### 2NC Politics 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.

#### **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.

### uq

will pass – recent negotiations have achieved breakthroughs none of their evidence assumes – that’s Binshteyn - prefer momentum – all their evidence is is a snapshot of the status quo

Will pass – Obama PC locking down key GOP senators

CNN Wire 3-2-13 (“5 things: What's next for Washington?,” Lexis)

Of all the issues Congress could tackle, immigration is seen as one of the most likely areas for progress. Both sides see a potential political benefit in hammering out a deal, and both sides are voluntarily at the negotiating table trying to work one out. "Send me a comprehensive immigration reform bill in the next few months and I will sign it right away," Obama said in his State of the Union address just over a month ago. The Republican response to his speech was delivered that night by Sen. Marco Rubio of Florida, one member of the bi-partisan Gang of Eight working behind the scenes to craft legislation. Rubio said immigration reform would be good for the economy. "We need a responsible, permanent solution to the problem of those who are here illegally," he said. "But first, we must follow through on the broken promises of the past to secure our borders and enforce our laws." The bipartisan effort nearly hit a snag when details of an Obama administration draft immigration proposal was published, but Obama phoned lawmakers and met with two Republicans in that Gang of Eight -- Sens. John McCain and Lindsey Graham -- at the White House in mid-February.

#### Will pass – momentum.

Korn 3-4. [Jennifer, Executive Director of the Hispanic Leadership Network. Previously, she served in President George W. Bush’s White House as Director of Hispanic Affairs, "New Momentum for immigration reform with conservatives leading the way" Fox News Latino -- latino.foxnews.com/latino/opinion/2013/03/04/new-momentum-for-immigration-reform-with-conservatives-leading-way/]

There is reason to be cautiously optimistic about the road that lies ahead toward immigration reform. After four years of inaction, the president is now focused on repairing his legacy with the Hispanic community. On the other hand, after the lessons learned from the 2012 presidential elections, a broad group of conservatives have embraced the concept of a long-lasting fix to our broken immigration system.¶ There is new momentum for immigration reform and conservatives are leading the way. This week, the Hispanic Leadership Network (HLN), a national organization that strives to engage Hispanics on center-right issues, launched an advocacy campaign in support of fixing our broken and antiquated immigration system. The campaign includes a six-figure ad buy on ABC, FOX, and Univision.¶ The ad, entitled “Be Part of the Solution,” features former Secretary of Commerce Carlos Gutierrez calling on Washington to pass immigration reform “that grows the economy and respects the rule of law.” Last month, Secretary Gutierrez resigned his senior position at Citigroup Inc. to become chairman of a pro-immigration reform super PAC. He will not only be an invaluable ally in HLN’s advocacy campaign, but a powerful force in his own right as the legislative process moves forward. ¶ HLN’s paid media campaign is only one of a series of initiatives aimed at growing our members across the nation and activating them to play a key role in the grassroots movement behind a bipartisan deal to fix our broken immigration system once and for all. HLN’s members support the work of the Senate, led by Senator Marco Rubio, to achieve a reform that addresses the main problems of our broken system — strengthening our southern border, overhauling our legal visa system, implementing a viable temporary worker program, and creating a fair but tough plan for earned legal status.¶ Also this week, HLN Co-Chair Jeb Bush will jump-start the public debate beyond the halls of Congress with the official launch of “Immigration Wars.” In the book, Governor Bush and constitutional lawyer Clint Bolick lay out a strategy to do away with all that is wrong with our current system and have a fresh, new start. “Immigration Wars” offers sensible advice to all conservatives. ¶ In the last few weeks, we have also been encouraged by the news of other conservative governors who have added their voices to the chorus advocating for immigration reform. Those include Governor Scott Walker of Wisconsin and Governor Bill Haslam of Tennessee. In calling for reform, it became evident that these leaders understand that immigration reform is needed to further our economic development.¶ In Washington, the push to overhaul our immigration system has now been embraced by the top brass of conservative congressional leaders, from Speaker John Boehner to former vice presidential candidate Paul Ryan. Across the nation, conservative governors are not only paying attention, but coming out in full force for reform. Even in the media, conservative commentators like Sean Hannity have jumped in the reform bandwagon. Lastly, and more importantly, poll after poll shows that there is an increasing appetite among conservative voters to see this issue resolved. ¶ This momentum and new appreciation for the changing face of our electorate should give conservatives in Congress the impetus to do what is morally right, economically wise, and politically prudent.

#### It’ll pass – Obama pushing.

Whitaker 3-6. [Morgan, segment producer @ MSNBC, "Obama is ‘pretty tenacious and he’s not about to give up now’" MSNBC -- tv.msnbc.com/2013/03/06/obama-is-pretty-tenacious-and-hes-not-about-to-give-up-now/]

The Violence Against Women Act is the first of many bills the president hopes to sign in his second term in office, including some big issues like immigration reform and the minimum wage. With the unparalleled obstructionism of Republicans in the 112th Congress, the president may need a new approach to win over his colleagues in the coming months and years. Wednesday night, that will include a small dinner with a handful of Republicans–including some of his sharpest critics like Senators Lindsey Graham and John McCain–but none of the leadership. Some believe the president is planning to appeal on an individual level, rather than bartering with top brass who aren’t always able to deliver enough votes to get bills passed to begin with.¶ When asked about that rumored new strategy, Jarrett said of the president, “He’ll do whatever it takes.”¶ “We’ll talk to whoever wants to come to the table and work with us in good faith,” she said “We have huge challenges… but there is nothing we can’t do with the American people behind us.”¶ Jarrett is hopeful that this step for women’s right is just the beginning. “We’re already seeing glimmers of light around comprehensive immigration reform,” she said. “We want to find those pathways where there is common ground and move forward.”¶ “The president as you know is pretty tenacious and he’s not about to give up now.”

### a/t: unions

evaluate uniqueness through the lens of political capital – there are obviously barriers to passage but pc can smooth them over

#### Unions pushing for reform now.

Wojcik 2-28. [John, labor editor, "Union leaders: Time is now for immigration reform" Peoples World -- peoplesworld.org/union-leaders-time-is-now-for-immigration-reform/]

The executive council of the AFL-CIO unanimously passed a resolution here Feb. 27 demanding that the Congress of the United States immediately pass immigration reform.¶ "In November, American voters soundly rejected the pro-corporate and anti-immigrant agenda advanced by those who have stood in the way of comprehensive immigration reform," the resolution said. "President Obama enters his second term with a mandate to fight for and pass immigration reform. Members of our unions, like the rest of the American public, strongly support reform that includes a road map to citizenship for aspiring Americans who love this country and call it home."¶ Randi Weingarten, president of the American Federation of Teachers, has been one of the most consistent voices in the trade union movement calling for immigration reform.¶ She discussed her opinions on the issue during a break in the executive council session yesterday.¶ "No matter how you look at this, it just makes sense," she said.¶ "First, the current immigration system adversely affects both native and foreign born workers in the United States.¶ "Whether its the realization that a nation made great by immigrants has a moral imperative to live up to our American values of democracy and opportunity, or because it's sound economic policy, or because it's just the right thing to do for hardworking families, reforming our immigration system makes sense."¶ Weingarten argued strongly for laws that protect immigrant workers in the United States. "When immigrant workers are paid below the markets rates, it drives down wages for all workers with similar skills," she said. "The best way to protect the jobs and wages of all workers is to apply strong labor standards equally. A worker's immigration status should be irrelevant."¶ She described how her union, three years ago, brought to light and helped end threats, extortion and other abuses of 350 Filipino teachers recruited to work in post-Katrina Louisiana.¶ "The AFT helped these teachers win a $4.5 million settlement against the unscrupulous recruitment agency. I shudder to think what would have happened to them without their union."¶ "Comprehensive immigration reform is a top priority for America's unions," said AFL-CIO president Richard Trumka in a sit-down with reporters at the executive council meeting yesterday.¶ "We've built a mobilization structure and we're out in force like we were in the presidential election and the health care fight," he added, "with one message - immigration reform now."¶ Maria Elena Durazo, the Los Angeles County Federation of Labor executive secretary-treasurer, said the AFL-CIO is going to hold major "launch events" over the next few weeks to "get the word out in every part of the country whether that be Miami, Chicago, or Seattle."¶ "Let no one doubt this, " she said. "I remind everyone about what unions did to pass health care reform and about what we did to first elect and then re-elect President Obama. Well that's what we will do to get this done." She said that the campaign for immigration reform will be " a major reflection of how we have transformed from an election to election mode to a year-round continuing campaign operation."¶ Trumka assured reporters who wanted to know whether there was any dissent among unions on immigration reform that "American's unions are all in on this." Only National ICE Council 118, an AFL-CIO affiliate which represents federal immigration agents, has called for expanded authority for its members to arrest and deport undocumented immigrants.

### a/t: thumpers

**Immigration reform on top of agenda – will pass – no thumpers.**

Berger 3-4. [Judson, journalist, "Recurring budget crises could put squeeze on Obama's second-term priorities" Fox News -- www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/03/04/recurring-budget-crises-could-put-squeeze-on-obama-second-term-priorities/]

Rep. Luis Gutierrez, D-Ill., a vocal advocate for immigration reform, voiced confidence Monday that the administration and Congress could handle the busy agenda. ¶ "The spirit of bipartisan cooperation that is keeping the immigration issue moving forward has not been poisoned by the sequester and budget stalemate, so far," he said in a statement. "The two sets of issues seem to exist in parallel universes where I can disagree with my Republican colleagues strenuously on budget matters, but still work with them effectively to eventually reach an immigration compromise. ... I remain extremely optimistic that immigration reform is going to happen this year." ¶ Immigration reform efforts are still marching along despite the budget drama. Obama met last week on the issue with Sens. John McCain, R-Ariz., and Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., who both are part of a bipartisan group crafting legislation. ¶ However, work on gun control before the Senate Judiciary Committee last week was postponed.

### Nichols and hook

**Obama’s Velcro – only blame will stick**

**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."

### PC Key

**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.”

**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

### Link

#### 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."

**Link Takes Out Solvency**

**Link alone takes out solvency- public opinion key to OCS production**

**Desselles, 11** -- Bureau of Ocean Energy Management resource evaluation chief

[Richard, U.S. Department of Interior, et al, "Offshore Oil and Gas Supply," 9-15-11, www.npc.org/Prudent\_Development-Topic\_Papers/1-3\_Offshore\_Oil\_and\_Gas\_Supply\_Paper.pdf, accessed 1-17-12, mss]

The resource and production estimates shown above indicate to some extent the importance of the previous moratoria areas for the potential expansion of oil and gas development in the US. Note that the estimates above are based on different models and assumptions. However, due to Deepwater Horizon event in the GOM, one must keep in mind that **adverse public sentiment** about offshore drilling and proactive government stance on restrictive development policies are likely to **hinder and** to **slow** the current trend of oil and gas development and production on the OCS.

### Link Extensions

#### Massive backlash from the East coast

Pallone, 12 – US House of Reps (D-NJ)

[Franke, "Hearing on Offshore Drilling," CQ Transcriptions, 5-9-12, l/n, accessed 1-31-13, mss]

Recently the department held a public listening session in Atlantic City, New Jersey, on the process leading to seismic testing. Local environmental organizations, fishermen, divers, and people from all over -- all backgrounds were there to oppose this decision. And I really call on the department to earnestly listen to the concerns and opposition. I -- I don't want to get into the comments you made about the West Coast, but it's certainly true that on the Atlantic Coast, there's **overwhelming opposition** to offshore drilling, and I don't really understand how you can say that, you know, you're -- you're listening to the people off the western coasts and saying they shouldn't be drilling there. Yet, when we do the same thing off the Atlantic Coast and say we shouldn't have drilling, then somehow it's going to be allowed here.

### AT: 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.

### Pakistan Frontline

#### Now their impacts- Pakistan

#### Multiple alt causes to Pakistan federalism- 1AC Author

Rais 9 (Dr Rasul Bakhsh Rais – Professor of Political Science in the Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, LUMS, , “The Balochistan Package; Redefining Federalism in Pakistan”, 2009, <http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=2&cad=rja&ved=0CCMQFjAB&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.forumfed.org%2Fen%2Fpubs%2Fpakistan%2FBalochistan%2520Package%2520paper%2520DrBakhshRais%2520LUMSfinalDec09.doc&ei=hUuZUM3MOpTo9gTGzIDwBQ&usg=AFQjCNFVJVwbn1RXEJ6OUzQYnuYMMzt-4Q&sig2=X4rfcoAc_tWOuVQqUZFmPw>)

Introduction Federalism, the constitutional distribution of power between the centre and the provinces, remains largely an unsettled issue in Pakistan for number of reasons. But chief among them is a historic tendency on the part of the federal governments, both military as well civilians, to assume greater responsibilities, and thus, greater powers than especially the smaller units in the federation would be comfortable with. From the very beginning, the political design of state and national building strategy placed greater trust and powers with the federal structure than the provinces, even ignoring their genuine identity, economic and political concerns. Far from achieving any meaningful integration, centralization of powers only alienated the provinces and resulted into disputes that involved use of force. The failure of keeping East Pakistan, now Bangladesh in the union, was primarily a failure in structuring a federal system that would balance the requirements of an effective national government with the aspirations of autonomy and self-empowerment of the provinces.

#### Their Sokolski card says the US has to increase economic assistance to Pakistan- aff doesn’t solve- 1AC author

Sokolski 9 (Henry, Executive Director of the Nonproliferation Policy Education Center, “PAKISTAN’S NUCLEAR FUTURE: REINING IN THE RISK,” Strategic Studies Institute, December, http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/pub963.pdf)

What, then, should the United States do? With regard to Pakistan reformulating its federal model, the United States might help to focus and condition economic assistance and freer access to U.S. markets and encourage Islamabad to foster greater equality among Pakistan’s key regions and ethnic and religious groups. One suggestion that this book’s authors discussed was giving each of Pakistan’s provinces greater power to promote trade directly with India and focusing foreign investment to expand such commerce. The aim here is to moderate Indian-Pakistani relations by bolstering Pakistan’s growing middle class. Pakistan, however, must take the first steps: If Islamabad does not want to reformulate its federal model to accommodate its various regions and ethnic and religious groups, Washington is in no position to help.

No Pakistani collapse

AP 10 (“Pakistan's stability, leadership under spotlight after floods and double dealing accusations,” August 6th, <http://www.foxnews.com/world/2010/08/06/pakistans-stability-leadership-spotlight-floods-double-dealing-accusations/>)

Not for the first time, Pakistan appears to be teetering on the edge with a government unable to cope. Floods are ravaging a country at war with al-Qaida and the Taliban. Riots, slayings and arson are gripping the largest city. Suggestions are flying that the intelligence agency is aiding Afghan insurgents. The crises raise questions about a nation crucial to U.S. hopes of success in Afghanistan and to the global campaign against Islamist militancy. Despite the recent headlines, few here see Pakistan in danger of collapse or being overrun by militants — a fear that had been expressed before the army fought back against insurgents advancing from their base in the Swat Valley early last year. From its birth in 1947, Pakistan has been dogged by military coups, corrupt and inefficient leaders, natural disasters, assassinations and civil unrest. Through it all, Pakistan has not prospered — but it survives. “There is plenty to be worried about, but also indications that when push comes to shove the state is able to respond," said Mosharraf Zaidi, an analyst and writer who has advised foreign governments on aid missions to Pakistan. "The military has many weaknesses, but it has done a reasonable job in relief efforts. There have been gaps in the response. But this is a developing a country, right?" The recent flooding came at a sensitive time for Pakistan, with Western doubts over its loyalty heightened by the leaking of U.S. military documents that strengthened suspicions the security establishment was supporting Afghan insurgents while receiving billions in Western aid. With few easy choices, the United States has made it clear it intends to stick with Pakistan. Indeed, it has used the floods to demonstrate its commitment to the country, rushing emergency assistance and dispatching helicopters to ferry the goods. The Pakistani government's response to the floods has been sharply criticized at home, especially since President Asif Ali Zardari departed for a European tour. With so many Pakistanis suffering, the trip has left the already weak and unpopular leader even more vulnerable politically. The flooding was triggered by what meteorologists said were "once-in-a-century" rains. The worst affected area is the northwest, a stronghold for Islamist militants. Parts of the northwest have seen army offensives over the last two years. Unless the people are helped quickly and the region is rebuilt, anger at the government could translate into support for the militants. At least one charity with suspected links to a militant outfit has established relief camps there. The extremism threat was highlighted by a suicide bombing in the main northwestern town of Peshawar on Wednesday. The bomber killed the head of the Frontier Constabulary, a paramilitary force in the northwest at the forefront of the terror fight. With authorities concentrating on flood relief, some officials have expressed concern that militants could regroup. The city of Karachi has seen militant violence and is rumored to be a hiding place for top Taliban and al-Qaida fighters. It has also been plagued by regular bouts of political and ethnic bloodletting since the 1980s, though it has been calmer in recent years. The latest violence erupted after the assassination of a leading member of the city's ruling party. More than 70 people have been killed in revenge attacks since then, paralyzing parts of the city of 16 million people. While serious, the unrest does not yet pose an immediate threat to the stability of the country. Although the U.S. is unpopular, there is little public support for the hardline Islamist rule espoused by the Taliban and their allies. Their small movement has been unable to control any Pakistani territory beyond the northwest, home to only about 20 million of the country's 175 million people.

**Deterrence prevents India/Pakistan conflict.**

**Tepperman ‘9** ( 9/7/2009 (John - journalist based in New York Cuty, Why obama should learn to love the bomb, Newsweek, p.lexis)

The record since then shows the same pattern repeating: nuclear-armed enemies slide toward war, then pull back, always for the same reasons. The best recent example is India and Pakistan, which fought three bloody wars after independence before acquiring their own nukes in 1998. Getting their hands on weapons of mass destruction didn't do anything to lessen their animosity. But it did dramatically mellow their behavior. Since acquiring atomic weapons, the two sides have never fought another war, despite severe provocations (like Pakistani-based terrorist attacks on India in 2001 and 2008). They have skirmished once. But during that flare-up, in Kashmir in 1999, both countries were careful to keep the fighting limited and to avoid threatening the other's vital interests. Sumit Ganguly, an Indiana University professor and co-author of the forthcoming India, Pakistan, and the Bomb, has found that on both sides, officials' thinking was strikingly similar to that of the Russians and Americans in 1962. The prospect of war brought Delhi and Islamabad face to face with a nuclear holocaust, and leaders on each side did what they had to do to avoid it.

#### Their usage of the Court turns their Pakistan impact- Their Khan 1AC author is a negative author- says Pakistan cited the US Supreme Court but that that was bad- proves the squo solves

Khan 11 (Amjad Mahmood, Senior Litigation Associate – Latham & Watkins LLP, Postgraduate Research Fellow – Harvard Law School, JD – Harvard Law School, “Misuse and Abuse of Legal Argument by Analogy in Transjudicial Communication: the Case of Zaheeruddin v. State,” Richmond Journal of Global Law & Business, 10(4), http://muslimwriters.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/khan\_10-4-2.pdf)

This article explores the risks and limits of transjudicial communication. In particular, I critique the scholarly contention that transjudicial communication can be built upon commonly accepted methods of legal reasoning. I argue that transnational courts do not uniformly understand or apply commonly accepted methods of legal reasoning, especially legal argument by analogy. As a result, transnational courts that utilize transjudicial communication can and do render specious, even destructive, judicial opinions. I analyze the case of Zaheeruddin v. State—a controversial decision by the Supreme Court of Pakistan that upheld the constitutionality of Pakistan’s antiblasphemy ordinances. The Supreme Court of Pakistan poorly analogized to numerous U.S. Supreme Court authorities to bolster and legitimize its deeply flawed decision. INTRODUCTION In his 2009 majority opinion in Graham v. Florida, U.S. Supreme Court Justice Anthony Kennedy cited to foreign law as persuasive authority to hold that life-without-parole sentences for juveniles convicted of non-homicide crimes were unconstitutional. 2 In his 2003 majority opinion in Lawrence v. Texas, Justice Kennedy cited a decision by the European Court of Human Rights as persuasive authority to hold that a Texas statute criminalizing acts of sodomy was unconstitutional. 3 The recent and rising trend of U.S. courts to rely on foreign law for constitutional adjudication, particularly for contentious issues, illustrates more generally the globalization of modern constitutionalism. Indeed, as legal problems become more common across more common law systems in the world, courts increasingly rely on the legal opinions of outside jurisdictions as a powerful source of persuasive authority. Professor Anne-Marie Slaughter describes such cross-court citation and deliberation on common legal problems as “transjudicial communication.” 4 Her typology suggests the relative merits of this communication and even describes its increasing trend as an emergence of a new and promising “global community of courts.” 5 Transjudicial communication, argues Slaughter, fosters cross-fertilization of legal ideas and becomes a “pillar of a compelling vision of global legal relations” where “national differences would be recognized, but would not obscure common legal problems nor block the adoption of foreign solutions.” 6 For Slaughter, what helps develop this cross-fertilization of legal ideas is a common judicial identity and legal methodology, including among other tools, common methods of legal reasoning across legal systems. 7 This article explores some of the risks and limits of transjudicial communication. I call into question Slaughter’s contention that common methods of legal reasoning necessarily advance cross-fertilization of ideas between courts of competing systems. I argue that transnational courts do not uniformly understand methods of legal reasoning. To this end, I focus my critique on one particular method of legal reasoning that Slaughter would deem to be “common” to transjudicial communication: legal argument by analogy. Proper legal argument by analogy is a less common, or a less consistently applied, judicial methodological tool to work with. To encourage transjudicial communication through legal argument by analogy is problematic not only because the mode of analogy itself is more rigorous than it appears, but also because legal argument by analogy carries special risks in the transjudicial setting. Part I details Slaughter’s typology of transjudicial communication. Part II introduces the basic principles and methodology underlying legal argument by analogy. Here, I contrast the views of two prominent scholars of jurisprudence—Professor Cass Sunstein and Professor Scott Brewer—concerning the rational force of legal argument by analogy. I also outline the basic problems associated with legal argument by analogy and highlight what Sunstein refers to as the “distinctive illogic of bad analogical reasoning.” 8 Finally, Part III illustrates the troubling consequences of poor analogical reasoning in the transjudicial context by way of an analysis of Zaheeruddin v. State 9 —a controversial and extant 1993 decision by the Supreme Court of Pakistan that relies principally on U.S. constitutional and trademark law as persuasive authority. PART I: SLAUGHTER’S TYPOLOGY OF TRANSJUDICIAL COMMUNICATION A. Horizontal and Vertical Communications Slaughter’s typology of transjudicial communication succinctly summarizes the characteristics and relative merits of certain courts citing and deferring to courts outside their national jurisdiction. She outlines two major types of transjudicial communication: horizontal and vertical. She defines horizontal communication as communication between courts of the same authority and stature across national and regional borders (e.g., the U.S. Supreme Court referencing decisions of the Supreme Court of Zimbabwe, or vice versa). 10 Horizontal communication consists of a court’s tacit emulation of a court of another jurisdiction by way of cross-citation of decisions. 11 Horizontal communication usually operates as a “monologue” where neither the originating nor the sharing court has any direct and formal links, nor do they directly converse with one another. 12 The originating court is wholly unaware that its views have a foreign audience; the listening court manufactures the foreign audience. Slaughter defines vertical communication as communication between courts of different statures across national and regional borders (e.g., the U.S. Supreme Court referencing decisions by the Inter- American Court, or vice versa). 13 Like horizontal communication, vertical communication consists of cross-citation between courts, but usually involves more formal deference on the part of a court of narrow jurisdiction towards a court of wider jurisdiction. Vertical communication can operate as a “dialogue” where both the originating and sharing courts recognize and acknowledge each other’s cross-citations. 14

### 2NC- Pakistan Alt Cause

#### Pakistani’s distrust the government- 1AC author

Rais 9 (Dr Rasul Bakhsh Rais – Professor of Political Science in the Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, LUMS, , “The Balochistan Package; Redefining Federalism in Pakistan”, 2009, <http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=2&cad=rja&ved=0CCMQFjAB&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.forumfed.org%2Fen%2Fpubs%2Fpakistan%2FBalochistan%2520Package%2520paper%2520DrBakhshRais%2520LUMSfinalDec09.doc&ei=hUuZUM3MOpTo9gTGzIDwBQ&usg=AFQjCNFVJVwbn1RXEJ6OUzQYnuYMMzt-4Q&sig2=X4rfcoAc_tWOuVQqUZFmPw>)

Balochistan presents another case of troubled federalism where the Baloch ethnic sentiments have repeatedly surged, showing deep distrust of the federal government over distribution of powers and rights over natural resources. At the moment, the province is going through a third insurgency in the past sixty-two years that adds tremendous difficulties for Pakistan’s security infrastructure that is struggling to put down the Taliban insurgency in the western tribal borderlands. Much of the problems that Pakistan is facing today are inherited troubled legacy of the military rule, including insurgency in Balochistan that both the character of the regime and its political manipulation triggered. Historically, military regimes have depended on centralizing agency of the armed forces, federal bureaucracy and selective political cooptation of provincial elites that accepted constitutional deviations. But that suppressed genuine political representation and pushed the democratic forces in the provinces to the sidelines, generating a deep feeling against the federal government and the Punjab, the largest province of the federation from where the great bulk of the armed forces is drawn. This is not to suggest that the civilian governments across the board have handled federal-province relations more prudently or have addressed provincial demands of more powers empathetically. Pakistan’s experience is patchy in this respect, but the democratic governments have inherently greater political capacity to negotiate, compromise and accommodate provincial rights than the military regimes.

#### Pakistani politicians aren’t federalist- no solvency

Rais 9 (Dr Rasul Bakhsh Rais – Professor of Political Science in the Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, LUMS, , “The Balochistan Package; Redefining Federalism in Pakistan”, 2009, <http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=2&cad=rja&ved=0CCMQFjAB&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.forumfed.org%2Fen%2Fpubs%2Fpakistan%2FBalochistan%2520Package%2520paper%2520DrBakhshRais%2520LUMSfinalDec09.doc&ei=hUuZUM3MOpTo9gTGzIDwBQ&usg=AFQjCNFVJVwbn1RXEJ6OUzQYnuYMMzt-4Q&sig2=X4rfcoAc_tWOuVQqUZFmPw>)

In the present case of Balochistan, the political debris that appears to be so toxic accumulated for a decade and mainly due to non-democratic and highly centralized military rule of Pervez Musharraf. On the contrary, in less than two years term, the elected government has taken first important steps, if not decisive or entirely to the satisfaction of Baloch nationalists. The first is the Balochistan Package that this paper focuses on, and the second, perhaps greater in significance, is a national consensus on the new National Finance commission Award. Our argument is that significance of handling the federal question in relation to Balochistan proactively and according to popular aspiration lies in three inter-related political facts. The first fact is Pakistan’s national character as a multi-ethnic society. But the understanding of this character needs to be more nuanced than many studies on this subject reflect. This multi-ethnic character is like a marble shape, more intricate, inter-woven and complex than is commonly understood or recognized. This development, that has taken place through migration, old and new, does not diminish the ethnic character of the provinces, their own ethnic mix notwithstanding. As it has become clearer through painful experiences, the issue of provincial rights is one Pakistan can ignore only at the cost of damaging the federation. The second political fact is that a multi-ethnic state like Pakistan requires a democratic, and consociational federal framework of governance, because many of the problems plaguing federal-province relations are about who exercises what political power. Democracy is a natural tool of handling ethnic diversity because popular participation gives peoples and their representatives a sense of ownership in the power structure and a stake in the political system, while federalism, in true spirit, would give them political, economic and cultural autonomy. As we know, the theoretical foundations of a federal system lie in the concept of dual sovereignty, as it creates two sets of political authority: an effective and efficient national government, and state or provincial governments with separate and well-defined areas of jurisdiction. Empirically, federalism has proved the best arrangement for ethnically diverse societies. Its recognition of social and political pluralism integrates different communities together in a single nationhood. Unfortunately, successive generations of politicians and policymakers in Pakistan have failed to demonstrate true understanding of ethnic pluralism and how to accommodate it in the political system. Maybe they understood the issue of ethnic diversity but fudged it by representing genuine ethnic and regional demands as opposed to the interests of the federation. This falsification had another sinister purpose: to legitimize themselves as true patriots while labeling ethnic leaders and groups as traitors. Pakistan’s national leaders, both civilian and military, never came to grips with the ethnic and regional realities of the country, which were presented as more of a problem than an opportunity to build inclusive, participatory nationalism. The use of religion to create national solidarity that would cut through ethnic identities was too idealistic to be a pragmatic solution to the real political problem.

#### Culture and ethnicity are alt causes

Rais 9 (Dr Rasul Bakhsh Rais – Professor of Political Science in the Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, LUMS, , “The Balochistan Package; Redefining Federalism in Pakistan”, 2009, <http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=2&cad=rja&ved=0CCMQFjAB&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.forumfed.org%2Fen%2Fpubs%2Fpakistan%2FBalochistan%2520Package%2520paper%2520DrBakhshRais%2520LUMSfinalDec09.doc&ei=hUuZUM3MOpTo9gTGzIDwBQ&usg=AFQjCNFVJVwbn1RXEJ6OUzQYnuYMMzt-4Q&sig2=X4rfcoAc_tWOuVQqUZFmPw>)

The third political fact is that ethnic identities of regional social groups are rooted deep in history, culture, language and folklore. The illusory assumption that these identities could be wished away or instantly substituted with another politically engineered identity was proved absolutely false in the case of East Pakistan. And if Pakistan continues to ignore the ethnic factor in reshaping federal political order, it will only add further pressures and demands on the political system that is already overloaded with demands and pressures. The problem is that most of Pakistani political leaders have been uncomfortable in recognizing ethnic identity as a legitimate human feeling. It is also lost on them that ethnic difference is and can be a legitimate basis on which regional groups can claim their share in national resources, power and decision-making. Ethnicity in Pakistan or in other countries is not inherently antagonistic to building a nation-state. Those who make the opposite argument are fixated on the European notion of culture-based nations, which were formed after many years of immeasurable bloodshed for powerful groups, often minorities, to impose their cultural hegemony on less fortunate, weaker groups. Most of the post-colonial states are ethnically diverse, and by necessity have to go through a painful process of adjustment, mutual accommodation and co-existence by mutual acknowledgement, respect and inclusive politics. Pakistan, compared to many other countries, has an ethnic complex more conducive to nation building than in many other places. It has many layers of integrative forces that it could have used, and still can intelligently use, in weaving a rich composite nationhood. Ethnic pluralism of the Indus valley region, that now forms the geographical core of Pakistan, historically was never separatist in orientation but rather interactive and integrationist for thousands of years under local kingdoms and great empires. There cannot be better evidence for this than in the historical pattern of migration and voluntary relocation of populations, regional commerce and trade. This historical pattern, which has continued over the past six decades, has further transformed the ethnic landscape of Pakistan into a marble shape that presents a diffused, patchy and inter-woven image of ethnic colors and cultures. This has happened, though, without any assistance from the country’s politics, which was divisive rather than integrative in its refusal to accept regional autonomy and ethnic rights as one of the guiding principles of Pakistan’s secular nationhood. Let me clarify the idea of secular nationhood: shared powers, responsibility and political significance among all regions and ethnic groups. Never in any situation is social diversity an obstruction to evolution into cohesive nationhood. It requires a different kind of politics, which must be dictated by the logic of ethnic diversity and built on the well established and widely practiced universal principles of federalism. It is a kind of national solidarity that needs to be built from below upward by listening to concerns and voices from the constituent regions; not by merely acknowledging them as rightful players but giving them a real say and a stake in national power and decision-making. The trust deficit that Pakistan has accumulated between the centre and the provinces is in proportion to defective national politics, which has not been appropriate for or responsive to the ethnic mosaic that is Pakistan. The successive authoritarian rules that Pakistan has been through for decades have alienated some ethnic groups, particularly the Balochis, fuelling anger and frustration among them. Military rule by nature has a centralizing tendency, and in Pakistan’s case, in popular regional perceptions, it has become associated with the dominance of the majority ethnic group, the Punjabis. It violated the spirit of federalism and the national consensus. It took Pakistan a quarter century to reach national consensus on the 1973 Constitution, somewhat settling the federal issue as the regional political parties accepted distribution of powers between the center and the provinces. But the successive regimes in Pakistan have not lived up to that promise, further eroding the trust of the provinces in the federation. The questions that we raise and try to answer in this paper generally relate to reshaping federalism with a focus on the Balochistan Package. The Package is part of larger efforts to transition centre-tilted cooperative federalism that Pakistan has practiced to a more balanced one that would address the grievances of the smaller provinces. In developing this line of argument we will raise the following questions regarding the Balochistan Package: Does it give a good political signal to the disaffected Baloch leaders about the willingness of the federation and the mainstream political parties to renegotiate centre-province relationship? Has the process of formulating the Package been inclusive? How is this package different from an earlier attempt in 2005? Why have Baloch nationalist parties rejected the Package? How likely the federation is to succeed in selling the package as a beginning of recognition of the rights of Balochistan and engage the Baloch leaders into a dialogue on resolving tricky issues of provincial autonomy, empowerment and rights of the provinces over their natural resources?

### 2NC- No Collapse

No impact to loose nukes even under their nightmare scenario

Tepperman 9—Deputy Editor at Newsweek. Frmr Deputy Managing Editor, Foreign Affairs. LLM, i-law, NYU. MA, jurisprudence, Oxford. (Jonathan, Why Obama Should Learn to Love the Bomb,http://jonathantepperman.com/Welcome\_files/nukes\_Final.pdf, )

Note – Michael Desch = prof, polsci, Notre Dame

As for Pakistan, it has taken numerous precautions to ensure that its own weapons are insulated from the country’s chaos, installing complicated firing mechanisms to prevent a launch by lone radicals, for example, and instituting special training and screening for its nuclear personnel to ensure they’re not infiltrated by extremists. Even if the Pakistani state did collapse entirely—the nightmare scenario— the chance of a Taliban bomb would still be remote. Desch argues that the idea that terrorists “could use these weapons radically underestimates the difficulty of actually operating a modern nuclear arsenal. These things need constant maintenance and they’re very easy to disable. So the idea that these things could be stuffed into a gunnysack and smuggled across the Rio Grande is preposterous.”