#### Obama is using his newly won political capital to hammer the GOP on immigration – it will pass, but getting it to the floor is key

**Epstein, 10/17/13** (Reid, Politico, “Obama’s latest push features a familiar strategy” <http://www.politico.com/story/2013/10/barack-obama-latest-push-features-familiar-strategy-98512.html>)

President Barack Obama made his plans for his newly won **political capital** official — he’s going to **hammer House Republicans on immigration**.

And it’s evident from his public and private statements that Obama’s latest immigration push is, in at least one respect, similar to his fiscal showdown strategy: yet again, the goal is to **boost public pressure** on House Republican leadership to call a vote on a Senate-passed measure.

“The majority of Americans think this is the right thing to do,” Obama said Thursday at the White House. “And it’s sitting there waiting for the House to pass it. Now, if the House has ideas on how to improve the Senate bill, let’s hear them. Let’s start the negotiations. But let’s not leave this problem to keep festering for another year, or two years, or three years. This can and should get done by the end of this year.”

And yet Obama spent the bulk of his 20-minute address taking whack after whack at the same House Republicans he’ll need to pass that agenda, culminating in a jab at the GOP over the results of the 2012 election — and a dare to do better next time.

“You don’t like a particular policy or a particular president? Then argue for your position,” Obama said. “Go out there and win an election. Push to change it. But don’t break it. Don’t break what our predecessors spent over two centuries building. That’s not being faithful to what this country’s about.”

Before the shutdown, the White House had planned a major immigration push for the first week in October. But with the shutdown and looming debt default dominating the discussion during the last month, immigration reform received little attention on the Hill.

Immigration reform allies, including Obama’s political arm, Organizing for Action, conducted a series of events for the weekend of Oct. 5, most of which received little attention in Washington due to the the shutdown drama. But activists remained engaged, with Dream Act supporters staging a march up Constitution Avenue, past the Capitol to the Supreme Court Tuesday, to little notice of the Congress inside.

Obama first personally signaled his intention to re-emerge in the immigration debate during an interview Tuesday with the Los Angeles Univision affiliate, conducted four hours before his meeting that day with House Democrats.

Speaking of the week’s fiscal landmines, Obama said: “Once that’s done, you know, the day after, I’m going to be pushing to say, call a vote on immigration reform.”

When he met that afternoon in the Oval Office with the House Democratic leadership, Obama said that he planned to be personally engaged in selling the reform package he first introduced in a Las Vegas speech in January.

Still, during that meeting, Obama knew so little about immigration reform’s status in the House that he had to ask Rep. Xavier Becerra (D-Calif.) how many members of his own party would back a comprehensive reform bill, according to a senior Democrat who attended.

The White House doesn’t have plans yet for Obama to participate in any new immigration reform events or rallies — that sort of advance work has been hamstrung by the 16-day government shutdown.

But the president emerged on Thursday to tout a “broad coalition across America” that supports immigration reform. He also invited House Republicans to add their input specifically to the Senate bill — an approach diametrically different than the House GOP’s announced strategy of breaking the reform into several smaller bills.

White House press secretary Jay Carney echoed Obama’s remarks Thursday, again using for the same language on immigration the White House used to press Republicans on the budget during the shutdown standoff: the claim that there are enough votes in the House to pass the Senate’s bill now, if only it could come to a vote.

“When it comes to immigration reform … we’re confident that if that bill that passed the Senate were put on the floor of the House today, it would win a majority of the House,” Carney said. “And I think that it would win significant Republican votes.”

#### Obama’s consistent pressure is key to get Boehner to allow a vote

**Sullivan, 10/24/13** (Sean, “John Boehner's next big test: Immigration” Washington Post Blogs, The Fix, lexis)

President Obama delivered remarks Thursday morning to renew his call for Congress to pass sweeping immigration reform. The prevailing sentiment in Washington is that it’s not going to happen this year, and may not even happen next year.

But because of the last few weeks, it just might get done by early next year. It’s all up to House Speaker John A. Boehner (R-Ohio), who by political necessity, must now at least consider leaning in more on immigration.

“Let’s see if we can get this done. And let’s see if we can get it done this year,” Obama said at the White House.

Fresh off a decisive defeat in the budget and debt ceiling showdown that cost the GOP big and won the party no major policy concessions from Democrats, Boehner was asked Wednesday about whether he plans to bring up immigration legislation during the limited time left on the 2013 legislative calendar. He didn’t rule it out.

“I still think immigration reform is an important subject that needs to be addressed. And I’m hopeful,” said Boehner.

The big question is whether the speaker’s hopefulness spurs him to press the matter legislatively or whether the cast-iron conservative members who oppose even limited reforms will dissuade him and extinguish his cautiously optimistic if noncommittal outlook.

Months ago, as House Republicans were slow-walking immigration after the Senate passed a broad bill, the latter possibility appeared the likelier bet. But times have changed. The position House Republicans adopted in the fiscal standoff badly damaged the party's brand. The GOP is reeling, searching desperately for a way to turn things around. That means Boehner, too, must look for ways to repair the damage.

And that's where immigration comes in. Even before the government shutdown showdown, a vocal part of the GOP (think Sen. John McCain) had been talking up the urgent need to do immigration reform or risk further alienating Hispanic voters. Now, amid hard times for the party driven by deeper skepticism from Democrats, independents and even some Republicans following the fiscal standoff, the political imperative is arguably even stronger.

The policy imperative already exists for some House Republicans -- perhaps enough of them that if Boehner allowed a vote, reform of some type could pass with a majority of House Democrats and a minority of House Republicans, as did last week's deal to end the government shutdown and raise the debt ceiling. (What specifically could pass and whether Obama could accept it is another question.)

What's not clear is whether Boehner would be willing to chart a path with less than majority GOP support again so soon after the last time and without his back against the wall as it was in the fiscal standoff.

This much we know: The White House and Senate Democrats will **keep applying pressure** on Boehner to act on immigration. Obama's planned remarks are the latest example of his plan. The speaker will be feeling external and internal pressure to move ahead on immigration.

But he will also feel pressure from conservatives to oppose it. Here's the thing, though: Boehner listened to the right flank of his conference in the fiscal fight, and that path was politically destructive for his party. That's enough to believe he will at least entertain the possibility of tuning the hard-liners out a bit more this time around.

#### It will be a fight and it requires all of Obama’s capital to pass it

**Orlando Sentinel, 11/1/13** (editorial, “It’ll take both parties to clear immigration logjam” database: LibraryPressDisplay (at the University of Michigan)

For those who thought the end of the government shutdown would provide a break from the partisan bickering in Washington, think again. The battle over comprehensive immigration reform could be every bit as contentious.

Polls show the popular momentum is there for comprehensive reform, which would include a path to citizenship for many of the nation's 11 million undocumented immigrants. But it'll take plenty of political capital from President Obama and leaders in both parties on Capitol Hill to make it happen.

Immigration-reform activists, who have been pushing for reform for years, are understandably impatient. This week police arrested 15 who blocked traffic at a demonstration in Orlando.

There are plenty of selling points for comprehensive immigration reform. An opportunity for millions of immigrants to get on due right side of the law. Stronger border security. The chance for law enforcement to focus limited resources on real threats to public safety instead of nannies and fruit pickers. A more reliable work force to meet the needs of key industries. Reforms to let top talent from around the world stay here after studying in U.S. universities.

The Senate passed its version of comprehensive immigration in June. It includes all of the benefits above. Its path to citizenship requires undocumented immigrants to pay lines, learn English, ass a criminal background check and wait more than a decade.

So far, House Republicans have balked, taking a piecemeal rather than comprehensive approach. Many members fear being challenged from the light for supporting "amnesty”.

Yet polls show the public supports comprehensive reform. In June, a Gallup poll found 87 percent of Americans - including 86 percent of Republicans - support a pathway to citizenship like the one outlined in the Senate bill.

Florida Republican Sen. Marco Rubio took flak from tea-party supporters for spear- heading the comprehensive bill. Now, apparently aiming to mend fences, he says immigration should be handled piecemeal He's politically savvy enough to know that's a dead end.

But comprehensive reform won't have a chance without President Obama making **full use** of his bully pulpit to promote it, emphasizing in particular all that undocumented immigrants would need to do to earn citizenship. House Democratic leaders will have to underscore the president’s message.

#### Plan will be an uphill battle for Obama – High cost to energy reform means the GOP is opposed

**Noon 7/14** (Marita, Executive Director of Energy Makes America Great, expert in energy reform and renewable energy, 7/14/13, Town Hall.com, <http://finance.townhall.com/columnists/maritanoon/2013/07/14/green-energys-too-expensive-n1640297> ) Okuno

**Democrats offered** **amendments to the** **bill aimed at restoring funding to renewable energy programs, which failed.** Republicans’ amendments focused on cuts: Rep. Tim Walberg of Michigan sponsored an amendment that would eliminate spending for a national media campaign promoting alternative energy, and Rep. John Fleming, M.D. of Louisiana sponsored an amendment to stop a $3.25 billion green energy loan program—both were approved.¶ While many of the different taxpayer funded green energy programs introduced in the 2009 stimulus bill —which have produced more than 50 bankrupt, or near bankrupt, projects—have now expired, the Fleming amendment draws attention to a pot of money that is, currently, largely unspent. Fleming describes this remaining boondoggle: “The Obama 2009 stimulus bill cost taxpayers about $830 billion, and much of it was wasted on growing government and administration giveaways, like a $3.25 billion loan program that put taxpayers on the hook for failed green energy projects. A company could take a government loan and walk away from a project without paying taxpayers back, even if the company remained in business. In a free market economy, companies may turn to banks and investors to borrow money, but the government should not force taxpayers to be lenders, even as it gives borrowers a pass on paying back their loans.”¶ While Republicans realize the embarrassing failure of the stimulus bill’s green energy programs**, Democrats want to keep spending**—often in the face of opposition from their usual supporters. One of the most controversial commercial green energy projects,Cape Wind, provides a case in point.¶

#### Immigration reform generates an effective base of IT experts - solves cyberterror

\*top 20 firms conclude H1-B visa requestors are oversees – increasing IT experts, the majority of which are overseas, cannot come to the US, talented students that have tremendous ability to develop tech and scientific advances don’t have the ability to come to the US – collapses response mechanisms

**McLarty 09 –** (Thomas F. III, President – McLarty Associates and Former White House Chief of Staff and Task Force Co-Chair, “U.S. Immigration Policy: Report of a CFR-Sponsored Independent Task Force”, 7-8, http://www.cfr.org/ publication/19759/us\_immigration\_policy.html)

We have seen, when you look at the table of the top 20 firms that are H1-B visa requestors, at least 15 of those are IT firms. And as we're seeing across industry, much of the hardware and software that's used in this country is not only manufactured now overseas, but it's developed overseas by scientists and engineers who were educated here in the United States. We're seeing a lot more activity around cyber-security, certainly noteworthy attacks here very recently. It's becoming an increasingly dominant set of requirements across not only to the Department of Defense, but the Department of Homeland Security and the critical infrastructure that's held in private hands. Was there any discussion or any interest from DOD or DHS as you undertook this review on the security things about what can be done to try to **generate a more effective group of IT experts** here in the **U**nited **S**tates, many of which are coming to the U.S. institutions, academic institutions from overseas and often returning back? This potentially puts us at a competitive disadvantage going forward. MCLARTY: Yes. And I think your question largely is the answer as well. I mean, clearly we have less talented students here studying -- or put another way, more talented students studying in other countries that are gifted, talented, really have a **tremendous ability to develop** these kind of **tech**nology **and scientific advances**, we're going to be put at an increasingly disadvantage. Where if they come here -- and I kind of like Dr. Land's approach of the green card being handed to them or carefully put in their billfold or purse as they graduate -- then, obviously, that's going to **strengthen**, I think, our system, **our security needs**.

#### A successful cyber-attack ensures accidental nuclear war

**Fritz 09 –** (Jason, BS – St. Cloud, “Hacking Nuclear Command and Control”, Study Commissioned on Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament, July, [www.icnnd.org/Documents/Jason\_Fritz\_Hacking\_NC2.doc](http://www.icnnd.org/Documents/Jason_Fritz_Hacking_NC2.doc))

The US uses the two-man rule to achieve a higher level of security in nuclear affairs. Under this rule two authorized personnel must be present and in agreement during critical stages of nuclear command and control. The President must jointly issue a launch order with the Secretary of Defense; Minuteman missile operators must agree that the launch order is valid; and on a submarine, both the commanding officer and executive officer must agree that the order to launch is valid. In the US, in order to execute a nuclear launch, an Emergency Action Message (EAM) is needed. This is a preformatted message that directs nuclear forces to execute a specific attack. The contents of an EAM change daily and consist of a complex code read by a human voice. Regular monitoring by shortwave listeners and videos posted to YouTube provide insight into how these work. These are issued from the NMCC, or in the event of destruction, from the designated hierarchy of command and control centres. Once a command centre has confirmed the EAM, using the two-man rule, the Permissive Action Link (PAL) codes are entered to arm the weapons and the message is sent out. These messages are sent in digital format via the secure Automatic Digital Network and then relayed to aircraft via single-sideband radio transmitters of the High Frequency Global Communications System, and, at least in the past, sent to nuclear capable submarines via Very Low Frequency (Greenemeier 2008, Hardisty 1985). The technical details of VLF submarine communication methods can be found online, including PC-based VLF reception. Some reports have noted a Pentagon review, which showed a potential “electronic back door into the US Navy’s system for broadcasting nuclear launch orders to Trident submarines” (Peterson 2004). The investigation showed that cyber terrorists could potentially infiltrate this network and insert false orders for launch. The investigation led to “elaborate new instructions for validating launch orders” (Blair 2003). Adding further to the concern of cyber terrorists seizing control over submarine launched nuclear missiles; The Royal Navy announced in 2008 that it would be installing a Microsoft Windows operating system on its nuclear submarines (Page 2008). The choice of operating system, apparently based on Windows XP, is not as alarming as the advertising of such a system is. This may attract hackers and narrow the necessary reconnaissance to learning its details and potential exploits. It is unlikely that the operating system would play a direct role in the signal to launch, although this is far from certain. Knowledge of the operating system may lead to the insertion of malicious code, which could be used to gain accelerating privileges, tracking, valuable information, and deception that could subsequently be used to initiate a launch. Remember from Chapter 2 that the UK’s nuclear submarines have the authority to launch if they believe the central command has been destroyed. Attempts by cyber terrorists to create the illusion of a decapitating strike could also be used to engage fail-deadly systems. Open source knowledge is scarce as to whether Russia continues to operate such a system. However evidence suggests that they have in the past. Perimetr, also known as Dead Hand, was an automated system set to launch a mass scale nuclear attack in the event of a decapitation strike against Soviet leadership and military. In a crisis, military officials would send a coded message to the bunkers, switching on the dead hand. If nearby ground-level sensors detected a nuclear attack on Moscow, and if a break was detected in communications links with top military commanders, the system would send low-frequency signals over underground antennas to special rockets. Flying high over missile fields and other military sites, these rockets in turn would broadcast attack orders to missiles, bombers and, via radio relays, submarines at sea. Contrary to some Western beliefs, Dr. Blair says, many of Russia's nuclear-armed missiles in underground silos and on mobile launchers can be fired automatically. (Broad 1993) Assuming such a system is still active, cyber terrorists would need to create a crisis situation in order to activate Perimetr, and then fool it into believing a decapitating strike had taken place. While this is not an easy task, the information age makes it easier. Cyber reconnaissance could help locate the machine and learn its inner workings. This could be done by targeting the computers high of level official’s—anyone who has reportedly worked on such a project, or individuals involved in military operations at underground facilities, such as those reported to be located at Yamantau and Kosvinksy mountains in the central southern Urals (Rosenbaum 2007, Blair 2008) Indirect Control of Launch Cyber terrorists could cause **incorrect information** to be transmitted, received, or displayed at nuclear command and control centres, or shut down these centres’ computer networks completely. In 1995, a Norwegian scientific sounding rocket was mistaken by Russian early warning systems as a nuclear missile launched from a US submarine. A radar operator used Krokus to notify a general on duty who decided to alert the highest levels. Kavkaz was implemented, all three chegets activated, and the countdown for a nuclear decision began. It took eight minutes before the missile was properly identified—a considerable amount of time considering the speed with which a nuclear response must be decided upon (Aftergood 2000). Creating a false signal in these early warning systems would be relatively **easy** using computer network operations. The real difficulty would be gaining access to these systems as they are most likely on a closed network. However, if they are transmitting wirelessly, that may **provide an entry point**, and information gained through the internet may reveal the details, such as passwords and software, for gaining entrance to the closed network. If access was obtained, a false alarm could be followed by something like a DDoS attack, so the operators believe an attack may be imminent, yet they can no longer verify it. This could add pressure to the decision making process**,** and if coordinated precisely, could appear as a first round EMP burst. Terrorist groups could also attempt to launch a non-nuclear missile, such as the one used by Norway, in an attempt to fool the system. The number of states who possess such technology is far greater than the number of states who possess nuclear weapons. Obtaining them would be considerably easier, especially when enhancing operations through computer network operations. Combining traditional terrorist methods with cyber techniques opens opportunities neither could accomplish on their own. For example, radar stations might be more vulnerable to a computer attack, while satellites are more vulnerable to jamming from a laser beam, thus together they deny dual phenomenology. Mapping communications networks through cyber reconnaissance may expose weaknesses, and automated scanning devices created by more experienced hackers can be readily found on the internet. Intercepting or spoofing communications is a highly complex science. These systems are designed to protect against the world’s most powerful and well funded militaries. Yet, there are recurring gaffes, and the very nature of asymmetric warfare is to bypass complexities by finding simple loopholes. For example, commercially available software for voice-morphing could be used to capture voice commands within the command and control structure, cut these sound bytes into phonemes, and splice it back together in order to issue false voice commands (Andersen 2001, Chapter 16). Spoofing could also be used to escalate a volatile situation in the hopes of starting a **nuclear war.** “ “In June 1998, a group of international hackers calling themselves Milw0rm hacked the web site of India’s Bhabha Atomic Research Center (BARC) and put up a spoofed web page showing a mushroom cloud and the text “If a nuclear war does start, you will be the first to scream” (Denning 1999). Hacker web-page defacements like these are often derided by critics of cyber terrorism as simply being a nuisance which causes no significant harm. However, web-page defacements are becoming more common, and they point towards alarming possibilities in subversion. During the 2007 cyber attacks against Estonia, a counterfeit letter of apology from Prime Minister Andrus Ansip was planted on his political party website (Grant 2007). This took place amid the confusion of mass DDoS attacks, real world protests, and accusations between governments.

#### Living **in accord with the Tao precludes taking action to prevent death. As mere humans, we are oblivious to the overarching meaning of the universe and thus any action we take is unproductive and immoral – 3 impacts – ethics, value to life, and a self-fulfilling prophecy.** **Kirkland 98** -  Ph.D. in East Asian Languages and Cultures, specialist in Asian Religions, Associate Professor of Religion at UGA, (1996, Russell Kirkland, "’RESPONSIBLE NON-ACTION’ IN A NATURAL WORLD : PERSPECTIVES FROM THE NEI-YEH, CHUANG-TZU, AND TAO-TE CHING" HARVARD CONFERENCE ON TAOISM AND ECOLOGY CB)

Once upon a time, several years ago, I had the opportunity to engage in a variety of teamteaching enterprises at Stanford University. At one time, my colleague Lee Yearley sought to impress upon students the differences between the thought of the Confucian thinker Mencius and the thought of the Taoist thinker Chuang-tzu. The starting point was Mencius' famous insistence that human nature is such that none of us would fail to be moved if we saw an infant facing imminent death, such as by falling into an open well; Chuang-tzu, meanwhile, presumably believed that humans are incapable of comprehending the true meaning of the events that constitute the context of our lives, and urged us to refrain from the delusion that we can correctly analyze those events and correctly govern the events that occur to us. To stimulate students' ruminations on these issues, Lee Yearley gave our students an assignment, to write a paper beginning with the following proposition: Mencius and Chuang-tzu are sitting together on a riverbank, when an infant was descried floating precariously on the river, apparently on its way to its death from drowning. The students' assignment was to describe what each man, in that situation, would do, and why.z His assumption was that as students wrestled with the thoughtcontent of each of the thinkers in question, students would have to grapple with the morally difficult imperative of Chuang-tzu's thought, which would ask us to forego intervention in the processes at work around us, even if such restraint should mean that innocent children should perish as a result. This presumed moral dilemma was intended to challenge students to wrestle meaningfully with the dilemma of the human condition: that is, that humans live with moral imperatives to do what seems to us to be good, at the same time that we realize that we cannot fully control the events that take place around us, and can probably not fully effect our will, despite our best intentions. Such, at least, was the apparent moral quandary into which Lee Yearley worked to lead the students in our class. One of my own students, however, quickly answered the assigned question, in an unexpectedly easy fashion. The assignment was to explain what Mencius and Chuang-tzu each would do, and why, so this student simply explained that Mencius would jump up to save the baby, for the obvious reasons, and that Chuang-tzu would do nothing whatsoever, because he had no reason to do so: Mencius was already out there saving the baby, so there was really nothing more for him to do. This example came to my mind when I began to ponder what the Taoists of ancient China would say about the ecological problems of the late twentieth century. If, so to speak, planet Earth is drifting precariously in the direction of presumable disaster, what would be the action that Chuang Chou and his contemporaries would have us take? In other words, would "Taoism," in that sense, provide a solution to the apparent moral dilemma that faces our planet in our own day and age, and if so, what form might that solution take? As some of the other presenters gathered here seem already to have suggested, it is commonly believed by some hopeful minds that Taoism provides a pretty solution to the presumed problems of the planet. But more careful thought suggests that Taoism might not offer happy solutions to the problems of the modern world. What if, for instance, the issue in the foregoing example was not a human baby floating in a river, but rather the species of the whooping crane, its continuance threatened by the encroachment of human civilization. If Chuang Chou were sitting by watching earth's species threatened with extinction, what would he really do, and why? The answer, I fear, is not certain to fill our hearts with sanguine certainty of the future of the cranes, or with sanguine happiness that Chuang Chou shares our desire to preserve them. In fact, the only logical answer to this latter-day challenge to Taoist values would seem to be that Chuang Chou would, as it were, watch the whooping cranes float down the river on their way to apparent extinction, and would do nothing whatsoever to interfere with the natural operations of the world. The only logical answer to this situation is that the Taoist sees no action to be required, for he trusts that the world is already operating as it is supposed to be operating, and all human activity — no matter how well-intentioned — can add nothing of value to such operation, and can logically only interfere with the course of nature as it is already unfolding. Just as Chuang-tzu would not dive into a river to save a floating baby, he would not take deliberate action to save the world from apparent destruction. It is, in fact, on this basis that one can, in fact, distinguish classical Taoists from classical Confucians: like modern Westerners, the Confucians generally assume that the world inherently tends toward chaos and requires the redemptive activity of human society, individually and collectively. But Taoists, as a rule, do not share the Confucian (or Western) fear of the natural processes of life, and consequently do not fear the extinction of the whooping cranes, nor do Taoists enjoin deliberate action to save the cranes, or even Earth as a whole, from extinction. In fact, according to what I shall refer, for the moment, as Taoist moral reasoning, it is, in fact, morally objectionable for humans to presume that they are correct in their judgment of what constitutes an impending ecological danger, or that corrective action is called for to prevent an apparent natural catastrophe. On the basis on the texts of classical Taoism, I contend that the only possible Taoist position is that humans who foresee impending ecological disaster should, as it were, sit down and shut up, and let the universe work. While it is also true that those who lead an authentically Taoist life are unlikely to contribute in substantial ways to any ecological degradation of the planet, that fact alone does not justify the conclusion that Taoist principles can justify remedial action to correct the effects of less-insightful humans of past and present. The Taoist answer to ecological problems, I shall argue, is always to be found in going contrary to the Confucians, who assume humans to have a special wisdom that is nowhere else found among the living things of the world: whereas a Confucian, like Mencius, would feel morally compelled to jump up and dive into the river of life's events to save a threatened species of tall, noisy birds, a Taoist, like Chuang-tzu, would feel morally compelled to refrain from doing so. In what follows, I will attempt to explain the moral reasoning that would compel Chuang Chou to watch the cranes on their apparent way to extinction, taking no action, despite the disquiet that such a prospect might produce within his heart/mind. The fundamental principle involved is that humans are not the all-knowing beings that we usually take ourselves to be, and that the activities that humans have taken with the intention to govern or improve the world have almost always proven, in the final analysis, to have been misguided and unjustified, and to have actually done more harm than good. The ultimate Taoist principle, I propose, is that there is a reality beyond the comprehension or control of human thought or activity, and that humans of the modern secular age need to beware the arrogant assumption that we are, in Western terms, the "God" of planet earth. The Taoist position, I shall argue, is that planet earth has no "God," and needs none, not even — or more correctly said, especially not — ourselves.

#### **The alternative is to do nothing in order to appreciate the flow of the Tao – only inaction in face of interventionism solves**

**Kirkland 96** – Ph.D. in East Asian Languages and Cultures, specialist in Asian Religions, Associate Professor of Religion at UGA (1996, Russell Kirkland, Ph.D. in East Asian Languages and Cultures, specialist in Asian Religions, Associate Professor of Religion at UGA, "The Book of the Way," 24-29 CB)

The focus of the Daode jing is something called "the Tao (or Dao)," a term that cannot adequately be translated. The text says that the Tao is "vague and subtle," and it never provides definitions. Instead, it employs metaphors to suggest the nature of the Tao, and to describe behaviors that are similar to its way of working. Most basically, the term Tao seems to denote a natural force that runs through all things and guides them through their natural course of development. It is an inexhaustible source of life and power, and is constantly at work in the world in subtle and imperceptible ways. Both its reality and its nature can be perceived by observing the world around us. However, most people have lost sight of the Tao, and have given way to unnatural behaviors that go contrary to it. The goal of the Daode jing is to persuade the reader to abandon those behaviors, and to learn once again how to live in accord with the true course of life. One can achieve those goals by appreciating the true nature of life, and modifying one's behavior to be more like that of the Tao. Specifically, the Tao is humble, yielding, and non-assertive. Like a mother, it benefits others selflessly: it gives us all life and guides us safely through it, asking nothing in return. This altruistic emphasis of the Daode jing has seldom been noticed, but it is one of the most important lessons that it draws from the observation of the natural world. Water, for instance, is the gentlest and most yielding of all things, yet it can overcome the strongest substances, and cannot itself be destroyed. More importantly, however, water lives for others: it provides the basis of life for all things, and asks nothing in return. If we learn to live like water does, we will be living in accord with the Tao, and its Power (De) will carry us safely through life. Such a way of life is called wuwei, usually translated as "non-action." Wuwei means foregoing all activity intended to effect desired ends. Instead, one should follow one's natural course and allow all other things to do likewise, lest our willful interference disrupt things' proper flow. Few modern readers have ever grasped the full radicality of the ideal of wuwei. Many of us today (like the ancient Chinese Confucians and Mohists) look at the world and see things that we think need correcting. The Daode jing would actually have us do nothing whatsoever about them. The repeated phrase "do nothing, and nothing will be undone" admonishes us to trust the Tao -- the natural working of things -- and never to do anything about anything. Actually, such is the most that anyone can do, because the Tao -- as imperceptible as it is -- is the most powerful force in existence, and nothing can thwart its unceasing operation.

#### The plan locks Chinese influence out of Mexico – that ends overall influence in Latin America.

Gary Regenstreif, 6/12/2013. “The looming U.S.-China rivalry over Latin America,” Reuters, http://blogs.reuters.com/great-debate/2013/06/12/the-looming-u-s-china-rivalry-over-latin-america/.

Though the U.S. and Chinese presidents heralded a “new model” of cooperation at their weekend summit, a growing competition looks more likely. The whirlwind of activity before President Barack Obama met with President Xi Jinping in the California desert revealed that Beijing and Washington’s sights are set on a similar prize — and face differing challenges to attain it.

Their focus is Latin America and the prize is increased trade and investment opportunities in a region where economic reforms have pulled millions out of poverty and into the middle class. Latin America is rich in the commodities and energy that both China and the United States need, largely stable politically and eager to do deals.

Consider the travel itinerary: Obama visited Mexico and Costa Rica last month. Vice President Joe Biden recently went to Colombia, Trinidad and Tobago and Brazil. Chile’s president paid Obama a visit last week, Peru’s leader arrived Tuesday and Brazil’s is due in October.

Meanwhile, just after Biden left Trinidad, Xi arrived, part of a tour that also took him to Costa Rica and Mexico to promote trade and cooperation.

Both U.S. and Chinese officials, however, are finding a more self-confident Latin America, able to leverage its new strength to forge better agreements and find multiple trading partners. That will likely force Washington to work harder to maintain its leading trade position against China — which has money to burn in the region.

“There is a more energetic [U.S.] tone, a more optimistic mood about economic agenda in second term than [the] first time,” Michael Shifter, president of the Inter-American Dialogue, a Washington policy group, told me. “There’s something happening in the region and the U.S. wants to be part of it. Whether there’s a well-thought-out vision or policy remains a question. But there is more of an affirmation of the region and a willingness to engage.”

The United States, Latin America’s largest trading partner throughout much of its history, still retains this position. Washington has now signed free trade agreements with more than a third of the hemisphere’s nations and annually exchanges more than $800 billion in goods and services with Latin America — more than three times the region’s commerce with China.

In Obama’s first term, however, the administration was widely viewed as neglecting Latin America. And China has moved in fast.

China built its annual trade with the region from virtually nothing in 2000 to about $260 billion in 2012. In 2009, it overtook the United States as the largest trading partner of Brazil, the region’s powerhouse — largely through massive purchases of iron ore and soy.

Other data is telling: In 1995, for example, the United States accounted for 37 percent of Brazil’s foreign direct investment. That dropped to 10 percent in 2011, [according to](http://www.americasquarterly.org/charticles/Latin-Americas-Changing-Global-Connections/) the Council of the Americas, which seeks to foster hemispheric ties.

Washington’s renewed ardor is at least partly because of the fear that China will repeat in Latin America the economic success it has [built in Africa](http://www.economist.com/news/middle-east-and-africa/21574012-chinese-trade-africa-keeps-growing-fears-neocolonialism-are-overdone-more). China has been able to present itself as a benevolent partner there, which has played well against the West’s history of [meddling in domestic affairs](http://www.coldwar.org/articles/50s/guatemala.asp).

“It’s about influence and leverage,” said Eric Farnsworth, vice president of the Council of the Americas, “…The region matured and expects to be treated in real partnership rather than [in the] patronizing way it happened in the past.”

The challenges facing Beijing and Washington lie in how each approaches the region. Washington confronts lingering resentment about its [historic regional interference](http://www.thenation.com/article/latin-americas-shock-resistance), stretching back to the 1823 Monroe Doctrine, and its continuing desire to mix business with policy — which muddies its approach to trade and investment. Washington’s domestic problems, its pivot to Asia and a host of global crises, also serve as distractions that could keep its actions in Latin America from matching its words — as has happened before.

#### Chinese influence in Latin America is key to maintain their economic growth.

Arnson et al. ‘9(Cynthia Anderson, Mark Mohr, Riordan Roett, writers for Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, “Enter the Dragon? China’s Presence in Latin America”, http://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/EnterDragonFinal.pdf) (JN)

China’s role in Latin America is, above all, based on trade, despite U.S. concerns about China’s military inﬂuence in Latin America. The major exception to this rule is Cuba, for which China represents a political relationship as well as one based on economic interests. Although Venezuelan authorities may also prefer that its relationship with China have political as well as economic dimensions, it is not clear that China has the same expectations of its relationship with Venezuela. To China, Latin America represents a signiﬁcant source of the necessary natural resources that will help China maintain its economic growth. Due primarily to trade with China, Latin America’s trade volume grew from $2.8 billion in 1988 to $49 billion in 2005. Also, and as publicly announced, China intends to surpass $180 billion in trade with Latin America by 2010, not only due to the country’s need for natural resources, but also as a result of China’s intention to diversify and expand its markets in the region. Thus, Latin America represents a substantial market for Chinese goods.

#### Chinese economic decline causes great power war.

**Kane 01** [Thomas Kane, PhD in Security Studies from the University of Hull & Lawrence Serewicz, Autumn, <http://www.carlisle.army.mil/usawc/Parameters/01autumn/Kane.htm>]

Despite China's problems with its food supply, the Chinese do not appear to be in danger of widespread starvation. Nevertheless, one cannot rule out the prospect entirely, especially if the earth's climate actually is getting warmer. The consequences of general famine in a country with over a billion people clearly would be catastrophic. The effects of oil shortages and industrial stagnation would be less lurid, but economic collapse would endanger China's political stability whether that collapse came with a bang or a whimper. PRC society has become dangerously fractured. As the coastal cities grow richer and more cosmopolitan while the rural inland provinces grow poorer, the political interests of the two regions become ever less compatible. Increasing the prospects for division yet further, Deng Xiaoping's administrative reforms have strengthened regional potentates at the expense of central authority. As Kent Calder observes, In part, this change [erosion of power at the center] is a conscious devolution, initiated by Deng Xiaoping in 1991 to outflank conservative opponents of economic reforms in Beijing nomenclature. But devolution has fed on itself, spurred by the natural desire of local authorities in the affluent and increasingly powerful coastal provinces to appropriate more and more of the fruits of growth to themselves alone.[ 49] Other social and economic developments deepen the rifts in Chinese society. The one-child policy, for instance, is disrupting traditional family life, with unknowable consequences for Chinese mores and social cohesion.[ 50] As families resort to abortion or infanticide to ensure that their one child is a son, the population may come to include an unprecedented preponderance of young, single men. If common gender prejudices have any basis in fact, these males are unlikely to be a source of social stability. Under these circumstances, China is vulnerable to unrest of many kinds. Unemployment or severe hardship, not to mention actual starvation, could easily trigger popular uprisings. Provincial leaders might be tempted to secede, perhaps openly or perhaps by quietly ceasing to obey Beijing's directives. China's leaders, in turn, might adopt drastic measures to forestall such developments. If faced with internal strife, supporters of China's existing regime may return to a more overt form of communist dictatorship. The PRC has, after all, oscillated between experimentation and orthodoxy continually throughout its existence. Spectacular examples include Mao's Hundred Flowers campaign and the return to conventional Marxism-Leninism after the leftist experiments of the Cultural Revolution, but the process continued throughout the 1980s, when the Chinese referred to it as the "fang-shou cycle." (Fang means to loosen one's grip; shou means to tighten it.)[ 51] If order broke down, the Chinese would not be the only people to suffer. Civil unrest in the PRC would disrupt trade relationships, send refugees flowing across borders, and force outside powers to consider intervention. If different countries chose to intervene on different sides, China's struggle could lead to major war. In a less apocalyptic but still grim scenario, China's government might try to ward off its demise by attacking adjacent countries.

#### Economic engagement is long-term strategy for promoting structural linkage between two economies – the plan is neither.

**Mastanduno, 1** – professor of Government at Dartmouth College (Michael, “Economic Engagement Strategies: Theory and Practice” <http://web.archive.org/web/20120906033646/http://polisci.osu.edu/faculty/bpollins/book/Mastanduno.pdf>

The basic causal logic of economic engagement, and the emphasis on domestic politics, can be traced to Hirschman. He viewed economic engagement as a long-term, transformative strategy. As one state gradually expands economic interaction with its target, the resulting (asymmetrical) interdependence creates vested interests within the target society and government. The beneficiaries of interdependence become addicted to it, and they protect their interests by pressuring the government to accommodate the source of interdependence. Economic engagement is a form of structural linkage; it is a means to get other states to *want* what you want, rather than to *do* what you want. The causal chain runs from economic interdependence through domestic political change to foreign policy accommodation.

#### That’s a voter for limits – broad interpretations of engagement include anything that effects the economy, which means everything

#### And, Good is not good enough – precise definition outweighs – don’t allow new 1AR answers to this card.

Resnick 01 – Dr. Evan Resnick, Ph.D. in Political Science from Columbia University, Assistant Professor of Political Science at Yeshiva University, “Defining Engagement”, Journal of International Affairs, Spring, 54(2), Ebsco

CONCLUSION

In matters of national security, establishing a clear definition of terms is a precondition for effective policymaking. Decisionmakers who invoke critical terms in an erratic, ad hoc fashion risk alienating their constituencies. They also risk exacerbating misperceptions and hostility among those the policies target. Scholars who commit the same error undercut their ability to conduct valuable empirical research. Hence, if scholars and policymakers fail rigorously to define "engagement," they undermine the ability to build an effective foreign policy.

#### widespread usage of renewables is costly and prevents reliable electrical supply – guarantees blackouts and grid failures

Garman and Thernstrom, 13 David, assistant secretary and under secretary at the U.S. Department of Energy (2001-07) and on the board of directors of the Energy Innovation Reform Project, and Samuel, executive director of EIRP, Former Resident Fellow and Codirector of the AEI Geoengineering Project, 7/29, WSJ, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887323309404578613792021690244.html>, “Europe's Renewable Romance Fades” | ADM

Europe has bet big on wind and solar energy, and many environmental advocates would like America to follow. Wind and solar have a role in the U.S. energy economy, but we would be wise to see the cautionary tale in the European experience and adjust our plans accordingly. Wind and solar generate 3.5% of America's electricity today, but Denmark gets 30% of its electricity from wind and hopes to produce 50% by 2020. Germany, Europe's largest national economy, produces roughly 12% of its electricity from wind and solar today, and it wants renewable energy to account for 35% of electricity generation by 2020. Clean energy powered by renewable resources is understandably attractive. But the honeymoon with renewables is ending for some Europeans as the practical challenges of the relationship become clear. The first challenge is cost. Germany has reportedly invested more than $250 billion in renewable energy deployment, and its households pay the highest power costs in Europe—except for the Danish. On average, Germans and Danes pay roughly 300% more for residential electricity than Americans do. Another challenge of Europe's growing dependence on renewable energy is far more serious: the potential loss of reliable electrical supply. It's one thing to ask consumers to pay more for cleaner energy; it's another to force them to endure blackouts. Since large amounts of electricity cannot be easily or inexpensively stored, it must be generated and delivered ("dispatched") to meet the constantly changing demand for power. As millions of consumers turn electric lights and appliances on and off, power generators and grid operators must match supply to demand to ensure that current is moving across wires at the proper frequency to avoid power failures, brownouts and other problems. Normally, this is fairly straightforward. Grid operators generally rely on coal and nuclear plants to meet baseload demand while modifying gas and hydroelectric power output to meet shifting demand. But electricity from wind and solar is variable and intermittent. Nature determines when and how much power will be generated from available capacity, so it is not necessarily "dispatchable" when needed. When intermittent renewables are small players in the grid, they can be easily absorbed. But as they reach European levels of penetration, the strain begins to show. There are increasing reports of management challenges resulting from wind and solar across the European grid, including frequency fluctuations, voltage support issues, and inadvertent power flows. Anxious operators are concerned about potential blackouts. In an April 17, 2012, letter to EU Commissioner for Energy Gunter Oettinger, for example, Daniel Dobbeni, the European Network of Transmission System Operators president, said grid operators are "deeply concerned about the difference in speed between the connection of very large capacities of renewable energy resources and the realization in due time of the grid investments needed to support the massive increase of power flows these new resources bring." He also expressed great concern "about the potential destabilizing effect of outdated connection conditions for distributed generation that are not being retrofitted anywhere fast enough."

#### blackouts cause nuclear meltdowns – risk assessment methods don’t assume a sustained grid failure and the lack of backup power

AP, 11 Associated Press, 3/29, <http://www.foxnews.com/us/2011/03/29/ap-impact-long-blackouts-pose-risk-reactors/>, “AP IMPACT: Long blackouts pose risk to US reactors” | ADM

Long before the nuclear emergency in Japan, U.S. regulators knew that a power failure lasting for days at an American nuclear plant, whatever the cause, could lead to a radioactive leak. Even so, they have required the nation's 104 nuclear reactors to develop plans for dealing only with much shorter blackouts on the assumption that power would be restored quickly. In one simulation presented by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in 2009, it would take less than a day for radiation to escape from a reactor at a Pennsylvania nuclear power plant after an earthquake, flood or fire knocked out all electrical power and there was no way to keep the reactors cool after backup battery power ran out. That plant, the Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station outside Lancaster, has reactors of the same older make and model as those releasing radiation at Japan's Fukushima Dai-ichi plant, which is using other means to try to cool the reactors. And like Fukushima Dai-ichi, the Peach Bottom plant has enough battery power on site to power emergency cooling systems for eight hours. In Japan, that wasn't enough time for power to be restored. According to the International Atomic Energy Agency and the Nuclear Energy Institute trade association, three of the six reactors at the plant still can't get power to operate the emergency cooling systems. Two were shut down at the time. In the sixth, the fuel was removed completely and put in the spent-fuel pool when it was shut down for maintenance at the time of the disaster. A week after the March 11 earthquake, diesel generators started supplying power to two other reactors, Units 5 and 6, the groups said. The risk of a blackout leading to core damage, while extremely remote, exists at all U.S. nuclear power plants, and some are more susceptible than others, according to an Associated Press investigation. While regulators say they have confidence that measures adopted in the U.S. will prevent or significantly delay a core from melting and threatening a radioactive release, the events in Japan raise questions about whether U.S. power plants are as prepared as they could and should be. Battery power As part of a review requested by President Obama in the wake of the Japan crisis, a top Nuclear Regulatory Commission official said last week that the agency will investigate whether the nation's nuclear reactors are capable of coping with station blackouts and whether regulatory requirements need to be strengthened. An obvious question is whether nuclear plants need enhanced battery supplies or batteries that last longer, said Bill Borchardt, the agency's executive director for operations. "There is a robust capability that exists already, but, given what happened in Japan, there's obviously a question that presents itself: Do we need to make it even more robust?" he said at a hearing before the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee. "We didn't address a tsunami and an earthquake, but clearly we have known for some time that one of the weak links that makes accidents a little more likely is losing power," said Alan Kolaczkowski, a retired nuclear engineer who worked on a federal risk analysis of Peach Bottom released in 1990 and is familiar with the updated risk analysis. Risk analyses conducted by the plants in 1991-94 and published by the commission in 2003 show that the chances of such an event striking a U.S. power plant are remote, even at the plant where the risk is the highest, the Beaver Valley Power Station in Pennsylvania. These long odds are among the reasons the United States since the late 1980s has required nuclear power plants to cope only with blackouts for four or eight hours. That's about how much time batteries would last. After that, it is assumed that power would be restored. And so far, that's been the case. Equipment put in place after the Sept. 11, 2001, terrorist attacks could buy more time. Otherwise, the reactor's radioactive core could begin to melt unless alternative cooling methods were employed. In Japan, the utility has tried using portable generators and dumping tons of seawater, among other things, on the reactors in an attempt to keep them cool. One-two punch in Japan A 2003 federal analysis looking at how to estimate the risk of containment failure said that, should power be knocked out by an earthquake or tornado, it "would be unlikely that power will be recovered in the time frame to prevent core meltdown." In Japan, it was a one-two punch: first the earthquake, then the tsunami. "Japan shows what happens when you play beat-the-clock and lose," said David Lochbaum, a former plant engineer and nuclear-safety director at the advocacy group Union of Concerned Scientists. At Tuesday's Senate committee hearing, he said the government and the nuclear-power industry have to do more to cope with prolonged blackouts, such as having temporary generators on site - or at nearby military bases - that can recharge batteries. A complete loss of electrical power, generally speaking, poses a major problem for a nuclear power plant because the reactor core must be kept cool, and backup cooling systems - mostly pumps that replenish the core with water - require massive amounts of power to work. Without the electrical grid, or diesel generators, batteries can be used for a time, but they will not last long with the power demands. And when the batteries die, the systems that control and monitor the plant can also go dark, making it difficult to ascertain water levels and the condition of the core. Eleven U.S. reactors are designed to cope with a station blackout lasting eight hours, while 93 are designed for four-hour blackouts. One variable not considered in the NRC risk assessments of severe blackouts was cooling water in spent-fuel pools, where rods once used in the reactor are placed. With limited resources, the commission decided to focus its analysis on the reactor fuel, which has the potential to release more radiation. Risk of core damage An analysis of individual plant risks released in 2003 by the NRC shows that for 39 of the 104 nuclear reactors, the risk of core damage from a blackout was greater than 1 in 100,000. At 45 other plants, the risk is greater than 1 in a million, the threshold the NRC is using to determine which severe accidents should be evaluated in its latest analysis. The Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit 1, in Pennsylvania had the greatest risk of core melt - 6.5 in 100,000, according to the analysis. But that risk may have been reduced in subsequent years as NRC regulations required plants to do more to cope with blackouts. Todd Schneider, a spokesman for FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Co., which runs Beaver Valley, told the AP that batteries on site would last less than a week. In 1988, eight years after labeling blackouts "an unresolved safety issue," the NRC required nuclear-power plants to improve the reliability of their diesel generators, have more backup generators on site, and better train personnel to restore power. These steps would allow them to keep the core cool for four to eight hours if they lost all electrical power. By contrast, the newest generation of nuclear-power plant, which is still awaiting approval, can last 72 hours without taking any action, and a minimum of seven days if water is supplied by other means to cooling pools. Despite the added safety measures, a 1997 report found that blackouts - the loss of on-site and off-site electrical power - remained "a dominant contributor to the risk of core melt at some plants."

#### Meltdowns cause extinction.

Wasserman ’02 (Harvey, Senior Editor – Free Press, Earth Island Journal, Spring, www.earthisland.org/eijournal/new\_articles.cfm?articleID=457&journalID=63)

The intense radioactive heat within today's operating reactors is the hottest anywhere on the planet. Because Indian Point has operated so long, its accumulated radioactive burden far exceeds that of Chernobyl. The safety systems are extremely complex and virtually indefensible. One or more could be wiped out with a small aircraft, ground-based weapons, truck bombs or even chemical/biological assaults aimed at the work force. A terrorist assault at Indian Point could yield three infernal fireballs of molten radioactive lava burning through the earth and into the aquifer and the river. Striking water, they would blast gigantic billows of horribly radioactive steam into the atmosphere. Thousands of square miles would be saturated with the most lethal clouds ever created, depositing relentless genetic poisons that would kill forever. Infants and small children would quickly die en masse. Pregnant women would spontaneously abort or give birth to horribly deformed offspring. Ghastly sores, rashes, ulcerations and burns would afflict the skin of millions. Heart attacks, stroke and multiple organ failure would kill thousands on the spot. Emphysema, hair loss, nausea, inability to eat or drink or swallow, diarrhea and incontinence, sterility and impotence, asthma and blindness would afflict hundreds of thousands, if not millions. Then comes the wave of cancers, leukemias, lymphomas, tumors and hellish diseases for which new names will have to be invented. Evacuation would be impossible, but thousands would die trying. Attempts to quench the fires would be futile. More than 800,000 Soviet draftees forced through Chernobyl's seething remains in a futile attempt to clean it up are still dying from their exposure. At Indian Point, the molten cores would burn uncontrolled for days, weeks and years. Who would volunteer for such an American task force? The immediate damage from an Indian Point attack (or a domestic accident) would render all five boroughs of New York City an apocalyptic wasteland. As at Three Mile Island, where thousands of farm and wild animals died in heaps, natural ecosystems would be permanently and irrevocably destroyed. Spiritually, psychologically, financially and ecologically, our nation would never recover. This is what we missed by a mere 40 miles on September 11. Now that we are at war, this is what could be happening as you read this. There are 103 of these potential Bombs of the Apocalypse operating in the US. They generate a mere 8 percent of our total energy. Since its deregulation crisis, California cut its electric consumption by some 15 percent. Within a year, the US could cheaply replace virtually all the reactors with increased efficiency. Yet, as the terror escalates, Congress is fast-tracking the extension of the Price-Anderson Act, a form of legal immunity that protects reactor operators from liability in case of a meltdown or terrorist attack.  Do we take this war seriously? Are we committed to the survival of our nation?  If so, the ticking reactor bombs that could **obliterate the very core of our life and of all future generations** must be shut down.

#### The United States federal government should offer subsidies and tax breaks for companies looking to invest in alternative energy in Mexico, use H.R. 2764 to encourage the Export-Import Bank to invest 10 percent of its financing capacity in promoting alternative energy projects in Mexico, become a signatory of the Kyoto Protocol and use the Kyoto Protocol’s Clean Development Mechanism to fund alternative energy projects in Mexico

#### CP Solves the case.

Miller and deLeon, 09 Stephanie, consultant on U.S.-Latin America relations and was formerly the Research Associate for the Americas Project on the National Security Team. Born in Venezuela with family from Colombia, Miller earned her degree from Duke University in International Comparative Studies with a focus on Latin America. She currently lives in Bogotá, Colombia, and Rudy, Senior Vice President of National Security and International Policy at American Progress in Washington, DC. He serves on several non-profit boards and is a parttime college instructor. DeLeon is also a former senior U.S. Department of Defense official, staff director on Capitol Hill, and retired corporate executive, April, Center for American Progress, <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2009/04/pdf/mexico.pdf>, “Transcending the Rio Grande - U.S.-Mexico relations need to reach beyond the border - Recommendations of our Mexico Working Group” | ADM

To foster a cooperative and mutually beneficial exploration of wind and solar energy investments between the United States and Mexico, the United States should: • Explore ways to make investing in alternative energy projects in Mexico more economically viable and profitable, including possible subsidies and tax breaks for companies looking to invest in alternative energy both within the United States and abroad. • Make use of The Department of State, Foreign Operations and Related Programs Appropriations Act of 2008 (H.R. 2764). H.R. 2764 was passed in the 110th U.S. Congress and signed into law in 2007. It encourages the Export-Import Bank of the United States to invest 10 percent of its financing capacity in promoting the export of clean-energy products and services.• Become a signatory of the Kyoto Protocol and any new international climate change initiatives on the horizon. The United States should take advantage of substantial financing opportunities in Mexico through the Kyoto Protocol’s Clean Development Mechanism. The Clean Development Mechanism allows emission-reduction (or emission removal) projects in developing countries to earn certified emission reduction credits, which can then be traded and sold and used by industrialized countries to meet a part of their emission reduction targets under the Kyoto Protocol. As of January 2008, Mexico accounted for 100 of the nearly 900 CDM projects registered worldwide. It was awarded with 2,333,150 carbon emission reduction credits, making it the second largest creator of carbon credits in Latin America.55

#### Squo solves.

**Meyer 13** – Analyst in Latin American affairs for the Congressional Research Service (Peter J. Meyer, “Brazil-US Relations”, Congressional Research Service, 2/27/13,  [https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL33456.pdf)//js](http://assets.opencrs.com/rpts/RL33456_20090121.pdf)//js)

Energy has been another important area of U.S.-Brazilian cooperation in recent years. Brazil is widely regarded as a world leader in energy policy for successfully reducing its reliance on foreign oil through the development of alternative energy resources and increased domestic production. In addition to being the world’s second-largest producer of ethanol (after the United States), Brazil currently generates 85% of its electricity through hydropower. Brazil also has recently discovered large offshore oil deposits that have the potential to turn the country into a major oil and gas producer and an important source of energy for the United States.106 To facilitate greater cooperation in the development of safe, secure, and affordable energy, President Obama and President Rousseff launched a Strategic Energy Dialogue in March 2011. Ethanol and Other Biofuels107 Brazil stands out as an example of a country that has become a net exporter of energy, partially by increasing its use and production of ethanol. In 1975, in response to sharp increases in global oil prices, the Brazilian government began a national program to promote the production and consumption of sugarcane ethanol. Brazil now produces some 390,000 barrels per day.108 Within Brazil, pure ethanol is available at nearly every fueling station and gasoline is required to include a 20% ethanol blend. About 90% of new cars sold in Brazil each year are fitted with “flex-fuel” engines capable of running on fuel blends ranging from pure ethanol to pure gasoline. As a result, ethanol accounts for over half of all fuel pumped in Brazil.109 On March 9, 2007, the United States and Brazil, the world’s two largest ethanol-producing countries, signed a memorandum of understanding to promote greater cooperation on ethanol and biofuels. The agreement involves (1) technology sharing between the United States and Brazil; (2) feasibility studies and technical assistance to build domestic biofuels industries in third countries; and (3) multilateral efforts to advance the global development of biofuels.110 Over the past six years, the United States and Brazil have moved forward on all three facets of the agreement. Presidents Obama and Rousseff signed onto a partnership agreement for the development of aviation biofuels in March 2011,111 and in October 2011, Boeing and Brazil’s Embraer announced plans to build a joint research center.112 Brazil and the United States have also worked together in a number of Latin American, Caribbean, and African countries. In March 2011, Presidents Obama and Rousseff agreed to commit $3 million to support the development of legal regimes and domestic biofuels production in the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, and Senegal.113 Additionally, the United States and Brazil are working with other members of the International Biofuels Forum (IBF) to make biofuels standards and codes more uniform. Brazil and the United States have taken steps to liberalize trade in ethanol over the past year. In December 2011, the Brazilian government issued a resolution to extend its duty-free treatment of imported ethanol until December 31, 2015.114 Similarly, the U.S. Congress allowed a 54-cent-pergallon duty on imported ethanol to expire at the end of 2011. Prior to its expiration, the duty served as a significant barrier to direct imports of Brazilian ethanol in most years. Although some Brazilian ethanol was allowed to enter the United States duty-free after being reprocessed in Caribbean Basin Initiative (CBI) countries, such imports could only account for up to 7% of the U.S. ethanol market. A 2.5% ad valorem tariff on ethanol imports to the United States remains in place permanently unless the Harmonized Tariff Schedule code is changed.

#### But the aff doesn’t.

Wood, 10 Duncan, Full Professor, Director of the Program in International Relations, and also Director of the Canadian Studies Program at the Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México (ITAM) in Mexico City. He is Senior Adviser for the Renewable Energy Initiative with the Mexico Institute of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars and a Senior Associate at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) in Washington, D.C. He is also a researcher in the Centro de Derecho Economico Internacional (CDEI) at ITAM, December, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, <http://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/Environment%2C%20Development%20and%20Growth.pdf>, “Environment, Development, and Growth: U.S.-Mexico Cooperation in Renewable Energies” | ADM

This brings us to the barriers that currently limit the export of more clean electricity to the United States and, in particular, to California. What is required is investment in increased transmission capacity from Mexico to the United States, either through Baja California to California, or from other border states to the rest of the United States. As we will discuss in a later section on wind power, transmission capacity remains the single largest obstacle to boosting RE electricity exports to the United States. Unlike wind power, however, geothermal power is constant and steady, providing the opportunity to transmit electricity without having to worry about intermittent fluctuations in power. To boost the growth of geothermal capacity in Mexico, U.S. authorities might consider the potential benefits of providing technical assistance and funding for mapping out Mexico’s geothermal resources. Although the general distribution of geothermal activity in the country is known, the specific location of the most appropriate sites for generation is not known. This will be of particular importance in the north of the country, with the predicted decline of Cerro Prieto, but throughout the country there is huge potential. With the future development of the Mexican national grid, such knowledge would be of enormous value to power authorities in both Mexico and the United States.

**No impact to heg.**

**Ikenberry 08** – professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University (John, “The Rise of China and the Future of the West Can the Liberal System Survive?” Jan/Feb 2008, Foreign Affairs)

Some observers believe that the American era is coming to an end, as the Western-oriented world order is replaced by one increasingly dominated by the East. The historian Niall Ferguson has written that the bloody twentieth century witnessed "the descent of the West" and "a reorientation of the world" toward the East. Realists go on to note that as China gets more powerful and the United States' position erodes, two things are likely to happen: China will try to use its growing influence to reshape the rules and institutions of the international system to better serve its interests, and other states in the system -- especially the declining hegemon -- will start to see China as a growing security threat. The result of these developments, they predict, will be tension, distrust, and conflict, the typical features of a power transition. In this view, the drama of China's rise will feature an increasingly powerful China and a declining United States locked in an epic battle over the rules and leadership of the international system. And as the world's largest country emerges not from within but outside the established post-World War II international order, it is a drama that will end with the grand ascendance of China and the onset of an Asian-centered world order. That course, however, is not inevitable. The rise of China does not have to trigger a wrenching hegemonic transition. The U.S.-Chinese power transition can be very different from those of the past because China faces an international order that is **fundamentally different** from those that past rising states confronted. China does not just face the United States; it faces a Western-centered system that is open, integrated, and rule-based, with wide and deep political foundations. The nuclear revolution, meanwhile, has made war among great powers unlikely -- eliminating the **major tool** that rising powers have used to overturn international systems defended by declining hegemonic states. Today's Western order, in short, is hard to overturn and easy to join. This unusually durable and expansive order is itself the product of farsighted U.S. leadership. After World War II, the United States did not simply establish itself as the leading world power. It led in the creation of universal institutions that not only invited global membership but also brought democracies and market societies closer together. It built an order that facilitated the participation and integration of both established great powers and newly independent states. (It is often forgotten that this postwar order was designed in large part to reintegrate the defeated Axis states and the beleaguered Allied states into a unified international system.) Today, China can gain full access to and thrive within this system. And if it does, China will rise, but the Western order -- if managed properly -- will live on.

**No risk of India-Pakistan war**

**Mutti 09** – over a decade of expertise covering on South Asia geopolitics, Contributing Editor to Demockracy journal (James, 1/5, Mumbai Misperceptions: War is Not Imminent, http://demockracy.com/four-reasons-why-the-mumbai-attacks-wont-result-in-a-nuclear-war/)

Writer Amitav Ghosh divined a crucial connection between the two messages. “When commentators repeat the metaphor of 9/11, they are in effect pushing the Indian government to mount a comparable response.” Indeed, India’s opposition Hindu nationalist BJP has blustered, “Our response must be close to what the American response was.” Fearful of imminent war, the media has indulged in frantic hand wringing about Indian and Pakistani nuclear arsenals and renewed fears about the Indian subcontinent being “the most dangerous place on earth.” As an observer of the subcontinent for over a decade, I am optimistic that war will not be the end result of this event. As horrifying as the Mumbai attacks were, they are not likely to drive India and Pakistan into an armed international conflict. The media frenzy over an imminent nuclear war seems the result of the media being superficially knowledgeable about the history of Indian-Pakistani relations, of feeling compelled to follow the most sensationalistic story, and being recently brainwashed into thinking that the only way to respond to a major terrorist attack was the American way – a war. Here are four reasons why the Mumbai attacks will not result in a war: 1. For both countries, a war would be a disaster. India has been successfully building stronger relations with the rest of the world over the last decade. It has occasionally engaged in military muscle-flexing (abetted by a Bush administration eager to promote India as a counterweight to China and Pakistan), but it has much more aggressively promoted itself as an emerging economic powerhouse and a moral, democratic alternative to less savory authoritarian regimes. Attacking a fledgling democratic Pakistan would not improve India’s reputation in anybody’s eyes. The restraint Manmohan Singh’s government has exercised following the attacks indicates a desire to avoid rash and potentially regrettable actions. It is also perhaps a recognition that military attacks will never end terrorism. Pakistan, on the other hand, couldn’t possibly win a war against India, and Pakistan’s military defeat would surely lead to the downfall of the new democratic government. The military would regain control, and Islamic militants would surely make a grab for power – an outcome neither India nor Pakistan want. Pakistani president Asif Ali Zardari has shown that this is not the path he wants his country to go down. He has forcefully spoken out against terrorist groups operating in Pakistan and has ordered military attacks against LeT camps. Key members of LeT and other terrorist groups have been arrested. One can hope that this is only the beginning, despite the unenviable military and political difficulties in doing so. 2. Since the last major India-Pakistan clash in 1999, both countries have made concrete efforts to create people-to-people connections and to improve economic relations. Bus and train services between the countries have resumed for the first time in decades along with an easing of the issuing of visas to cross the border. India-Pakistan cricket matches have resumed, and India has granted Pakistan “most favored nation” trading status. The Mumbai attacks will undoubtedly strain relations, yet it is hard to believe that both sides would throw away this recent progress. With the removal of Pervez Musharraf and the election of a democratic government (though a shaky, relatively weak one), both the Indian government and the Pakistani government have political motivations to ease tensions and to proceed with efforts to improve relations. There are also growing efforts to recognize and build upon the many cultural ties between the populations of India and Pakistan and a decreasing sense of animosity between the countries. 3. Both countries also face difficult internal problems that present more of a threat to their stability and security than does the opposite country. If they are wise, the governments of both countries will work more towards addressing these internal threats than the less dangerous external ones. The most significant problems facing Pakistan today do not revolve around the unresolved situation in Kashmir or a military threat posed by India. The more significant threat to Pakistan comes from within. While LeT has focused its firepower on India instead of the Pakistani state, other militant Islamic outfits have not. Groups based in the tribal regions bordering Afghanistan have orchestrated frequent deadly suicide bombings and clashes with the Pakistani military, including the attack that killed ex-Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto in 2007. The battle that the Pakistani government faces now is not against its traditional enemy India, but against militants bent on destroying the Pakistani state and creating a Taliban-style regime in Pakistan. In order to deal with this threat, it must strengthen the structures of a democratic, inclusive political system that can also address domestic problems and inequalities. On the other hand, the threat of Pakistani based terrorists to India is significant. However, suicide bombings and attacks are also carried out by Indian Islamic militants, and vast swaths of rural India are under the de facto control of the Maoist guerrillas known as the Naxalites. Hindu fundamentalists pose a serious threat to the safety of many Muslim and Christian Indians and to the idea of India as a diverse, secular, democratic society. Separatist insurgencies in Kashmir and in parts of the northeast have dragged on for years. And like Pakistan, India faces significant challenges in addressing sharp social and economic inequalities. Additionally, Indian political parties, especially the ruling Congress Party and others that rely on the support of India’s massive Muslim population to win elections, are certainly wary about inflaming public opinion against Pakistan (and Muslims). This fear could lead the investigation into the Mumbai attacks to fizzle out with no resolution, as many other such inquiries have. 4. The international attention to this attack – somewhat difficult to explain in my opinion given the general complacency and utter apathy in much of the western world about previous terrorist attacks in places like India, Pakistan, and Indonesia – is a final obstacle to an armed conflict. Not only does it put both countries under a microscope in terms of how they respond to the terrible events, it also means that they will feel international pressure to resolve the situation without resorting to war. India and Pakistan have been warned by the US, Russia, and others not to let the situation end in war. India has been actively recruiting Pakistan’s closest allies – China and Saudi Arabia – to pressure Pakistan to act against militants, and the US has been in the forefront of pressing Pakistan for action. Iran too has expressed solidarity with India in the face of the attacks and is using its regional influence to bring more diplomatic pressure on Pakistan.

**The war won't escalate or cause extinction**

**Dyer 02 –** (5/24, Gwinette, Hamilton Spectator, "Nuclear war a possibility over Kashmir", Lexis, WEA)

For those who do not live in the subcontinent, the most important fact is that the damage would be largely confined to the region. The Cold War is over, the strategic understandings that once tied India and Pakistan to the rival alliance systems have all been cancelled, and no outside powers would be drawn into the fighting. The detonation of a hundred or so relatively small nuclear weapons over India and Pakistan would not cause grave harm to the wider world from fallout. People over 40 have already lived through a period when the great powers conducted hundreds of nuclear tests in the atmosphere, and they are mostly still here.

**US will accept its new role peacefully – no backlash**

**Kupchan, 99 –** Charles A. Kupchan Fall 1999 World Policy Journal "Life after pax Americana"

The bad news is that the global stability that unipolarity has engendered will be jeopardized **as power becomes more equally distributed in the international system**. The good news is that this structural **change** will occur through different mechanisms than in the past, and therefore **may be easier to manage peacefully**. The rising challenger is Europe, not a unitary state with hegemonic ambitions. Europe's aspirations will be moderated by the self-checking mechanisms inherent in the EU and by cultural and linguistic barriers to centralization. In addition, the United Statesis likely to react to a more independent Europe by stepping back and making room for an EU that appears ready to be more self-reliant and more muscular. **Unlike reigning hegemons in the past, the United States will not fight to the finish to maintain its primacy and prevent its eclipse by a rising challenger. On the contrary, the United States will cede leadership willingly as its economy slows and it grows weary of being the security guarantor of last resort. The prospect is thus not one of clashing titans, but of no titans at all**. Regions long accustomed to relying on American resourcesand leadership to preserve the peace may well be left to fend for themselves. These are the main reasons that the challenge for American grand strategy as the next century opens will be to wean Europe and East Asia of their dependence on the United States andput in place arrangements that will prevent the return of competitive balancing and regional rivalries in the wake of an American retrenchment.

**No resource wars**

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

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

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

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

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

#### Internal Link Turn –

#### Energy independence comparatively destroys hegemony.

**Hulbert 12** – (8-19-2012, Matthew, Lead Analyst at European Energy Review and consultant to a number of governments, most recently as Senior Research Fellow, Netherlands Institute for International Relations, former Senior Research Fellow at ETH Zurich working on energy and political risk, MPhil in international relations from Cambridge University, “America Will Deeply Regret Its Fixation On Energy Independence,” <http://www.forbes.com/sites/matthewhulbert/2012/08/19/why-america-will-deeply-regret-us-energy-independence/4/>)

The U.S. energy independence debate is getting very tetchy of late. Seasoned energy experts are trading cheap blows, principally for sitting on opposite sides of the fence. Nobody doubts that U.S. energy output will keep growing, but **whether it ever amounts to full ‘independence’ is at best tenuous**. More importantly, **it spells total disaster for America’s role in the world**. No global oil role, **forget being a global hyper power**. Those days will be gone.

The allure of energy independence is a compelling story to tell. The U.S. can shut up shop, source all its energy from home shores, never having to step foot outside the Americas to get its energy fix. The U.S. will supposedly be able to boast 15 million barrels a day of liquids by 2020 from a raft of shale oil plays, with massive new oil plays feeding in from Canada in the North, inching production up to around 22mb/d. Unconventional resources are expected to explode from Latin America in the South. Brazil, Argentina, Venezuela will all see rapid supply growth, with Mexico having nothing short of a second energy revolution. Boil the numbers down, the Americas sits on 6.4 trillion unconventional barrels vs. 1.2 trillion conventional barrels across the Middle East. The U.S. will not only be the world’s largest single producer of crude; oil will flow from North to South across the America’s, not East to West across the globe. America can declare total energy independence, import dependency (already clipped to 45%) will be banished; the deficit will be fixed. Oil receipts will replenish the Federal Reserve, not OPEC states. Millions of hydrocarbon jobs will be created in the U.S. to boot. American oil, for American consumers, at American (WTI) prices. Whatever’s left over could be the swing supply for the rest of world, dictating how much everyone pays for a barrel of oil. **Epic stuff, no doubt**.

**Whether you believe all these numbers doesn’t really matter**. Few U.S. politicians (or analysts) pay much regard to depletion rates, cost uncertainties for viable extraction, local environmental risks, or contrasting production priorities across the Americas, not to mention the small fact that Asian NOCs have been making some of the main investments across North America. The fact that oil and gas only accounts for 1% of U.S. GDP, is also rather conveniently overlooked. **Energy independence is already being touted as a self-fulfilling prophecy playing out in real time today**, not as a gradual process of increments and change. This not only flies in the face of global hydrocarbon fundamentals that will see OPEC market share become more concentrated than ever over the next decade, (50% or more), it’s already creating serious geopolitical gaps across international energy markets.

That’s deeply problematic, precisely because supply side dynamics are looking more fragile than they have for a very long time. America has not only gone ‘missing in action’ to underwrite global supplies, it’s contributing to the **international malaise** by putting **perceived political interests ahead of global oil stability.** This comes in two forms, ‘passive’ and ‘aggressive’ from Washington – both built on the single idea that the U.S. can play a new geopolitical game thanks to energy independence beckoning just around the corner.

Independence: Passive And Active

Passive = Libya, where the U.S. made it abundantly clear to Europe that Tripoli was not considered a vital national security interest for the U.S., despite prices hitting $127/b. Britain and France were left picking up the pieces, with U.S. firepower providing back-up support, rather than frontline artillery. The chances of that happening had the U.S. not struck oil would have been unthinkable in the 2000s. Conversely, aggressive = Iran. The U.S. has decided that chimerical nuclear containment is a higher priority than collateral impacts Iranian sanctions have had on global oil markets. The conclusions are now chillingly clear. The U.S. will increasingly only act in its own perceived national security interests. As long as those interests went hand in hand with safeguarding international oil supplies, consumer state could all rest easy. But U.S. energy independence has torn up the script: We’ve entered a brave new world where Washington is not only unwilling to cover supply gaps through military / political action (Libya), and if needs be, is willing to put narrow interests above and beyond oil market stability (Iran).

No one should blame, or bemoan the U.S. for doing this. **It’s entirely up to the U.S. whichever path they chose to take**. You could even argue it’s exactly what Washington should be doing to create serious foreign policy optionality: pick and choose whatever it does where, when, and how for the rest of the world to fall back on. All fair enough, but the downside risk this presents to Washington has already been captured in the ‘Kuwait Question’: Would the U.S. take assertive action to secure some of the key producer states of the world, or would they now turn the cheek? We all know the U.S. is no longer dependent on Middle East supplies; it hasn’t been for a long time given it sources less than 15% of its oil from the sand. But we also know that the decision to underwrite MENA supplies is nothing to do with U.S. consumption – and everything to do with retaining a dominant global geopolitical role. Ensure that hydrocarbons globally flow to the East and West, and much else follows as the geo-economic and geo-political lynchpin of the world. Lose it, and you’ll be geopolitically downgraded quicker than credit analysts can get stuck into Greek debt. That’s before we consider where Gulf States decide to recycle their petrodollars in future. No security, no $? It’s certainly a question for the U.S. to ponder – not only in terms of who they are going to sell their Treasuries to, but what currency oil is priced in. Hence the bottom line for the U.S.; **Middle East energy isn’t about oil for America, it’s ultimately about power**. If the U.S. wasn’t part of the Gulf energy game, it would hold zero sway with Saudi, no powers of persuasion over Iranian nukes, no say in the Arab Awakening, or how Gulf Monarchies handle critical succession problems in future. Let alone shaping vested interests to promote and extend U.S. influence across the globe.

#### Their aff is the status quo – relations are high and renewable assistance is increasing rapidly – voting neg solves the aff

Jacobson 6/18 – Assistant Secretary Of State For Western Hemisphere Affairs (Roberta S, “State’s Jacobson at Senate Hearing on U.S.-Mexico Partnership,” 6/18/13, U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Before Foreign Relations Committee Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/texttrans/2013/06/20130618276661.html#axzz2XAL8c3nZ)//SJF

When President Obama met with President Peña Nieto in Mexico on May 2, the two presidents spoke again of their commitment to bilateral partnership and built on the positive personal relationship they established at their first meeting in November 2012 in Washington. They agreed to take new steps to strengthen our economic relationship, enhance shared competitiveness, and create new trade, investment, and employment opportunities. The presidents reaffirmed their commitment to collaborate on citizen security based on shared responsibility and mutual respect. They highlighted efforts to increase the connections between our peoples that enrich the culture and prosperity of both societies. The presidents also reviewed our cooperation on global and hemispheric issues. Their discussion highlighted the extraordinary benefits we realize from our relationship that often do not make the daily headlines, but are profoundly relevant to our daily lives and to our future.

ECONOMIC AND ENERGY ENGAGEMENT

The United States and Mexico share one of the world’s most vibrant and mutually beneficial economic relationships. Our economic links are the linchpin of our overall relationship. We are partners in an integrated enterprise whose success depends on us working together. Given the high degree of intra-industry trade, much of what we import consists of U.S. exports to Mexico processed further in Mexico. U.S. companies have more than $91 billion invested in Mexico, while Mexican companies are increasing their investment in the American economy, currently nearly $27.9 billion.

It is difficult to overstate the importance of our trade relationship with Mexico. In 2012, two-way merchandise trade reached nearly $500 billion and services trade was $39 billion in 2011. Mexico is our second largest export market and third largest overall trading partner. We sell more to Mexico than we do to Brazil, Russia, India, and China combined. The United States is Mexico’s largest trading partner. Together with Canada, Mexico and the United States comprise one of the most successful and competitive economic platforms in the world today. We have taken steps to strengthen that trading relationship. Last October, the United States and eight other countries welcomed Mexico (and Canada) to join the negotiations for the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP). TPP is a high-standard, 21st century trade agreement that includes countries from one of the fastest-growing regions in the world.

To increase competitiveness, foster economic growth and innovation, and explore ways to partner for global leadership, Presidents Obama and Peña Nieto announced on May 2 the establishment of a High-Level Economic Dialogue (HLED). We plan to hold the first meeting later this year. We will organize the dialogue around three broad themes: promoting competitiveness and connectivity; fostering economic growth, productivity, and innovation; and partnering for regional and global leadership.

The HLED will increase cooperation in sectors that connect our economies, including transportation, telecommunications, and energy, and promote greater two-way investment. The dialogue will stimulate entrepreneurship and innovation, encourage the development of human capital, and examine regional and international initiatives, including our engagement on the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation forum, and the G20.

Given the massive flow of goods and people across our shared border, modernizing border infrastructure and border management is essential. At their May meeting, President Obama and President Peña Nieto reaffirmed their commitment to our 21st Century Border Management Initiative. At the April meeting of the initiative’s Executive Steering Committee, senior representatives of both governments encouraged projects and initiatives that will improve infrastructure, facilitate the secure flow of legitimate commerce and travel, and strengthen law enforcement along the border.

Our energy relationship with Mexico is a critical component of North American energy security. In 2012, Mexico was our second largest supplier of imported crude oil, the largest export market for U.S. refined petroleum products, and a growing market for U.S. natural gas exports. President Peña Nieto has made energy reform a priority, and if it is successful, Mexico could attract international investment and expertise to reverse the decline in its oil production.

We have negotiated and signed the U.S.-Mexico Transboundary Hydrocarbons Agreement. By establishing a cooperative framework and greater legal clarity for the development of reserves that traverse the U.S.-Mexico maritime border, it would benefit both the United States and Mexico. In his meeting with President Peña Nieto, President Obama committed to working with Congress to pass legislation to implement the Transboundary Hydrocarbons Agreement. Senators Wyden and Murkowski recently introduced S.812, legislation which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to implement the Agreement. We look forward to working with the Senators to move this important legislation forward.

In Mexico, the Peña Nieto administration is pursuing a broad reform agenda with a focus on economic development. In just six months, Mexico passed major reforms in labor, education, and telecommunications. The Mexican government announced plans for further reforms of energy, fiscal, and financial policy. Provided the implementing legislation accompanying these reforms leads to meaningful policy change, as is likely, these changes have the potential to reshape our neighbor’s economic landscape and expand our economic engagement with Mexico.

SECURITY COOPERATION

Since the Merida Initiative was announced in 2007, we have based our cooperation with Mexico on the recognition that our countries share responsibility for combating transnational criminal networks and for protecting our citizens from the crime, corruption, and violence they generate. Our unprecedented cooperation reflects our mutual respect and our understanding of the tremendous benefits our two countries can produce through collaboration. Our strong partnership improves citizen safety by fighting drug trafficking, organized crime, corruption, illicit arms trafficking, money laundering, and demand for drugs on both sides of the border.

Our Merida partnership is organized around four pillars:

• Disrupting the capacity of organized criminal groups;

• Institutionalizing reforms to sustain rule of law and respect for human rights;

• Creating a 21st century border; and

• Building strong and resilient communities.

We are strengthening institutions, especially police, justice, and civil society organizations; expanding our border focus beyond interdiction of contraband to include facilitation of legitimate trade and travel; and building strong communities resistant to the influence of organized crime.

Since the inception of the Merida Initiative, the U.S. government has delivered about $1.2 billion out of $1.9 billion worth of training and equipment. The Merida Initiative has provided crucial support to the Mexican government’s efforts to build the capacity of its rule of law institutions and reform the justice sector, while enhancing the bilateral relationship and extent of cooperation between the U.S. and Mexican governments. Our Mexican partners have invested at least 10 dollars for every dollar we have contributed to our Merida goals in Mexico. The U.S. contribution is vitally important.

U.S.-Mexico bilateral engagement has been transformed over the last 10 years, and the Merida partnership is an important component of this broader evolution in the relationship. President Peña Nieto and his team have consistently made clear to us their interest in continuing our close collaboration on security issues, most recently during President Obama’s visit. The Merida Initiative continues to provide a comprehensive, flexible framework under which our partnership can move forward to the benefit of both Americans and Mexicans.

PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE TIES

The people-to-people ties that bind Mexico to the United States are strong and deep, and they enrich both countries. One in 10 Americans – more than 30 million people – is of Mexican heritage. A robust Mexican-American community in the United States contributes to our culture, our values, our politics, and our social structures. Some 20 million Americans travel to Mexico every year for tourism, business, or study. The cities and towns along our common border are interconnected. Mexico is home to the largest expatriate community of American citizens in the world –more than one million people. These ties bring us together as families, neighbors, and friends, and contribute to our mutual understanding.

During President Obama’s visit to Mexico, we announced new initiatives to use people-to-people links to build a stronger bilateral relationship. The Presidents announced the creation of a Bilateral Forum on Higher Education, Innovation, and Research to promote mutual prosperity, expanded opportunity, job creation, and the development of a 21st century workforce in both countries. The Forum, which will begin meeting this year, will bring together government, academia, and civil society to develop a shared vision on educational cooperation. Through President Obama's 100,000 Strong in the Americas initiative, we encourage Mexican students to study in the United States, just as President Peña Nieto did. We also want to facilitate American students to study abroad in the Hemisphere, including in Mexico, and greater academic mobility between our two countries. These initiatives will strengthen educational institutions in both countries, just as Mexico begins to implement its education reforms.

President Obama also spoke in Mexico of his administration’s vision for comprehensive immigration reform that respects our tradition as a nation of immigrants, but also a nation of laws; reform that recognizes the need to strengthen border security, but also to strengthen legal immigration. Although comprehensive immigration reform would affect Mexico more than any other country, President Peña Nieto publicly recognized that it is a U.S. domestic issue. Our border is more secure than it has ever been and illegal immigration attempts into the United States are near their lowest level in decades. Mexico announced its intention to improve border security along its own southern border, at least in part to reduce the flow of migrants who seek to transit Mexico on their way to the United States.

NEW OPPORTUNITIES FOR DRUG DEMAND REDUCTION IN MEXICO

We are working together on new opportunities for drug demand reduction in Mexico. The Peña Nieto administration has made demand reduction one of the principal pillars of its crime and violence prevention program, with the objective of modernizing and expanding its addiction diagnosis and treatment capabilities.

The United States and Mexico will be able to apply this approach to three areas of demand reduction policy—professionalizing addiction treatment counseling, improving Mexican capacity to research and develop addiction prevention and treatment methods, and expanding the prevalence and use of drug treatment courts.

GLOBAL ENGAGEMENT AND COOPERATION

We are increasing cooperation with Mexico on global and regional issues. Mexico is an important player on the world stage – demonstrated by its hosting of the UN Climate Change Conference in 2010 and the G20 Summit in 2012. Mexico joined the Wassenaar Arrangement, a multilateral export control regime, and the Nuclear Suppliers Group non-proliferation regimes. Mexico has made great advances on its own strategic trade controls – something we welcome from a major trading partner – and hosted the plenary meeting of the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism in May. We engage closely with Mexico on these issues.

Our common interest in the environment and clean energy is another area of growing cooperation. Since the 2010 UN climate negotiations in Cancun, the United States and Mexico have maintained a high level of engagement. Mexican leadership has been critical to successful outcomes on a range of important environmental issues. We engage closely on the responsible and environmentally sound development of unconventional gas resources, as well as wind energy development, energy efficiency, cross-border electricity trade, a bilateral renewable energy market, and low-emissions development. We cooperate closely under the Energy and Climate Partnership of the Americas, for which Mexico will host the next Ministerial in the fall. President Obama also discussed with President Peña Nieto in May our interest in working with Mexico to engage with Central American partners in facilitating a robust regional electricity market.

#### 2 Reasons their energy diplomacy internal link is out of context –

#### 1. About hydrocarbons and exporting US LNG – the plan is neither.

#### 2. About LNG dominance in Europe

**~~Investment in Mexico boosts our energy diplomacy~~**

**F.D.I., ‘12**, (Future Directions International), "energy diplomacy to be key feature of obama administration," October 24, 2012 <http://www.futuredirections.org.au/publications/energy-security/27-energy-security-swa/760-energy-diplomacy-to-be-key-feature-of-obama-administration.html>

If successful in the November election, the Obama Administration will make energy a centrepiece of US foreign policy. **While energy has always been central to US diplomacy, recent discoveries and technological developments have reversed Washington’s long-term vulnerability**. As a result, a government led by President Obama will exploit the forecast hydrocarbon export potential as a diplomatic tool. If production targets are realised, **US soft power influence may change the global dynamics, approach and commitment of Washington’s foreign policy for decades to come**. In a speech at Georgetown University in Washington, Secretary of State, Hillary **Clinton**, **detailed how America’s newly acquired energy influence would promote global opportunities**. Ms **Clinton’s speech was founded on three broad themes**: **building capacity among allies; countering challenges to Washington’s global interests; and fostering economic growth**.

**<their card ends here>**

Ms Clinton suggested the US hydrocarbon expansion had international benefits. Referring to petroleum products, the Secretary of State, argued that gas production was in danger of monopolisation. US exports of liquefied natural gas may weaken the strength of the major hydrocarbon exporters and their influence over energy-poor states.

While not mentioned specifically, it is likely Ms Clinton was referring to Russia and its dominance over Europe. American natural gas could change European energy dynamics, reducing Moscow’s ability to influence policy within the continent, particularly among former Warsaw Pact states. Given the disruptions to gas flows from Russia in recent years, it is likely that Europe will welcome improved gas opportunities. While Russia will continue to provide a significant share of the continent’s gas, its influence over European policy may become increasingly marginalised

During increasing rationalisation of American spending and its presence overseas, energy could prove to be an important tool in promoting US interests. Ms Clinton suggested US production would promote its role in energy dialogues. Citing the South China Sea and the Arctic, she argued that the US could work as a partner to resolve tensions. This should not be perceived as a statement of international commitment, however. Rather Ms Clinton’s speech suggests that the US will use its position to stabilise the present volatility in the energy market, moderating shocks and sensitivities. In reality, however, achievement of this aim is unlikely. While US production is forecast to be significant, the hydrocarbon sector is globalised and interdependent. Oil and gas prices and supplies will continue to fluctuate, depending on trends in the international system.

#### CIR turns heg

**Nye 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, 12-10-2012, http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/obama-needs-immigration-reform-to-maintain-america-s-strength-by-joseph-s--nye#3lbxO0TM6Q8JpxEA.99

CommentsAs 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. CommentsFears 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. CommentsDuring 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. CommentsBoth 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. CommentsBut 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. CommentsWhile 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. CommentsFor 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. CommentsToday, 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. CommentsIn 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. CommentsEqually 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. CommentsLikewise, 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.** CommentsSingapore’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. CommentsThat 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.

#### it also turns renewables

**Meija 09 –** (Robert, Employment Services Manager at South Bay Workforce Investment Board, City University of New York-Baruch College , “What’s Old is New: Green Jobs & What America’s Federal Workforce Investment System Can Do Now to Develop a Green Workforce”, 1/14/09, www.southbayresource.net/articles/whatsoldisnew.pdf, tables, charts, and graphs omitted)

In addition to adaptation, science, technology and innovation may prove to be our greatest allies in the battle to defeat global warming. A number of promising eco-tech solutions to our environmental challenges are starting to emerge; they hinge on further **r**esearch and **d**evelopment, access to capital, and accommodating government regulations. Innovations such as Bio-char (a stable and rich charcoal produced from biomass) for carbon sequestration, improved soil fertility, sustainable (carbon-negative) energy production, and poverty reduction; the use of algae as an alternative fuel source; and bio- organisms and nano devices that clean up toxic spills and improve solar technology hold great potential for solving some of the world’s most difficult consumption challenges and contamination problems. Sustained advances and U.S. leadership in environmental technologies, not only in terms of global warming, but in terms of competitiveness, will rely on an expansion of the nation’s knowledge workforce, with a strong emphasis on green-centered science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM). Sadly, the U.S. lags other developed countries in its preparation of technologists, scientists, engineers and mathematicians. The U.S.’ share of the world’s scientists and engineers is projected to fall from 40 percent in 1975 to 15 percent in 2010.22 This trend must be reversed. As reported by the U.S. Department of Labor on January 15, 2008 in the Federal Register: There is a broad consensus that the long-term key to continued U.S. competitiveness and growth in an increasingly global economic environment is the adequate supply of qualified Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) workers capable of translating knowledge and skills into new processes, products and services. According to the National Science Foundation (NSF), scientific innovation has produced roughly half of all U.S. economic growth in the last fifty years and the STEM disciplines, including those who work in them, are critical engines to that innovation and growth--one recent estimate, while only five percent of the U.S. workforce is employed in STEM fields, the STEM workforce accounts for more than fifty percent of the nation’s sustained growth (Babco 2004). The National Academy of Sciences study, Rising Above the Gathering Storm (2006), argues that: Absent a serious and rapid response, the U.S. will lose quality jobs to other nations; lowering our standard of living, reducing tax revenues, and weakening the domestic market for goods and services. Once this cycle accelerates, it will be difficult to regain lost pre-eminence in technology-driven innovation and its economic benefits.23 In Thrive: The Skills Imperative, the Council on Competitiveness states that: Looking ahead, skills for sustainability could become a key competitive differentiator. As Joseph Stanislaw has noted: we are at the very beginning of a global race to create dominant green economies.(42) Global warming and competition for resources could very well change the ground rules of globalization-at the very least, the need to reduce carbon footprints and achieve higher resource productivity could alter corporate calculations about where and how to distribute operations and assets globally.America could get out in front of this paradigm shift. But it is not clear that the **U**nited **S**tates will have enough talent with the right set of skills, or has even defined the path forward on skills for sustainability.24 To defeat global warming, we must focus on developing both the intellectual and physical infrastructure of our country. A national campaign to promote STEM education in environmental technologies, with strong federal financing of community and public sector organizations to provide career and academic support, will make a difference.

#### Immigration reform will pass – GOP defections and lobbying are building pressure on the House GOP leadership

**Leopold, 10/31/13** (David, Huffington Post, “Another Day, Another House Republican Signs On To Comprehensive Immigration Reform” lexis)

There's no doubt about it. Pressure is building on the House GOP leadership to bring an immigration bill to the floor for a vote -- one that includes a path to earned citizenship for the 11 million undocumented immigrants.

Over the weekend Representative Jeff Denham (R-CA)[1] announced that he would team up with the House Democrats in support of H.R. 15, comprehensive immigration reform legislation which is similar to the immigration overhaul passed by the Senate earlier this year. Denham was the first Republican to publicly join hands with the Democrats but he wasn't alone for long. He was quickly followed by Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (R-FL)[2] on Tuesday. And just this morning a California news outlet[3] reports that a third Republican, Rep. David Valadao (R-CAL)[4], will likely join add his name to the list. These Representatives have now joined hands with 185 Democrats to co-sponsor a plan that would give millions of unauthorized immigrants the chance to attain citizenship.

And this is likely just the beginning. Immigration advocates -- who are fired up and strongly motivated to get immigration reform done this year -- are circulating a list of 28 target House Republicans who have expressed support in the past for a path to citizenship, some of whose districts include a large number of Hispanic voters. If other Republicans follow Denham's and Ros-Lehtinen's lead it will show the country that they are serious about fixing the immigration problem and are willing to work in a bipartisan way.

And all this comes the same week as some 600 conservative leaders[5] from various religious denominations, the agricultural industry, law enforcement, and the business sector have come to Washington to lobby nearly 150 members of Congress for a broad immigration overhaul. These leaders recognize that America's continued economic vitality and future competitiveness require that our immigration policy be brought into the 21st century.

There is no question immigration reform **can happen by the end of the year**. The votes are there in the House. 218 is the magic number it would take to pass an immigration bill on a majority vote. Last month Rep. Chris Van Hollen (D-MD), who serves in the House Democratic leadership, said that there are "at least 200 Democratic votes" in the House for a Senate-like bill. Add the 28 House Republicans who have expressed support for immigration reform and a path to citizenship and real reform can become a reality -- this year.

#### Current GOP defections are creating political opportunity to pressure the leadership – picking off more moderate GOP means House leaders will cave and get a conference committee vote

**Sargent, 10/30/13** (Greg, The Plum Line blog, Washington Post, “Immigration reform is definitely undead” http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/wp/2013/10/30/immigration-reform-is-definitely-undead/)

We now have three House Republicans who have signed on to the House Dem comprehensive immigration reform bill, putting immigration reform officially back in the “undead” category.

GOP Rep. David Valadao of California is officially on board with the bipartisan proposal, according to a statement from the Congressman sent my way:

“I have been working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to find common ground on the issue of immigration reform. Recently, I have focused my efforts on joining with likeminded Republicans in organizing and demonstrating to Republican Leadership broad support within the Party to address immigration reform in the House by the end of the year.

“By supporting H.R. 15 I am strengthening my message: Addressing immigration reform in the House cannot wait. I am serious about making real progress and will remain committed to doing whatever it takes to repair our broken immigration system.”

Valadao’s move is not wholly unexpected, given that he inhabits a moderate district with a lot of Latinos. But his insistence that addressing immigration reform “cannot wait” is helpful. It seems like an implicit message to the GOP leadership: We must act this year, and on this bill, if necessary.

This comes after GOP Reps. leana Ros-Lehtinen and Jeff Denham Jeff Denham did the same. Denham has said he expects “more” Republicans to ultimately sign on, and has also said that the House GOP leadership told him there will be a vote on something immigration-related by the end of the year.

It’s unclear whether there will actually be a House vote on anything involving immigration before the year runs out, and it seems very unlikely that there will be a vote on the House Dem measure, which is essentially the Senate comprehensive immigration reform bill, without the Corker-Hoeven border security amendment that House Dems dislike, and instead with another border security amendment House Dems like swapped in.

However, the movement among Republicans towards the Dem bill — even if it is only a trickle for now — is interesting, as a reminder that immigration reform can happen if House GOP leaders actually want it to.

To be sure, immigration reform faces a huge obstacle: The stark underlying structural realities of the House Republican caucus. Far too few Republican members have large enough Latino populations to impact the outcome in 2014. With primaries coming, there just may be no incentive for Republicans to act until after the 2014 elections.

But there are other factors to consider. In some key respects, immigration reform poses its own unique set of political challenges and conditions — it is not quite as polarizing an issue as, say, Obamacare or even the question of whether to agree to new revenues as part of a budget deal. Major GOP aligned constituencies — the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, evangelicals, high tech and agricultural interests in the districts of House Republicans – want immigration reform. What’s more, there is a built-in incentive for Republicans to put this issue behind them, given the slow forward march of demographic realities.

Also, as longtime immigration operative Simon Rosenberg explains, Congressional Republicans have a long history of working on this issue. And some polls show that even sizable chunks of Republican voters want comprehensive reform, particularly if it is packaged with border security. Republican pollster Whit Ayres’ research, in particular, has shown that even GOP primary voters want action when informed that the other option is the status quo or “de facto amnesty,” as some pro-reform Republicans put it.

Indeed, if there is anything that can make something happen, it’s the possibility that inaction is far more difficult politically for Republicans than many of them (and many commentators) claim. The immigration problem — “de facto amnesty” is not going away. If more Republicans like these three urge action inside the GOP caucus, it’s not impossible that House GOP leaders will allow votes on border security, the Kids Act, or potentially the legalization proposal that Republicans are said to be working on. That could possibly get us to conference.

#### they say piecemeal but that’s fine– Boehner will compromise because of Obama’s political strength – even if this means a series of piecemeal bills, the final package will be similar enough to CIR

\*framing issue – none of their uniqueness evidence takes into account Boehner’s willingness to compromise on a series of piecemeal bills that aggregate into a final package that includes high tech-visas and achieve the same effect as a comprehensive bill – Boehner will compromise – the shutdown strengthened his position with his hard-right flank to maneuver piecemeal reforms

\*Republicans will vote for it – GOP leaders acknowledge the political futility of being seen as obstructing immigration – the pro-reform side has money, and key agreements between AFL-CIO, Chamber of Commerce, and farmworkers make passage likely

\*democratic unity also exists which overwhelms Republican opposition

**MacGillis, 10/24/13** - New Republic senior editor (Alec, “Seven Reasons To Stop Being Fatalistic About Immigration Reform” The New Republic, http://www.newrepublic.com/article/115341/immigration-reform-may-actually-pass)

But the natural optimist in me thinks that the odds for some sort of serious immigration reform happening in the months ahead are better than many realize. A few reasons why, in no particular order:

**Boehner has space**. To the extent that there was any logic to the Speaker’s letting the government shutdown and debt-ceiling brinkmanship drag out as long as he did, it was that he had strengthened his position with his caucus’s hard-right flank and thereby created some room to maneuver on other fronts. “Boehner’s hold is a little stronger than it was” a few months ago, his near-predecessor as speaker, the lobbyist supreme Bob Livingston, told me when I ran into him at a function Wednesday night.

Well, there is no better opportunity for Boehner to show that this is the case – to retroactively justify a gambit that cost the country billions of dollars – than to press forward with immigration reform. To do that will require more than just casual comments like the one he tossed off Wednesday – it will require making clear that the leadership is serious about this and setting aside time on the calendar for it.

But wouldn’t pushing the issue forward mean once again breaking the not-so-hallowed Hastert Rule, which requires leadership to bring up for a vote only measures supported a majority of the caucus? Well, yes and no. There is increasing talk of taking a piecemeal route in the House – with, among others, one Dream Act-style measure to legalize those who came into the country as minors, one to stiffen border enforcement, one to expand visas for skilled foreign workers, and, yes, one to provide some sort of eventual path to citizenship for illegal immigrants beyond the Dreamers. The latter would not get a majority of House GOP support, but perhaps if brought through in a stream of other measures would not set off the Hastert Rule alarms as loudly. There would remain the question of how to reconcile whatever passed with the comprehensive reform bill already passed by the Senate – House conservatives say they are wary of a conference committee. But the fact remains that there is a conceivable path forward – if Boehner wants to pursue it. “He’s in a much stronger place for himself job-security-wise all around,” says one House Democratic aide.

**It’s in the Republicans’ interest**. Why would the cautious, conflict-averse Boehner want to put himself through the hassle, even if he does have a path forward? Because, of course, he and so many other leaders of his party and the conservative movement – Paul Ryan, Karl Rove, Grover Norquist – grasp that the party cannot continue be seen as obstructing immigration reform by the country’s growing legions of Hispanic and Asian-American voters. Yes, many of the same leaders were warning the hard-liners in the House and Senate off of the defund-Obamacare government-shutdown path to no avail, but those warnings were highly ambivalent, a matter of tactical disagreement after years in which the leaders had been banging the same anti-Obamacare drum. Whereas in this case the leaders are truly in favor of immigration reform, even if just for reasons of self-preservation.

It’s not Obamacare. This is the other reason why Boehner might be able to push forward on this front: as incendiary an issue as immigration reform has been for many Republican voters in recent years, it’s actually less threatening than the two-headed beast of Obamacare and government spending. For one thing, it predates Obama as an issue – it was fellow Republicans George W. Bush and John McCain who were most identified with the 2007 push. For another, some of the most ardent anti-Obamacare soldiers are in favor of immigration reform to varying degrees, from Idaho Rep. Raul Labrador to border congressmen like New Mexico's Steve Pearce to the evangelical groups that have come out for reform. “In the grand scheme of Republican issues, it just doesn’t match up to Obamacare – that’s health care and Obama. That’s partly because they haven’t yet made it about Obama,” said the House Democratic aide.

**Follow the money**. Put simply: the pro-reform side has lots of it, the opponents not so much. Again, this is a crucial contrast with the battles over Obamacare, where the Club for Growth, Koch Brothers and the like are spending heavily to thwart the reformers, even to the point of punishing Republican state legislators who dare to contemplate embracing federal funds for Medicaid expansion. In the immigration realm, the big bucks are coming from these guys.

**The pro-reform side isn’t giving up**. This is the element too often discounted in drawn-out legislative battles: the energy and resolve of the footsoldiers. And it has not abated as much on the pro-reform side as much as the pessimistic Beltway take on the issue would have one think. There are millions of people in this country with a huge stake in this fight, and plenty others who have taken up arms in their support, and not just in the usual places: I was amazed to see several dozen people agitating for reform at the annual Fancy Farm political picnic in far western Kentucky, in August. Advocates have gotten further than ever before – they’ve gotten a bipartisan vote in their favor in the Senate, and they’ve gotten key agreements between the AFL-CIO and Chamber of Commerce and growers and farmworkers in California, among others. They’re not about to give up now. “This is the absolute best opportunity we have to pass reform,” says Angelica Salas, executive director of the Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights of Los Angeles. “If we were going to leave it to the national pundits, this issue would have died a long time ago, but the reality is that it’s in the hands of the immigration rights movement and people are not going to end the fight until there’s a fix to this cruel situation that we’re living in.”

**Obama wants to make it happen**. One might think this would be the biggest obstacle for reform, in that Republicans would be unwilling to grant the president a legislative triumph. In fact, Democrats are having to contend with the reverse, a suspicion among many House Republicans that Obama and the Democrats secretly want reform to fail, so that they can keep bludgeoning Republicans with the issue among Hispanic voters. This is hogwash, as far as Obama is concerned: he desperately wants a major achievement in his second term, not least given the troubles that have arisen in implementing his main first-term one. As for the Republicans’ suspicion, there’s an easy way to keep Democrats from using immigration as a wedge issue: **voting for a reform package**. “It’s a self-fulfilling prophecy,” says the Democratic House aide.

#### Conservatives won’t vote for immigration no matter what and affirmative evidence quoting them is irrelevant. The only evidence that matters is how moderates react – and Obama can work with them now, and capital is key

\*critical framing issue – view the uniqueness debate through the lens of how GOP moderates and leadership will act and not the conservative base – Obama will face opposition from tea party Republicans but the crucial issue is how the House GOP leaders will act and they are in favor of passing CIR – Obama’s PC is key to switching votes of fringe voters

**Balz, 10/17/13** (Dan, Washington Post, “Can Obama seize the moment and make Washington work?” http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/can-obama-seize-the-moment-to-make-washington-work/2013/10/17/d84c1934-3753-11e3-80c6-7e6dd8d22d8f\_story\_1.html)

Obama will continue to face unyielding opposition from the tea party Republicans in the House and the Senate. Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Tex.) made that clear Wednesday when he denounced the Senate compromise and praised those in the House whose opposition to the health-care law triggered the crisis.

The key now is whether the president has a strategy to **govern around them** by winning support from what he called the responsible Republicans.

Obama’s agenda

On Thursday, Obama called on Congress to focus on three priorities. But he offered few specifics about what he will ask and what he will give. Nor is it clear whether he has a strategy to win the support of some Republicans.

The first priority he talked about was the economy and the budget. Budget negotiations will resume with the goal of reaching an agreement by mid-December, lest the country face a repeat of what just happened.

Obama wants to replace the across-the-board spending reductions that have cut indiscriminately with more sensible spending priorities. He also says he is willing to negotiate over entitlements programs. He wants any agreement to include more revenue, although Republicans say he got his revenue package at the end of 2012. Republicans who opposed the shutdown (but quietly went along with it) are skeptical that Obama is truly willing to make concessions to get a satisfactory deal.

The two other legislative priorities the president cited were immigration reform and passage of the farm bill. No one can say what the prospects are for passage of an immigration bill. Much of that still depends on how House GOP leaders decide whether it is in the party’s long-term interest to pass it. Obama did not mention what should be his other major priority, the health-care law, whose implementation has gotten off to a stumbling start, to put it mildly.

All of that is on the table. Meanwhile, there is a question of **how engaged Obama will be** in the **grinding work** of trying to produce compromise with potentially willing Republicans.

#### Winners don’t win, several reasons –

#### a) time-frame differential – takes too long to generate success – prefer our evidence, it is specific to Obama

\*the timeframe differential for rebuilding capital is a framing issue – even if Obama can regenerate political capital in the long term, the empirical record proves that Obama loses massive amounts of political capital in the short-term obliterating his capability of passing agenda items – Health Care proves

**Silber 07** [PhD Political Science & Communication – focus on the Rhetoric of Presidential Policy-Making – Prof of Poli Sci – Samford, [Marissa, WHAT MAKES A PRESIDENT QUACK?, Prepared for delivery at the 2007 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, August 30th-September 2nd, 2007, UNDERSTANDING LAME DUCK STATUS THROUGH THE EYES OF THE MEDIA AND POLITICIANS]

Important to the discussion of political capital is whether or not it can be replenished over a term. If a President expends political capital on his agenda, can it be replaced? Light suggests that “capital declines over time – public approval consistently falls: midterm losses occur” (31). Capital can be rebuilt, but **only to a limited extent**. The decline of capital makes it difficult to access information, recruit more expertise and maintain energy. If a lame duck President can be defined by a loss of political capital, this paper helps determine if such capital can be replenished or if a lame duck can accomplish little. Before determining this, a definition of a lame duck President must be

developed.

#### b) Obama cannot win – legislative wins don’t spillover

\*prefer Obama specific evidence – even if other presidents are able to regenerate capital quickly, Obama cannot – every time Obama allocates political capital on unpopular legislation it turns into a journalistic convention of pointing fingers – makes it impossible to get legislation through

Todd **Eberly** **13** – is coordinator of Public Policy Studies and assistant professor in the Department of Political Science at St. Mary's College of Maryland. His email is teeberly@smcm.edu. This article is excerpted from his book, co-authored with Steven Schier, "American Government and Popular Discontent: Stability without Success," to published later this year by Routledge Press., **1-21**-2013 http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2013-01-21/news/bs-ed-political-capital-20130121\_1\_political-system-party-support-public-opinion/2

As Barack Obama prepares to be sworn in for the second time as president of the United States, he faces the stark reality that **little of what he hopes to accomplish** in a second term **will** likely **come to pass**. Mr. Obama occupies an office that many assume to be all powerful, but like so many of his recent predecessors, the president knows better. He faces a political capital problem and a power trap.¶ In the post-1960s American political system, presidents have found the exercise of effective leadership a difficult task. To lead well, a president needs support — or at least permission — from federal courts and Congress; steady allegiance from public opinion and fellow partisans in the electorate; backing from powerful, entrenched interest groups; and accordance with contemporary public opinion about the proper size and scope of government. This is a long list of requirements. If presidents fail to satisfy these requirements, they face the prospect of inadequate political support or political capital to back their power assertions.¶ What was so crucial about the 1960s? We can trace so much of what defines contemporary politics to trends that emerged then. Americans' confidence in government began a precipitous decline as the tumult and tragedies of the 1960s gave way to the scandals and economic uncertainties of the 1970s. Long-standing party coalitions began to fray as the New Deal coalition, which had elected Franklin Roosevelt to four terms and made Democrats the indisputable majority party, faded into history. The election of Richard Nixon in 1968 marked the beginning of an unprecedented era of divided government. Finally, the two parties began ideologically divergent journeys that resulted in intense polarization in Congress, diminishing the possibility of bipartisan compromise. These changes, combined with the growing influence of money and interest groups and the steady "thickening" of the federal bureaucracy, introduced significant challenges to presidential leadership.¶ Political capital can best be understood as a combination of the president's party support in Congress, public approval of his job performance, and the president's electoral victory margin. The components of political capital are central to the fate of presidencies. It is difficult to claim warrants for leadership in an era when job approval, congressional support and partisan affiliation provide less backing for a president than in times past. In recent years, **presidents' political capital has shrunk while their power assertions have grown,** making the president a volatile player in the national political system.¶ Jimmy Carter and George H.W. Bush joined the small ranks of incumbents defeated while seeking a second term. Ronald Reagan was elected in two landslides, yet his most successful year for domestic policy was his first year in office. Bill Clinton was twice elected by a comfortable margin, but with less than majority support, and despite a strong economy during his second term, his greatest legislative successes came during his first year with the passage of a controversial but crucial budget bill, the Family and Medical Leave Act, and the North American Free Trade Agreement. George W. Bush won election in 2000 having lost the popular vote, and though his impact on national security policy after the Sept. 11 attacks was far reaching, his greatest domestic policy successes came during 2001. Ambitious plans for Social Security reform, following his narrow re-election in 2004, went nowhere.¶ Faced with obstacles to successful leadership, recent presidents have come to rely more on their formal powers. The number of important executive orders has increased significantly since the 1960s, as have the issuance of presidential signing statements. Both are used by presidents in an attempt to shape and direct policy on their terms. Presidents have had to rely more on recess appointments as well, appointing individuals to important positions during a congressional recess (even a weekend recess) to avoid delays and obstruction often encountered in the Senate. Such power assertions typically elicit close media scrutiny and often further erode political capital.¶ Barack Obama's election in 2008 seemed to signal a change. Mr. Obama's popular vote majority was the largest for any president since 1988, and he was the first Democrat to clear the 50 percent mark since Lyndon Johnson. The president initially enjoyed strong public approval and, with a Democratic Congress, was able to produce an impressive string of legislative accomplishments during his first year and early into his second, capped by enactment of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. But with each legislative battle and success, his political capital waned. His impressive successes with Congress in 2009 and 2010 were accompanied by a shift in the public mood against him, evident in the rise of the tea party movement, the collapse in his approval rating, and the large GOP gains in the 2010 elections, which brought a return to divided government.¶ By mid-2011, Mr. Obama's job approval had slipped well below its initial levels, and Congress was proving increasingly intransigent. In the face of declining public support and rising congressional opposition, Mr. Obama, like his predecessors, looked to the energetic use of executive power. In 2012, the president relied on executive discretion and legal ambiguity to allow homeowners to more easily refinance federally backed mortgages, to help veterans find employment and to make it easier for college graduates to consolidate federal student loan debt. He issued several executive orders effecting change in the nation's enforcement of existing immigration laws. He used an executive order to authorize the Department of Education to grant states waivers from the requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act — though the enacting legislation makes no accommodation for such waivers. Contrary to the outcry from partisan opponents, Mr. Obama's actions were hardly unprecedented or imperial. Rather, they represented a rather typical power assertion from a contemporary president.¶ Many looked to the 2012 election as a means to break present trends. But Barack Obama's narrow re-election victory, coupled with the re-election of a somewhat-diminished Republican majority House and Democratic majority Senate, hardly signals a grand resurgence of his political capital. The president's recent issuance of multiple executive orders to deal with the issue of gun violence is further evidence of his power trap. Faced with the likelihood of legislative defeat in Congress, the president must rely on claims of unilateral power. But such claims are not without limit or cost and will likely further erode his political capital.¶ Only by solving the problem of political capital is a president likely to avoid a power trap. **Presidents** in recent years **have been unable to prevent their political capital from eroding**. When it did, their power assertions often got them into further political trouble. Through leveraging public support, presidents have at times been able to overcome contemporary leadership challenges by adopting as their own issues that the public already supports. Bill Clinton's centrist "triangulation" and George W. Bush's careful issue selection early in his presidency allowed them to secure important policy changes — in Mr. Clinton's case, welfare reform and budget balance, in Mr. Bush's tax cuts and education reform — that at the time received popular approval.¶ However, short-term legislative strategies may win policy success for a president but do not serve as an antidote to declining **p**olitical **c**apital over time, as the difficult final years of both the Bill Clinton and George W. Bush presidencies demonstrate. None of Barack Obama's recent predecessors solved the political capital problem or avoided the power trap. It is the central political challenge confronted by modern presidents and one that will likely weigh heavily on the current president's mind today as he takes his second oath of office.

#### c) doesn’t apply to the AFF – suddenly forcing a bill through doesn’t boost political capital – our links outweigh because the AFF overstretches

\*fiat of the plan means you can’t access winners win – suddenly forcing a bill through Congress doesn’t boost political capital but obliterates Obama’s chance to use the bully pulpit to push controversial decisions

\*fiat makes the plan sancrosanct – it circumvents the deliberative policymaking that is associated with passing contentious issues which is what all their “winners win” authors say is crucial to rebuilding capital

**Ornstein 09** – resident scholar at AEI, PhD in political science from University of Michigan (Norman, "Is Obama Too Weak in Dealing with Congress?” 7/8/09, Roll Call, WEA)

If Congress were less dysfunctional--if the minority would actually engage in legislative compromise, and if the majority would be less obtuse at all levels and try regularly and early to engage the substantial number of minority Members who want to engage--the climate change bill would actually be better. Some of the convolutions required to try to get to 218 with Democrats alone could have been avoided or lessened if there were 20 or 30 Republicans on board. Some GOPers who wanted to take part were pressured not to engage by a leadership that believes that united minority opposition to Obama or House Democratic initiatives is their best strategy. But even in a wonderfully functional Congress, achieving policy success in an area as difficult as this one would be a **tough** and uphill battle—no matter how skillful and popular a president may be. The same is true of health policy. Presidents can and must engage, have to step in at crucial moments and shape outcomes, mediate disputes, and use the **bully pulpit** to push controversial or difficult policy decisions. But the history of presidents and Congresses shows that trying to do more--to go over the heads of Congressional leaders, to set a series of bottom lines and insist on them from party leaders and committee chairmen who find it easy to resist White House pressure--**rarely works** unless we are neck deep, not just waist or chest deep, in a crisis. That has always been true, but is even more so today, when majorities have to be largely one-sided and a majority party (especially when it is the Democrats) has limited cohesion or homogeneity. The approach Obama has taken, cutting Congress a lot of slack and being supportive when necessary, led to a string of early and meaningful successes and enactments. True, the tough ones lie ahead. Finding any majority for any climate change bill in the Senate is even more challenging than it was to get a bill through the House. Finding any compromise between health bills that might make it through the House and Senate, pass fiscal muster, and be enacted into law is a tough slog. But I believe the approach the White House has used so far has actually been smart and tough-minded, not simply expedient and weak. A successful president looks at the endgame, sees what is possible and maneuvers in the best way to get to that endgame. If you can't get bills through committee, or you can't find a majority on the floor of either chamber, you get nowhere.

#### Stuxnet disproves their impact defense

**Clayton 10** – (Stuxnet 'virus' could be altered to attack US facilities, report warns, December 12, 2010, http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/2010/1215/Stuxnet-virus-could-be-altered-to-attack-US-facilities-report-warns)

Stuxnet, a computer worm that hit and may have severely damaged Iranian nuclear facilities, is the type of cyberweapon that could broadly harm the United States, undermining both society and government ability to defend the nation, says a strongly worded report to Congress.

A successful broad-based attack on the US, using new variants of the Stuxnet weapon, could do enough widespread damage to critical infrastructure – including water, power, transportation, and other services – that it "threatens to cause harm to many activities deemed critical to the basic functioning of modern society," said the little-noticed report issued by the Congressional Research Service (CRS) Dec. 9.

If retooled slightly, Stuxnet could be directed to target a wide swath of critical infrastructure facilities, rather than a narrow target such as Iran's nuclear fuel-enrichment facilities and nuclear power plant, the eight-page CRS synopsis warns, quoting researchers and other analysts.

**IN PICTURES: Who has nukes?**

"Depending on the severity of the attack, the interconnected nature of the affected critical infrastructure facilities, and government preparation and response plans, entities and individuals relying on these facilities could be without life sustaining or comforting services for a long period of time," the study's summary states. "The resulting damage to the nation’s critical infrastructure could threaten many aspects of life, including the government’s ability to safeguard national security interests."

Terrorist groups, previously deemed not to have much independent ability to launch damaging cyberattacks, could potentially purchase or even rent a Stuxnet-based variant from organized crime groups

#### <MARKED>

to launch an infrastructure attack on the US, the report warns.

While some experts say the "cyber threat to critical infrastructure is exaggerated, regardless of the perpetrators’ capabilities," most such skepticism has been general in nature and does not factor in the new Stuxnet cyberweapon, the report says.

The report quotes Dr. Udo Helmbrecht, executive director of the European Network and Information Security Agency, as saying in October that “Stuxnet is really a paradigm shift, as Stuxnet is a new class and dimension of malware." He went on to call it a "first strike" weapon that is "one of the first organized, well prepared attacks against major industrial resources. This has tremendous effect on how to protect national (critical infrastructure) in the future.”

Stuxnet news continues to ripple outward. On Dec. 4, a senior Iranian official blamed United Nations spies for helping to undermine Iran's nuclear program, the Associated Press reported. Intelligence Minister Heidar Moslehi said International Atomic Energy Agency staffers had used spying, as part of a broader Western campaign against Iran's nuclear facilities that included the Stuxnet attack, the AP report said.

Ralph Langner, an industrial control system expert who first detailed Stuxnet's role as the world's first cyberweapon able to destroy physical infrastructure, noted the damage to Iran's facilities in an interview with the Jerusalem Post published Wednesday.

“It will take two years for Iran to get back on track,” he said. “This was nearly as effective as a military strike, but even better since there are no fatalities and no full-blown war. From a military perspective, this was a huge success.”