used in a future great power war; the fear of retaliation should breed great caution on the part of the belligerents.78 But the larger point is that the possibility of a faraway nuclear exchange is precisely the reason that America should keep its military forces out of other country’s disputes.79 An Indo-Pakistani nuclear war would be a terrible thing, but it makes no sense to get in the middle. Distant wars would be costly, but not nearly as costly as the solution that selective engagers propose.

#### There is no existential threat to US security- engagement only causes our entanglement

Harvey M. Sapolsky et al is a professor of public policy and organization at MIT. Benjamin H. Friedman is a research fellow in defense and homeland security studies at Cato Institute. Eugene Gholz is an associate professor of public affairs at the University of Texas at Austin. Daryl G. Press is an associate professor of government at Dartmouth College. World Affairs Fall 2009 “Restraining Order: For Strategic Modesty” http://www.worldaffairsjournal.org/article/restraining-order-strategic-modesty

No nation or ideology now menaces American security in the same ways or to the same degree that the Soviet Union and Communism did during the Cold War. Instead, a variety of ethnic, religious, and nationalistic conflicts oceans away from us now obsess our policymakers, even though those conflicts have little to no prospect of spreading our way. To be sure, radical Islamists have attacked Americans at home and abroad, and while these attackers should be hunted down, they do not pose an existential threat, only a difficult and distracting one. Killing or capturing the criminals who attack Americans makes sense; trying to fix the failed states they call home is hopeless and unnecessary. The United States is safer than ever. The challenge now is staying safe. The U.S. military is supposed to stand between America and hostile nations, but its forward deployment actually puts our forces between others and their own enemies. Alliances once meant to hold a coalition together against a common foe now protect foreign nations from adversaries that in most cases have no direct dispute with the United States. Although our allies are capable of fending for themselves, the fact that they can take shelter under an American umbrella allows them to defer taking responsibility for their own security. The United States should now use tough love to get our allies off our security dole. We need to do less so others will do more.

#### Hegemony causes proliferation

John J. Mearsheimer R. Wendell Harrison Distinguished Service Professor of Political Science, University of Chicago National Interest; Jan/Feb 2011, Issue 111, p16-34, 19p EBSCO

If all of this were not enough, global dominance, especially the Bush administration’s penchant for big-stick diplomacy, negatively affects nuclear proliferation as well. The United States is deeply committed to making sure that Iran does not acquire a nuclear arsenal and that North Korea gives up its atomic weapons, but the strategy we have employed is likely to have the opposite effect. The main reason that a country acquires nuclear weapons is that they are the ultimate deterrent. It is extremely unlikely that any state would attack the homeland of a nuclear-armed adversary because of the fear that it would prompt nuclear retaliation. Therefore, any country that feels threatened by a dangerous rival has good reason to want a survivable nuclear deterrent. This basic logic explains why the United States and the Soviet Union built formidable stockpiles during the Cold War. It also explains why Israel acquired atomic weapons and refuses to give them up. All of this tells you that when the United States places Iran, Iraq and North Korea on the “axis of evil” and threatens them with military force, it gives those countries a powerful incentive to acquire a nuclear deterrent. The Bush administration, for example, would not have invaded Iraq in March 2003 if Saddam had an atomic arsenal because the Iraqi leader probably would have used it, since he almost certainly was going to die anyway. It is not clear whether Iran is pursuing nuclear weapons today, but given that the United States and Israel frequently hint that they might attack it nevertheless, the regime has good reason to want a deterrent to protect itself. Similarly, Pyongyang would be foolish to give up its nuclear capability in the absence of some sort of rapprochement with Washington. And there is no good reason to think that spreading democracy would counter proliferation either. After all, five of the nine nuclear-armed states are democracies (Britain, France, India, Israel and the United States), and two others (Pakistan and Russia) are borderline democracies that retain significant authoritarian features. In short, the Bush administration’s fondness for threatening to attack adversaries (oftentimes with the additional agenda of forced democratization) encouraged nuclear proliferation. The best way for the United States to maximize the prospects of halting or at least slowing down the spread of nuclear weapons would be to stop threatening other countries because that gives them a compelling reason to acquire the ultimate deterrent. But as long as America’s leaders remain committed to global dominance, they are likely to resist this advice and keep threatening states that will not follow Washington’s orders.

### Allied Prolif

#### Regional regimes solve allied prolif

Joseph M. Parent Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Miami. Paul K. Macdonald is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Wellesley College. Nov/Dec 2011, Vol. 90, Issue 6 Foreign Affairs “The Wisdom of Retrenchment” Ebsco

Although Russia continues to meddle in its near abroad and has employed oil and gas embargoes to coerce its immediate neighbors, western Europe's resources are more than sufficient to counter an assertive Russia. A more autonomous Europe would take some time to develop a coherent security and defense policy and would not always see events through the same lens as Washington. But reducing Europe's dependence on the United States would create a strong incentive for European states to spend more on defense, modernize their forces, and better integrate their policies and capabilities. U.S. forces in the European theater could safely be reduced by 40-50 percent without compromising European security. Asia is also ready for a decreased U.S. military presence, and Washington should begin gradually withdrawing its troops. Although China has embarked on an ambitious policy of military modernization and engages in periodic saber rattling in the South China Sea, its ability to project power remains limited. Japan and South Korea are already shouldering greater defense burdens than they were during the Cold War. India, the Philippines, and Vietnam are eager to forge strategic partnerships with the United States. Given the shared interest in promoting regional security, these ties could be sustained through bilateral political and economic agreements, instead of the indefinite deployments and open-ended commitments of the Cold War. In the event that China becomes domineering, U.S. allies on its borders will act as a natural early warning system and a first line of defense, as well as provide logistical hubs and financial support for any necessary U.S. responses. Yet such a state of affairs is hardly inevitable. For now, there are many less expensive alternatives that can strengthen the current line of defense, such as technology transfers, arms sales, and diplomatic mediation. Defending the territorial integrity of Japan and South Korea and preventing Chinese or North Korean adventurism demands rapid-response forces with strong reserves, not the 30,000 soldiers currently stationed in each country. Phasing out 20 percent of those forces while repositioning others to Guam or Hawaii would achieve the same results more efficiently.

### A2: Rogues

#### No rogue state expansionism without hegemony

Joseph M. Parent Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Miami. Paul K. Macdonald is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Wellesley College. Nov/Dec 2011, Vol. 90, Issue 6 Foreign Affairs “The Wisdom of Retrenchment” Ebsco

A somewhat more compelling concern raised by opponents of retrenchment is that the policy might undermine deterrence. Reducing the defense budget or repositioning forces would make the United States look weak and embolden upstarts, they argue. "The very signaling of such an aloof intention may encourage regional bullies," Kaplan worries. This anxiety is rooted in the assumption that the best barrier to adventurism by adversaries is forward defenses--the deployment of military assets in large bases near enemy borders, which serve as tripwires or, to some eyes, a Great Wall of America. There are many problems with this position. For starters, the policies that have gotten the United States in trouble in recent years have been activist, not passive or defensive. The U.S.-led invasion of Iraq alienated important U.S. allies, such as Germany and Turkey, and increased Iran's regional power. NATO's expansion eastward has strained the alliance and intensified Russia's ambitions in Georgia and Ukraine. More generally, U.S. forward deployments are no longer the main barrier to great-power land grabs. Taking and holding territory is more expensive than it once was, and great powers have little incentive or interest in expanding further. The United States' chief allies have developed the wherewithal to defend their territorial boundaries and deter restive neighbors. Of course, retrenchment might tempt reckless rivals to pursue unexpected or incautious policies, as states sometimes do. Should that occur, however, U.S. superiority in conventional arms and its power-projection capabilities would assure the option of quick U.S. intervention. Outcomes of that sort would be costly, but the risks of retrenchment must be compared to the risks of the status quo. In difficult financial circumstances, the United States must prioritize. The biggest menace to a superpower is not the possibility of belated entry into a regional crisis; it is the temptation of imperial overstretch. That is exactly the trap into which opponents of the United States, such as al Qaeda, want it to fall.

### Hegemony

#### Quicker transition is better

Paul K. MacDonald is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Wellesley College and Joseph M. Parent is Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Miami. Spring 2012 International Security “Correspondence: Decline and Retrenchment—Peril or Promise?” Volume 36 Number 4 pg 197-203

The obvious impetus for examining decline and retrenchment is to offer provisional guidance for contemporary policymakers. Both Haynes and Thompson, though, are skeptical of our findings' relevance for current events. Haynes worries that in our effort to discredit retrenchment pessimists, we "understate the potential costs of such a strategy." Even if retrenchment does not court geopolitical catastrophe, Haynes warns that retrenching great powers may still be forced to concede on vital issues and run considerable risks. Let us be absolutely clear: retrenchment is risky, but not retrenching is riskier. Living beyond one's means is possible temporarily, but prolonged insolvency invites a terrible reckoning. Grasping great powers present a brittle, overextended defensive perimeter with strategic inflexibility and shallow reserves—a blatantly ripe target for opportunistic states. This is likely why so few declining states in our study chose not to retrench, and those that failed to fared poorly. It is understandable that declining powers retrench reluctantly; it is all the more telling that they tend to do so quickly.

### Wdraw good

#### Attempts to integrate others into a global order fail

Richard N. Haass is president of the Council on Foreign Relations January/February 2012 The American Interest “The Restoration Doctrine” http://the-american-interest.com/article.cfm?piece=1164

But the bottom line is that integration, however desirable, is more an aspiration than an immediate reality. World trade talks are stalled. Global climate change talks are in even worse shape. Agreement on what to do to denuclearize North Korea, prevent Iran’s nuclearization, or deal with global economic challenges (despite the birth of the G-20) is sharply limited. The fact is that the benefits of inclusion in a global commons cannot be expected to outweigh parochial aspirations in many respects. There is more than a little irony in my pointing this out, since I developed and introduced the idea of integration a decade ago when I was Director of Policy Planning at the State Department. Why is the idea not gaining more traction? The simple answer, as already suggested, is that most governments are more sensitive to immediate domestic political and economic pressures and interests than they are to medium- and long-term considerations, be they strategic or economic. This goes a long way toward explaining the lack of push behind a new world trade pact. There are also flat-out disagreements. For example, there is no consensus on the limits of sovereignty or on the appropriate times to use military force. Finally, there are differing priorities and differing resource constraints. Integration, still perhaps the most appealing foreign policy compass for the long-term, is an idea whose time has not yet come.

#### We don’t need to protect global shipping routes- they are extremely flexible

Harvey M. Sapolsky et al is a professor of public policy and organization at MIT. Benjamin H. Friedman is a research fellow in defense and homeland security studies at Cato Institute. Eugene Gholz is an associate professor of public affairs at the University of Texas at Austin. Daryl G. Press is an associate professor of government at Dartmouth College. World Affairs Fall 2009 “Restraining Order: For Strategic Modesty” http://www.worldaffairsjournal.org/article/restraining-order-strategic-modesty

Some policy analysts suggest that political instability abroad would disrupt the global economy, interfering with trade and investment. They presume that growing economic interdependence means that the United States has an economic interest in policing the globe. Although globalization heightens economic ties between countries, those ties mitigate U.S. vulnerability to overseas shocks. Globalization has multiplied the alternatives for almost every economic relationship. There are now alternative suppliers for the goods we consume, alternative consumers for the products we manufacture, alternative locations in which we can invest, and alternative sources of capital for our firms. A common metaphor for the global economy—a complex web—is on the mark. The structure of that web can survive even if a few strands are severed. Profit-seeking actors respond quickly to disruptions by searching for the next-best alternative. If there is trouble in the Strait of Malacca, ships will quickly reroute through the nearly-as-convenient Straits of Lombok or Makassar. If disruptions abroad make it harder to sell U.S. bicycles in Korea, manufacturers will sell them in Portugal. Because of globalization, the United States depends more on access to the global economy as a whole but depends less on any specific economic relationship. The oil market seems to stand out as an exception. Disruptions to oil supply routinely cause huge price spikes and painful adjustments. But the danger of oil disruptions does not require that Washington police the Middle East; rather, the United States ought to retain large stockpiles of oil and other critical materials. The U.S. government has already amassed approximately 700 million barrels of oil. If you add the stockpiles in the European Union, Japan, South Korea, and China, the total for the industrialized world is approximately 1.5 billion barrels of oil. And those are only government-controlled stocks; most analysts believe private holdings exceed official stockpiles. When one compares these massive reserves against plausible disruptions, government-controlled stockpiles alone count as more than sufficient to maintain global supply. The extreme flexibility of the global economy adds to restraint’s appeal as a strategy for the United States. The global economy is not a rigid chain with links that must be protected. It is a flexible, constantly changing web that needs no global policeman to direct its traffic.

#### Nations that face decline will opt to go down silently- statistics prove

Paul K. MacDonald is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Williams College and Joseph M. Parent is Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Miami Spring 2011 International Security “Graceful Decline? The Surprising Success of Great Power Retrenchment” Volume 35 Number 4 pg 7-44

Based on our universe of cases, the predictions of retrenchment pessimists receive little support. In contrast to arguments that retrenchment is rare, we find that great powers facing acute relative decline adopted retrenchment in at least eleven and at most fifteen of the eighteen cases, a range of 61-83 percent. By any accounting, a majority of the countries in these cases retrenched shortly after their ordinal transition. Nor does the evidence support the view that domestic interests constrain retrenchment. Every one of the great powers in our [End Page 28] sample that chose to retrench did so within five years of the ordinal transition. This suggests timely responses to external constraints rather than domestic intransigence. Moreover, there does not appear to be a strong connection between regime type and retrenchment. Democracies account for about two-thirds of the great powers in our study, and are slightly more likely to face acute relative declines, accounting for thirteen of our eighteen cases, or 72 percent. Of the twelve democracies, seven retrenched, two did not, and three are debatable, yielding parameters from 58 to 83 percent. There are only three cases of autocracy, which makes comparison among groups difficult, but of these, two retrenched and one case is arguable, producing a range of 67-100 percent.59 In short, evidence at the coarse-grained level tentatively supports the neorealist approach outlined above: during acute relative decline, a significant majority of great powers of differing regime types elected to retrench. Wars, preventive or otherwise, do not appear to be a common fate for declining states, and recovery of lost rank was fairly frequent. Declining great powers found themselves embroiled in an interstate war in only four of the eighteen cases, and in only one of these cases—1935 United Kingdom—did the declining power go to war with the power that had just surpassed it in ordinal rank.60 In addition, in six of fifteen cases, declining great powers that adopted a policy of retrenchment managed to rebound, eventually recovering their ordinal rank from the state that surpassed them. These findings suggest that retrenching states rarely courted disaster and occasionally regained their prior position. Further, even if retrenchment was not successful, this does not prove that a preferable policy existed.61 In many cases of decline, there are few restorative solutions available; politics is often a game of unpalatable alternatives. Short of a miracle, it is hard to say what great powers such as Britain, France, or the Soviet Union could have done to stay aloft, even with the benefit of hindsight.

### A2: Key to cooperation

#### US power is on the decline- attempts to shape the world as we go down only foster conflict

Charles A. Kupchan is professor of International Affairs at Georgetown University and senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations. And Adam Mount is a doctoral candidate in the Department of Government at Georgetown University spring 2009 Democracy Journal “The Autonomy Rule” http://www.democracyjournal.org/pdf/12/Kupchan.pdf

The era that opened with the promulgation of the Atlantic Charter may well be drawing to a close. The West is steadily losing its sway. Shifts in the international balance of power; the global economic crisis; the growing assertiveness of China, Russia, and other non-democratic powers; the strength of political Islam—these developments call into question the durability of the international order erected during America’s watch. As the National Intelligence Council recently concluded, “although the United States is likely to remain the single most powerful actor, the United States’ relative strength— even in the military realm—will decline and U.S. leverage will become more constrained . . .The U.S. will find itself as one of a number of important actors on the world stage.” Many American strategists recognize the inevitability of a more level global playing field, but they have arrived at an illusory response: that the United States and its democratic allies should dedicate the twilight hours of their primacy to universalizing the Western order. According to G. John Ikenberry, a political scientist at Princeton University, “The United States’ global position may be weakening, but the international system the United States leads can remain the dominant order of the twenty-first century.” The West should “sink the roots of this order as deeply as possible” to ensure that the world continues to play by its rules even as its material preponderance wanes. Such confidence in the universality of the Western order is, however, based on wishful thinking about the likely trajectory of ascending powers, which throughout history have sought to adjust the prevailing order in ways that favor their own interests. Presuming that rising states will readily take their seats at the West’s table is unrealistic and even dangerous, promising to alienate emerging powers that will be pivotal to global stability in the years ahead. Instead, the West will have to make room for the competing visions of rising powers and prepare for an international system in which its principles no longer serve as the primary anchor. Sinking the roots of the West, founding a “league of democracies,” and turning NATO into a global alliance of democratic states would be admirable visions in a politically homogeneous world. But the Western model does not command widespread acceptance. If the next international system is to be characterized by norm-governed order rather than competitive anarchy, it will have to be based on great-power consensus and toleration of political diversity rather than Western primacy and the single-minded pursuit of universal democracy.

### Transition Disease Impact

#### Diseases cause extinction

Yu 9, Victoria Yu, Dartmouth Journal of Undergraduate Science, “Human Extinction: The Uncertainty of Our Fate”, 5-22-09 http://dujs.dartmouth.edu/spring-2009/human-extinction-the-uncertainty-of-our-fate

A pandemic will kill off all humans. In the past, humans have indeed fallen victim to viruses. Perhaps the best-known case was the bubonic plague that killed up to one third of the European population in the mid-14th century (7). While vaccines have been developed for the plague and some other infectious diseases, new viral strains are constantly emerging — a process that maintains the possibility of a pandemic-facilitated human extinction. Some surveyed students mentioned AIDS as a potential pandemic-causing virus. It is true that scientists have been unable thus far to find a sustainable cure for AIDS, mainly due to HIV’s rapid and constant evolution. Specifically, two factors account for the virus’s abnormally high mutation rate: 1. HIV’s use of reverse transcriptase, which does not have a proof-reading mechanism, and 2. the lack of an error-correction mechanism in HIV DNA polymerase (8). Luckily, though, there are certain characteristics of HIV that make it a poor candidate for a large-scale global infection: HIV can lie dormant in the human body for years without manifesting itself, and AIDS itself does not kill directly, but rather through the weakening of the immune system. However, for more easily transmitted viruses such as influenza, the evolution of new strains could prove far more consequential. The simultaneous occurrence of antigenic drift (point mutations that lead to new strains) and antigenic shift (the inter-species transfer of disease) in the influenza virus could produce a new version of influenza for which scientists may not immediately find a cure. Since influenza can spread quickly, this lag time could potentially lead to a “global influenza pandemic,” according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (9). The most recent scare of this variety came in 1918 when bird flu managed to kill over 50 million people around the world in what is sometimes referred to as the Spanish flu pandemic. Perhaps even more frightening is the fact that only 25 mutations were required to convert the original viral strain — which could only infect birds — into a human-viable strain (10).

### Trade

#### Also, Trade conflicts don’t escalate

David Bearce (Associate Professor of Political Science at Pittsburg University) 2003 “Grasping the commercial institutional peace” ebsco

Even as we accept that such trade dispute settlement mechanisms help resolve economic conflict, it is not clear that this finding should have any strong application to the dependent variable of inter-state military conflict. On this point, it is important to distinguish between different types of inter-state conflict economic versus military (McMillan, 1997:39)Fand recognize that disputes about banana tariffs, for example, are not likely to escalate into military confrontations. While military conflict often has economic antecedents, there is little evidence that trade wars ever become shooting wars. In terms of inter-state disagreements with real potential for military conflict, scholars highlight territorial disputes (Vasquez, 1993; Hensel, 2000; Huth, 2000). The trade dispute settlement mechanisms embedded in regional commercial institutions simply have no jurisdiction or power to resolve highly contentious territorial disagreements. In short, these two possible explanations offer little leverage in understanding the commercial institutional peace. We have accumulating empirical evidence associating joint membership in commercial (and other types of international) institutions with the resolution of inter-state military conflict. But it remains difficult to explain this relationship. The next section will address this theoretical gap.

#### The literature is on our side

Yoram Haftel (Department of Political Science University of Illinois-Chicago) 2004 “From the Outside Looking In” ebsco

These findings have several theoretical implications as well. First, as my empirical analysis reveals, the growing number of disputes in the WTO reflects the tension between the U.S. and Europe. This rising commercial discord, however, is accompanied by continued peaceful relations among the same states. Thus, fears that economic conflicts might escalate into more severe, militarized conflicts seem unwarranted (see, e.g., Copeland, 1996; Levy and Ali, 1998). In addition, this observation reinforces recent calls by IR scholars to refine the concept of ‘‘conflict’’ and to make a more elaborated distinction between economic conflicts and military conflicts
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## \*\*\*Immigration DA\*\*\*

### Impact

#### Visa liberalization key to Indian economy

Ahmed and Walmsley ‘8 S. Amer, graduate student of the Center for Global Trade Analysis, Purdue University and Terrie L., Research Assistant Professor and Director of the Center for Global Trade Analysis, Purdue University. February.“The liberalization of Temporary migration: India’s story” Originally presented at the 9th annual conference on global economics analysis in 2006. Online

Due to the politically sensitive nature of any migration policy, Mode 4 has seen the least action in terms of trade flows, has often been given lower priority over the other modes, and thus has relatively limited commitments and scheduled concessions (Winters et al, 2003). However, as pointed out by van der Mensbrugghe (2005), the declining labor forces and increasing dependency rates of developed countries has led to growing global demand for skilled workers. Given this increasing demand and the decreasing financial and social costs of labor mobility, Mode 4 now appears to have gained the attention of policy makers as a viable alternative to permanent migration. Despite politics and the lack of attention, Mode 4 is economically very significant given the large and untapped comparative advantage that many developing countries have in labor intensive services. Among the developing countries, India is a particularly interesting case not only because of its large labor force, but also because of the volume of skilled and unskilled workers that it sends overseas every year. While empirical studies have shown that labor importers often enjoy welfare improvements as a result of TMNP liberalization, the effect on the labor exporting country is often unclear. Despite this it is the labor exporting economies, such as India, which have put forward proposals on Mode 4. Advocates of Mode 4 liberalization argue that liberalization of the temporary movement of workers would bring more benefits than drawbacks. They argue that most of the criticisms over migration are based on the assumption that the migration is permanent and hence leads to the usual concerns associated with permanent migration, such as social integration and brain drain. Mode 4 liberalization on the other hand is temporary and therefore the effects of brain drain on the labor exporting economy are expected to be mitigated by the return of the temporary migrant workers. In fact, it has been argued that TMNP liberalization may actually lead to brain gain, with return migrant workers bringing home new techniques and skills. Moreover the labor exporting economies are also expected to gain from the substantial investments made by former expatriates and remittance flows. There are significant remittance flows from migrant Indian workers abroad to the home country; according to the GMig2 Data Base as much as 60% of income earned by Indian migrant workers is sent back home. These savings and remittances often translate into domestic investment opportunities. There is a large body of anecdotal evidence of rural infrastructure, healthcare, and housing development being funded by expatriate remittances (The Guardian, 2004). Hence investments and remittances from migrant workers can have a tremendous influence on the lives of the Indians left behind. Increased TMNP liberalization between India and its major labor importing partners could therefore lead to potentially large benefits for India, especially if return migration can be increased. The booming IT sector – responsible for the largest percentage of India’s trade in services – is an example of a services industry providing attractive career opportunities for many skilled Indian personnel, serving both to dissuade them from going overseas and to lure back return migrant workers.

#### India economy key to mitigate I-P conflict

Mamoon and Murshed ’10 Dawood and Mansoob “the conflict mitigating effects of trade in the India-Pakistan case” http://www.springerlink.com/content/4736rl34w118q532/fulltext.pdf Online

However, if India is able to export or import more, this would at least put a check on any rise in the severity of conflict and hostilities would adjust to some average level. Any decline in Indian trade will enhance hostilities. The current low levels of bilateral trade between Pakistan and India is conflict enhancing, so more trade with increased exports by both sides to each other should be encouraged. More access to Pakistani markets on the Indian side may not lead to conflict mitigation if Pakistan is not able to also export more to India. A rise in education expenditure puts a check on hostilities, as seen in Graph 1e. Graph 1f is the standard representation of India-Pakistan conflict, and not only best fits historical trends but also explain the rationale behind recent India-Pakistan peace initiatives with decreasing hostilities when not only India but Pakistan also has had economic growth rates as high as 7% per annum. The forecasts suggest that conflict will rise, even if there is a significant increase in combined democracy scores, if growth rates plummet. Both Pakistan and India have seen many such years, when hostilities between both countries rose significantly when at least one of the countries is performing poorly, but were channeling more resources on the military as a proportion of national income, while at the same time having a divergent set of political institutions, though recently Pakistan has edged towards greater democracy with elections in February 2008.

#### Immigration reform is key to food security

**ACIR ‘7** (December 4, 2007 THE AGRICULTURE COALITION FOR IMMIGRATION REFORM

Dear Member of Congress: The Agriculture Coalition for Immigration Reform (ACIR) is deeply concerned with pending immigration enforcement legislation known as the ‘Secure America Through Verification and Enforcement Act of 2007' or ‘SAVE Act’ (H.R.4088 and S.2368). While these bills seek to address the worthy goal of stricter immigration law enforcement, they fail to take a comprehensive approach to solving the immigration problem. History shows that a one dimensional approach to the nation’s immigration problem is doomed to fail. Enforcement alone, without providing a viable means to obtain a legal workforce to sustain economic growth is a formula for disaster. Agriculture best illustrates this point. Agricultural industries that need considerable labor in order to function include the fruit and vegetable, dairy and livestock, nursery, greenhouse, and Christmas tree sectors. Localized labor shortages have resulted in actual crop loss in various parts of the country. More broadly, producers are making decisions to scale back production, limit expansion, and leave many critical tasks unfulfilled. Continued labor shortages could force more producers to shift production out of the U.S., thus stressing already taxed food and import safety systems. Farm lenders are becoming increasingly concerned about the stability of affected industries. This problem is aggravated by the nearly universal acknowledgement that the current H-2A agricultural guest worker program does not work. Based on government statistics and other evidence, roughly 80 percent of the farm labor force in the United States is foreign born, and a significant majority of that labor force is believed to be improperly authorized. The bills’ imposition of mandatory electronic employment eligibility verification will screen out the farm labor force without providing access to legal workers. Careful study of farm labor force demographics and trends indicates that there is not a replacement domestic workforce available to fill these jobs. This feature alone will result in chaos unless combined with labor-stabilizing reforms. Continued failure by Congress to act to address this situation in a comprehensive fashion is placing in jeopardy U.S. food security and global competitiveness. Furthermore, congressional inaction threatens the livelihoods of millions of Americans whose jobs exist because laborintensive agricultural production is occurring in America. If production is forced to move, most of the upstream and downstream jobs will disappear as well. The Coalition cannot defend of the broken status quo. We support well-managed borders and a rational legal system. We have worked for years to develop popular bipartisan legislation that would stabilize the existing experienced farm workforce and provide an orderly transition to wider reliance on a legal agricultural worker program that provides a fair balance of employer and employee rights and protections. We respectfully urge you to oppose S.2368, H.R.4088, or any other bills that would impose employment-based immigration enforcement in isolation from equally important reforms that would provide for a stable and legal farm labor force.

#### Skilled worker shortage tanks solvency – only increased skilled immigration solves

COC 9 (COMPETE – Council on Competitiveness, “Mobilizing a World-Class Energy Workforce,” Dec., <http://www.compete.org/images/uploads/File/PDF%20Files/CoC_-_Pillar_6_Handout_-_Mobilizing_a_World-Class_Energy_Workforce,_Dec09.pdf> )

America currently lacks an energy workforce of sufficient size and capabilities to meet the needs¶ of a sustainable, secure energy system.1 With increasing demand come abundant job¶ opportunities in both traditional and emerging energy industries. Unfortunately, U.S. workers are¶ neither aware nor sufficiently prepared to take them. Moreover, with an aging population and the¶ retirement of the baby boomers well under way, there is an inadequate pipeline of replacement¶ workers, technicians and managers to succeed them.¶ Bridge the Skills Gap and Build the Talent¶ The Council Recommends that:¶ • The U.S. Government offer full scholarships to U.S. graduates who commit to a minimum period of¶ service in an energy-related career in the governmental, academic or non-profit sectors.¶ • Congress establish a CompetePass program that will allow eligible participants to redeem the¶ passes at U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) one-stop training centers.¶ • The U.S. Government grant green cards to foreign students receiving undergraduate and advanced¶ degrees in scientific and engineering disciplines from U.S. institutions.¶ The United States stands to lose half of its electric power industry workforce within the next five to ten¶ years due to retirement. America’s oil and gas workforce averages 50 years in age; half are likely to retire¶ soon. Workers in these conventional energy sector jobs, from power plant operators to transmission line¶ and pipeline workers, are retiring at a much faster rate than they are being replaced. The introduction of¶ any new energy technologies will not compensate for this workforce shortage. For example, in the nuclear¶ industry, the fact that there has been no new construction of a nuclear facility in the United States in over¶ 30 years has led to the atrophy of skills, the loss of technicians, the dearth of American students in¶ nuclear engineering and a national security risk for the primarily nuclear-powered U.S. Navy. 2¶¶ The development, installation and¶ maintenance of new technologies¶ require skills at all levels of educational¶ training. Many of these jobs, such as¶ building new power plants, cannot be¶ exported and will remain in the United¶ States. So-called “green collar” jobs¶ could fill this gap over time and provide¶ for significant domestic employment¶ growth, but capitalizing on this¶ opportunity will require government¶ being proactive in developing programs¶ to provide the necessary skills.¶ Government should provide a 21st¶ century education to match the 21st¶ century job opportunities, requirements¶ and needs.¶ There is growing global competition for¶ scientific and engineering talent today,¶ and the U.S. pipeline of students is¶ slowing.3 The private sector, where the overwhelming majority of careers will be, knows best the current¶ opportunities that are not being met. Executives cite the lack of scientific, engineering and skilled talent as¶ among the most serious challenges facing their businesses today.4 They know what skills will be required¶ and can assist in developing the workforce of the future by working closely with educational institutions as¶ well as within their own organizations.

### Uniqueness

#### Immigration reform will pass – problems will be resolved quickly, momentum to passage.

Tim Gaynor Senators say they expect to deliver immigration bill March 27, 2013| | Reuters

http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2013-03-27/news/sns-rt-us-usa-immigration-senatebre92q17z-20130327\_1\_immigration-bill-immigration-reform-millions-of-illegal-immigrants

¶ The senators are trying to create metrics for defining whether the border is secure as part of a comprehensive immigration bill that would give millions of illegal immigrants a path to citizenship.¶ ¶ Speaking at a news conference after meeting with border patrol agents and flying over the international border around the frontier city of Nogales, Schumer said he was hopeful they would present a bill when Congress resumes April 8.¶ ¶ "The bottom line is we are very close. I'd say we are 90 percent there. We have a few little problems to work on ... but we're very hopeful that we will meet our deadline," said Schumer, who was speaking at a building that was within sight of the steel border fence.¶ ¶ "We hope to have a bill agreed to and done .. the day we come back," he said.¶ ¶ The senators are members of the so-called Gang of Eight - four Democrats and four Republicans - who are working on a plan for the biggest overhaul of immigration laws since 1986.¶ ¶ Flake and McCain have tried to impress on their colleagues the difficulties in their homestate of Arizona, which is part of the most heavily trafficked section of the nearly 2,000 mile southwest border with Mexico.¶ ¶ "In the last several years we have made improvements on the border. The border is still not in many areas as secure as we want it to be or expect it to be," McCain told reporters at the same news conference.¶ ¶ Asked if it would take billions of dollars and decades to secure the border, McCain said, "We are talking about a lot of money, but we also have to make sure that the money is well spent."¶ ¶ Although the group of senators has agreed to create a way for the 11 million undocumented foreigners in the country to earn citizenship, problems with the future flow of immigrants has remained a sticking point.¶ ¶ A new temporary worker program is critical for Republicans, who will not agree to overhaul the immigration system unless there is a process for foreigners to fill U.S. jobs temporarily if needed.¶ ¶ The issue of wages for the new workers briefly stalled talks on Friday in Washington with unions and businesses publicly hurling insults at each other.¶ At the time, the AFL-CIO, the biggest labor federation, said Republicans and businesses wanted to undercut wages. The Chamber of Commerce, the biggest U.S. business lobby, said the unions had jeopardized the entire immigration reform effort.¶ ¶ Tempers cooled earlier this week with both sides cautiously voicing some optimism.¶ ¶ Obama acknowledged on Wednesday that the future flow of guest workers was a sticking point between labor and business, but he said the conflicts could be resolved.¶ ¶ "I don't agree that it's threatening to doom the legislation," Obama said in an interview with Telemundo, according to a transcript. "This is a resolvable issue."¶ ¶ Obama also said he did not think it would be necessary for him to step in, given the progress that lawmakers were making.¶ ¶ "If we have a bill introduced at the beginning of next month as these senators indicate it will be, then I'm confident that we can get it done certainly before the end of the summer," he said.¶ ¶ Sources said organized labor and the business community met on Tuesday to try to resolve their differences over a new program that would determine the future of immigration for low-skilled foreign workers such as janitors and cooks.¶ ¶ At the news conference, Schumer declined to provide details on the disagreement or what the group still had to resolve. A small group of Democrat and Republican lawmakers in the House of Representatives is also working on an immigration bill that would provide a path to citizenship.

#### Guest worker and wage disputes will be resolved and not derail passage

David Nakamura, Updated: Thursday, March 28, 9:00 PM http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/dispute-over-guest-worker-program-puts-immigration-talks-at-risk/2013/03/28/d68bee2c-96ee-11e2-814b-063623d80a60\_story.html

The senators maintain that the negotiations continue to move forward. Four members of the working group inspected border-control measures in Arizona on Wednesday, and Sen. Charles E. Schumer (D-N.Y.) said afterward that the group’s work on the legislation is “90 percent” complete.¶ The guest-worker program is not the only contentious area. The bill is likely to include a large increase in visas for high-tech workers and the elimination of some categories of family visas, two areas that have provoked strong opposition from advocates who fear it could make it harder for families to be reunited.¶ The guest-worker dispute broke into view last week when U.S. Chamber of Commerce officials went public with their concerns over the process, leading to angry responses from AFL-CIO officials.¶ The Chamber has called for 400,000 visas for guest workers, along with the ability for those workers to switch jobs once they are in the United States. Union officials countered with an offer of 10,000 visas and said that foreign workers should be allowed to pursue citizenship once they have entered the country.¶ The senators have reportedly agreed to cap the program at 200,000 visas per year, starting at a much lower figure and moving up as the economy improves.¶ But the biggest sticking point has been wages. The chamber wants to pay the foreign workers based on a government calculation of the prevailing wages of American workers — based on the minimum wage and on regional and industry norms. Unions are holding out for a higher pay scale based on median wages for each industry.¶ Business leaders contend that the AFL-CIO — and, by association, the White House — are not negotiating in good faith.¶ “The president is obviously close to unions on this issue. The constituencies they’re trying to keep happy with immigration reform do not care about this piece of it,” said Tamar Jacoby, president of ImmigrationWorks USA, a federation of small-business owners that supports immigration reform.¶ Jacoby said that based on last year’s election results, the White House is calculating that “Republicans so badly need to get on the right side of history with Latino voters, they will throw business to the wolves and throw future immigrants under the bus.”

#### \*Labor and wage issues have been resolved – won’t stall progress on immigration reform.

Rachelle Younglai 3-28 http://www.bayoubuzz.com/us-news/item/381105-organized-labor-says-closer-to-deal-on-immigration-reform

U.S. labor unions said on Thursday they were closer to resolving problems with wages for future unskilled immigrant workers like janitors and housekeepers - an issue that has stalled progress on a U.S. Senate proposal to overhaul the immigration system.¶ "We have moved off poverty level wages and are moving forward and are working on a standard that will protect U.S. workers," said Andrea Zuniga DiBitetto , legislative representative for the biggest union the AFL-CIO .¶ Late last week, disputes over a new visa program for foreign workers between the AFL-CIO, the labor federation, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce threatened to derail immigration reform talks between a group of four Republican and four Democratic Senators .¶ The AFL-CIO had accused Republicans and businesses of trying to undercut wages. And the Chamber , the biggest business lobby, said unions were jeopardizing the immigration reform

#### \*Immigration reform will pass – labor and wage issues will be resolved; it’s the top priority

JENNIFER EPSTEIN | 3/27/13 6:30 PM EDT Obama renews push on immigration reform http://www.politico.com/politico44/2013/03/obama-renews-push-on-immigration-reform-160372.html

President Obama sought to refocus the political conversation on immigration reform Wednesday in interviews with two Spanish-language networks that come after weeks of news cycles dominated by discussions of guns, sequestration and same-sex marriage.¶ In interviews with Telemundo and Univision conducted Wednesday at the White House, the president stayed firm on the immigration reform timeline he set earlier this year and voiced confidence in the bipartisan group of eight senators who are negotiating a bill.¶ “I think we’ve seen enormous progress over the last month and a half,” Obama said in an interview with Telemundo. “I think both sides, Democrats and Republicans, have been very serious about the negotiations. I’m actually very optimistic that when they return in early April … we’ll see a bill ready to move through the process.”¶ "We're seeing right now a good, bipartisan spirit. I want to encourage that," he added on Univision. "Hopefully we'll be able to get it done."¶ The president is still holding lawmakers to the same timeline he laid out in late January, when he last sat for interviews on immigration reform. “If we have a bill introduced at the beginning of next month — as these senators indicate it will be — then I’m confident that we can get it done certainly before the end of the summer.”¶ ¶ Obama often chides Congress for being unproductive, but on immigration he still seems hopeful that the bipartisan cooperation of which he has long waxed poetic will finally come to fruition. “The most important thing is that we’re seeing a strong commitment to finally solve this problem in a way that strengthens our border security, makes sure that there’s a pathway to citizenship, an earned one, a tough one, but a pathway so that people can live out their dreams and make sure that they have a better life for themselves and their kids," he said.¶ He also reiterated that he has the option of rolling out his own bill, telling Telemundo: "I've got my own legislation, I'm prepared to step in, but I don't think that's going to be necessary."¶ Though talks between the AFL-CIO and the Chamber of Commerce over visas for low-skilled workers have been bumpy, both sides indicated Wednesday that the talks are back on. To Obama, any issues over guest workers are “resolvable," he said.¶ Nor would Obama flirt with the notion that the Senate bill might fail. “I’m not gonna presuppose failure,” he told Telemundo. “I don’t know why you keep on asking about failure, ‘cause I think this is gonna succeed. And I’m not concerned about the Democratic Party, I’m concerned about the people whose actual lives are gonna be impacted by it. And I want to make sure that they have the capacity to move forward and live out the dream of immigrants that has driven this country for so many years. I think it’s good for our economy. I think it’ll be good for these families. That’s my number-one priority.”

### YES PC

#### Obama still has political capital and is using it wisely – immigration is next

Chris Cillizza “Newtown didn’t change the politics of guns” March 22, 2013 http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2013/03/22/newtown-didnt-change-the-politics-of-guns/

Senate Democrats up for re-election in Republican-leaning states in 2014 — think Montana, North Carolina, Alaska, Arkansas and Louisiana — were loathe to vote on things like the assault weapons ban for fear that their eventual Republican opponent would use such a vote to cast them as out of touch with the average person in their state. According to Reid, less than 40 Senate Democrats were ready or willing to vote for the assault weapons ban. And, the White House, perhaps sensing that it would need to spend its political capital on other priorities — debt ceiling/budget fight, immigration and perhaps even climate change — seemed to decide that passing something (even something that didn’t include major provisions like an assault weapons ban or a ban on high capacity clips) was better than passing nothing at all.

#### Obama didn’t spend PC on guns

Chris Cillizza on March 22, 2013 Newtown didn’t change the politics of guns http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2013/03/22/newtown-didnt-change-the-politics-of-guns/

And yet, as Newtown disappeared further in the political rearview mirror, the same politics that had turned guns into a dormant issue on the national political stage for much of the 1990s and 2000s began to take hold. Senate Democrats up for re-election in Republican-leaning states in 2014 — think Montana, North Carolina, Alaska, Arkansas and Louisiana — were loathe to vote on things like the assault weapons ban for fear that their eventual Republican opponent would use such a vote to cast them as out of touch with the average person in their state. According to Reid, less than 40 Senate Democrats were ready or willing to vote for the assault weapons ban. And, the White House, perhaps sensing that it would need to spend its political capital on other priorities — debt ceiling/budget fight, immigration and perhaps even climate change — seemed to decide that passing something (even something that didn’t include major provisions like an assault weapons ban or a ban on high capacity clips) was better than passing nothing at all.

### Top of the agenda

#### Top of the agenda

Helicopter Association International, News Staff posted on March 27, 2013 13:04 Could Immigration Be Next for Congress?

http://www.rotor.com/Publications/RotorNews/tabid/843/articleType/ArticleView/articleId/2230/Could-Immigration-Be-Next-for-Congress.aspx

The U.S. Senate is expected to begin debating a sweeping reform bill sometime this spring that would legalize some 11 million unauthorized immigrants and create a new way for foreign workers to come into the United States. Some observers think it may be the only substantive work Congress can accomplish this year.¶ Immigration reform has become the No. 1 policy priority at the AFL-CIO, a shift for the labor group that has in the past spent more time trying to pass a healthcare law or destroy a proposal to privatize Social Security. Immigration reform has also become a top priority at the Business Roundtable, which represents the largest U.S. corporations. The group previously has focused its attention on corporate tax reform and trade policy.

#### Obama is holding back his capital for immigration now

By Paul Barrett on March 20, 2013 Five Hard Realities for Gun-Control Proponents

President Barack Obama isn’t serious about pushing gun control. Yes, he has given a few speeches, saying things like, “Weapons of war have no place in our streets or in our schools or threatening our law enforcement officers.” Notice, however, that the Feinstein bill died without a peep from the president. If there were a time for him to step up and spend political capital, it’s now. He’s not doing it. My bet is that he’s keeping his social-reform powder dry for immigration reform.

### Link

#### Any bipartisan support has diminished – Congress backlashes to this as a renewable stimulus

Margaret Ryan August 31 2011 http://energy.aol.com/2011/08/31/tax-break-tactics-divide-renewable-industry/

¶ But Rhone Resch, executive director of the Solar Energy Industries Association, said the option for conversion was already under discussion in Congress, and had bipartisan support, when it was attached to the stimulus bill as Section 1603.¶ ¶ Now, Resch said, its extension chances are being harmed by the Congressional backlash against anything "stimulus."

#### It’s a major budgetary concern

Koprowski 12 Gene Koprowski, reporter for the Daily Caller, “Obama energy officials funded solar firms despite ‘junk bond’ ratings from S&P, Fitch”, March 31st, 2012, http://dailycaller.com/2012/03/31/obama-energy-officials-funded-solar-firms-despite-junk-bond-ratings-from-sp-fitch/

“The markets were expressing a sense of caution on these firms,” Jeffrey Solsby, a senior aide to Issa, told TheDC. “The administration did not have this same sense of caution.” Earlier this month, About Solar announced that it would stop producing solar power panels and lay off 180 employees. Before the disclosure, the company had already spent $70 million of its awarded federal funds. Federal investigators detailed other dramatic abuses at the green energy firms: Bright Source Energy, which received a $1.6 billion federal loan guarantee to build a solar power plant, has spent some $56 million on a “desert tortoise relocation program.” And Beacon Power, which received Energy Department funding, went bankrupt — but not before paying three executives more than $250,000 in “bonuses” in March 2010. Foreign firms also received loan guarantees from the federal government as part of the program. One such overseas company was Spain’s Abengoa, another corporation with a poor credit rating, which rounded out the energy department’s junk bond portfolio. Federal investigators told TheDC that an audit of these loans and loan guarantees indicated that the administration “ignored” clear warning signs of a “likely loss” of taxpayer dollars. Investigators also said the administration exercised “improper influence” in the approval of loan guarantees to favored companies “through manipulation of analysis — defrauding taxpayers and misappropriating assets.” Even more damning allegations, which suggest that former Obama administration officials and campaign bundlers received a sizable share of those federal funds, are now surfacing. Christine Lakatos, a researcher and conservative writer who has followed the emerging scandals for several years at the blog Green Corruption, told TheDC the administration is engaging in “crony capitalism with ‘green’ dollars.” Lakatos claimed the scandal goes deeper than Rep. Issa and his investigators have detected. She said companies linked to contribution “bundlers” from President Obama’s 2008 campaign received about 80 percent of the “green energy” loans made by the Energy Department during the last three years.

#### \*Only a link-- allows Republicans to blame economic problems on large solar investments

Wyler 7/18, Grace Wyler, reporter at Business Insider, “Another Obama-Funded Solar Plant Goes Under, And Republicans Are Already Pouncing”, July 18th, 2012, <http://www.businessinsider.com/obama-clean-energy-funds-amonix-solar-plant-closes-republicans-attack-2012-7>

The Las Vegas Review Journal reports today that Amonix, a California-based solar panel company that has received more than $20 million in federal tax credits and grants, has shut down its manufacturing plant in Northern Las Vegas, just 14 months after it opened. The company, which makes concentrating solar photovoltaic technology, is the latest clean energy casualty of the Obama adminstration's clean energy initiatives, which have become a main target of Republicans since last year's Solyndra bankruptcy scandal. According to the LVRJ, the Las Vegas manufacturing plant — Amonix's largest manufacturing facility, has been idle since May, and the company started selling off the factory equipment this week. The company did not respond to Business Insider's calls for comment today. The plant, which opened in May 2011, was financed in part by $9.5 million in tax credits from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, according to the company's website. The company also received $15.6 million in grant funding from the Department of Energy's Solar America Initiative. At the time of its opening, Amonix's Las Vegas factory was widely praised by Nevada politicians from both sides of the aisle, including Republican Governor Brian Sandoval and Democratic Congresswoman Shelley Berkeley, who is now in a tight race for Nevada's open Senate seat. President Obama also praised the company during a 2010 speech at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. The news comes at an opportune moment for Republicans, as the party's presidential nominee Mitt Romney attempts to move the conversation away from his record at Bain Capital and his refusal to disclose more tax returns. The Republican National Committee has already sent out an email blasting the Obama administration's clean energy program and accusing the White House of providing funds to the failed Amonix project as a favor to Obama donor Steve Westly, whose company, The Westly Group, has also invested in Amonix.

### Velcro

#### Obama gets the blame – he is Velcro

Nicholas and Hook 10 **Peter Nicholas and Janet Hook, “Obama the Velcro President,” LOS ANGELES TIMES, 7—30—10,** [**http://articles.latimes.com/2010/jul/30/nation/la-na-velcro-presidency-20100730/3**](http://articles.latimes.com/2010/jul/30/nation/la-na-velcro-presidency-20100730/3)**, accessed 8-22-11.**

If Ronald Reagan was the classic Teflon president, Barack Obama is made of Velcro. Through two terms, Reagan eluded much of the responsibility for recession and foreign policy scandal. In less than two years, Obama has become ensnared in blame. Hoping to better insulate Obama, White House aides have sought to give other Cabinet officials a higher profile and additional public exposure. They are also crafting new ways to explain the president's policies to a skeptical public. But Obama remains the colossus of his administration — to a point where trouble anywhere in the world is often his to solve. The president is on the hook to repair the Gulf Coast oil spill disaster, stabilize Afghanistan, help fix Greece's ailing economy and do right by Shirley Sherrod, the Agriculture Department official fired as a result of a misleading fragment of videotape. What's not sticking to Obama is a legislative track record that his recent predecessors might envy. Political dividends from passage of a healthcare overhaul or a financial regulatory bill have been fleeting. Instead, voters are measuring his presidency by a more immediate yardstick: Is he creating enough jobs? So far the verdict is no, and that has taken a toll on Obama's approval ratings. Only 46% approve of Obama's job performance, compared with 47% who disapprove, according to Gallup's daily tracking poll. "I think the accomplishments are very significant, but I think most people would look at this and say, 'What was the plan for jobs?' " said Sen. Byron L. Dorgan (D-N.D.). "The agenda he's pushed here has been a very important agenda, but it hasn't translated into dinner table conversations." Reagan was able to glide past controversies with his popularity largely intact. He maintained his affable persona as a small-government advocate while seeming above the fray in his own administration. Reagan was untarnished by such calamities as the 1983 terrorist bombing of the Marines stationed in Beirut and scandals involving members of his administration. In the 1986 Iran-Contra affair, most of the blame fell on lieutenants. Obama lately has tried to rip off the Velcro veneer. In a revealing moment during the oil spill crisis, he reminded Americans that his powers aren't "limitless." He told residents in Grand Isle, La., that he is a flesh-and-blood president, not a comic-book superhero able to dive to the bottom of the sea and plug the hole. "I can't suck it up with a straw," he said. But as a candidate in 2008, he set sky-high expectations about what he could achieve and what government could accomplish. Clinching the Democratic nomination two years ago, Obama described the moment as an epic breakthrough when "we began to provide care for the sick and good jobs to the jobless" and "when the rise of the oceans began to slow and our planet began to heal." Those towering goals remain a long way off. And most people would have preferred to see Obama focus more narrowly on the "good jobs" part of the promise. A recent Gallup poll showed that 53% of the population rated unemployment and the economy as the nation's most important problem. By contrast, only 7% cited healthcare — a single-minded focus of the White House for a full year. At every turn, Obama makes the argument that he has improved lives in concrete ways. Without the steps he took, he says, the economy would be in worse shape and more people would be out of work. There's evidence to support that. Two economists, Mark Zandi and Alan Blinder, reported recently that without the stimulus and other measures, gross domestic product would be about 6.5% lower. Yet, Americans aren't apt to cheer when something bad doesn't materialize. Unemployment has been rising — from 7.7% when Obama took office, to 9.5%. Last month, more than 2 million homes in the U.S. were in various stages of foreclosure — up from 1.7 million when Obama was sworn in. "Folks just aren't in a mood to hand out gold stars when unemployment is hovering around 10%," said Paul Begala, a Democratic pundit. Insulating the president from bad news has proved impossible. Other White Houses have tried doing so with more success. Reagan's Cabinet officials often took the blame, shielding the boss. But the Obama administration is about one man. Obama is the White House's chief spokesman, policy pitchman, fundraiser and negotiator. No Cabinet secretary has emerged as an adequate surrogate. Treasury Secretary Timothy F. Geithner is seen as a tepid public speaker; Energy Secretary Steven Chu is prone to long, wonky digressions and has rarely gone before the cameras during an oil spill crisis that he is working to end. So, more falls to Obama, reinforcing the Velcro effect: Everything sticks to him. He has opined on virtually everything in the hundreds of public statements he has made: nuclear arms treaties, basketball star LeBron James' career plans; Chelsea Clinton's wedding. Few audiences are off-limits. On Wednesday, he taped a spot on ABC's "The View," drawing a rebuke from Democratic Pennsylvania Gov. Edward G. Rendell, who deemed the appearance unworthy of the presidency during tough times. "Stylistically he creates some of those problems," Eddie Mahe, a Republican political strategist, said in an interview. "His favorite pronoun is 'I.' When you position yourself as being all things to all people, the ultimate controller and decision maker with the capacity to fix anything, you set yourself up to be blamed when it doesn't get fixed or things happen." A new White House strategy is to forgo talk of big policy changes that are easy to ridicule. Instead, aides want to market policies as more digestible pieces. So, rather than tout the healthcare package as a whole, advisors will talk about smaller parts that may be more appealing and understandable — such as barring insurers from denying coverage based on preexisting conditions. But at this stage, it may be late in the game to downsize either the president or his agenda. Sen. Richard J. Durbin (D-Ill.) said: "The man came in promising change. He has a higher profile than some presidents because of his youth, his race and the way he came to the White House with the message he brought in. It's naive to believe he can step back and have some Cabinet secretary be the face of the oil spill. The buck stops with his office."

### A2: Winners Win

#### Only true for top agenda items.

**Mathews and Todd, 2009** (Chris and Todd, political director at NBC, Hardball, June 22, google)

MATTHEWS: What are the political stakes for Obama get health care passed this year? Does the success of Obama`s presidency ride on it? Chuck Todd is NBC News chief White House correspondent and NBC News political director, as well. Eugene Robinson‘s an MSNBC political analyst, and of course, lest we forget—I never will—Pulitzer Prize-winning columnist for “The Washington Post.” MATTHEWS: Gentlemen, let‘s start and I want to start with Chuck, our guy on the beat. One thing we`ve learned, it seems, from presidents is you better win that first year. Reagan won the first year. Bush won the first year. If you win the first year, you really get it going. If you don`t win on your big issue, your pet project, if you will -- and it`s more important than that -- you really set a standard for defeat and you go down to further losses down the road. Your thoughts on this. CHUCK TODD, NBC CORRESPONDENT/POLITICAL DIRECTOR: Well, no, you`re -- A, you`re absolutely right. And B, it`s, like, people that are familiar with the way Rahm Emanuel thinks on trying to strategize when it comes to a legislative agenda and getting these big things done, you know, this is the lessons he feels like he learned the hard way in that first two years of the Clinton administration, `93, `94, when a lot of their big things went down. Sure, they got their big stimulus package, but they never did get health care. And that is what defines those first two years when you look back on it.

#### Can’t win on energy – proves the link

Matthew N. Eisler, Research Fellow at the Center for Contemporary History and Policy at the Chemical Heritage Foundation, 12 [“Science, Silver Buckshot, and ‘All of The Above’” Science Progress, April 2, http://scienceprogress.org/2012/04/science-silver-buckshot-and-%E2%80%9Call-of-the-above%E2%80%9D/]

Conservatives take President Obama’s rhetoric at face value. Progressives see the president as disingenuous. No doubt White House planners regard delaying the trans-border section of the Keystone XL pipeline and approving the Gulf of Mexico portion as a stroke of savvy realpolitik, but one has to wonder whether Democratic-leaning voters really are as gullible as this scheme implies. And as for the president’s claims that gasoline prices are determined by forces beyond the government’s control (speculation and unrest in the Middle East), it is probably not beyond the capacity of even the mildly educated to understand that the administration has shown little appetite to reregulate Wall Street and has done its part to inflate the fear premium through confrontational policies in the Persian Gulf. Committed both to alternative energy (but not in a rational, comprehensive way) and cheap fossil fuels (but not in ways benefiting American motorists in an election year), President Obama has accrued no political capital from his energy policy from either the left or the right by the end of his first term. The president long ago lost the legislative capacity for bold action in practically every field, including energy, but because the GOP’s slate of presidential candidates is so extraordinarily weak in 2012, he may not need it to get re-elected. At least, that is the conventional wisdom in Democratic circles. Should President Obama win a second term, Congress is likely to be even more hostile than in his first term, as in the Clinton years. And as in the Clinton years, that will probably mean four more years of inaction and increased resort to cant.

accommodation.