# Overview

#### Reform solves science leadership.

Arizona Daily Sun 2-10-13. azdailysun.com/news/opinion/editorial/cooperation-on-immigration-reform-only-way-forward/article\_c5b261e3-e267-566f-a235-3de051bdce57.html

And what does reform look like? Both the bipartisan Senate package and President Obama's plan start with even more border security and better enforcement of the federal employment verification system and temporary visas that are overstayed. These are just as important to border security as any 20-foot-high fence -- would-be migrants who have heard they cannot find work and who know they will be tracked down once their visas expire will think twice before leaving Mexico for Arizona.¶ LET SCIENCE GRADUATES STAY¶ For those illegals already here, a system of registration, payment of fines, the requirement to learn English, and a waiting period for green cards and citizenship that likely will be at least 10 years doesn't sound like amnesty to us. The devil, of course, is in the details, but the principles of reform should be clear: Bring millions of undocumented aliens out of the shadows, allow them to work legally and pay taxes, and bring them into the mainstream of American culture.¶ Flagstaff, as a university city, has a stake in the part of the reform package that calls for an immediate increase in the number H-1B visas for foreign workers skilled in STEM (science, technology, engineering and math). NAU is attracting hundreds of foreign students in those fields, some of whom would gladly stay past graduation if they could obtain visas. Based on the number of foreign-born U.S citizens who start businesses, obtain patents and even win Nobel Prizes, this is just the kind of immigration reform that Flagstaff, a self-declared STEM city, needs.

#### Expanding visas key to bioweapons security --- checks use of engineers pathogens

Brumfiel 3 [Geoff, Physical Science Correspondent – Nature Magazine, “Russia’s Bioweapons Labs: Still Out in the Cold”, Science, 423, 6-23]

Collaborations between Western researchers and former Soviet bioweapons scientists could benefit both parties. But mistrust and bureaucracy are getting in the way, says Geoff Brumfiel. In autumn 2001, three American researchers sped down a deserted two-lane road that cuts through the forests south of Moscow. They were travelling to Obolensk, once a secret city and home to one of the former Soviet Union's largest bioweapons research complexes — the State Research Center for Applied Microbiology. The researchers were part of a programme, funded by the Pentagon, that aims to keep Russia's former bioweapons scientists gainfully employed on useful projects. Despite the dilapidated surroundings in Obolensk, the visitors were enthused by the opportunities for collaboration. The crumbling concrete buildings "looked almost like a ghetto", recalls Rebecca Morton, a veterinary scientist at Oklahoma State University in Stillwater. But after two weeks, she had hatched a plan to work with Obolensk researcher Vitaly Pavlov on endemic Eurasian strains of Francisella tularensis. This bacterium causes tularaemia, a potentially fatal and extremely infectious disease that affects the liver, spleen, lungs and lymph nodes, which was studied at Obolensk because of its bioweapons potential. Morton's project, which would study the surface proteins on different strains of the bacterium in an effort to develop strain-specific diagnostic tests, is exactly the sort of initiative that the programme is designed to support. Butalmost 18 months down the line, she is no nearer to getting the project under way. Although her proposal has had positive peer review, the funding request is still winding its way through the Pentagon's bureaucracy. "I haven't spoken to Vitaly for a while, because I don't have much to tell him," says Morton. "It's a little embarrassing." Obstacle course Other researchers who hope to set up collaborations at the Obolensk centre and its sister facility, the State Research Center of Virology and Biotechnology, known as Vector, at Koltsovo near Novosibirsk in Siberia, are experiencing similar delays. Cultural differences, mistrust between Russia and the United States, and bureaucratic obstacles on both sides are allconspiring to stall promising avenues of research. After the demise of the Soviet Union in 1991, US funds flowed rapidly to former nuclear scientists and rocket engineers, with the goal of preventing them from accepting lucrative offers from countries eager to acquire an arsenal of ballistic nuclear weapons. But bioweaponeers were left out in the cold. The reason, according to Amy Smithson, a senior associate at the Henry L. Stimson Center — a security-policy think-tank in Washington DC — was that US officials lacked contacts inside the super-secret Soviet bioweapons network. "The biological non-proliferation programme literally had to be started from scratch," she says. As a result, more than half of the staff at Obolensk and Vector melted away during the 1990s — to where, no one knows for sure. Obolensk and Vector were two research powerhouses in a network of facilities spread throughoutthe Soviet Union, known collectively as 'Biopreparat'. This network weaponized diseases such as plague,anthrax, tularaemia, brucellosis and smallpox, behind the façade of a state-run pharmaceutical enterprise.Scientists at Obolensk and Vector even genetically engineered bacteria to resist antibiotics. In addition to the staff's expertise, the centres have containment labs for working on dangerous pathogens — the provision of which is currently a limiting factor in US plans to ramp up biodefence research. With Russia now suffering epidemics of diseases such as tuberculosis and AIDS, it stands to benefit from projects that would redirect the expertise at Obolensk and Vector to these problems. "Russia is a time bomb right now," says Ann Harrington, who studies options for reducing the threat of bioweapons at the National Defense University in Washington DC. "It has an enormous need for facilities that can support public health, and that can monitor and identify disease." In her former job as acting director of the US state department's Office of Proliferation Threat Reduction, Harrington helped to set up the programme that took Morton and her colleagues to Obolensk. The modus operandi of this scheme, funded by the US Department of Defense and administered by the US National Academies, is to build partnerships between Western academics and the former Soviet bioweapons establishment. A sister programme, run by the International Science and Technology Center (ISTC), a non-proliferation organization in Moscow funded in most part by the European Union, Japan and the United States, aims to pay for more extended visits by foreign scientists to former Soviet bioweapons labs (see '[Blazing the trail](http://www.nature.com.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/nature/journal/v423/n6941/box/423678a_BX1.html)'). Take your partners Under the National Academies scheme, researchers are paid to travel to Obolensk or Vector for up to two weeks in search of partnerships. If they find a Russian to work with, they draw up a proposal, which is reviewed by the US academies' National Research Council, and can win up to $10,000. The idea is that participants will then apply for further grants from the Pentagon, the ISTC or other non-proliferation bodies. Researchers selected for the first round of visits went to Russia in autumn 2001. "I had this idea that I could essentially extend my lab and also switch to interesting organisms that I wouldn't be able to study in the United States," says Konstantin Severinov, a microbiologist of Russian extraction who now works at Rutgers University in New Jersey. But so far, little progress has been made towards realizing the programme's potential. At a National Academies meeting in Washington DC last December, Severinov and Gregory Ebel, an immunologist with the New York State Department of Health in Slingerlands, expressed their frustration. Severinov, who studies viruses called phages that infect bacteria, said that his research at Obolensk has slowed to a crawl, and Ebel explained that both US and Russian customs officials were blocking transport of even the most simple equipment. The problems have several causes, but many stem from the secretive culture of Biopreparat. For decades, the network's scientists were cut off from the outside world, other Russian researchers and even each other. Unsurprisingly, they are not familiar with the grant writing, publication and peer review that underpins mainstream science. At higher levels, trust continues to be an issue. Many senior managers at Obolensk and Vector are veterans from the Soviet era and have a deep mistrust of the United States. They have almost absolute authority over their labs — determining what can flow to the West, and having an obligation to the Russian state to protect classified research. "Scientists may be convicted for giving state secrets to foreigners," says Ken Alibek, who served as deputy director of Biopreparat for five years before defecting to the United States in 1992. As a result of these attitudes, some US politicians complain that the Russian labs are simply trying to take cash handouts without opening themselves up to proper scrutiny. "We must ensure that the investment can be directly traced to an actual tangible reduction in military threats," the chair of the House of Representatives Armed Services Committee, Duncan Hunter (Republican, California), said at a hearing in January. Suspicions about the new schemes are heightened by the experience of earlier non-proliferation programmes established in the former Soviet Union, which have been plagued by corruption: lab administrators have been known to take a cut from each research grant at their facility. Today, financial checks are in place to prevent such abuses, but these also slow research. Following a congressional crackdown, for instance, there are now strict limits on how much of the funding can be spent by US researchers on projects in Russia. "We have some money for travel," says Bruce Scharf, a veterinary scientist at the State University of New York's Downstate Medical Center in Brooklyn, who is setting up a project to study rabies at Vector under the National Academies programme. "But I'm not paid a cent." Closed borders Perhaps the most serious problems are those caused by customs andimmigration restrictions. Especially since the terrorist outrages of 11 September 2001, and the anthrax attacks that followed, the US customs service has enforced strict controlson the import of biological material. As a result, Scharf has been unable to get the rabies samples he is studying at Vector into the United States. Similarly tough regulations on both the US and Russian sides are preventing Sergey Morzunov, a Russian-born microbiologist at the University of Nevada at Reno, from sending even basic materials, such as reagents for a DNA sequencing kit, to Vector. "The expiry date for my sequencing kit is May 2003, but it is still sitting on a shelf in the warehouse," Morzunov complains. New immigration regulations have also stopped Russian partners in the programme from visiting the United States to build links with their new Western colleagues, adds Vladimir Volkov, deputy director of the Obolensk facility. "Getting a visa for a business trip to the States may now take over three months," he says. Given the litany of problems, Alibek doubts whether the programmes will do much to further the cause of non-proliferation — especially as so many Obolensk and Vector staff drifted away in the 1990s. But other experts point to the vast expertise on biological warfare still present at the centres, and argue that it must be worth harnessing this knowledge. "I think the programme is still very much in its infancy," says Glenn Schweitzer, its coordinator at the US National Academies.

#### **Reform’s key to naval power**

Nye 12. [Joseph S., a former US assistant secretary of defense and chairman of the US National Intelligence Council, is University Professor at Harvard University. “Immigration and American Power,” December 10, Project Syndicate, http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/obama-needs-immigration-reform-to-maintain-america-s-strength-by-joseph-s--nye]

CAMBRIDGE – The United States is a nation of immigrants. Except for a small number of Native Americans, everyone is originally from somewhere else, and even recent immigrants can rise to top economic and political roles. President Franklin Roosevelt once famously addressed the Daughters of the American Revolution – a group that prided itself on the early arrival of its ancestors – as “fellow immigrants.”¶ In recent years, however, US politics has had a strong anti-immigration slant, and the issue played an important role in the Republican Party’s presidential nomination battle in 2012. But Barack Obama’s re-election demonstrated the electoral power of Latino voters, who rejected Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney by a 3-1 majority, as did Asian-Americans.¶ As a result, several prominent Republican politicians are now urging their party to reconsider its anti-immigration policies, and plans for immigration reform will be on the agenda at the beginning of Obama’s second term. **Successful reform will be an important step in preventing the** decline of American power**.**¶ Fears about the impact of immigration on national values and on a coherent sense of American identity are not new. The nineteenth-century “Know Nothing” movement was built on opposition to immigrants, particularly the Irish. Chinese were singled out for exclusion from 1882 onward, and, with the more restrictive Immigration Act of 1924, immigration in general slowed for the next four decades.¶ During the twentieth century, the US recorded its highest percentage of foreign-born residents, 14.7%, in 1910. A century later, according to the 2010 census, 13% of the American population is foreign born. But, despite being a nation of immigrants, more Americans are skeptical about immigration than are sympathetic to it. Various opinion polls show either a plurality or a majority favoring less immigration. The recession exacerbated such views: in 2009, one-half of the US public favored allowing fewer immigrants, up from 39% in 2008.¶ Both the number of immigrants and their origin have caused concerns about immigration’s effects on American culture. Demographers portray a country in 2050 in which non-Hispanic whites will be only a slim majority. Hispanics will comprise 25% of the population, with African- and Asian-Americans making up 14% and 8%, respectively.¶ But mass communications and market forces produce powerful incentives to master the English language and accept a degree of assimilation. Modern media help new immigrants to learn more about their new country beforehand than immigrants did a century ago. Indeed, most of the evidence suggests that the latest immigrants are assimilating at least as quickly as their predecessors.¶ While too rapid a rate of immigration can cause social problems, over the long term, immigration strengthens US power. It is estimated that at least 83 countries and territories currently have fertility rates that are below the level needed to keep their population constant. Whereas most developed countries will experience a shortage of people as the century progresses, America is one of the few that may avoid demographic decline and maintain its share of world population.¶ For example, to maintain its current population size, Japan would have to accept 350,000 newcomers annually for the next 50 years, which is difficult for a culture that has historically been hostile to immigration. In contrast, the Census Bureau projects that the US population will grow by 49% over the next four decades.¶ Today, the US is the world’s third most populous country; 50 years from now it is still likely to be third (after only China and India). This is highly relevant to economic power: whereas nearly all other developed countries will face a growing burden of providing for the older generation**, immigration could help to attenuate the policy problem for the US.**¶ In addition, though studies suggest that the short-term economic benefits of immigration are relatively small, and that unskilled workers may suffer from competition**, skilled immigrants can be important to** particular sectors – and to long-term growth. There is a strong correlation between the number of visas for skilled applicants and patents filed in the US. At the beginning of this century, Chinese- and Indian-born engineers were running one-quarter of Silicon Valley’s technology businesses, which accounted for $17.8 billion in sales; and, in 2005, immigrants had helped to start one-quarter of all US technology start-ups during the previous decade. Immigrants or children of immigrants founded roughly 40% of the 2010 Fortune 500 companies.¶ Equally important are immigration’s benefits for America’s soft power. The fact that people want to come to the US enhances its appeal, and immigrants’ upward mobility is attractive to people in other countries. The US is a magnet, and many people can envisage themselves as Americans, in part because so many successful Americans look like them. Moreover, connections between immigrants and their families and friends back home help to convey accurate and positive information about the US.¶ Likewise, because the presence of many cultures creates avenues of connection with other countries, it helps to broaden Americans’ attitudes and views of the world in an era of globalization. Rather than diluting hard and soft power, immigration enhances both.¶ Singapore’s former leader, Lee Kwan Yew, an astute observer of both the US and China, argues that China will not surpass the US as the leading power of the twenty-first century, precisely **because the US attracts the best and brightest** from the rest of the world and melds them into a diverse culture of creativity. China has a larger population to recruit from domestically, but, in Lee’s view, its Sino-centric culture will make it less creative than the US.¶ That is a view that Americans should take to heart. If Obama succeeds in enacting **immigration reform** in his second term, he **will** have gone a long way toward fulfilling his promise to maintain the strength of the US.

# 2NC: Uniqueness Wall

#### Framing issue – immigration reform will pass only if Obama uses capital – overcomes all current roadblocks.

Des Moines Register 1-22-13. www.desmoinesregister.com/article/20130122/OPINION03/301220049/0/NEWS/?odyssey=nav%7Chead&nclick\_check=1

Taken as an agenda for his second term, Monday’s inaugural address included references to immigration, climate change, gay rights, voting rights and safe schools. Achieving those things will require the president mounting his bully pulpit to put heat on Congress to pass comprehensive immigration reform, protections for the rights of gays and lesbians, gun control, environmental regulation and expansion of renewable forms of energy.¶ President Obama again demonstrated his gift of oratory on Monday. He delivered a well-crafted inaugural address with inspiring themes woven throughout and a call to action for our generation to achieve the ideals of previous generations.¶ But Obama should have learned in his first term that it is not enough to state lofty goals in great speeches. It takes hard work, perseverance and tough-mindedness to deal with members of Congress who may not want him to succeed.

#### Urgency and momentum now.

Seldin 2-6. [Jeff, journalist, "Battle for US immigration reform gathers steam" Voice of America -- www.voanews.com/content/battle-for-us-immigration-reform-moves-on-ahead-of-state-of-the-union/1598101.html]

U.S. President Barack Obama is expected to make immigration reform a priority in his State of the Union Address. But already, talk of tackling this controversial issue is gaining momentum.¶ There are an estimated 11-million illegal immigrants in the United States with more still hoping to cross the border.¶ Claudia Hernandez came here as a child, and like many in her situation, she feels she belongs in the U.S. ¶ "I have been here more than half of my life, and I respect the United States. This is my country," she said.¶ Only days into his second term, President Obama began the push for change.¶ "The time has come for common-sense, comprehensive immigration reform," he stated. "The time is now."¶ Already, Congress has begun to hold hearings.¶ And a bipartisan group of senators, including former Republican presidential candidate John McCain, is pushing ahead with a plan of its own.¶ "We have been too content for too long to allow individuals to mow our lawn, serve us food, clean our homes and even watch our children while not affording them any of the benefits that make our country so great," McCain said.¶ The bi-partisan plan calls for tighter border controls as well as a path to citizenship, something President Obama insists upon.¶ That worries Jim Gilchrist. He founded the Minuteman Project, a citizen's group that helps guard the border.¶ "If we are going to grant amnesty to 15 to 30-million people, who are here illegally now, we are going to be granting amnesty to 300 million," he added. "Who will follow them over the next several decades."¶ Other activists and lawmakers say proposals to secure the borders don't go far enough - even though the United States spends more money on immigration enforcement than on all other federal law enforcement activities combined.¶ In the meantime, the pressure is on - both President Obama and Congress.¶ Janet Murguia heads La Raza, the largest U.S. Hispanic civil rights and advocacy group. "The reality is that Hispanic and Latin voters went to the polls on election day with the economy on their minds, but with immigration reform in their hearts," she said.¶ With the State of the Union address as a platform, advocates on all sides of the issue are hoping something gets done, all too aware such hopes have been dashed before.

#### Obama has the upper hand now.

Reuters 2-4-13. www.reuters.com/article/2013/02/04/us-usa-immigration-idUSBRE9130V620130204

Obama is expected to use his February 12 State of the Union speech to Congress - a major annual address by the president in which he lays out his legislative priorities for the year - to keep the heat on Republicans, who appear more willing to accept an immigration overhaul after they were chastened by Latino voters' rejection in the November election.¶ But differences have emerged since Obama and a bipartisan Senate working "group of eight" rolled out their proposals last week aimed at the biggest U.S. immigration revamp in decades.¶ Obama wants to give America's 11 million illegal immigrants a clear process to achieve citizenship, including payment of fines, criminal background checks and going to the "back of the line" behind legal applicants. He has vowed to introduce his own bill if Congress fails to act in a timely fashion.¶ But top Republicans want to defer citizenship until the county's borders are deemed more secure - a linkage that Obama and most of his fellow Democrats would find hard to accept.¶ Obama's aides are confident the president has enough leverage to avoid giving ground - not least because they believe that if the reform effort fails in Congress, voters are more likely to blame the Republicans and they would suffer in the 2014 midterm congressional elections.

#### GOP coming on board now.

Merrills and Coffey 2-4. [Andrew, Justin, lawyers @ Ogletree Deakins, "Post-election immigration reform - What's at issue?" Lexology -- www.lexology.com/library/detail.aspx?g=fec318c5-d79a-4a70-8b8d-3ed17e59f65d]

The prospect of comprehensive immigration reform appears to be gaining momentum. On January 28, a bipartisan group of eight senators announced a broad proposal for immigration reform. Meanwhile, a similar bipartisan effort is underway in the House and, as this issue was going to press, it was expected that President Obama would announce his proposal for comprehensive immigration reform.¶ The Senate Proposal¶ The Senate proposal has four basic elements: (1) a path to legalization for illegal immigrants; (2) increased border security; (3) increased employer verification requirements; and (4) increased employment-based immigration. Illegal immigrants would pay monetary penalties to legalize but would not be eligible for permanent resident status until other enforcement-related measures are in place (such as increased border security).¶ The proposal would also increase certain types of employment-based immigration and allow individuals who have an advanced degree in science, technology, engineering, or mathematics from a U.S. university to obtain permanent resident status. The proposal includes increased fines and criminal penalties for employers that knowingly employ unauthorized workers.¶ Highlights of the proposal include:¶ Increased border security (additional unmanned drones, surveillance equipment, and border agents);¶ Entry-exit system to monitor visa overstays;¶ A commission to provide a recommendation as to whether increased border security measures have been completed;¶ A government registry for illegal immigrants who must pass background checks, pay fines, and back taxes in order to obtain temporary legal status (when increased border security measures are completed they can apply for permanent resident status behind others who have already applied);¶ A quicker path to legalization for foreign nationals that were brought to the United States as children;¶ A reduction in the immigrant visa backlogs for both family-based and employment-based immigration;¶ Permanent resident status for individuals who have an advanced degree in science, technology, engineering, or mathematics from U.S. universities;¶ Electronic verification of employment authorization and identity for new hires;¶ Increased fines and criminal penalties for employers that knowingly employ unauthorized workers;¶ Increased employment-based immigration where it can be demonstrated that employment of a foreign national would not displace U.S. workers;¶ Creation of an agricultural worker program;¶ Increased or decreased immigration for lower-skilled workers as needed depending on economic conditions; and¶ Permanent resident status for long-term employees who have contributed to the community and to the workplace.¶ Reaction from the White House¶ Initial reaction from the White House to the Senate’s proposal has been positive; and with a similar bipartisan effort underway in the House, the prospect of comprehensive immigration reform seems a possibility. President Obama has made comprehensive immigration reform a priority, referencing the idea in recent speeches including his inaugural address.¶ With approximately 70 percent of Latinos voting for Obama in the past election, Republicans appear to have become more receptive to a comprehensive overhaul of immigration laws. Latinos accounted for approximately 11 percent of the electorate in 2012 (up from eight percent in 2008) and this community has been especially important in key swing states, such as Florida, Colorado, Nevada, and New Mexico. More than two-thirds of exit polls were in favor of comprehensive immigration reform.¶ The perception is that Republicans have alienated the Latino community, the fastest-growing demographic group in the country, on the immigration issue. Immigration policy, largely overlooked during President Obama’s first term, has now re-emerged as a key issue as Republicans scurry to rebound from their election performance, motivated by the need to repair the electoral damage through comprehensive immigration reform.¶ The fact that Latinos cast significantly fewer votes for Mitt Romney than they had for previous Republican presidential candidates has led to an ostensible shift in the GOP’s position on immigration, forcing Republicans to reconsider their opposition to reform. In fact, following the election, many Republican Congressional Leaders (including House Speaker John Boehner), well aware of the election results, the polls, and demographic trends, have stepped forward to show support for comprehensive immigration reform.

# a/t: intrinsicness

# a/t: fights now

#### Obama has priced in the rest of his agenda and will get immigration done – a new contentious topic ruins his strategy

Zeleny 1-24. [Jeff, NYT political correspondent, “For Obama, am ambitious agenda faces ticking clock” IHT -- lexis]

The State of the Union address that Mr. Obama will deliver to Congress on Feb. 12 will offer the most definitive road map yet for how the White House will set priorities in his second term as well as how it intends to **avoid becoming mired in a heated debate over one contentious topic** to the detriment of the full agenda. ''There's no doubt you want to get off to a strong start, and we've got a pretty big dance card,'' said David Plouffe, a senior adviser to Mr. Obama who is leaving the White House this week. He ticked through a list of agenda items that included guns, immigration and fiscal issues, but he disputed the suggestion that one item would overtake the others. **''We clearly have this moment where we can get immigration done**,'' Mr. **Plouffe added**. ''If we don't get it done, then shame on us. We've got to seize this opportunity.''

# a/t: watered down

**capital’s key to keep it together**

**Helderman and Nakamura 1/25**, Rosalind S. Helderman covers Congress and politics for the Washington Post, staff writer for The Washington Post “Senators nearing agreement on broad immigration reform proposal,” 1/25, http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/senators-nearing-agreement-on-broad-immigration-reform-proposal/2013/01/25/950fb78a-6642-11e2-9e1b-07db1d2ccd5b\_story.html

But obstacles abound. For instance, Rubio has said he thinks immigrants who came to the country illegally should be able to earn a work permit but should be required to seek citizenship through existing avenues after those who have come here legally. Many Democrats and immigration advocates fear Rubio’s approach would result in wait-times stretching for decades, creating a class of permanent legal residents for whom the benefits of citizenship appear unattainable. They have pushed to create new pathways to citizenship specifically available to those who achieve legal residency as part of a reform effort. It is not yet clear whether the Senate group will endorse a mechanism allowing such people to eventually become citizens — something Obama is expected to champion. Schumer said it would be “relatively detailed” but would not “get down into the weeds.” A source close to Rubio said he joined the group in December at the request of other members only after they agreed their effort would line up with his own principles for reform. As a possible 2016 presidential contender widely trusted on the right, Rubio could be key to moving the bipartisan effort. Rubio and other Republicans have said they would prefer to split up a comprehensive immigration proposal into smaller bills that would be voted on separately, but the White House will pursue comprehensive legislation that seeks to reform the process in a single bill. “I doubt if there will be a macro, comprehensive bill,” said Sen. Johnny Isakson (R-Ga.), who supported the 2007 effort. “Anytime a bill’s more than 500 pages, people start getting suspicious. If it’s 2,000 pages, they go berserk.” But Schumer said Friday that a single package will be key for passage. “**We’ll not get it done in pieces**,” he said. “**Every time you do a piece, everyone says what about my piece, and you get more people opposing it.”** Eliseo Medina, secretary treasurer of the Service Employees International Union, which spent millions recruiting Hispanic voters last year, said immigration advocates expect Obama to be out front on the issue. “The president needs to lead and then the Republicans have a choice,” Medina said. “The best way to share the credit is for them to step up and engage and act together with the president.”

# a/t: rubio

**supports immigration now**

**Fitzgerald 2/8**¸ Sandy, writes for newsmax, ”Rubio's Mom Changed His Mind on Immigration,” 2/8, http://www.newsmax.com/Newsfront/rubio-immigration-stance-mother/2013/02/08/id/489536

Marco Rubio's softening stance toward immigration reform boils down to his mom, a new profile of the fast-rising Florida senator reveals. "Don't mess with the immigrants, my son," Oriales Garcia Rubio told her youngest son during a Dec. 21 phone call, Time magazine reports. Illegal immigrants, she said, are "human beings just like us, and they came for the same reasons we came. To work. To improve their lives." Rubio took his mother's words to heart, and says they are shaping his work on immigration. "I have to balance that humanity with reality," he said. "We have immigration laws. They have to be followed. But yeah, she reminded me that there¹s a human element to this as well. As a policymaker, you have to strike a balance." Mrs. Rubio came to the United States with her husband, and despite a hard life, they scraped together enough to send all four of their children to college. To this day, the senator takes his family and ethnic obligations seriously. Rubio himself came of age in west Miami, married the daughter of immigrants, and has emerged as the most influential voice on immigration. He is considered his party's chief player in wooing Hispanic voters ­while remaining conservative enough to remain a tea party favorite. The senator, having only been in Washington for two years, has already been chosen to give the party's response to President Barack Obama's State of the Union Address on Feb. 12 — ­ a speech he'll give in both English and Spanish. Rubio has also been mentioned as a potential presidential candidate in 2016, but he hasn't yet announced his intentions on the nation's top office. It's a decision that may hinge on whether his friend and fellow Floridian, Jeb Bush, decides to seek the nomination. Rubio now endorses a path to citizenship — something he once derided as "code for amnesty" — and that could alienate supporters who favor a tougher stance on illegal immigration.

# a/t: compartmentalized

#### Offshore drilling is controversial – Democrats hate it and it’ll cause a fight

Colman 1/3/13 (Zack, “Dems Raise Drilling Safety Concerns After Arctic Oil Rig Accident”)

Democrats and green groups are pushing the Obama administration to address offshore Arctic drilling concerns after a Shell oil rig ran aground earlier this week. Shell’s Kulluk rig grounded onto Sitkalidak Island in the Gulf of Alaska on Monday. The U.S. Coast Guard and Interior Department are investigating the incident. The accident arrives as Democratic lawmakers are already focusing on the safety of offshore oil-and-gas development, while Republicans are seeking to expand the practice. “The Coast Guard and Interior Department will be investigating the causes of this incident, so it's too soon to draw any firm conclusions. But as I've said before, I plan to look at drilling safety rules this year, to see if regulators are doing enough to make sure offshore drilling operations aren't putting lives or the environment at risk,” said Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee Chairman Ron Wyden (D-Ore.). The Kulluk episode is the latest in a string of Arctic mishaps for Shell. Its other Arctic drilling rig, the Noble Discoverer, also nearly grounded, and the firm’s blowout containment dome, the Arctic Challenger, failed safety tests. Shell in 2012 won federal permission to begin preliminary drilling in the Beaufort and Chukchi seas off Alaska’s coast. But a series of problems, such as failure to get final sign-offs on critical spill containment equipment, led regulators to withhold permission to drill into oil-bearing zones. Republicans, who say increasing offshore drilling would provide a boost for the economy, urged caution on indicting the oil company. “We need to find out exactly what happened and the extent of it,” House Natural Resources Chairman Doc Hastings (R-Wash.) told The Hill. But a group of liberal House Democrats who advocate energy efficiency and renewable energy said the Kulluk incident highlighted the risks of Arctic drilling. “The recent grounding of Shell’s Kulluk oil rig amplifies the risks of drilling in the Arctic. This is the latest in a series of alarming blunders,” the Sustainable Energy and Environment Coalition said in a Thursday statement. Green groups went a step further, calling on the Obama administration to withhold permits for offshore Arctic drilling. Environmental group Oceana sent a letter to Interior Secretary Ken Salazar on Thursday, calling on him to stop future drilling in the Arctic “to prevent the catastrophe that we have thus far avoided.” The Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) also plans to send a formal request to the White House asking for a halt to offshore Arctic permitting. “No matter how much Shell has poured into the Arctic drilling — and it has been a lot — it cannot make the effort anything but a terrifying gamble,” Chuck Clusen, director of national parks and Alaska projects with NRDC, said in a Thursday media call. Republicans resisted the idea of stopping Arctic drilling. Rep. John Fleming (R-La.) reflected on battling President Obama’s decision to impose a six-month freeze on new deepwater drilling permits in the Gulf of Mexico following the 2010 BP oil spill. The ban was formally lifted in October of 2010 but permits were not issued again until early 2011.

# a/t: fiat solves the link

**fiat doesn’t solve the link**

**a) fiat is minimally sufficient means – only 51 senators vote for the plan – the rest still backlash**

**b) nonsensical – the senators that oppose the plan would backlash later even if fiat means they voted for it**

**c) destroys neg ground – justifies fiating through other barriers guaranteeing solvency**

# a/t: plan bipart

#### Business interests are backing out of the Arctic – it’s too risk – means the plan gets no major lobbying push

Naidoo 10/3/12 (Kumi, “Drilling for Oil in the Arctic: The Risks Are Too Great for Companies to Take On”)

The floating ice cap of the Arctic has been shrinking at an alarming rate for several years, but [this year's melt was truly remarkable](http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2012/sep/19/arctic-ice-shrinks). The area of the Arctic Ocean covered in ice in the summer is now just half the size it was when satellite monitoring began three decades ago, with scientists now radically changing their predictions for when the entire ocean will be open water. It's refreshing to see that oil industry players, both current and former, have formed an unlikely chorus of collective opinion and are saying that drilling in the Arctic is a bad idea. An analysis of the combination of the cost and the risk of Arctic drilling is leading to the emergence of a new conventional wisdom. If corporate social responsibility (CSR) is to mean anything more than mere branding then there is a line beyond which the oil companies cannot go, and it is a line in the ice. When we launched the [Save the Arctic](http://www.savethearctic.org/) campaign at Rio+20, I shared the platform with Sir Richard Branson, who spoke eloquently on the urgent need to transition away from carbon fuels. Puma chairman, Jochen Zeitz, was one of the first to sign the [Greenpeace Arctic scroll](http://www.greenpeace.org.uk/blog/climate/together-we-can-save-arctic-20120621) that will next year be planted on the seabed 4km beneath the pole. Nick Butler, the former head of BP's expro division and Lord Browne's one-time right-hand man,[wrote in the Financial Times](http://blogs.ft.com/nick-butler/2012/09/19/shells-risky-play-in-the-arctic/?Authorised=false" \l "axzz28EacuFlY" \o ") that the setbacks Shell has suffered in the Arctic should cause it to pull out. "To abandon the Arctic project would not be an admission of technical failure, nor an act of submission to the environmentalists. It would be a statement of commercial common sense," Butler writes. Also [writing about Shell's Arctic venture](http://www.forbes.com/sites/matthewhulbert/2012/09/18/has-unconventional-production-peaked/), Forbes magazine commentator Matthew Hulbert, said: "There will be another 'Macondo moment' at some stage from unconventional plays. It's just a matter of where, when, and who." Macondo, of course, was the blowout that nearly crashed BP. Lloyd's of London warned companies not to "rush in [but instead to] step back and think carefully about the consequences of that action." The German bank WestLB announced it would not provide financing to any offshore oil or gas drilling in the region because the "risks and costs are simply too high." Then last week Christophe de Margerie, chief executive of oil giant Total, made an extraordinary intervention, warning the oil majors that Arctic drilling was bad business. "Oil on Greenland would be a disaster," he said. "A leak would do too much damage to the image of the company."

# a/t: wind ptc

# a/t: plan not piss off base

# a/t: pc not k/

**Capital key to comprehensive reform – fights over details can derail the whole package including high-skilled reform.**

PRI 1-29-13. www.pri.org/stories/politics-society/social-justice/comprehensive-immigration-reform-has-run-up-against-hurdles-in-the-past-12819.html

President Barack Obama has spoken a lot about the need for “comprehensive” immigration reform.¶ That means taking on a lot. Securing the border, providing more visas, protecting worker’s right, and figuring out how to deal with an estimated 11 million unauthorized immigrants living in the United States.¶ That’s a lot to sort out. Some argue, too much to take on at once, especially when the parties already agree on small pieces of the immigration debate¶ One of the downsides of this all-or-nothing approach is that a lot of the proposals that have bipartisan support don’t get done.¶ Consider agriculture, and the fruit and vegetable farms in Arizona and California.¶ “The existing workforce is approximately 70 percent illegal, or undocumented, or falsely documented workers,” said Tom Nasif, president of Western Growers, an association that represents fruit, vegetable, and nut farmers in Arizona and California.¶ Nasif arrived at that 70 percent figure from university and think tank studies, along with statistics from W-2 forms that have mismatched social security numbers.¶ Every farmer will insist they check documents before they hire anyone. But it’s well known that phony documents are rampant on American farms. It’s a risky game: Workers with fraudulent papers can get deported. The farmer can lose his workforce — and his harvest.¶ Politicians on both sides of the aisle agree that the system needs fixing. A bill in Congress called AgJobs has enjoyed bipartisan support. It offers a path to citizenship for undocumented agricultural workers and makes it easier for growers to hire temporary immigrant workers.¶ But the bill has died, mostly because politicians couldn’t reach a bigger compromise on the entire immigration problem.¶ Nasif said American agriculture can’t go on like this.¶ “When the legislature wants to act on a sticky issue, such as immigration reform, they can do it very quickly,” said Nasif, pointing to the example of Major League Baseball.¶ When baseball teams exceeded their visa allotments, Congress quickly made things right in 2006.¶ “We have an adequate supply of outstanding baseball players in the United States. And so if anyone is taking jobs Americans would love to have, it’s foreign baseball players,” Nasif said.¶ Nasif makes this point for effect, not because he wants foreign baseball players out of the country. Meanwhile, plenty of other interest groups want their own issues addressed as well. So-called “Dreamers,” young people brought to this country illegally by their parents as children, want a path to citizenship.¶ And then there are high-tech companies that want more visas granted to foreign engineers and scientists.¶ On tech worker and agricultural visas, Democrats and Republicans actually agree on key points. But as political scientist Mark Jones at Houston’s Rice University points out, politics over who gives up what, or who gets what, in a massive immigration debate can kill smaller bills. With the AgJobs bill, the Democrats blocked it.¶ “They don’t want to give away what they know is the one immigration reform that most Republicans want without getting something in return,” Jones said.¶ Of course, Republicans have stopped immigration-related bills that Democrats want too.¶ Frustrating, for many, but avoiding the piecemeal approach to immigration reform makes political sense to Edward Alden, a senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations.¶ “It’s a very tough tactical question and it always has been. And the reason has to do with the most difficult issue of all, which is: Do you do some kind of legalization for the 10 to 11 million unauthorized immigrants living in the United States?," he said. "And every time the discussion comes of doing immigration reform piecemeal, the problem is that that’s the issue that gets left to last. And if that’s the issue that left to last, it probably does not happen."¶ That’s why many people on the bottom of the food chain in America — undocumented immigrants — favor going after comprehensive reform during this presidential term.¶ “It’s harder to do, but it’s harder if we keep another four years separating families, thousands of families,” said Alain Cisneros, a community organizer in Houston with the Texas Organizing Project.¶ Cisneros said working immigrants without papers are basically trapped — they can’t return to their home countries to visit family and they’re afraid to speak out against abusive employers. When he came here, he worked as a janitor cleaning buildings in downtown Houston.¶ “Clean up every single night for hours," he said. "I see many, many people just come in and for any reason get fired. And the companies pay less, like in the black market. And (the workers) don’t receive protection for the time working.”¶ Cisneros said with comprehensive immigration reform, everybody’s rights and needs will be on the table.¶ Like many who follow the immigration debate, Jones said if comprehensive reform has a chance of passing, now is the time.¶ “In the end, I think a lot will depend on what type of priority President Obama and the Democratic Party give to comprehensive immigration reform. If he really does make this the healthcare reform of his second term, it’s likely to be passed,” he said.

**Presidential leadership shapes the agenda**

**Kuttner 11** (Robert, Senior Fellow – Demos and Co-editor – American Prospect, “Barack Obama's Theory of Power,” The American Prospect, 5-16, <http://prospect.org/cs/articles?article=barack_obamas_theory_of_power>)

As the political scientist Richard Neustadt observed in his classic work, Presidential Power, a book that had great influence on President John F. Kennedy, the essence of a president's power is "the power to persuade." Because our divided constitutional system does not allow the president to lead by commanding, presidents amass power by making strategic choices about when to use the latent authority of the presidency to move public and elite opinion and then use that added prestige as clout to move Congress. In one of Neustadt's classic case studies, Harry Truman, a president widely considered a lame duck, nonetheless persuaded the broad public and a Republican Congress in 1947-1948 that the Marshall Plan was a worthy idea.  As Neustadt and Burns both observed, though an American chief executive is weak by constitutional design, a president possesses several points of leverage. He can play an effective outside game, motivating and shaping public sentiment, making clear the differences between his values and those of his opposition, and using popular support to box in his opponents and move them in his direction. He can complement the outside bully pulpit with a nimble inside game, uniting his legislative party, bestowing or withholding benefits on opposition legislators, forcing them to take awkward votes, and using the veto. He can also enlist the support of interest groups to pressure Congress, and use media to validate his framing of choices. Done well, all of this signals leadership that often moves the public agenda.

**Political capital influences legislative outcomes**

**Sidlow and Henschen 8** - \*PhD, associate professor of political science at Eastern Michigan University \*\*PhD from OSU, professor at Eastern Michigan University (Edward and Beth, “America at Odds,” Cengage Learning, 2008, pg. 273, //deuce)

The expansion of the president’s legislative powers Congress has come to expect the president to develop a legislative program. From time to time the president submits special messages on certain subjects. These messages call on Congress to enact laws that the president thinks are necessary. The president also works closely with members of Congress to persuade them to support particular programs. The president writes, telephones, and meets with various congressional leaders to discuss pending bills. The president also sends aides to lobby on Capitol Hill. One study of the legislative process found that “no other single actor in the political system has quite the capability of the president to set agendas in given policy areas.” As one lobbyist told a researcher, “Obviously, when a president sends up a bill [to Congress], it takes first place in the queue. All other bills take second place. The Power to Persuade. The president’s political skills and ability to persuade others play a large role in determining the administrations success. According to Richard Neustadt, in his classic work entitled Presidential Power, “Presidential power is the power to persuade.”7 For all of the resources at the president’s disposal, the president still must rely on others if the administrations’ goals are to be accomplished. After three years in office, President Harry Truman made this remand about the powers of the president: “The president may have a great many powers given to him in the Constitution and may have certain powers under certain laws which are given to him by the Congress of the United States’ but the principal power that the president has is to bring people in and try to persuade them to do what they ought to do without persuasion. That’s what the powers of the president amount to.” For example, President Bush embarked on an ambitious legislative agenda following his reelection in 2004. His ability to win congressional support for his plans depended largely on his persuasive power. (As you will read in this chapter’s Perception versus Reality feature on page 274, however, President Bush did not rely solely on his persuasive powers to implement his agenda.) Persuasive powers are particularly important when divided government exists. If a president from one political party faces a Congress dominated by the other party, the president must overcome opposition than usual to get legislation passed

# winners win

**Obama can’t win off energy policy**

Eisler 12 (Matthew, Research Fellow at the Center for Contemporary History and Policy at the Chemical Heritage Foundation” 4/2)

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](http://news.nationalpost.com/2012/03/21/obama-angers-both-environmentalists-and-energy-companies-by-supporting-keystone-pipelines-south-leg/) 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](http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/22/us/politics/obama-to-promote-energy-policy-on-4-state-trip.html?_r=2&hp=&adxnnl=1&adxnnlx=1332342006-6OFWK5chxZ+cEgBTM7CcQw) 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](http://www.slate.com/articles/business/project_syndicate/2012/03/the_iran_israel_conflict_could_cause_another_global_recession_here_s_how_.html) 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.

**Obama’s Velcro**

**Nicholas and Hook 10** [Peter Nicholas and Janet Hook, Tribune Washington Bureau, “Obama the Velcro president,” <http://articles.latimes.com/2010/jul/30/nation/la-na-velcro-presidency-20100730>]

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."

**Political capital is finite**

**Marshall et al 11**, Bryan W, Miami University BRANDON C. PRINS University of Tennessee & Howard H. Baker, Jr. Center for Public Policy Power or Posturing? Policy Availability and Congressional Influence on U.S. Presidential Decisions to Use Force Presidential Studies Quarterly 41, no. 3 (September)

We argue that the more important effect of Congress occurs because presidents anticipate how the use of force may affect the larger congressional environment in which they inevitably have to operate (Brulé, Marshall, and Prins 2010). It may be true that presidents consider the chances that Congress will react to a specific use of force with countervailing tools, but even more importantly they anticipate the likelihood that a foreign conflict may damage (or advantage) their political fortunes elsewhere—in essence, the presidential calculus to use force factors in how such actions might shape their ability to achieve legislative priorities. To be clear, presidents can and do choose to use force and press for legislative initiatives in Congress. Taking unilateral actions in foreign policy does not preclude the president from working the legislative process on Capitol Hill. However, **political capital is finite so spending resources in one area lessens what the president can bring to bear in other areas.** That is, presidents consider the congressional environment in their decision to use force because their success at promoting policy change in either foreign or domestic affairs is largely determined by their relationship with Congress. Presidents do not make such decisions devoid of calculations regarding congressional preferences and behavior or how such decisions may influence their ability to achieve legislative objectives. This is true in large part because presidential behavior is motivated by multiple goals that are intimately tied to Congress. Presidents place a premium on passing legislative initiatives. The passage of policy is integral to their goals of reelection and enhancing their place in history (Canes-Wrone 2001; Moe 1985). Therefore, presidents seek to build and protect their relationship with Congress.

# a/t: not kill econ

**Immigration reform spurs 1.5 trillion growth in GDP.**

Escalona 1-24. [Alejandro, writer and editor, "Time Is Ripe for Immigration Reform" Huffington Post -- www.huffingtonpost.com/alejandro-escalona/time-for-immigration-reform\_b\_2533806.html]

As the U.S. economy continues to improve, there will be a greater need for labor and the deport-all approach to illegal immigration will start to subside. Our country should not have millions living in the shadows. It is a matter of national security, but also of economic opportunity.¶ In 2010, the Center for American Progress concluded that immigration reform would lead to a $1.5 trillion growth in gross domestic product over the next ten years. Legalized immigrants would buy homes and cars generating new revenues for the private sector and more taxes for governments.¶ Comprehensive immigration reform makes sense. Obama should work with Congress to approve a path to legalize those undocumented immigrants who work hard and have not committed serious crimes.

# decline causes war

**best studies go neg**

Royal ‘10 (Director of CTR Jedediah, Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction – U.S. Department of Defense, “Economic Integration, Economic Signaling and the Problem of Economic Crises”, Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal and Political Perspectives, Ed. Goldsmith and Brauer, p. 213-215)

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defence behaviour of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances Modelski and Thompson's (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous shocks such as economic crises could usher in a redistribution of relative power (see also Gilpin. 1981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation (Feaver, 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflict as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power (Werner. 1999). Separately, Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remain unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland's (1996, 2000) theory of trade expectations suggests that 'future expectation of trade' is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behaviour of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, if the expectations of future trade decline, particularly for difficult to replace items such as energy resources, the likelihood for conflict increases, as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states.4 Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write: The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favour. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self-reinforce each other. (Blomberg & Hess, 2002. p. 89) Economic decline has also been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism (Blomberg, Hess, & Weerapana, 2004), which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. "Diversionary theory" suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have increased incentives to fabricate external military conflicts to create a 'rally around the flag' effect. Wang (1996), DeRouen (1995). and Blomberg, Hess, and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997), Miller (1999), and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states, due to the fact that democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States, and thus weak Presidential popularity, are statistically linked to an increase in the use of force. In summary, recent economic scholarship positively correlates economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflict at systemic, dyadic and national levels.5 This implied connection between integration, crises and armed conflict has not featured prominently in the economic-security debate and deserves more attention.

# a/t: china/us not key

#### US growth spills over globally

Caploe ‘9 (David Caploe is CEO of the Singapore-incorporated American Centre for Applied Liberal Arts and Humanities in Asia., “Focus still on America to lead global recovery”, April 7, The Strait Times, lexis)

IN THE aftermath of the G-20 summit, most observers seem to have missed perhaps the most crucial statement of the entire event, made by United States President Barack Obama at his pre-conference meeting with British Prime Minister Gordon Brown: 'The world has become accustomed to the US being a voracious consumer market, the engine that drives a lot of economic growth worldwide,' he said. 'If there is going to be renewed growth, it just can't be the US as the engine.' While superficially sensible, this view is deeply problematic. To begin with, it ignores the fact that the global economy has in fact been 'America-centred' for more than 60 years. Countries - China, Japan, Canada, Brazil, Korea, Mexico and so on - either sell to the US or they sell to countries that sell to the US. This system has generally been advantageous for all concerned. America gained certain historically unprecedented benefits, but the system also enabled participating countries - first in Western Europe and Japan, and later, many in the Third World - to achieve undreamt-of prosperity. At the same time, this deep inter-connection between the US and the rest of the world also explains how the collapse of a relatively small sector of the US economy - 'sub-prime' housing, logarithmically exponentialised by Wall Street's ingenious chicanery - has cascaded into the worst global economic crisis since the Great Depression. To put it simply, Mr Obama doesn't seem to understand that there is no other engine for the world economy - and hasn't been for the last six decades. If the US does not drive global economic growth, growth is not going to happen. Thus, US policies to deal with the current crisis are critical not just domestically, but also to the entire world. Consequently, it is a matter of global concern that the Obama administration seems to be following Japan's 'model' from the 1990s: allowing major banks to avoid declaring massive losses openly and transparently, and so perpetuating 'zombie' banks - technically alive but in reality dead. As analysts like Nobel laureates Joseph Stiglitz and Paul Krugman have pointed out, the administration's unwillingness to confront US banks is the main reason why they are continuing their increasingly inexplicable credit freeze, thus ravaging the American and global economies.