

Immigration – NCPA

Immigration 1nc

Immigration reform will pass – Obama and the GOP will come together despite budget battles – must have space for agreement – the plan prevents it

Reuters 1/4 http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/04/obama-second-term-plans_n_2411168.html

Obama has **promised to pursue** a broad second-term agenda focused on comprehensive **immigration reform**, bolstering domestic energy production, fighting climate change and gun control. **After the "fiscal cliff" deal**, **he** said he **would not curtail his agenda**

because of the looming budget fights. **"We can** settle this debate, or at the very least, **not allow it to be so all-**

consuming all the time that it stops us from meeting a host of other challenges that we face," Obama said on New Year's Day before boarding a flight to Hawaii to resume a holiday interrupted by the fiscal cliff fight. **"It's not just possible to do these things; it's an obligation to ourselves and to future generations,"** he said. **PRIMED FOR A FIGHT** **Republicans are primed for the coming fight**, believing they have more leverage against Obama than during the fiscal cliff battle. Failure to close a deal on the debt ceiling could mean a default on U.S. debt or another downgrade in the U.S. credit rating like the one after a similar showdown in 2011. **A failure to reach agreement on a government funding bill could mean another federal shutdown like brief ones in 1995 and 1996.** **Republicans say they will not back an increase in the federal debt ceiling without significant spending cuts** opposed by many Democrats, particularly to popular "entitlement" programs such as the government-funded Medicare and Medicaid healthcare plans for the elderly and poor. **"When you look at what's coming down the pike, it will make the fiscal cliff look like a day in Sunday school,"** said Democratic strategist Chris Kofinis. **"You're talking about a battle that's going to last weeks or months. If they get a deal, it's going to be ugly, it's going to be brutal. Once you get past that, where do you find the will to address**

other issues? It's going to be very hard," he said. **Administration officials promise to move quickly in** January in **pursuit of**

new legislation on gun control and **immigration**. The gun control effort will be led by Vice President Joe Biden, who was appointed to develop a response to the deadly Connecticut school shootings in December. **But what seemed to be fresh momentum for new measures such as a ban on assault rifles after the mass killing in Connecticut could be stalled by a protracted focus on the seemingly never-ending budget showdowns.** **Obama** also **plans to introduce**

comprehensive immigration legislation this month. Republicans will have fresh incentive on the issue after Hispanics soundly rejected Republican presidential contender Mitt Romney in the November election, giving Obama more than 70 percent of their vote. **But a Senate Republican leadership aide said economic issues would be the prime concern of Congress for months, pushing back consideration of gun control and immigration.** The aide blamed Obama. **"The lack of leadership on spending and debt has put us behind on a number of other issues. That is not something that can be resolved quickly,"** the aide said. **When blocked in Congress, Obama has shown a willingness to use executive orders and agency rules to make policy changes.** During last year's campaign, Obama ordered an end to deportations of young undocumented immigrants who came to the country as children and had never committed a crime. **This week, the Department of Homeland Security changed its rules to make it easier for undocumented immigrants to get a waiver allowing them to stay in the country as they seek permanent residency.** **With Republicans motivated to improve their standing with Hispanics,**

there is a chance Congress will work with the White House to pass an immigration bill that both bolsters border security and offers a pathway to legal status for undocumented immigrants who pay their back taxes and fines. **Finding the rare sweet spot**

where Obama and Republicans actually **agree on an issue could be the key to** second-term **legislative success.**

INSERT LINK

Political capital is key.

Dallas Morning News, 1-2-2013, p. www.dallasnews.com/opinion/editorials/20130102-editorial-actions-must-match-obamas-immigration-pledge.ece

The president's words to NBC's David Gregory **are only that — words. What will really matter is whether he puts his muscle into the task**

this year. We suggest that Obama start by looking at the example of former President George W. Bush. Back in 2006 and 2007, the Republican and his administration constantly worked Capitol Hill to pass a comprehensive plan. They failed, largely because Senate Republicans balked. But the opposition didn't stop the Bush White House from fully engaging Congress, including recalcitrant Republicans. Obama may have a similar problem with his own party. **The dirty little secret in the 2006 and 2007 immigration battles was that**

some **Democrats were content to let** Senate **Republicans kill the effort. Labor-friendly Democrats didn't want a bill, either. And they may not want one this year. That reluctance is a major reason the president needs to**

invest in this fight. He must figure out how to **bring** enough **Democrats along, while** also **reaching out to Republicans.**

In short, the nation doesn't need a repeat of the process through which the 2010 health care legislation was passed. Very few Republicans bought into the president's plan, leaving the Affordable Care Act open to partisan sniping throughout last year's election. **If**

the nation is going to create a saner immigration system, **both parties need to support substantial parts of an answer**. The new system must include a guest worker program for future immigrants and a way for illegal immigrants already living here to legalize their status over time. Some House Republicans will object to one or both of those reforms, so Speaker John Boehner must be persuasive about the need for a wholesale change. But **the leadership that matters most will come from the White House**. **The president has staked out the right position. Now he needs to present a bill and fight** this year **for a comprehensive solution**. Nothing but action will count. HE SAID IT ... "I've said that **fixing our broken immigration system is a top priority. I will introduce legislation** in the first year [of the second term] to get that done. I think we have talked about it long enough. We know how we can fix it. We can do it in a comprehensive way that the American people support. **That's something we should get done.**" President Barack **Obama**, in an interview on Meet the Press Sunday

Key to hegemony – both hard and soft power

Nye 12/10/12 (Joseph S. Nye, a former US assistant secretary of defense and chairman of the US National Intelligence Council, is University Professor at Harvard University, <http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/obama-needs-immigration-reform-to-maintain-america-s-strength-by-joseph-s--nye>,

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.

Extinction

Barnett 11 (Thomas P.M., Former Senior Strategic Researcher and Professor in the Warfare Analysis & Research Department, Center for Naval Warfare Studies, U.S. Naval War College American military geostrategist and Chief Analyst at Wikistrat., worked as the Assistant for Strategic Futures in the Office of Force Transformation in the Department of Defense, "The New Rules: Leadership Fatigue Puts U.S., and Globalization, at Crossroads," March 7,

Events in Libya are a further reminder for Americans that we stand at a crossroads in our continuing evolution as the world's sole full-service superpower. Unfortunately, we are increasingly seeking change without cost, and shirking from risk because we are tired of the responsibility. We don't know who we are anymore, and our president is a big part of that problem. Instead of leading us, he explains to us. Barack Obama would have us believe that he is practicing strategic patience. But many experts and ordinary citizens alike have concluded that he is actually beset by strategic incoherence -- in effect, a man overmatched by the job. It is worth first examining the larger picture: We live in a time of arguably the greatest structural change in the global order yet endured, with this historical moment's most amazing feature being its relative and absolute lack of mass violence. That is something to consider when Americans contemplate military intervention in Libya, because if we do take the step to prevent larger-scale killing by engaging in some killing of our own, we will not be adding to some fantastically imagined global death count stemming from the ongoing "megalomania" and "evil" of American "empire." We'll be engaging in the same sort of system-administering activity that has marked our stunningly successful stewardship of global order since World

War II. Let me be more blunt: As the guardian of globalization the U.S. military has been the greatest force for peace the world has ever known. Had America been removed from the global dynamics that governed the 20th century, the mass murder never would have ended. Indeed, it's entirely conceivable there would now be no identifiable human civilization left, once nuclear weapons entered the killing equation. But the world did not keep sliding down that path of perpetual war. Instead, America stepped up and changed everything by ushering in our now-perpetual great-power peace. We introduced the international liberal trade order known as globalization and played loyal Leviathan over its spread. What resulted was the collapse of empires, an explosion of democracy, the persistent spread of human rights, the liberation of women, the doubling of life expectancy, a roughly 10-fold increase in adjusted global GDP and a profound and persistent reduction in battle deaths from state-based conflicts. That is what American "hubris" actually delivered. Please remember that the next time some TV pundit sells you the image of "unbridled" American military power as the cause of global disorder instead of its cure. With self-deprecation bordering on self-loathing, we now imagine a post-American world that is anything but. Just watch who scatters and who steps up as the Facebook revolutions erupt across the Arab world. While we might imagine ourselves the status quo power, we remain the world's most vigorously revisionist force. As for the sheer "evil" that is our military-industrial complex, again, let's examine what the world looked like before that establishment reared its ugly head. The last great period of global structural change was the first half of the 20th century, a period that saw a death toll of about 100 million across two world wars. That comes to an average of 2 million deaths a year in a world of approximately 2 billion souls. Today, with far more comprehensive worldwide reporting, researchers report an average of less than 100,000 battle deaths annually in a world fast approaching 7 billion people. Though admittedly crude, these calculations suggest a 90 percent absolute drop and a 99 percent relative drop in deaths due to war. We are clearly headed for a world order characterized by multipolarity, something the American-birthed system was designed to both encourage and accommodate. But given how things turned out the last time we collectively faced such a fluid structure, we would do well to keep U.S. power, in all of its forms, deeply embedded in the geometry to come. To continue the historical survey, after salvaging Western Europe from its half-century of civil war, the U.S. emerged as the progenitor of a new, far more just form of globalization -- one based on actual free trade rather than colonialism. America then successfully replicated globalization further in East Asia over the second half of the 20th century, setting the stage for the Pacific Century now unfolding.

Uniqueness

2nc UQ wall

Immigration reform is Obama's top agenda item – bipartisanship emerging now and election will act as mandate to get it passed – that's Reuters

Obama pushing now – will have support

Fox News 1/13 "Obama to push for one-step, comprehensive immigration reform early in second term"

<http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/01/13/obama-to-push-for-comprehensive-immigration-reform-early-in-second-term/#ixzz2HylwRSow>

President **Obama seems ready to tackle** the illegal **immigration** issue in the coming months **and push Congress to act promptly** on comprehensive reform of U.S. policy, perhaps **laying out his plan in the coming weeks.** The president and Senate Democrats will propose the changes in a comprehensive bill, compared to some Republicans who want a more step-by-step reform, according to The New York Times.

Will pass – GOP support and guns/fiscal policies will not bounce it

Huffington Post 1/13 http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/13/obama-immigration_n_2468112.html

WASHINGTON, Jan 13 (Reuters) - President Barack **Obama is forging ahead on** a wide-ranging plan to overhaul the U.S.

immigration system early this year, including a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants already in the country, the New York Times reported on Sunday. **Obama wants to advance the plan even as he faces tough battles with Congress over fiscal issues and gun-control laws,** and may lay out his ideas during his annual State of the Union address on Feb. 12, the Times said, citing senior administration officials and lawmakers. **The president had made immigration reform a key promise for his second term,** and said in November after he won the election that **he expected a bill would be introduced in**

Congress shortly after his **January** inauguration. "We are still assessing our options, no decisions have been finalized and as a result it would be premature to speculate - reports to the contrary are inaccurate," a senior administration official told Reuters on Sunday. The Times said the immigration plan would require immigrants seeking to obtain legal status to pay fines and back-taxes, and would make it possible to pursue citizenship. The plan would require businesses to verify that new employees are in the country legally, and could create a guest-worker program for low-wage immigrants, the report said. It may also add visas to relieve backlogs and allow high-skilled immigrants to stay in the country, the Times said. Some analysts had expected that Obama's immigration reform plans could be delayed by fractious deficit talks with Congress, which face a series of critical deadlines in February and March. **Obama will need cooperation from Republicans, but they have acknowledged they need to address issues important to Latinos,** an influential voting bloc that voted heavily for Obama and his Democrats in the November election. Top Republican lawmaker John **Boehner** has **said he wants to see immigration reforms.** The House of Representatives passed a bill in November that would create a permanent visa program for foreigners with advanced science and technical degrees. The Times said a bipartisan group of senators led by Charles Schumer, a New York Democrat, and Lindsey Graham, a South Carolina Republican, would like to introduce comprehensive legislation as early as March, and hold a vote by August. **This is so important now to both parties that neither the fiscal cliff nor guns will get in**

the way, Schumer told the Times, saying talks were advancing quickly.

Obama pushing and efforts are already underway to build a compromise

Espo, 1/4 (David, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, 1/4/2013, "MORE FISCAL CLASHES LOOM A NEW CONGRESS BEGINS, STILL DIVIDED OVER FEDERAL DEFICIT," Factiva,

While neither Mr. Boehner nor Mr. Reid mentioned immigration in their opening-day speeches, Mr. Obama is expected to highlight the issue in the first State of the Union address of his new term. **Lawmakers are already working toward a compromise they hope can clear both houses.**

Passage likely – GOP support and momentum – prefer experts

MacAskill 1/6 (Ewen, "Barack Obama readies for host of reforms on Washington return", <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2013/jan/06/barack-obama-second-term-reforms>,

Norman **Ornstein, a widely respected analyst at** Washington's **American Enterprise Institute**, cautioned that second terms were usually less productive than first terms. Ornstein identified potential problems as "the continuing hold on the GOP [Grand Old Party] by the radical right, and the continuing dysfunction **in our politics**", and also the high expectations among the Democratic base. ¶ Ornstein, author of one of the best-received political books of the year, *It's Even Worse Than It Looks*, quickly **qualified** this gloomy assessment to add: "But that is not a surefire prediction that Obama will have a mediocre second term. **The election produced a new**

momentum for comprehensive immigration reform, which would be a major advance. There is, obviously, a new dynamic on gun control." ¶ Obama appears emboldened by his election victory, his confidence apparent around the White House and in his dealings with Republicans in Congress. ¶ The broad outlines of his second term are already taking shape. When he initially jotted down his list of aims, gun control was not on it. Now it is a central issue, with proposed legislation planned for early this year – opening the way for confrontation with the gun lobby as well as members of Congress, predominantly the Republican party. ¶ The start of the new Congress on 3 January was accompanied by a blizzard of proposed gun laws from Democrats, which include bans on automatic and semi-automatic weapons, a ban on large-capacity magazines (restricting the number of bullets to around half-a-dozen or so), and plugging loopholes that allow sales at gun shows without background checks. ¶ **Republicans are coming round to the prospect of immigration reform, having been punished by Latino voters.** A path to citizenship for the estimated 12 million undocumented immigrants may be a step too far for many Republicans but they could put into legislation the Dream Act, building on Obama's executive order legalising the position of young Latinos brought to the US illegally by their parents. ¶ Other priorities for a second term on the domestic front include steering the economy towards full recovery and consolidating healthcare reforms introduced in the first term but not due to start until 2014. ¶ On the foreign front, the biggest challenge remains Iran and the prospect of direct talks between the US and Iran, as reported in the *New York Times* before the election and denied at the time by the White House, seem in the offing. There is Syria, Israel-Palestine and winding down the war in Afghanistan. Also outstanding is his failure to fulfil pledge to close Guantánamo. He will also face pressure to reduce the number of drone strikes. ¶ If he manages to secure some foreign policy successes – adding to first-term achievements that include healthcare reform, ending the use of torture, recognition of gay service personnel in the military, and ending the war in Iraq – he could be well on his way to going down in history as one of the better Democratic presidents, up there with LBJ and Bill Clinton. ¶ Tom **Mann, a political analyst at the Brookings Institution and author of many books on the presidency and Congress**, including co-authoring *It's Even Worse Than It Looks*, **predicts Obama has a "decent chance" of achieving something on** gun violence and **immigration.**

Obama will push this month, will pass

Tom **Kludt**, "Report: Obama to Make Push for Immigration Reform this Month," TPM LIVEWIRE, 1--3--13, <http://livewire.talkingpointsmemo.com/entry/report-obama-to-make-push-for-immigration-reform>

President Barack **Obama is prepared to use his political capital to pursue immigration reform this month**, according to a report published Wednesday in the *Huffington Post*. ¶ The report cited an anonymous official in the Obama administration, who suggested that **the president is unlikely to be deterred by the protracted fiscal cliff debate that will be revisited in the coming months.** As such, **the administration will reportedly move quickly on** both **immigration reform** and gun control. ¶ The report also quoted an unnamed Senate Democratic aide, who gauged the likelihood of immigration reform to pass Congress. **Citing the fiscal cliff deal that passed the House of Representatives this week with a combination of Republican and Democratic votes, the aide expressed confidence that** House Speaker John **Boehner** (R-OH) **will be able to overcome expected opposition from the conservative wing** of his caucus. ¶ "He already did it with this fiscal issue, so I would not be surprised if when it came down to it he puts up a bill that **he just allows to go through with a combination of Democratic and Republican votes, without worrying about a majority of the majority**," the aide said.

2nc UQ – top priority

Top priority – but new issues will cause crowd-out

González 1/4/12 (and Dan Nowicki, “Cliff” fight, gun control pushing immigration reform out of spotlight”, <http://www.azcentral.com/news/politics/articles/20130103immigration-reform-at-crossroads.html>,

In an interview Sunday on NBC's "Meet the Press," **Obama reiterated** that **fixing** our broken **immigration** system **is a top priority**. "We've talked about it long enough," he said. ¶ **The overwhelming support Obama received from Latino voters in November** also **prompted many Republicans to call for immigration reform** in a bid to rehabilitate their party's negative image with Latinos. ¶ **But immigration reform has a long history of being sidetracked by other issues**. Health-care reform and fixing the economy knocked immigration reform off the table in 2009 and 2010. Now, spending cuts and gun control are threatening to derail immigration reform again. ¶ That's because **the window to pass immigration legislation is short**, analysts and immigration-reform advocates say. ¶ **If nothing happens this year, immigration reform may become too politically radioactive to tackle leading up to the 2014 congressional midterm election** and then the **2016 presidential election**.

Top priority – will invest all his PC

Peterson 1/3/13 (Hayley, “Obama will introduce broad immigration reform as early as January”, <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2256426/Obama-introduce-broad-immigration-reform-early-January.html>,

Now, **with his second election behind him, Obama is** again **pushing to make immigration a top priority** for his administration. ¶ **Fixing our broken immigration system is a top priority,** he said on NBC's 'Meet the Press' last week. Obama also **said** during the interview he would act quickly on passing new restrictions on firearms in 2013. ¶ **I'm going to be putting forward a package and I'm going to be putting my full weight behind it,** he said. 'I'm going to be making an argument to the American people about why this is important and why we have to do everything we can to make sure that something like what happened at Sandy Hook Elementary does not happen again.'

Top priority – won't be consumed by other fights

Timm 1/3 (Jane C, “With the cliff resolved, immigration back on the table”, <http://tv.msnbc.com/2013/01/03/with-the-cliff-resolved-immigration-back-on-the-table/>,

While gun control, taxes, and the fiscal cliff mess have dominated headlines, huge Latino turnout in the last election has not been lost on legislators and it's **only a matter of time** before there is **legislative efforts to reform immigration**. Republicans have voiced support in tackling immigration, but so far have only pledged piece-meal, zero-sum reform and special interests, like anti-immigration group Numbers USA, appear to be as strong as ever. And on a rare appearance on Meet the Press Sunday, **Obama suggested that an immigration overhaul was a “top priority”** for his next four years.

2nc top of docket

Immigration first, Obama pushing, capital key

ABC NEWS, "Analysis: 6 things Obama Needs to Do for Immigration Reform," 1--2--13, http://abcnews.go.com/ABC_Univision/News/things-president-obama-immigration-reform/story?id=18103115#.UOYgd5PjIJ8

On Sunday, President Barack **Obama said** that **immigration reform is a "top priority" on his agenda** and that he would introduce legislation in his first year. To find out what he needs to do to make reform a reality, we talked to Lynn Tramonte, the deputy director at America's Voice, a group that lobbies for immigration reform, and Muzaffar Chishti, the director of the New York office of the Migration Policy Institute, a think tank. Here's what we came up with. 1. Be a Leader During Obama's first term, bipartisan legislation never got off the ground. The president needs to do a better job leading the charge this time around, according to Chishti. "He has to make it clear that it's a high priority of his," he said. "He has to make it clear that **he'll use his bully pulpit and his political muscle to make it happen, and** he has to **be open to using his veto power**." His announcement this weekend is a step in that direction, but he needs to follow through. 2. Clear Space on the Agenda Political priorities aren't always dictated by the folks in D.C., as the tragic Connecticut school shooting shows us. While immigration had inertia after the election, the fiscal cliff and gun violence have been the most talked about issues around the Capitol in recent weeks. **The cliff could recede from view now that Congress has passed a bill, but** how quickly **the president** can resolve the other issues on his agenda **could determine whether immigration reform is possible** this year. "There's only limited oxygen in the room," Chishti said.

Yes Obama will push.

Oman Observer, 1-1-2013, p. main.omanobserver.com/node/136439

President Barack **Obama is pledging to focus in his second term on immigration reform**, boosting economic growth through infrastructure repair and energy policies that nod to environmental protection. The president is mired in a difficult fight with congressional Republicans to avoid sharp spending cuts and steep tax increases collectively referred to as the "fiscal cliff." However, **he** still **has a** longer-term **to-do list for his remaining four years in office**, he said in an interview on NBC's Meet the Press that was broadcast on Sunday. Obama, who won re-election in November after a campaign in which he succeeded in painting himself as a strong advocate for the middle class and those aspiring to join it, also promised in the interview to make a run at passing gun control legislation in the first year of his second term. "**Fixing our broken immigration system is a top priority," he said. He renewed a pledge to introduce legislation in the first year of his second term to get it done.** Immigration reform is a sensitive subject for the president, who failed to fulfil his promise to revamp the system during his first term. Latino voters were a critical part of the coalition that helped get him re-elected, a fact that may soften political opposition from Republicans, who are eager to bolster their support with that demographic group.

Top of agenda--Obama pushing hard

Igor Volsky, "Obama to Introduce Immigration Reform Bill in 2013," THINK PROGRESS, 12--30--12, <http://thinkprogress.org/justice/2012/12/30/1379841/obama-to-introduce-immigration-reform-bill-in-2013/>

President **Obama reiterated his call for comprehensive immigration reform** during an interview on Meet The Press, claiming that **the effort will be a top goal** in his second term. "**Fixing our broken immigration is a top priority**... I will introduce legislation in the first year to get that done," Obama said. Administration **officials** have **hinted that Obama will "begin an all-out drive for comprehensive immigration reform"**, including seeking a path to citizenship for 11 million undocumented immigrants, after Congress addresses the fiscal cliff. The Obama **administration's** "social media **blitz** will start in January" and is expected "to tap the same organizations and unions that helped get a record number of Latino voters to reelect the president." Cabinet secretaries and **lawmakers** from both parties **are already holding** initial meetings to iron out the details of the proposal and Obama will to push for a broad bill.

A2 no political capital

Prefer issue specific uniqueness

Yes political capital --- fiscal cliff victory.

Politico, 1-1-2013

While **Democrats** outside the West Wing **view**ed **the fight over the fiscal cliff as a win-win**, Obama's aides, ever leery of wasting political capital, saw it as a dangerous dilemma, and one that pulled the president in opposite directions simultaneously. To avoid going over the cliff and attracting blame for hiking taxes on millions of middle-class Americans, he needed to be a deal-maker, even at the risk of being accused of caving to GOP demands. But **to establish his authority for the fights ahead, he needed to be a back-breaker**, a role he has never embraced. **That his first major post-election decision sought a moderate, middle course** that triangulated between the extremes of both parties **comes as no surprise** to the people who have worked most closely with Obama. They expect him to be similarly on guns, immigration and entitlements -- no more prone to engage in fights he feels he can't win than he was before beating Mitt Romney. Obama said as much this weekend. "I remain optimistic, I'm just a congenital optimist, that eventually people kind of see the light. Winston Churchill used to say that we Americans, we try every other option before we finally do the right thing," he told Gregory. "I think that that's true for Congress as well. And I think it's also important for Americans to remember that politics has always been messy. People have been asking me a lot about the film 'Lincoln' --" Gregory interrupted to ask Obama if the fiscal cliff was "your Lincoln moment?" Obama -- who kicked off his 2008 campaign in the shadow of Lincoln at the Springfield, Ill., statehouse, bristled: "I never compare myself to Lincoln," he shot back. But he does have a president in mind, according to several people in his inner circle: Ronald **Reagan, who was able to leverage an improving economy and a strong victory into** a year or **more** of **muscular governance** after the 1984 campaign. And **a reasonable deal on the cliff**, even a middling, short-term New Year's Eve deal being floated to the consternation of liberals, **could set the stage**.

Yes capital

Kathleen Hennessey, LA Times, 12/29/12, www.latimes.com/news/politics/la-pn-obama-fiscal-cliff-vote-20121228,0,2652554.story

The move was meant to increase the political heat on Republicans, who opposed Obama's plan to allow taxes to rise on top earners. If no deal is reached, Republicans could find themselves in the position of blocking the legislation that would prevent the tax hike for most taxpayers. Obama delivered the same message Friday night, after a meeting with congressional leaders at which Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) and Senate Minority Leader Mitch **McConnell** (R-Ky.) **agreed to work together to try to reach a last-minute compromise to avoid the fiscal cliff**. "There's not much time, but there's still time to act," said Sen. Roy Blunt (R-Mo.), in the GOP address. "**The president will never have more political capital than he does right now**", and the next few days will begin to define his second term. **He was elected to lead.**"

Link

2nc generic link wall

New spending especially controversial—violates bipart spending agreement to keep the government running

Deidre Walsh, CNN, 9/11/12, Congress has little motivation for compromise before election, lexis

After a five-week summer recess, Congress returns to a long list of unfinished business, but with 57 left days before Election Day, it's likely it will tackle only the bare minimum in its short fall session. The one must-pass measure -- a

short-term continuing resolution to fund federal agencies -- will avoid any pre-election talk of a government shutdown, with which neither party wants to be tagged. Republican and Democratic leaders struck a deal this summer on a six-month bill, but both chambers still need to pass the legislation before government funding expires at the end of this month. The House is expected vote on the bill Thursday, and two GOP leadership aides predict it will get a sizable bipartisan majority. A senior Senate Democratic aide tells CNN the Senate is expected to approve the measure next week. Rep. Kevin McCarthy, the third-ranking GOP leader in the House, did not directly answer whether a majority of House Republicans would vote for the stopgap spending bill, but said, "I expect that bill to be a bipartisan vote, and I expect the Senate to pass it as well and not add anything to it." What could move -- It's possible that GOP and Democratic leaders could work out a deal on a farm bill to reform agriculture programs and provide some relief to drought-stricken states -- or at least agree to another short-term extension of the current law, according to multiple congressional aides. If they can't reconcile differences between the two varying approaches taken by the House and Senate, some money for drought assistance, plus some money for states affected by recent natural disasters, could be tacked onto the spending bill. McCarthy, who represents some agricultural interests in his California district, told reporters Monday he's still pressing to pass a bill before the election. He acknowledged to reporters on Capitol Hill that "the time frame is tough," but "it's our intent to get it done." -- The Senate will return and work on a veterans jobs bill this week. Senate Democrats are also considering action this month on a housing bill that President Barack Obama included on his congressional "to do" list earlier this summer, but House Republicans haven't expressed any desire to act on it. -- Some key provisions of the federal wiretapping bill known as FISA that was created after the 9/11 terror attacks under President George W. Bush are due to expire at the end of the year, and Congress is expected to pass an extension of the current law. House Republicans have slated a vote this week to renew the current law for another five years. Likely to be

punted. The roughly eight-week sprint to Election Day means several major measures that lawmakers have failed to make any progress on over the summer will continue to languish on Capitol Hill. These include some issues that both parties say they want to address but will have little motivation to compromise on: The renewal of the Violence Against Women Act, a bill providing new cybersecurity protections and legislation to reform the postal service, which recently defaulted on payments to the Treasury Department for employee health plans. In each case, the proposal favored by the GOP-led House is at odds with the bills in the Democrat-controlled Senate. A divided Congress means these issues will be punted into the lame duck session after the election, or even postponed until next year. Less legislating and more campaign messaging While there won't be much legislating, congressional aides say the messages from leaders and rank-and-file members on Capitol Hill will echo the campaign themes of Obama and GOP presidential candidate Mitt Romney, particularly when it comes to the economy and jobs. On his first post-convention stop in New Hampshire on Friday, Obama prodded voters to urge Congress to pass his jobs legislation. "If the Republicans are serious about being concerned about joblessness, we could create a million new jobs right now if Congress would pass the jobs plan that I sent to them a year ago -- jobs for teachers, jobs for construction workers, jobs for folks who have been looking for work for a long time. We can do that," Obama said. Kevin Smith, a spokesman for House Speaker John Boehner, emphasized that the House GOP has already approved legislation aimed at helping the economy. "The House has done its job. We've passed more than 30 jobs bills." Noting that House Republicans have also passed a bill to undo the automatic spending cuts scheduled to go into effect in January and extend all the current tax rates, Smith added, "We are ready to act on all of those measures if the president and Senate Democrats would show some courage to work with on those things with us." Romney continues to highlight the Obama administration's failed loan to the now-bankrupt energy company Solyndra. House Republicans will keep the issue out front with a vote this week on a bill to eliminate the federal loan guarantee program that funded several energy start-ups. Dubbed the "No more Solyndras Act," the GOP bill is expected to pass mostly along party lines, but won't move in the Senate. One open question is whether GOP vice presidential nominee Rep. Paul Ryan of Wisconsin will return to the Capitol for any part of the September session. Under Wisconsin law, Ryan is allowed to also run for his House seat, so he may feel pressure to take a break from barnstorming battleground states to vote on the bipartisan deal to keep the government funded. McCarthy told reporters Monday that Ryan would be back in Washington on Thursday to vote on the continuing resolution, and a Romney campaign official confirmed that. The six-month spending bill keeps the government funded at the level agreed to in last summer's debt deal -- \$1.047 trillion. But after criticism from a bloc of conservative House Republicans that the deal didn't cut spending fast enough, Ryan introduced a budget that moved the overall spending level about \$20 billion lower to \$1.028 trillion. That budget passed the House, but was immediately rejected by Senate Democrats as violating the bipartisan debt deal.

The roughly eight-week sprint to Election Day means several major measures that lawmakers have failed to make any progress on over the summer will continue to languish on Capitol Hill. These include some issues that both

parties say they want to address but will have little motivation to compromise on: The renewal of the Violence Against Women Act, a bill providing new cybersecurity protections and legislation to reform the postal service, which recently defaulted on payments to the Treasury Department for employee health plans. In each case, the proposal favored by the GOP-led House is at odds with the bills in the Democrat-controlled Senate. A divided Congress means these issues will be punted

into the lame duck session after the election, or even postponed until next year. Less legislating and more campaign messaging While there won't be much legislating, congressional aides say the messages from leaders and rank-and-file members on Capitol Hill will echo the campaign themes of Obama and GOP presidential candidate Mitt Romney, particularly when it comes to the economy and jobs. On his first post-convention stop in New Hampshire on Friday, Obama prodded voters to urge Congress to pass his jobs legislation. "If the Republicans are serious about being concerned about joblessness, we could create a million new jobs right now if Congress would pass the jobs plan that I sent to them a year ago -- jobs for teachers, jobs for construction workers, jobs for folks who have been looking for work for a long time. We can do that," Obama said. Kevin Smith, a spokesman for House Speaker John Boehner, emphasized that the House GOP has already approved legislation aimed at helping the economy. "The House has done its job. We've passed more than 30 jobs bills." Noting that House Republicans have also passed a bill to undo the automatic spending cuts scheduled to go into effect in January and extend all the current tax rates, Smith added, "We are ready to act on all of those measures if the president and Senate Democrats would show some courage to work with on those things with us." Romney continues to highlight the Obama administration's failed loan to the now-bankrupt energy company Solyndra. House Republicans will keep the issue out front with a vote this week on a bill to eliminate the federal loan guarantee program that funded several energy start-ups. Dubbed the "No more Solyndras Act," the GOP bill is expected to pass mostly along party lines, but won't move in the Senate. One open question is whether GOP vice presidential nominee Rep. Paul Ryan of Wisconsin will return to the Capitol for any part of the September session. Under Wisconsin law, Ryan is allowed to also run for his House seat, so he may feel pressure to take a break from barnstorming battleground states to vote on the bipartisan deal to keep the government funded. McCarthy told reporters Monday that Ryan would be back in Washington on Thursday to vote on the continuing resolution, and a Romney campaign official confirmed that. The six-month spending bill keeps the government funded at the level agreed to in last summer's debt deal -- \$1.047 trillion. But after criticism from a bloc of conservative House Republicans that the deal didn't cut spending fast enough, Ryan introduced a budget that moved the overall spending level about \$20 billion lower to \$1.028 trillion. That budget passed the House, but was immediately rejected by Senate Democrats as violating the bipartisan debt deal.

The six-month spending bill keeps the government funded at the level agreed to in last summer's debt deal -- \$1.047 trillion. But after criticism from a bloc of conservative House Republicans that the deal didn't cut spending fast enough, Ryan introduced a budget that moved the overall spending level about \$20 billion lower to \$1.028 trillion. That budget passed the House, but was immediately rejected by Senate Democrats as violating the bipartisan debt deal.

rejected by Senate Democrats as violating the bipartisan debt deal.

Kills an agreement

Bucci & Graham 12 (Steven Bucci, Senior Research Fellow for Defense and Homeland Security, The Heritage Foundation, Ph.D., M.A. International Relations, University of South Carolina, B.S. National Security, U.S. Military Academy at West Point, graduate of the U.S. Army War College, the Hellenic Army War College in Greece and the Senior Seminar of the Department of State; and Owen Graham, Research and Operations Coordinator for National Security and Foreign Policy, The Heritage Foundation, M.A. International Politics, B.A. International Studies, American University; “Sequestration’s Shadow on the Defense Industrial Base,” The Foundry, 7-13-2012, <http://blog.heritage.org/2012/07/13/sequestrations-shadow-on-the-defense-industrial-base/>)

So far, neither President Obama nor Senate Democrats have offered any concrete legislation to avert sequestration despite repeated statements from senior defense officials about its disastrous impact. As former Pentagon comptroller Dov Zakheim noted:¶ Despite the urgency of the sequester’s challenge, the administration continues to sit on its hands. No draft legislation has emerged from the White House that would at least postpone the sequester for a reasonable period to enable Congress to try its hand at another effort to reduce the deficit. The administration’s allies on the hill, particularly in the Senate, have been equally nonchalant about the coming programmatic and economic

disaster.¶ Second, **it is far from certain** that a so-called “grand **bargain**” to stave off sequestration **can be worked**

out among the House of Representatives, the Senate, and the President during the post-election lame-duck session of Congress. Indeed,

the agenda for the lame-duck session **is already becoming filled with** highly contentious and divisive

issues—in particular, expiration of the Bush tax cuts, expiration of the temporary payroll tax relief holiday, expiration of the annual “tax extenders” break, the Medicare “doc fix,” the farm bill reauthorization, the transportation bill reauthorization, the fiscal year 2013

appropriations bills, and the possible need to increase once again the federal debt ceiling—**that will reduce what little time**

there is for sequestration fixes to be considered.¶ Third, the outlines of the debate over the national debt have been well established, and there is little reason to believe that they will change. Both the President and congressional Democrats have repeatedly stated that they will not support any deal to resolve sequestration that does not include tax increases—an option viewed to be unpalatable to

congressional Republicans. Given the events of 2011 that gave rise to sequestration in the first place, **it remains to be seen**

whether conservatives and liberals will be able to **bridge** their **differences** during the brief lame-duck session.¶

2nc Crowd Out

Plan independently kills reform --- delay crowds out immigration.

ABC News, 1-2-2013, p. abcnews.go.com/ABC_Univision/News/things-president-obama-immigration-reform/story?id=18103115#.UOUq8onjkax

On Sunday, President Barack **Obama said that immigration reform is a "top priority"** on his agenda and that he would introduce legislation in his first year. **To** find out what he needs to do to **make reform a reality**, we talked to Lynn Tramonte, the deputy director at America's Voice, a group that lobbies for immigration reform, and Muzaffar Chishti, the director of the New York office of the Migration Policy Institute, a think tank. Here's what we came up with. 1. Be a Leader During Obama's first term, bipartisan legislation never got off the ground. The president needs to do a better job leading the charge this time around, according to Chishti. "He has to make it clear that it's a high priority of his," he said. "He has to make it clear that he'll use his bully pulpit and his political muscle to make it happen, and he has to be open to using his veto power." His announcement this weekend is a step in that direction, but he needs to follow through. 2. **Clear Space on the Agenda** Political priorities aren't always dictated by the folks in D.C., as the tragic Connecticut school shooting shows us. **While immigration had inertia after the election, the fiscal cliff and gun violence have been the most talked about issues** around the Capitol in recent weeks. The cliff could recede from view now that Congress has passed a bill, but **how quickly the president can resolve the other issues on his agenda could determine whether immigration reform is possible this year.** **"There's only limited oxygen in the room,"** Chishti said. 3. Choose an Approach The president has said that he plans to introduce his own immigration legislation in 2013. That's a strategic choice -- he could also wait for Democrats or Republicans in Congress to come up with a bill. Some Republicans, like Speaker of the House John Boehner, seem ready to cede leadership on the issue to the president. But that doesn't preclude Republicans in Congress from coming up with their own piece of legislation, and Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.), a strong voice on immigration in his party, recently met with reform champion Rep. Luis Gutiérrez (D-Ill.). Obama's decision to introduce his own bill could also have repercussions in the 2014 congressional elections. A liberal immigration bill could put Republicans in the position of either embracing the president's approach or adopting more restrictionist positions, as noted by The Daily Caller. Congressional Republicans could find themselves facing the same questions as Mitt Romney in whether to embrace reform or something like "self-deportation." 4. Acknowledge the Power of the Latino Vote What sort of policies should be included in a 2013 reform bill? An article in the Los Angeles Times earlier this month mentioned that the White House could pick up more than 300 pages of draft legislation that was developed during the first term. But that might not be as relevant today. The role that Latino voters played in the election -- and will continue to play in future elections -- has changed the game, according to Lynn Tramonte. The president and Congress need to "realize that the negotiating dynamic has changed on this issue," she says. "Democrats bring the votes to immigration reform but Republicans have the most to gain with it politically." Groups like America's Voice are hoping that means a better chance at passing a large-scale legalization program without the same level of increased enforcement that has been proposed as a trade-off in the past. "We've done a lot of enforcement, but what we haven't done is deal with the 11 million people without papers." 5. Keep a Clear Message Remember death panels? The claim started on Sarah Palin's Facebook page but became a headache for the Obama administration during the fight for healthcare reform (It was eventually awarded PoliFact's "Lie of the Year" for 2009). The president will need to focus on selling the core points of the bill -- which could be quite complicated overall -- and not get distracted by minutia and misinformation. "Something that happened in healthcare was that it was very confusing to Americans," Tramonte said. "They didn't know what was in the bill...Immigration has the potential to be much simpler." 6. **Move Quickly "Time is of the essence,"** according to Tramonte. **Members of Congress are always looking ahead to the next election, and some advocates think a reform bill will need to be introduced early in 2013 to have a chance. "I don't think it helps any issue stay out there in Congress** for a long time," Tramonte said. "Just get it off the table and move on to the next thing."

New fights drain oxygen from all other agenda items.

Daily Beast, 1-2-2013, p. www.thedailybeast.com/cheats/2013/01/02/obama-set-to-tackle-immigration.html

Get ready for the next big fight. President **Obama is planning to tackle immigration reform this January**, an anonymous official told the Huffington Post Wednesday. The source claims the White House will also be pushing for new gun-control laws in the coming months, despite upcoming deficit talks. **"The negative effect of this fiscal-cliff fiasco is that every time we become engaged in one of these fights, [there's no oxygen for anything else],"** the official said. The process for **immigration** reform certainly **won't be quick and painless**: it's expected that a bipartisan bill will be drafted in the next two months, and won't be voted on until a few months later.

2nc Political Capital Key

Capital key

DALLAS MORNING NEWS, editorial, "Actions Must Match Obama's Immigration Pledge," 1--2--13, <http://www.dallasnews.com/opinion/editorials/20130102-editorial-actions-must-match-obamas-immigration-pledge.ece>

President Barack **Obama** said all the right things Sunday about immigration reform. The president told NBC's Meet the Press that he **is serious about getting Congress to overhaul the laws governing immigrants**. He even declared that he will introduce an immigration bill this year. This newspaper welcomes that announcement. Texans particularly understand the unique challenges that an outdated immigration system presents. Even though the flow of illegal immigrants into the U.S. has subsided in the last few years, the many holes in the system leave families, schools, businesses and law enforcement struggling. And those are just some of the constituents challenged by flawed immigration laws. The president's words to NBC's David Gregory are only that — words. **What will really matter is whether he puts his muscle into the task** this year. We suggest that Obama start by looking at the example of former President George W. Bush. Back in 2006 and 2007, the Republican and his administration constantly worked Capitol Hill to pass a comprehensive plan. They failed, largely because Senate Republicans balked. But the opposition didn't stop the Bush White House from fully engaging Congress, including recalcitrant Republicans. **Obama may have a similar problem with his own party**. The dirty little secret in the 2006 and 2007 immigration battles was that some Democrats were content to let Senate Republicans kill the effort. **Labor-friendly Democrats didn't want a bill**, either. And they may not want one this year. **That reluctance is a major reason the president needs to invest in this fight**. He must figure out how to bring enough Democrats along, while also reaching out to Republicans. In short, the nation doesn't need a repeat of the process through which the 2010 health care legislation was passed. Very few Republicans bought into the president's plan, leaving the Affordable Care Act open to partisan sniping throughout last year's election. **If the nation is going to create a saner immigration system, both parties need to support substantial parts** of an answer. The new system must include a guest worker program for future immigrants and a way for illegal immigrants already living here to legalize their status over time. Some House Republicans will object to one or both of those reforms, so Speaker John Boehner must be persuasive about the need for a wholesale change. But **the leadership that matters most will come from the White House**. The president has staked out the right position. Now he needs to present a bill and fight this year for a comprehensive solution. Nothing but action will count.

Capital's key

Michael **Shifter**, President, Inter-American Dialogue, "Will Obama Kick the Can Down the Road," REVISTE IDEELE, 12--27--12, <http://www.thedialogue.org/page.cfm?pageID=32&pubID=3186>

Not surprisingly, **Obama has been explicit that reforming** the US's shameful and broken **immigration** system will be a top priority in his second term. There is every indication that **he intends to use some of his precious political capital** — especially in the first year — to push for serious change. The biggest lesson of the last election was that the "Latino vote" was decisive. No one doubts that it will be even more so in future elections. During the campaign, many Republicans -- inexplicably -- frightened immigrants with offensive rhetoric. But the day after the election, there was talk, in both parties, of comprehensive immigration reform. **Despite the sudden optimism** about immigration reform, there is, of course, no guarantee that it will happen. **It will require a lot of negotiation and deal-making. Obama will have to invest a lot of his time and political capital -- twisting some arms, even in his own party**. Resistance will not disappear. There is also a chance that something unexpected could happen that would put off consideration of immigration reform. Following the horrific massacre at a Connecticut elementary school on December 14, for example, public pressure understandably mounted for gun control, at least the ban of assault weapons. But a decision to pursue that measure -- though desperately needed -- would take away energy and time from other priorities like immigration.

Political capital key to immigration.

ABC News, 1-2-2013, p. abcnews.go.com/ABC_Univision/News/things-president-obama-immigration-reform/story?id=18103115#.UOUq8onjkax

On Sunday, President Barack **Obama said that immigration** reform **is a "top priority"** on his agenda **and that he would introduce legislation** in his first year. To find out what he needs to do to make reform a reality, we talked to Lynn Tramonte, the deputy director at America's Voice, a group that lobbies for immigration reform, and Muzaffar Chishti, the director of the

New York office of the Migration Policy Institute, a think tank. Here's what we came up with. 1. Be a Leader **During Obama's first term, bipartisan legislation never got off the ground. The president needs to** do a better job **leading the charge this time around**, according to Chishti. **"He has to make it clear that it's a high priority of his,"** he said. **"He has to make it clear that he'll use his bully pulpit and his political muscle to make it happen**, and he has to be open to using his veto power." His announcement this weekend is a step in that direction, but **he needs to follow through.**

Political capital key to immigration reform.

American Prospect, 12-29-2012

Address Immigration While **Obama was unable to make good on his promise of passing comprehensive immigration reform** in his first two years in office thanks to Republican stonewalling after passage of the Affordable Care Act, the president was able to offer some administrative relief to those left in legal limbo by our dysfunctional immigration system. In June of this year, the administration announced it would stop deporting undocumented immigrants who had been brought to the country through no fault of their own; before age 16; had graduated from high school, earned a GED, or served in the military; and had no criminal record. The move was widely seen as an effort to provide relief for undocumented youth after the DREAM Act, which would have given undocumented youth brought to the country by their parents a path to citizenship, failed to pass the Senate in 2010. The Department of Homeland Security also suspended its 287(g) program, which authorized local law-enforcement officials like Arizona's notorious Maricopa County Sheriff Joe Arpaio to enforce federal immigration laws. But none of these administrative measures scratches the surface of the problems with the immigration system, which include overburdened courts, deplorable conditions in immigrant-detention centers, draconian family-unification policies, insufficient work Visas and arbitrary Visa caps, years-long administrative delays, and per-country caps that do not reflect current economic and humanitarian demands. The dysfunction in our immigration system is largely the reason there are 12 million undocumented immigrants currently living in the U.S. **Buoyed by his re-election and with key Republicans eager to soften their image with Latino voters, Obama has a prime opportunity to modernize** our outdated and dysfunctional **immigration system. Doing so is** both savvy politically and **necessary from an economic and humanitarian standpoint: It will** redound to the president and his party's advantage; serve to **meet the needs of the agriculture and technology sectors, which rely heavily on immigrant labor; and provide humanitarian relief for those fleeing poverty** in their home countries. **While the president is sure to face stalwart opposition from hard-line anti-immigrant legislators, he only needs to rally his party behind him and win over** the support of **a critical mass of Republicans. Immigrant-rights groups are** rightly **pushing for the president to undertake** comprehensive immigration **reform** in 2013, **before his political capital begins to wane** and he **slips into the lame-duck twilight** of his presidency.

A2 Political irrelevant

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.

PC is key and finite—Congress will link unrelated issues

Haftel '11 (Yoram Z, Assist Prof, PhD @ Ohio State, “Delayed Ratification: The Domestic Fate of Bilateral Investment Treaties”, December, http://polisci.osu.edu/faculty/athompson/pdf/Delayed_Ratification_Dec2011.pdf,

Of course, leaders face many political obstacles that are not captured in the formal process of treaty ratification, and it is important to consider such constraints in addition to the specific hurdles governing treaty ratification. As one U.S. BIT negotiator explained, it is not just the ratification institutions that Washington takes into account in a partner, “it’s how freely the government functions.”³⁴ Like legislation and other policy initiatives, treaty ratification is subject to issue-linkage at the domestic level and often requires the expenditure of finite political capital, thus the executive must take into account these broader political dynamics when advocating for a treaty. For example, President Obama's efforts to secure Senate ratification of the new START treaty with Russia were held up by Republicans in Congress as part of a broad political strategy, not for reasons related to proliferation or national security. Partly for these reasons, and because executives may depend on legislatures and local governments to implement a treaty's provisions, the preferences of other domestic actors matter even when they do not play a formal role in ratification. In Canada, for example, the prime minister often seeks to “build a broad base of support for international treaties”³⁵—even though no such legal requirement exists.

Political capital is key and zero-sum— plan crowds-out _____ [also an a2 winners win]

Rottinghaus '10 – Assistant Professor of Political Science at U of H [Brandon, Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, U of H-Town, “The Provisional Pulpit: Modern Presidential Leadership of Public Opinion”, page number below,

Similarly, other issues (countervailing elements) may crowd out the president's agenda and complicate his ability to focus the media and public on an issue. An administration may miscalculate the ability of the political system

(especially Congress) to deal with multiple issues simultaneously, as in the case of the Kennedy administration and their pursuit of several policies at once in Congress in addition to Medicare. This phenomenon may reflect a lack of planning but also may reflect economic or electoral needs to rush passage of several pieces of legislation. The opposition (or support) from interest groups also plays a role, one that is important to evaluating the limits to presidential leadership, especially in modern presidential policymaking. More issues on the agenda mean more voices to compete with the president's message. As a result, especially in foreign policy cases, the president has less success when the issue has high salience, since more political activity is generated by more visible issues. The "size" of the president's agenda (or the number of issues concomitantly pursued) clearly has an effect on his ability to lead public opinion, especially related to his ability to sustain public attention to that agenda. A White House agenda is inherently limited, and, according to Paul Light, "the President's domestic agenda also reflects the allocation of resources, which often are fixed and limited." As the President moves through the term, each agenda choice commits some White House resources—time, energy, information, expertise, political capital." The restrictions that emerge in the modern presidency limit the resources presidents can devote to too many subjects—focusing on one single issue (at a time) is critical. This slow, "spoon feeding" approach is important because it allows for a timely digestion by the public and the media (and eventually Congress) rather than a rapid-fire, adversarial approach that may sour stomachs. The reality of limited resources directly connects to the conditional theory of presidential leadership that requires presidents to focus on single issues with intense focus. Indeed, there are several examples of how presidents fail to lead public opinion when too many issues are pursued at once or when a White House's laserlike focus on an issue enabled successful leadership. For instance, President Kennedy's rush to pursue several major pieces of legislation in 1961 and 1962 crowded the political agenda and complicated his ability to put the force of the White House's popularity behind his Medicare legislation. President Ford's inability to secure passage of his anti-inflation proposals was not aided by his own reluctance about the proposals (in that the proposal was eventually withdrawn), the White House's loose commitment to solving the inflation problem over the un-employment problem, and the rush of the plan to the media. On the other hand, President Reagan focused exclusively on tax and budget proposals in his first months in office and secured congressional passage of both pieces of legislation. Likewise, President Clinton's intense focus on the issue of the budget late in his first term allowed him to focus public attention early, commit the information resources of the White House, and effectively organize his troops for battle against an averse Congress. [page 193-195]

Yes vote switching—even due to unrelated legislation

Simes '10 – *publisher of the National Interest, Executive Director of The Nixon Center and Associate Publisher of The National Interest, served in the State Department from 2003 to 2005 [12/23, Dimitri and Paul Saunders, National Interest, "START of a Pyrrhic Victory?", <http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/start-pyrrhic-victory-4626>,

Had the lame-duck session not already been so contentious, this need not have been a particular problem. Several Senate Republicans indicated openness to supporting the treaty earlier in the session, including Senator Lindsey Graham and Senator John McCain. Senator Jon Kyl—seen by many as leading Republican opposition to the agreement—was actually quite careful to avoid saying that he opposed New START until almost immediately prior to the vote. Our own conversations with Republican Senate sources during the lame duck session suggested that several additional Republicans could have voted to ratify New START under other circumstances; Senator Lamar Alexander is quoted in the press as saying that Republican anger over unrelated legislation cost five to ten votes. By the time the Senate reached New START, earlier conduct by Senate Democrats and the White House had alienated many Republicans who could have voted for the treaty. That the administration secured thirteen Republican votes (including some from retiring Senators) for the treaty now—and had many more potentially within its grasp—makes clear what many had believed all along: it would not have been so difficult for President Obama to win the fourteen Republican votes needed for ratification in the new Senate, if he had been prepared to wait and to work more cooperatively with Senate Republicans. Senator Kerry's comment that "70 votes is yesterday's 95" ignores the reality that he and the White House could have secured many more than 70 votes had they handled the process differently and attempts to shift the blame for the low vote count onto Republicans.

Impact

2nc IMPACT overview – hegemony

Disad outweighs –

SPEED – immigration vote coming within weeks and will lock-in collapse of US economic power and cultural influence, crushing global hegemony – aff impacts are long-term and solved by future policymakers

SCOPE – hegemony controls and mitigates the escalation of all global conflict – collapses causes great power nuclear war – err neg since it's the only impact supported by history and statistics

1nc impact – competitiveness

Immigration reform key to competitiveness

Kinnari 12/29 Aaron, founder of the Future Forum a platform for educating and engaging young leaders on important global issues, Immigration Reform Would Be the Biggest Gift We Could Get This Year. 12/29/12. <http://www.policymic.com/articles/21633/immigration-reform-would-be-the-biggest-gift-we-could-get-this-year>.

When it takes session in January, the 113th Congress will have a number of critical issues that demand attention. There will be the potential fallout from the fiscal cliff, a new round of debt ceiling negotiations, and confirmation hearings for new cabinet secretaries, among others. But **there is one policy matter that, while complex and long elusive, enjoys broad calls for improvement and immense potential for impact. The greatest gift we could get next year from Washington would be a comprehensive effort to finally fix America's broken immigration system.**¶ **President Obama has signaled that immigration reform will be an early priority** for his Administration in 2013. He's not alone in calling for reform. The leading Republican presidential candidates all supported some elements of immigration reform, mostly focused on high-skilled labor and border security. And **congressional leaders from both sides of the aisle are also coming together, with a bipartisan group of senators already meeting to discuss the issue.**¶ A number of trade groups and research organizations from across industry and ideology have also signaled their support and have outlined the costs of inaction and benefits of reform. The U.S. Travel Association estimates that visa hurdles have resulted in a loss of 78 million foreign visitors over the past decade, resulting in the forfeiture of \$606 billion in spending and 500,000 American jobs every year. Tourism and hospitality companies, as well as agricultural businesses, also find it difficult to hire short-term or seasonal workers – positions that Americans are often unable or unwilling to fill. While they depend on these employees to meet consumer demand, businesses often face bureaucratic barriers that can make an application for a temporary H-2B visa take several weeks and cost thousands of dollars.¶ **Immigrants play important roles in America's high-tech sectors** as well but face similar obstacles. Researchers at Duke and UC Berkeley found that 25% of technology and engineering companies started between 1995 and 2005 had at least one immigrant key founder and those companies created more than 450,000 jobs. Another report by the American Enterprise Institute and the Partnership for a New American Economy found that **every foreign-born STEM graduate that stays in the U.S. creates 2.62 American jobs**. But despite their strong track record, the U.S. still lacks a visa for immigrant entrepreneurs, doesn't grant STEM graduates enough green cards, and doesn't have an adequate supply of H-1B visas for high-skilled immigrants.¶ And of course, a plan to address undocumented immigrants currently living in the United States must also be part of the fix. A recent poll demonstrates broad support for legalization, with 62% of Americans supporting a path to citizenship. And the Center for American Progress estimates that **legalizing the 11 million undocumented immigrants in the U.S. would result in a gain of \$1.5 trillion in GDP over 10 years.**¶ **The benefits are clear and the support for immigration reform is there.** The question that remains is what's the best strategy for Congress to pursue. Some argue for a piecemeal approach that would first address areas where there is broad support and potential for impact, and leave tougher questions for a later time. Given the political climate, this might seem like a practical path. But **a comprehensive package might actually be more viable.** Addressing challenges in silos would siphon support from those whose issues don't make the first cut. Therefore, **Congress must confront all components together – from a path to legalization to border security to a streamlined process for new immigrants – and leave enough room for the typical bartering that comes with political negotiations.** Past administrations and Congresses have tried to pass immigration reform and have failed. But **we can no longer afford inaction if America hopes to maintain its status as a global engine for innovation and a destination for hard-working talent from around the world.** If Washington can finally deliver a comprehensive package to fix our nation's broken immigration system, it will be the gift that will keep on giving for generations to come.

Solves great power war

Baru 9 Sanjaya is a Professor at the Lee Kuan Yew School in Singapore Geopolitical Implications of the Current Global Financial Crisis, Strategic Analysis, Volume 33, Issue 2 March 2009 , pages 163 – 168,

Hence, **economic policies and performance do have strategic consequences**.¹ In the modern era, the idea that **strong economic performance is the foundation of power** was argued most persuasively by historian Paul Kennedy. 'Victory (in war)', Kennedy claimed, 'has repeatedly gone to the side with more flourishing productive base.'² **Drawing attention to the interrelationships between economic wealth, technological innovation, and the ability of states to efficiently**

mobilize economic and technological resources for power projection and national defence. Kennedy argued that **nations that** were able to **better combine military and economic strength scored over others**. 'The fact remains', Kennedy argued, **that** all of the major shifts in the world's military-power balance have followed alterations in the productive balances; and further, that the **rising and falling** of the various empires and states in the international system **has been confirmed by** the outcomes of the **major Great Power wars**, where victory has always gone to the side with the greatest material resources'.⁴ In Kennedy's view, **the geopolitical consequences of an economic crisis, or even decline, would be transmitted through** a nation's **inability to find** adequate financial **resources to** simultaneously **sustain** economic growth and **military power**.

2nc overview – competitiveness

Competitiveness creates benign hegemony

Richard **Armitage**, Former Deputy Secretary of State, **and** Joseph **Nye**, Professor of Political Science at Harvard. 12-12-07. "Why So Angry, America?"

http://www.atimes.com/atimes/South_Asia/IL12Df01.html

The world is dissatisfied with American leadership. Shocked and frightened after September 11, 2001, we put forward an angry face to the globe, not one that reflected the more traditional American values of hope and optimism, tolerance and opportunity. This fearful approach

has hurt the United States' ability to bring allies to its cause, but it is not too late to change. **The nation should embrace a smarter strategy that blends our "hard" and "soft" power** - our ability to attract and persuade, as well as our ability to use economic and military might. Whether it is ending the crisis in Pakistan, winning the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, deterring Iran's and North Korea's nuclear ambitions, managing China's rise or improving the lives of those left behind by globalization, the US needs a broader, more balanced approach. Lest anyone think that this approach is weak or naive, remember that Defense Secretary Robert Gates used a major speech on November 26 "to make the case for strengthening our capacity to use 'soft' power and for better integrating it with 'hard' power". We - one Republican, one Democrat - have devoted our lives to promoting American pre-eminence as a force for good in the world. But the US cannot stay on top without strong and willing allies and partners. Over the past six years, too many people have confused sharing the burden with relinquishing power. In fact, when we let others help, we are extending US influence, not diminishing it. Since September 11, the war on terrorism has shaped this isolating outlook, becoming the central focus of US engagement with the world. The threat from terrorists with global reach is likely to be with us for decades. But unless they have weapons of mass destruction, groups such as al-Qaeda pose no existential threat to the US - unlike our old foes Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union. In fact, al-Qaeda and its ilk hope to defeat us by using our own strength against us. They hope that we will blunder, overreact and turn world opinion against us. This is a deliberately set trap, and one whose grave strategic consequences extend far beyond the costs this nation would suffer from any small-scale terrorist attack, no matter how individually tragic and collectively painful. We cannot return to a nearsighted pre-September 11 mindset that underestimated the al-Qaeda threat, but neither can we remain stuck in a narrow post-September 11 mindset that alienates much of the world. More broadly, when our words do not match our actions, we demean our character and moral standing. We cannot lecture others about democracy while we back dictators. We cannot denounce torture and waterboarding in other countries and condone it at home. We cannot allow Cuba's Guantanamo Bay or Iraq's Abu Ghraib to become the symbols of American power. The United States has long been the big kid on the block, and it will probably remain so for years to come. But its staying power has a great deal to do with whether it is perceived as a bully or a friend. States and non-state actors can better address today's challenges when they can draw in allies; those who alienate potential friends stand at greater risk. The past six years have demonstrated **that hard power alone cannot secure the nation's long-term goals**. The US military remains the best in the world, even after having been worn down from years of war. We will have to invest in people and materiel to maintain current levels of readiness; as a percentage of gross domestic product, US defense spending is actually well below Cold War levels. But an extra dollar spent on hard power will not necessarily bring an extra dollar's worth of security. After all, security threats are no longer simply military threats.

China is building two coal-fired power plants each week. US hard power will do little to curb this trend, but US-developed technology can make Chinese coal cleaner, which helps the environment and opens new markets for American industry. In a changing world, the US should become a smarter power by once again investing in the global good - by providing things that people and governments want but cannot attain without US leadership. By complementing US military and economic strength with greater investments in soft power, Washington can build the framework to tackle tough global challenges. We call this smart power. Smart power is not about getting the world to like us. It is about developing a strategy that balances our hard (coercive) power with our soft (attractive) power. During the Cold War, the US deterred Soviet aggression through investments in hard power. But as Gates noted late last month, US leaders also realized that "the nature of the conflict required us to develop key capabilities and institutions - many of them non-military". So the US used its soft power to rebuild Europe and Japan and to establish the norms and institutions that became the core of the international order for the past half-century. The Cold War ended under a barrage of hammers on the Berlin Wall rather than a barrage of artillery across the Fulda Gap precisely because of this integrated approach.

Heg decline causes multiple nuclear wars, systemic global instability, and magnifies all impacts

Niall **Ferguson**, Professor, History, School of Business, New York University and Senior Fellow, Hoover Institution, Stanford University, September-October **2004** ("A World Without Power" – Foreign Policy)

<http://www.hoover.org/publications/digest/3009996.html>

so **what is left? Waning empires. Religious revivals. Incipient anarchy. A coming retreat into fortified cities. These are the** Dark Age **experiences that a world without a hyperpower might quickly**

find itself reliving. The trouble is, of course, that this Dark Age would be an altogether more dangerous one than the Dark Age of the ninth century. For the world is much more populous--roughly 20 times more--so friction between the world's disparate "tribes" is bound to be more frequent. Technology has transformed production; now human societies depend not merely on freshwater and the harvest but also on supplies of fossil fuels that are known to be finite. **Tech**nology **has upgraded destruction**, too, **so it is now possible not just to sack a city but to obliterate it.** For more than two decades, globalization--the integration of world markets for commodities, labor, and capital--has raised living standards throughout the world, except where countries have shut themselves off from the process through tyranny or civil war. **The reversal of globalization**--which a new Dark Age would produce--**would certainly lead to economic stagnation and even depression.** As the **U**nited **S**tates **sought to protect itself** after a second September 11 devastates, say, Houston or Chicago, **it would inevitably become a less open society**, less hospitable for foreigners seeking to work, visit, or do business. Meanwhile, **as Europe's Muslim enclaves grew, Islamist extremists' infiltration** of the EU **would become irreversible, increasing trans-Atlantic tensions** over the Middle East **to the breaking point.** An **economic meltdown in China** **would plunge the Communist system into crisis**, unleashing the centrifugal forces that undermined previous Chinese empires. Western investors would lose out and conclude that lower returns at home are preferable to the risks of default abroad. The worst effects of the new Dark Age would be felt on the edges of the waning great powers. **The wealthiest ports of the global economy**--from New York to Rotterdam to Shanghai--**would become the targets of plunderers and pirates.** With ease, **terrorists could disrupt the freedom of the seas**, targeting oil tankers, aircraft carriers, and cruise liners, while Western nations frantically concentrated on making their airports secure. Meanwhile, **limited nuclear wars could devastate numerous regions, beginning in the Korean peninsula and Kashmir**, perhaps **ending** catastrophically **in the Middle East.** In Latin America, wretchedly poor citizens would seek solace in Evangelical Christianity imported by U.S. religious orders. In Africa, **the great plagues of AIDS and malaria would continue their deadly work.** The few remaining solvent airlines would simply suspend services to many cities in these continents; who would wish to leave their privately guarded safe havens to go there? For all these reasons, the prospect of an apolar world should frighten us today a great deal more than it frightened the heirs of Charlemagne. **If the United States retreats from global hegemony**--its fragile self-image dented by minor setbacks on the imperial frontier--its **critics** at home and abroad **must not pretend that they are ushering** in a new era of **multipolar harmony**, or even a return to the good old balance of power. Be careful what you wish for. **The alternative to unipolarity would not be multipolarity at all. It would be apolarity--a global vacuum of power. And far more dangerous forces than rival great powers would benefit from such a not-so-new world disorder.**

1nc impact – economy

Comprehensive reform key to US economic recovery

Garcia and Fitz 12/10 (Ann Garcia is a Research and Policy Associate for the Center for American Progress. Marshall Fitz is the Director of Immigration Policy at the Center, “Progressive Immigration Policies Will Strengthen the American Economy”, 2012,

<http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/immigration/news/2012/12/10/47406/progressive-immigration-policies-will-strengthen-the-american-economy/>,

Immigrants have been a critical part of the American economy since the founding of our nation, but they are even more important today as we look to the future of our economic recovery and our

economy. While Congress debates the economic strategy to restore our nation’s fiscal health, an opportunity is on the horizon that would maximize the human capital and talent of the nearly 40 million immigrants who call America home.¶ In order to reap the rewards of this talented and diverse labor pool, **we must develop a legislative solution to fix our nation’s broken immigration system. Immigration reform** that creates a pathway to earned legal status—and eventually to citizenship—for the undocumented immigrants living in our country while at the same time updating our legal immigration system **will** unleash the potential of immigrant workers and students to work, innovate, and **add hundreds of billions of dollars to the U.S. economy.**¶ Let’s review how progressive immigration policies can help make this happen.¶ Legalizing our nation’s undocumented immigrants¶ Legalizing the 11 million undocumented immigrants in the United States would add a cumulative \$1.5 trillion to the U.S. gross domestic product—the largest measure of economic growth—over 10 years. That’s because immigration reform that puts all workers on a level playing field would create a virtuous cycle in which legal status and labor rights exert upward pressure on the wages of both American and immigrant workers. Higher wages and even better jobs would translate into increased consumer purchasing power, which would benefit the U.S. economy as a whole.¶ The federal government would accrue \$4.5 billion to \$5.4 billion in additional net tax revenue over just three years if the 11 million undocumented immigrants were legalized.¶ The national advantage of legalizing the undocumented immigrants is obvious in the previous figures, but gains are also evident at the state level. The state of Texas, for example, would see a \$4.1 billion gain in tax revenue and the creation of 193,000 new jobs if its approximately 1.6 million undocumented immigrants were legalized.¶ States that have passed stringent immigration measures in an effort to curb the number of undocumented immigrants living in the state have hurt some of their key industries, which are held back due to inadequate access to qualified workers. A farmer in Alabama, where the state legislature passed the anti-immigration law H.B. 56 in 2011, for example, estimated that he lost up to \$300,000 in produce in 2011 because the undocumented farmworkers who had skillfully picked tomatoes from his vines in years prior had been forced to flee the state.¶ With nearly half of agricultural workers, 17 percent of construction workers, and 12 percent of food preparation workers nationwide lacking legal immigration status, it isn’t hard to see why a legalization program would benefit a wide range of industries. Business owners—from farmers to hotel chain owners—benefit from reliable and skilled laborers. A legalization program would ensure that they have them.¶ Passing the DREAM Act¶ Passing the DREAM Act—legislation that proposes to create a roadmap to citizenship for immigrants who came to the United States as children—would put 2.1 million young people on a pathway to legal status, adding \$329 billion to the American economy over the next two decades.¶ Legal status and the pursuit of higher education would create an aggregate 19 percent increase in earnings for DREAMers—young people who would benefit from passage of the DREAM Act—by 2030. The ripple effects of these increased wages would create \$181 billion in induced economic impact, 1.4 million new jobs, and \$10 billion in increased federal revenue.¶ Reforming the high-skilled immigration system¶ Creating a 21st century high-skilled immigration system—a system that accepts highly qualified immigrant workers when there is a demand that cannot be filled by American workers—would stimulate innovation, enhance competitiveness, and help cultivate a flexible, highly skilled U.S. workforce, while protecting American workers from globalization’s destabilizing effects.¶ The United States has always been and continues to be the nation where creative and talented individuals from around the world can come to realize their dreams, and our economy has significantly benefited from their innovation. In 2011 immigrant entrepreneurs were responsible for more than one in four new U.S. businesses, and immigrant businesses employ 1 in every 10 people working for private companies. Immigrants and their children founded forty percent of Fortune 500 companies. These Fortune 500 companies collectively generated \$4.2 trillion in revenue in 2010—more than the GDP of every country in the world except the United States, China, and Japan. Reforms that enhance legal immigration channels for high-skilled immigrants and entrepreneurs while protecting American workers and placing all high-skilled workers on a level playing field will promote economic growth, innovation, and workforce stability in the United States.¶ Our economy has benefited enormously from the talented immigrants who come here to study. Upon graduation, however, immigrant students face the tough choice between returning home and finding an employer to sponsor their entry into a visa lottery that may allow them to stay and work. Reforming the high-skilled immigration system would allow us to reap the benefits of having subsidized the education and training of these future job creators as immigrant students graduate and go on to work at our nation’s companies, contributing directly and immediately to our nation’s competitiveness in the global market.¶ Significant reform of the high-skilled immigration system would benefit certain industries that require high-skilled workers, such as the high-tech manufacturing and information technology industries. Immigrants make up 23 percent of the labor force in both of these industries and are more highly educated, on average, than the native-born Americans working in these industries. Still, immigrants working in science, technology, engineering, and math fields in the United States complement, rather than compete with, American workers. For every immigrant who earns an advanced degree in one of these fields at a U.S. university, 2.62 American jobs are created. By focusing on drawing human capital to our country and retaining it, Congress can help ensure that key sectors of our economy have an adequate labor pool to draw from and can boost our collective economic potential.¶ Our economy has much to

gain from reforming our broken immigration system. But **the biggest rewards will only be realized if Congress approaches immigration reform as an economic opportunity** to be seized rather than an enforcement problem to be solved. **Legislation that deals comprehensively with the issue** by putting the nation's undocumented immigrants, including DREAMers, on a path to citizenship while also reforming the high-skilled immigration system **will strengthen the nation's economy** while increasing prosperity for all Americans.

US economic collapse emboldens adversaries – ensures global warfare

Lieberthal and O'Hanlon, Director of the China center and Director of research at Brookings, **12** (7/10, The Real National Security Threat: America's Debt, www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2012/07/10-economy-foreign-policy-lieberthal-ohanlon)

Lastly, **American economic weakness undercuts U.S. leadership abroad. Other countries sense our weakness and wonder about our purported decline. If this perception becomes more widespread**, and the case that we are in decline becomes more persuasive, **countries will begin to take actions that reflect their skepticism about America's future. Allies and friends will doubt our commitment** and may pursue nuclear weapons for their own security, for example; **adversaries will sense opportunity and be less restrained in throwing around their weight** in their own neighborhoods. **The crucial Persian Gulf and Western Pacific regions will likely become less stable. Major war will become more likely.** When running for president last time, **Obama** eloquently **articulated big foreign policy visions**: healing America's breach with the Muslim world, controlling global climate change, dramatically curbing global poverty through development aid, moving toward a world free of nuclear weapons. These were, and remain, worthy if elusive goals. **However, for Obama or his successor**, there is now **a much more urgent big-picture issue: restoring U.S. economic strength. Nothing else is really possible if that fundamental prerequisite to effective foreign policy is not reestablished.**

2nc overview – economy

Biggest, quickest internal link

Hinojosa-Ojeda 12 – Founding Director of the North American Integration and Development Center at the University of California, Los Angeles

(Raúl, “The Economic Benefits of Comprehensive Immigration Reform”, Cato Institute, Winter, online, The Economic Benefits of Comprehensive Immigration Reform) The results of our modeling suggest that Comprehensive Immigration Reform **would increase U.S. GDP by at least 0.84 percent per year**. Using 10-year GDP projections prepared by the Congressional Budget Office, this translates into a steadily increasing amount of added annual GDP over the coming decade. **The 10-year total is at least \$1.5 trillion in added GDP**, which includes roughly \$1.2 trillion in additional consumption and \$256 billion in additional investment. Comprehensive Immigration reform **brings substantial economic gains even in the short run**—during the first three years following legalization. The real wages of newly legalized workers increase by roughly \$4,400 per year among those in less-skilled jobs during the first three years of implementation, and \$6,185 per year for those in higher-skilled jobs. The higher earning power of newly legalized workers translates into an increase in net personal income of \$30 billion to \$36 billion, which would generate \$4.5 to \$5.4 billion in additional net tax revenue nationally, enough to support 750,000 to 900,000 new jobs. Ultimately, only the federal government can resolve the status of the undocumented. But for the purposes of our analysis, we examine what would happen on a state and county level if local workforces were fully legalized through comprehensive immigration reform. In California, which faces a \$25.4 billion budget shortfall in 2011–12, this scenario would lead to a \$27 billion increase in labor income (pre-tax salary and wage earnings) that would generate a \$5.3 billion boost in tax revenue for the state and add 633,000 desperately needed jobs to the economy. In Los Angeles County, labor income would increase \$10 billion through legalization, leading to \$1.9 billion in additional net tax revenue and 211,000 new jobs. In Arizona, the same legalization scheme would generate \$5.6 billion more in labor income, leading to \$1.68 billion in tax revenue and an additional 261,000 jobs. The wages of native-born workers also increase under the comprehensive immigration reform scenario because the “wage floor” rises for all workers—particularly in industries where large numbers of easily exploited, low-wage, unauthorized immigrants currently work. Wages for native-born U.S. workers increase by roughly \$162 per year for the less-skilled and \$74 per year for the higher-skilled. Under the temporary worker program scenario, wages fall for both less-skilled and higher-skilled native-born U.S. workers. And under the mass deportation scenario, wages for less-skilled native-born workers actually rise, but only at the cost of significantly fewer jobs as the economy contracts and investment declines. The cost of this scheme to local economies, however, is staggering. If California’s workforce were depleted by mass deportation, the resulting contraction of the economy would mean a loss of \$176 billion in labor income and a reduction in gross product of \$300 billion, or 17 percent of the state economy. As a result, 3.6 million jobs would be lost. Los Angeles County would be even harder hit, with the \$60.1 billion loss in labor income causing a 22 percent reduction in the local economy and the loss of 1.2 million jobs. Arizona’s case is almost as severe, with the \$29.5 billion the state would lose in labor income as a result of mass deportation and the \$48.8 billion reduction in gross product representing a 20 percent depletion of the economy and the loss of 581,000 jobs. **The benefits of additional U.S. GDP growth under the comprehensive immigration reform scenario are spread very broadly throughout the U.S. economy, with virtually every sector expanding.** Particularly large increases occur in immigrant-heavy industries such as textiles, ferrous metals, transportation equipment, electronic equipment, motor vehicles and parts, nonelectric machinery and equipment, capital goods, mineral products, and construction. In comparison, every sector experiences significantly smaller gains under the temporary worker scenario, while every sector contracts under the mass deportation scenario. Conclusion The experience of IRCA and the results of our modeling both indicate that **legalizing currently unauthorized immigrants and creating flexible legal limits on future immigration** in the context of full labor rights **would raise wages, increase consumption, create jobs, and generate additional tax revenue**—particularly in those sectors of the U.S. economy now characterized by the lowest wages. This is a compelling economic reason to move away from the current “vicious cycle” where enforcement-only policies perpetuate unauthorized migration and exert downward pressure on already-low wages, and toward a “virtuous cycle” of worker empowerment in which legal status and labor rights exert upward pressure on wages. **Legalization of the nation’s unauthorized workers and new legal limits on immigration that rise and fall with U.S. labor demand would help lay the foundation for robust, just, and widespread economic growth.** **Moving unauthorized workers out of a vulnerable underground status strengthens all working families’ ability to become more productive and creates higher levels of job-generating consumption, thereby laying a foundation for long-term community revitalization, middle-class growth, and a stronger, more equitable national economy.**

1nc impact – H1B

Only Obama's PC can ensure a comprehensive overhaul – includes increased H-1B's
AP 12/12 (“Editorial Roundup: Excerpts from recent editorials in newspapers in the US and abroad”,
http://www.washingtonpost.com/business/editorial-roundup-excerpts-from-recent-editorials-in-newspapers-in-the-us-and-abroad/2012/12/12/b6108852-447c-11e2-8c8f-fbebf7ccab4e_story.html,
The immigration reform debate is over. The nativists lost.¶ **That's the undeniable conclusion** to be drawn **from a new Politico/George Washington University poll**, and it means **there ought to be a stiff wind at President Barack Obama's back** should he embark on a new push to overhaul immigration laws next year.¶ Fully 62 percent of those surveyed want to give illegal immigrants an eventual path to citizenship as part of comprehensive reform. Perhaps most surprising, **even Republicans favored a path to citizenship** — with 48 percent saying yes and 45 percent no.¶ On allowing younger illegal Americans to get permanent residency status if they earn a college degree or serve in the military — the contours of **the DREAM Act** — **support is even more overwhelming: 77 percent back it**, 19 percent oppose.¶ **The numbers represent a tidal shift and suggest the country would also welcome residency permits for students who earn advanced degrees** in science, technology, math and engineering — **and rapping the number of H-1B high-tech visas.**¶ **Obama must finally go all out for immigration reform**, as he has long promised and never done.¶ For their part, members of Congress — Republicans especially — should remember the November election. Obama won the Latino vote overwhelmingly, in no small part because of his pro-immigrant stances. Those include suspending deportations for many children of the illegal immigrants.¶ **It is rare that the courage to do the right thing also happens to be relatively easy** politics. ...On one side is **common-sense reform** that **would improve border security, let in more skilled workers, streamline the outrageous backlog for legal immigration applicants** — **and give** 11 million **illegals** a road to **permanent status**. On the other are crass appeals to economic and political fears. ...

Key to science diplomacy – solves every impact **Pickering et al. '10**

[Ambassador Thomas R. Pickering served as under secretary of State from 1997 to 2000 and chairs the advisory council of the Civilian Research and Development Foundation. Dr. Peter Agre, director of the Johns Hopkins Malaria Research Institute and president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, won the 2003 Nobel Prize in chemistry. They are among the signers of a bipartisan statement by the Partnership for a Secure America on the use of science in American diplomacy: www.psaonline.org/science. “POLITICAL SCIENCE; MORE OPPORTUNITIES NEEDED FOR U.S. RESEARCHERS TO WORK WITH THEIR FOREIGN COUNTERPARTS”, Baltimore Sun, Feb 9, lexis]
In 1979, a science and technology agreement between the United States and China paved the way for bilateral scientific cooperation that continues to benefit American science and society more broadly. Now, **science diplomacy may help America open a door toward improved relations with Pyongyang, too. In December, six Americans representing leading scientific organizations sat down with their North Korean counterparts.** The meeting took place on the heels of U.S. Special Envoy Stephen Bosworth's first official bilateral meeting with North Korea. **Science, an international enterprise that relies on a lively exchange of ideas and data, can help build trust and expand understanding when government-to-government contacts may be strained.** The North Korea visit, plus the first-ever U.S. science envoys, represent a fine beginning to a new era of international research cooperation. But **the White House, the State Department and Congress must do far more to bolster science diplomacy.** In particular, **the U.S. government should quickly and significantly increase the number of H1-B visas** being approved for specialized foreign workers such as doctors, scientists and engineers. **Their contributions are critical to improving human welfare as well as our economy. Foreign scientists working or studying in U.S. universities also become informal goodwill ambassadors** for America globally - an important benefit in the developing world, where senior scientists and engineers often enter national politics. More broadly, **we urgently need to expand and deepen links between the U.S. and foreign scientific communities to advance solutions to common challenges.** Climate change, sustainable development, pandemic disease, malnutrition, protection for oceans and

wildlife, national security and innovative energy technologies all demand solutions that draw on science

and technology. Fortunately, U.S. technological leadership is admired worldwide, suggesting a way to promote dialogue with countries where we otherwise lack access and leverage. A June 2004 Zogby International poll commissioned by the Arab American Institute found that **only 11 percent of Moroccans surveyed had a favorable overall view of the United States - but 90 percent had a positive view of U.S. science and technology. Only 15 percent of Jordanians had a positive overall view, but 83 percent registered admiration for U.S. science and technology.** Similarly, **Pew polling data from 43 countries show that favorable views of U.S. science and technology exceed overall views of the United States by an average of 23 points. The recent mission to North Korea exemplified the vast potential of science for U.S. diplomacy.** Within the scientific community, after all, journals routinely publish articles co-written by scientists from different nations, and scholars convene frequent conferences to extend those ties. Science demands an intellectually honest atmosphere, peer review and a common language for professional discourse. Basic values of transparency, vigorous inquiry and respectful debate are all inherent to science. **Nations that cooperate on science strengthen the same values that support peaceful conflict resolution** and improved public safety. U.S. and Soviet nongovernmental organizations contributed to a thaw in the Cold War through scientific exchanges, with little government support other than travel visas.

2nc overview – H1B

Impact to oceans is extinction

Craig 8

Robin Kundis, Attorneys' Title Insurance Fund Professor of Law, Florida State University College of Law, Tallahassee, Florida, "CLIMATE CHANGE, REGULATORY FRAGMENTATION, AND WATER TRIAGE", Summer, 79 U. Colo. L. Rev. 825, lexis

Marine ecosystems have immense value. **Oceans cover more than 70% of our planet**,³¹⁴ **support vast reserves of biodiversity** (in all senses),³¹⁵ **produce at least half of the Earth's atmospheric oxygen**,³¹⁶ **drive the planet's hydrological cycle**,³¹⁷ **sequester carbon dioxide**,³¹⁸ **and play a significant role in the earth's climate and weather**.³¹⁹ As such, **oceans and estuaries are critical providers of ecosystem services - those "myriad of life support functions"**, the observable manifestations of ecosystem processes that ecosystems provide and **without which human civilizations could not thrive.**³²⁰ According to a comprehensive study that appeared in Nature in 1997, "about 63% of the estimated value [of the world's ecosystem services] is contributed by marine ecosystems," especially coastal ecosystems.³²¹ Specifically, "coastal environments, including estuaries, [*892] coastal wetlands, beds of sea grass and algae, coral reefs, and continental shelves ... cover only 6.3% of the world's surface, but are responsible for 43% of the estimated value of the world's ecosystem services."³²²

Disease causes extinction – outweighs war

West Australian 8

"The silent future threat: fears that a devastating super virus may be around the corner is driving global research into infectious diseases such as HIV", may 28, lexis

When it comes to a future breed of **super viruses** that **are able to adapt to the genetic make-up of every person they infect**, leading HIV expert Simon Mallal has a clear image in his head of what scares him the most. "To give you the name of the particular organism is less relevant than its properties," he said. **"It is a combination of different organisms that we dread the most."** **"What we fear is a virus with the ease of spread of an influenza**, that can be spread by droplets - so **if someone sneezes many people can be infected - and then with the extraordinary adaptability that HIV has and a high virulence, a high propensity to cause disease** in a patient. **"Worse still, something with a relatively long asymptomatic phase, during which others can be silently infected before they, too, become sick and die.** Then we would really have the potential for millions of people to be killed." While the scene sounds like the promo for a horror movie, Professor Mallal, a Royal Perth Hospital HIV physician and clinical immunologist and director of Murdoch University's Institute for Immunology and Infectious Diseases, explained this fear was partly what was driving researchers and fuelling the time and effort being invested around the world in studying HIV and influenza and related diseases. **"If they combined properties in any way, they would pose an enormous threat,"** he said. He described HIV as the "best teacher yet", saying it was "the most diabolical in its tendency to mutate and morph itself into a unique version in each host it finds itself in". And even if researchers found a cure for HIV tomorrow, research on a vaccine would have to continue, he said, so researchers could gain the necessary knowledge and tools to arm themselves against a possible new breed of morphing viruses that were yet to emerge. "For the new emerging diseases that come at us - and we know they are going to come at us - we are going to need man-made solutions like drugs and vaccines," Professor Mallal said. "That is why **we are so worried** about this and we care so much. **For our children, for future generations**, we know how important this is." The time line for an emerging new threat, he said, depended on a range of factors - particularly whether we let Third World countries linger behind, with poor health, nutrition and hygiene making them fertile breeding grounds for new infections. Also on how soon it will take organisms to evolve to overtake the genetic diversity that protects us. It could be just decades away or it could be hundreds of years. "If we do not bring the **Third World** with us, we will continue to have large **populations** of men, women and children who are living in terrible conditions in proximity to animals, birds, insects and other creatures **harbouring infectious diseases**," Professor Mallal said. **"These are the perfect incubators from which new and dangerous diseases will emerge. And while these infectious-disease missiles typically emerge from the places and people yet to benefit from globalisation, they endanger all of us no matter where** we live." Testing and treatment facilities, and vaccines, along with other important aspects of bio-defence as infectious disease case and resistance tracking, data sharing, state-of-the-art research laboratories and public health campaigns, were the "army, navy and air force" that needed to be assembled to guard against yet unknown infectious disease threats, he said. But **what was limiting the general population's understanding of the urgency and magnitude was the wiring of our brains**, still **better tuned to prehistoric physical threats such as war**, assault and physical accidents **than a pressing new biological threat.**

Impact to environment is extinction

Bryan Walsh, 10-18-10. "Wildlife: A Global Convention on Biodiversity Opens in Japan, But Can It Make a Difference?" Ecocentric Blog @ TIME, <http://ecocentric.blogs.time.com/2010/10/18/wildlife-a-global-convention-on-biodiversity-opens-in-japan-but-can-it-make-a-difference/#ixzz131wU6CSp>

The story of non-human life on the planet Earth over the past few decades is a simple one: loss. While there are always a few bright spots—including the recovery of threatened animals like the brown pelican, thanks to the quietly revolutionary Endangered Species Act—on a planetary scale **biodiversity is steadily marching backwards, with extinctions rising** and habitat destroyed. Species as diverse as the tiger—less than 3,500 live in the wild today—to tiny frogs could be gone forever if the trends keep heading downwards. In a bitterly ironic twist, back in 2002 the United Nations declared that 2010 would be the international year of biodiversity, and countries agreed to "achieve a significant reduction of the current rate of biodiversity loss at the global, regional and national level," as part of the UN Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). At this paper in Science shows (download a PDF here), however, **the world has utterly failed to reduce** the rate of **biodiversity loss, and** by just about every measurement, **things are getting worse all the time.** (Read the Global Biodiversity Outlook if you really want to be depressed.) With that cheery backdrop, representatives from nearly 200 nations are meeting in the Japanese city of Nagoya—home to Toyota and not a whole lot else—for the 10th summit of the CBD, where they will set new goals for reducing species loss and slowing habitat destruction. At the very least, they should know how critical the biodiversity challenge is—as Japanese Environment Minister Ryo Matsumoto said in an opening speech: **All life on Earth exists thanks to** the benefits from **biodiversity in** the forms of fertile **soil**, clear **water and** clean **air. We are now close to a 'tipping point'** – that is, **we are about to reach a threshold beyond which biodiversity loss will become irreversible, and may cross that threshold in the next 10 years if we do not make proactive efforts** for conserving biodiversity. Ahmed Djoghlaif, the executive secretary of the CBD, struck an even darker note, reminding diplomats that they were on a clock—and time was running out: Let's have the courage to look in the eyes of our children and admit that we have failed, individually and collectively, to fulfill the Johannesburg promise made by 110 heads of state to substantially reduce the rate of loss of biodiversity by 2010. Let us look in the eyes of our children and admit that we continue to lose biodiversity at an unprecedented rate, thus mortgaging their future. But what will actually come out of the Nagoya summit, which will continue until Oct. 29? Most likely there will be another agreement—a new protocol—outlining various global strategies on sustaining biodiversity and goals on slowing the rate of species loss. (You can download a PDF of the discussion draft document that will be picked over at Nagoya.) It won't be hard for governments to agree on general ambitions for reducing biodiversity loss—who's against saving pandas?—but the negotiations will be much trickier on the question of who will actually pay for a more biodiverse planet? And much as we've seen in international climate change negotiations, the essential divide is between the developed and developing nations—and neither side seems ready to bend. The reality is that much of the world's biodiversity—the most fantastic species and the most complete forests—is found in the poorer, less developed parts of the world. That's in part because the world's poor have been, well, too poor to develop the land around them in the way rich nations have. (There was once a beautiful, undeveloped island off the East Coast of the U.S., with wetlands and abundant forests. It was called Mannahatta. It's a little different now.) As a result, the rural poor—especially in tropical nations—are directly dependent on healthy wildlife and plants in a way that inhabitants of developed nations aren't. So on one hand that makes the poor directly vulnerable when species are lost and forests are chopped down—which often results in migration to thronging urban areas. But on the other, poverty often drives the rural poor to slash-and-burn forests for agriculture, or hunt endangered species to sell for bush meat. Conservation and development have to go hand in hand. That hasn't always been the mantra of the conservation movement—as Rebecca Tuhus-Dubrow writes in Slate, conservation projects in the past sometimes displaced the human inhabitants over a reserve or park, privileging nature over people. But that's changed in recent decades—environmental groups like Conservation International or the Nature Conservancy now spend as much of their time working on development as they do in protecting nature. "Save the people, save the wildlife"—that's the new mantra. The missing ingredient is money—and that's what will be up for debate at Nagoya. As climate change has risen on the international agenda, funding for biodiversity has lagged—the 33 member nations of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) donated \$8.5 billion for climate change mitigation projects in 2008, but just \$3 billion annually for biodiversity. One way to change that could be through "payment for ecosystem services." **A biodiverse landscape**, intact forests, clean water and air—all of these ebbing qualities of a healthy world **are vital for** our **economies** as well. (The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity, a UN-funded study, estimates that nature **degradation costs** the world **\$2 trillion to \$5 trillion a year**, with the poorest nations bearing the brunt of the loss.) Rich countries could pay more biodiverse developing nations to keep nature running—allowing poorer countries to capitalize on their natural resources without slashing and burning. Will that work? I'm skeptical—the experience of climate change negotiations have shown that the nations of the world are great at high ideals and fuzzy goals, but not so hot at actually dividing up the pie in a more sustainable fashion. That doesn't mean there aren't smaller solutions—like Costa Rica's just-announced debt-for-nature deal—but a big bang from Japan this month doesn't seem too likely. The problem is as simple as it is unsolvable, at least so far—there's no clear path to national development so far that doesn't take from the natural world. That worked for rich nations, but we're rapidly running out of planet, as a report last week from the World Wildlife Fund showed. And there's something greater at stake as well, as the naturalist E.O. Wilson once put it: **The one process** now going on **that will take millions of years to correct is the loss of** genetic and species **diversity** by the destruction of natural habitats—*this is the folly our descendants are least likely to forgive us.* **We're losing nature. And that loss really is forever.**

Nuclear war doesn't cause extinction

Yehoshua Socol (Ph.D.), an inter-disciplinary physicist, is an expert in electro-optics, high-energy physics and applications, and material science and Moshe Yanovskiy, Jan 2, 2011, "Nuclear Proliferation and Democracy", http://www.americanthinker.com/2011/01/nuclear_proliferation_and_demo.html, CMR

Nuclear proliferation should no longer be treated as an unthinkable nightmare; it is likely to be the future reality. Nuclear weapons have been acquired not only by an extremely poor per capita but large country such as India, but also by even poorer and medium-sized nations such as Pakistan and North Korea. One could also mention South Africa, which successfully acquired a nuclear arsenal despite economic sanctions (the likes of which have not yet been imposed on Iran). It is widely believed that sanctions and rhetoric will not prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons and that many countries, in the Middle East and beyond, will act accordingly (see, e.g., recent Heritage report). Nuclear Warfare -- Myths And Facts **The direct consequences of** the limited **use of nuclear weapons** -- especially low-yield devices most likely to

be in the hands of non-state actors or irresponsible governments -- **would** probably **not be great enough to bring** about significant geopolitical **upheavals**. **Casualties from a single 20-KT nuclear device are** estimated [1] at about **25,000** fatalities with a similar number of injured, assuming a rather unfortunate scenario (the center of a large city, with minimal warning). Scaling the above toll to larger devices or to a larger number of devices is less than linear. For example, it has been estimated that it would take as many as eighty devices of 20-KT yield each to cause 300,000 civilian fatalities in German cities (a result actually achieved by Allied area attacks, or carpet-bombings, during the Second World War). A single 1-MT device used against Detroit has been estimated by U.S. Congress OTA to result in about 220,000 fatalities. It is anticipated that well-prepared **civil defense measures**, based on rather simple presently known techniques, **would decrease** these **numbers by** maybe **an order of magnitude** (as will be discussed later). There is little doubt that **a nation determined to survive** and with a strong sense of its own destiny **would not succumb to** such **losses**. It is often argued that the **fallout effects** of even the limited use of nuclear weapons would be worldwide and would last for generations. This **is** an **exaggeration**. The following facts speak for themselves. -- **In Japan**, as assessed by REFR, **less than 1,000** excess **cancer cases** (i.e., above the natural occurrence) **were recorded in** over **100,000 survivors over** the past **sixty years** -- compared with about 110,000 immediate fatalities in the two atomic bombings. No clinical or even sub-clinical effects were discovered in the survivors' offspring. -- In the Chernobyl area, as assessed by IAEA, only fifteen cancer deaths can be directly attributed to fallout radiation. No radiation-related increase in congenital formations was recorded. Nuclear Conflict -- Possible Scenarios With reference to a possible regional nuclear conflict between a rogue state and a democratic one, the no-winner (mutual assured destruction) scenario is probably false. An analysis by Anthony Cordesman, et al. regarding a possible Israel-Iran nuclear conflict estimated that while Israel might survive an Iranian nuclear blow, Iran would certainly not survive as an organized society. Even though the projected casualties cited in that study seem to us overstated, especially as regards Israel, the conclusion rings true. **Due to the** extreme high **intensity** ("above-conventional") **of nuclear conflict**, it is nearly certain that **such a war**, no matter its outcome, **would not last for years**, as we have become accustomed to in current low-intensity conflicts. Rather, **we should anticipate** a new geo-political reality: the emergence of **clear winners** and losers **within** several **days**, or at most weeks after the initial outbreak of hostilities. This latter reality will most probably contain fewer nuclear-possessing states than the former.