# Uniqueness

Comprehensive immigration reform will pass:

**USA Today, 4-23,** 13, <http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2013/04/23/klobuchar-obama-immigration-guns-minnesota/2106389/>

"I hope he has a chance to get a word in edgewise," Sen. Amy Klobuchar, D-Minn., said. "We'll have a lot to say."¶ Obama has hosted one dinner with a small group of Republican senators and another of Democratic ones in an effort to forge closer ties in Congress as he pushes his second-term agenda. Now he is joining one of the few enduring bipartisan conclaves on Capitol Hill, the regular dinner series held by the growing number of female members of the Senate. On the agenda: trying to reach a compromise budget deal and the prospects for passing a comprehensive immigration bill this year.¶ **Klobuchar**, interviewed for the USA TODAY video series "Capital Download," **rejected** the suggestion by some Republican senators **that th**e Boston Marathon **bombing** — thought to be the work of two Chechen immigrants — **was a reason to reconsider an immigration overhaul**. "I don't think it's a reason to slow it down," she said. "I think **it's actually a reason to make reforms," underscoring the need to more closely track "**who gets in here and how they get in and who they are."¶ **Those urging a slowdown "were going to oppose the immigration bill anyway,** is my guess."¶ **She said the odds of passing an immigration overhaul "are incredibly high**"in the wake of a proposal unveiled last week by the so-called Gang of Eight, four Republican and four Democratic senators. But hopes for passing a gun-control bill have faded, especially after supporters last week couldn't muster the 60 votes necessary for a bipartisan plan sponsored by Sens. Joe Manchin, D-W.Va., and Pat Toomey, R-Pa., to expand background checks of gun buyers.

# Issue tradeoff link

New policies means no immigration. My Ev. Is issue specific to immigration tradeoff.

**Politico, 4-18** , 13 <http://www.politico.com/story/2013/04/gun-control-vote-obamas-biggest-loss-90244_Page2.html> (Glenn Thrush covers the White House for Politico. Before that, he ran the site’s Hill blog and before that, spent five years with Newsday – the last three in Washington following Hillary Rodham Clinton’s highly entertaining presidential quest – with a little Rudy Giuliani, Barack Obama and Chuck Schumer thrown in)

Added Sen. Barbara Boxer (D-Calif.): “I never saw a president fight so hard, a vice president, never on any issue… It shows us the cowardice of the Senate.”¶ In the end, however, **moderates and conservatives** in the upper chamber **said they** simply **couldn’t deal with a flurry of progressive issues at once** — from gay marriage to immigration to guns.¶ The other three Democratic “no” votes — Max Baucus of Montana, Mark Pryor of Arkansas and Mark Begich of Alaska — were never really in play, sources familiar with the situation told POLITICO.¶ **One senator told a White House official** that it was“**Guns, gays and immigration - it’s too much. I can be with you on one or two of them, but not all three.”**¶ A glum Obama was sitting in the White House Situation Room for a previously scheduled national security briefing when news of the 54-to-46 vote broke, according to a senior administration official. Obama wasn’t watching the proceedings closely on C-SPAN because he already knew the whip count; over the last few days, the president personally lobbied most of the red and purple state Democrats and Republicans sitting on the fence, and had already vented his frustration with a handful of Democratic hold-outs who were waiting to see what other would do before committing.¶ In a break from protocol — Obama seldom talks publicly about what other politicians say to him privately — the president called out the Senate, including members of his own party, for succumbing to bullying of the National Rifle Association in the Rose Garden about an hour after the vote.¶ “Most of these senators couldn’t offer any good reasons… there were no coherent arguments about why we couldn’t do this… it came down to politics,” a visibly agitated Obama said, flanked by former Rep. Gabrielle Giffords, a clearly shaken Vice President Joe Biden and family members of Sandy Hook victims.¶ Senators on both sides of the aisle “caved to the pressure and started looking for an excuse, any excuse, to say no,” he said, adding that he planned to continue pushing on the issue.¶ “I see this as round one,” Obama intoned.¶ But privately, administration officials were looking ahead to the far more sanguine prospects of negotiating a bipartisan immigration reform bill — and expressed hope that clearing the decks on guns would raise prospects for a faster agreement. Despite Obama’s vow to fight on, one senior adviser to the president said “it was a fair question” to ask if Obama’s old campaign apparatus, Organizing for Action, could help create a groundswell of protest against the “no” voters in each party.¶

# Vote delay link

Making cjs reform come to the forefront delays the immigration debate which kills support.

**National Journal, 4-24,** 13, <http://www.nationaljournal.com/daily/immigration-reform-opponents-lack-strategy-20130424>

**In the week since the “Gang of Eight” released its** 844-page **immigration bill, there have been three days of hearings featuring 26 witnesses. The compressed time frame has left opponents of the bill little time to read it, let alone formulate a strategy to** alter the measure to their liking or **kill it entirely. That was probably the point**. Many of the Republican lawmakers on the Senate Judiciary Committee and their staffs are still reading and analyzing the bill, aides said. Sen. Chuck Grassley, R-Iowa, the ranking member on the committee, told reporters Tuesday he’s only read the first 50 pages. Most haven’t even gotten to the process of thinking about amendments for the bill’s markup, which is likely to begin in about two weeks when the Senate returns from recess. “**The strategy now seems to be to use delay to buy time and hope that they can build opposition to the overall bill, and that’s exactly the same thing that happened the last time around**,” said Darrell West, vice president and director of governance studies at the Brookings Institution.

# Political capital link

Rehab kills pol. Cap. It’s a question of issues importance not agreement with policy.

Trinick Why Won’t The Candidates Talk About Prisons? By Richard | October 17, 2012

It’s politically toxic. Any move to alter the current tough stance on criminal justice is inevitably viewed as being ‘soft on crime’, regardless of how much sense a new policy might make or how much it might reduce crime in the long-run. No politician, especially one running in a race as close as the current match-up, wants to be seen as ‘soft on crime’. For Republicans, “the party of law and order”, it would be sacrilege to even suggest a change in policy. ForDemocrats, especially Obama, the aimappears to be[is] to avoid looking “weak and liberal”and avoid alienating middle-class white voters. In addition, it lacks appeal — few voters (read ‘people likely to vote in swing states’) care about the issue as they perceive that it does not affect them and it requires hard choices to be made.

Political capital is key to immigration.

Foley 1/15 Elise is a writer @ Huff Post Politics. “Obama Gears Up For Immigration Reform Push In Second Term,” 2013, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/15/obama-immigration-reform\_n\_2463388.html

Obama has repeatedly said he will push hard for immigration reform in his second term, and administration officials have said that other contentious legislative initiatives -- including gun control and the debt ceiling -- won't be allowed to get in the way. At least at first glance, he seems to have politics on his side. GOP lawmakers are entering -- or, in some cases, re-entering -- the immigration debate in the wake of disastrous results for their party's presidential nominee with Latino voters, who support reform by large measures. Based on those new political realities, "it would be a suicidal impulse for Republicans in Congress to continue to block [reform]," David Axelrod, a longtime adviser to the president, told The Huffington Post.¶ Now there's the question of how Obama gets there. While confrontation might work with Republicans on other issues -- the debt ceiling, for example -- the consensus is that the GOP is serious enough about reform that the president can, and must, play the role of broker and statesman to get a deal. It starts with a lesson from his first term. Republicans have demanded that the border be secured first, before other elements of immigration reform. Yet the administration has been by many measures the strictest ever on immigration enforcement, and devotes massive sums to policing the borders. The White House has met many of the desired metrics for border security, although there is always more to be done, but Republicans are still calling for more before they will consider reform. Enforcing the border, but not sufficiently touting its record of doing so, the White House has learned, won't be enough to win over Republicans.¶ In a briefing with The Huffington Post, a senior administration official said the White House believes it has met enforcement goals and must now move to a comprehensive solution. The administration is highly skeptical of claims from Republicans that immigration reform can or should be done in a piecemeal fashion. Going down that road, the White House worries, could result in passage of the less politically complicated pieces, such as an enforcement mechanism and high-skilled worker visas, while leaving out more contentious items such as a pathway to citizenship for undocumented immigrants.¶ "Enforcement is certainly part of the picture," the official said. "But if you go back and look at the 2006 and 2007 bills, if you go back and look at John McCain's 10-point 'This is what I've got to get done before I'm prepared to talk about immigration,' and then you look at what we're actually doing, it's like 'check, check, check.' We're there. The border is as secure as it's been in a generation or two, so it's really time."¶ One key in the second term, advocates say, will be convincing skeptics such as Republican Sen. John Cornyn of Texas that the Obama administration held up its end of the bargain by proving a commitment to enforcement. The White House also needs to convince GOP lawmakers that there's support from their constituents for immigration reform, which could be aided by conservative evangelical leaders and members of the business community who are pushing for a bill.¶ Immigrant advocates want more targeted deportations that focus on criminals, while opponents of comprehensive immigration reform say there's too little enforcement and not enough assurances that reform wouldn't be followed by another wave of unauthorized immigration. The Obama administration has made some progress on both fronts, but some advocates worry that the president hasn't done enough to emphasize it. The latest deportation figures were released in the ultimate Friday news dump: mid-afternoon Friday on Dec. 21, a prime travel time four days before Christmas.¶ Last week, the enforcement-is-working argument was bolstered by a report from the nonpartisan Migration Policy Institute, which found that the government is pouring more money into its immigration agencies than the other federal law-enforcement efforts combined. There are some clear metrics to point to on the border in particular, and Doris Meissner, an author of the report and a former commissioner of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, said she hopes putting out more information can add to the immigration debate.¶ "I've been surprised, frankly, that the administration hasn't done more to lay out its record," she said, adding the administration has kept many of its metrics under wraps.¶ There are already lawmakers working on a broad agreement. Eight senators, coined the gang of eight, are working on a bipartisan immigration bill. It's still in its early stages, but nonmembers of the "gang," such as Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.) are also talking about reform.¶ It's still unclear what exact role the president will play, but sources say he does plan to lead on the issue. Rep. Zoe Lofgren (D-Calif.), the top Democrat on the House immigration subcommittee, said the White House seems sensitive to the fact that Republicans and Democrats need to work out the issue in Congress -- no one is expecting a fiscal cliff-style arrangement jammed by leadership -- while keeping the president heavily involved.

# Econ impact

**Norquist, 4-24**Grover**,** 13, Guardian. http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2013/apr/24/immigration-reform-grover-norquist-support

People are an asset, not a liability. The Senate's immigration bill would reduce America's deficit and should be passed soon¶ People are an asset, not a liability. The United States is the most immigrant-friendly nation in the world and the richest country in the world. This is not a coincidence. Those voices that would make us less immigrant-friendly would make us less successful, less prosperous, and certainly less American.¶ Today some 11 million "undocumented workers" live in the shadows in the United States. Sixty percent of them crossed the Mexican border or the Canadian border without government approval and 40% arrived by plane and overstayed their visas.¶ The 844-page immigration reform bill submitted to the Senate by the "Gang of Eight" senators would allow the 11 million to earn legal status by submitting to a background check to weed out those with felony convictions, paying back taxes and a fine. They would then be Registered Provisional Immigrants (RPI) allowing them to work anywhere in the United States, denied means-tested federal welfare benefits for 10 years, and only after the 10 years become eligible for the 3 to 5 year process of becoming citizens.¶ This legislation would greatly strengthen the American economy. When a similar immigration reform measure passed in 1986, those immigrants granted legal status saw their incomes rise by 15% simply because they could move around, hold a driver's license, and interview for work without fear. Their legal status made more employers willing to hire them.¶ To understand the magnitude of this increase in productivity by millions of workers in the American economy, imagine if your sibling or child was told to go out and make the most of his or her talents with the imposed handicap that they not hold a legal driver's license, are forbidden to fly on commercial airlines for want of documentation, and could only work for individuals or firms that did not check for citizenship.¶ Douglas Holtz-Eakin, the former Director of the Congressional Budget Office, recently published a dynamic analysis of how immigration reform might affect GDP and projected that such a reform would increase GDP growth by 0.9% each year. Over a decade this would reduce the projected federal deficit by $2.7t[rillio]n without raising taxes – largely through present taxation on more workers and rising incomes.¶ The Cato Institute commissioned a study by professor Raul Hinojosa-Ojeda of UCLA that projected $1.5tn in economic growth (pdf) in response to animmigration reform similar to the Senate plan and conversely should the United States take the advice of those who would deport all "illegal immigrants" the GDP would fall $2.6tn over the decade.¶ One notes that immigrants or their children have founded more than 40% of all Fortune 500 companies in the United States, employing more than 10 million people worldwide. And the Kauffman Foundation, which studies entrepreneurship, found that in 2012 immigrants were twice as likely as native-born Americans to start a new business.¶ The traditional naysaying by opponents of both legal immigration and allowing earned legal status for those without papers today have been smacked down by studies by Heritage Foundation senior fellow Julian L. Simon's Nine Myths About Immigration and the Heritage Foundation's 2006 study by Tim Kane and Kirk Johnson that pronounced, "Whether low-skilled or high-skilled, immigrants boost national output, enhance specialization, and provide a net economic benefit."

U.S. economic strength prevents china war.

HSU 11-[“Economic Ties Could Help Prevent US-China War” Jeremy Hsu, Innovation NewsDaily Senior Writer; 01 November 2011 05:32 PM ET;

http://www.innovationnewsdaily.com/660-china-military-cyber-national-security.html]

As the U.S. faces China's economic and military rise, it also holds a dwindling hand of cards to play in the unlikely case of open conflict. Cyberattacks aimed at computer networks, targeted disabling of satellites or economic warfare could end up bringing down both of the frenemies. That means ensuring the U.S. economy remains strong and well-balanced, with China's economy possibly representing the best deterrent, according to a new report. The Rand Corporation's analysts put low odds on a China-U.S. military conflict taking place, but still lay out danger scenarios where the U.S. and China face greater risks of stumbling into an unwanted war with one another. They point to the economic codependence of both countries [is] as the best bet against open conflict, similar to how nuclear weapons ensured mutually assured destruction for the U.S. and Soviet Union during the Cold War. War Militaria Collectors www.JCAmericana.comWe Buy War Artifacts & Militaria Free Appraisals for AuthenticityLearn German in 10 Days PimsleurApproach.com/Learn-GermanWorld-famous Pimsleur Method. As seen on PBS - $9.95 w/ Free S&H.VA Home Loan for Veterans www.VAMortgageCenter.comGet a Quote in 2 Minutes! VA Loans now Up to $729,000 with $0 Down. Ads by Google "It is often said that a strong economy is the basis of a strong defense," the Rand report says. "In the case of China, a strong U.S. economy is not just the basis for a strong defense, it is itself perhaps the best defense against an adventurous China." Such "mutually assured economic destruction" would devastate both the U.S. and China, given how China represents America's main creditor and manufacturer. The economic fallout could lead to a global recession worse than that caused by the financial crisis of 2008-2009. The U.S. still spends more than five times on defense compared with China, but Rand analysts suggest that China's defense budget could outstrip that of the U.S. within the next 20 years. The U.S. Air Force and Navy's current edge in the Pacific has also begun to shrink as China develops aircraft, ships, submarines and missiles capable of striking farther out from its coast. Existing U.S. advantages in cyberwar and anti-satellite capabilities also don't offset the fact that the U.S. military depends far more heavily on computer networks and satellites than China's military. That makes a full-out cyberwar or satellite attacks too risky for the U.S., but perhaps also for China. "There are no lives lost — just extensive harm, heightened antagonism, and loss of confidence in network security," Rand analysts say. "There would be no 'winner.'" Open military conflict between China and the U.S. could also have "historically unparalleled" economic consequences even if neither country actively engages in economic warfare, Rand analysts say. The U.S. could both boost direct defense in the unlikely case of war and reduce the risk of escalation by strengthening China's neighbors. Such neighbors, including India, South Korea, Japan and Taiwan, also represent possible flashpoints for China-U.S. conflict in the scenarios laid out by the Rand report. Other possible danger zones include the South China Sea, where China and many neighboring countries have disputes over territorial claims, as well as in the murkier realm of cyberspace. Understandably, China has shown fears of being encircled by semi-hostile U.S. allies. That's why Rand analysts urged the U.S. to make China a partner rather than rival for maintaining international security. They also pointed out, encouragingly, that China has mostly taken "cautious and pragmatic" policies as an emerging world power. "As China becomes a true peer competitor, it also becomes potentially a stronger partner in the defense as well as economic field," the Rand analysts say.

 U.S. china war causes extinction.

Takai (Mitsuo, retired colonel and former researcher in the military science faculty of the Staff College for Japan’s Ground Self Defense Force,“U.S.-China nuclear strikes would spell doomsday,” 2009. http://www.upiasia.com/Security/2009/10/07/us-china\_nuclear\_strikes\_would\_spell\_doomsday/7213/)

Tokyo, Japan — Those who advocate nuclear armaments, and are now raising their voices in Japan and elsewhere, should take a look at an objective analysis by U.S. scientists who have disclosed the results of several studies on strategic nuclear missile strikes. What would happen **if China launched its** 20 Dongfeng-5 **i[cbms]** ntercontinental ballistic missiles, each with a 5-megaton warhead, at 20 major U.S. cities? Prevailing opinion in Washington D.C. until not so long ago was that **the raids would cause** over **40 million casualties**, annihilating much of the United States. In order to avoid such a doomsday scenario, consensus was that **the U[S]**nited States **would have to eliminate this potential threat at its source** with preemptive strikes on China. But **cool heads at institutions such as the Federation of American Scientists and the National Resource Defense Council** examined the facts and produced their own analyses in 2006, which differed from the hard-line views of their contemporaries. The FAS and NRDC **developed several scenarios involving nuclear strikes over ICBM sites** deep **in** the Luoning Mountains in **China**’s western province of Henan, and analyzed their implications. One of the scenarios involved direct strikes on 60 locations – including 20 main missile silos and decoy silos – hitting each with one W76-class, 100-kiloton multiple independently targetable reentry vehicle carried on a submarine-launched ballistic missile. I**n order to destroy** the **hardened silos**, the **strikes would aim for maximum impact** by causing ground bursts near the silos' entrances. Using air bursts similar to the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki would not be as effective, as the blasts and the heat would dissipate extensively. In this scenario, the **6 megatons of ground burst caused by the 60 attacks would create enormous mushroom clouds** over 12 kilometers high, composedof radioactive dirt and debris. Within 24 hours following the explosions, deadly fallout would spread from the mushroom clouds, driven by westerly winds toward Nanjing and Shanghai. They would contaminate the cities' residents, water, foodstuff and crops, causing irreversible damage. The impact of a 6-megaton nuclear explosion would be 360 times more powerful than the Hiroshima bomb, killing not less than 4 million people. Such massive casualties among non-combatants would far exceed the military purpose of destroying the enemy's military power. This would cause political harm and damage the United States’ ability to achieve its war aims, as it would lose international support. On the other hand, China could retaliate against U.S. troops in East Asia, employing intermediate-range ballistic missiles including its DF-3, DF-4 and DF-21 missiles, based in Liaoning and Shandong provinces, which would still be intact. If the United States wanted to destroy China's entire nuclear retaliatory capability, **U.S. forces would have to** **employ almost** **all their nuclear weapons,** causing catastrophic environmental hazards **that could lead to the annihilation of mankind.** Accordingly, the FAS and NRDC conclusively advised U.S. leaders to get out of the vicious cycle of nuclear competition, which costs staggering sums, and to promote nuclear disarmament talks with China. Such advice is worth heeding by nuclear hard-liners.

# High tech visas impact

Immigration reform will increase high tech visas.

**Smith**, 11/7/2012 (Gerry, Technology Industry Puts Immigration Reform As Top Hope For Obama's Second Term, p. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/11/07/technology-immigration-reform-obama\_n\_2087457.html)

Many **startups** in New York's "Silicon Alley" say they **can't hire enough qualified engineers because of a shortage of** temporary **work visas and green cards. They have been pushing for legislation that would allow more immigrants with high-tech skills** to remain in the country. The issue was not a priority during the president's first term. But on the campaign trail, **Obama hinted that it would be a priority** in his next term. And in his acceptance speech early Wednesday morning, he said "fixing our immigration system" would be one of the policy issues that he would address "in the coming weeks and months." But to accomplish that, Obama will need help from Congress, which after Tuesday's election, remains divided. Democrats maintained control of the Senate and Republicans kept control of the House. The issue of expanding visas for highly-skilled immigrants has faced opposition from both parties. The STEM Jobs Act, which would have granted more visas to immigrants with math and science degrees, was widely supported by the tech community. But it failed to pass this year in part because Democrats demanded more comprehensive immigration reform. And expanding visa programs are politically controversial: Critics claim they produce an influx in foreign-born workers who depress wages and make it more difficult for American-born workers to find jobs in high-tech fields. Over the past four years, Obama has received high marks from the tech community on some measures. He recently signed laws, for example, that will allow entrepreneurs to use “crowdfunding” to raise capital. But they've expressed disappointed that he hasn't accomplished more. "He hasn’t done as much on tech as we would like but he's clearly leaning toward many of our policy goals," said Andrew Rasiej, chairman of NY Tech Meetup, which hosts monthly gatherings for tech entrepreneurs. Besides immigration, those goals include increasing investment in research and development and science and math education. In a letter he sent last month to NY Tech Meetup, which has more than 27,000 members, Obama said he planned to recruit 10,000 math and science teachers over the next decade and train 2 million workers for high-tech jobs. Now that the election is over, some are optimistic that **Obama** will give more attention to their top policy issue. "We think the president **was sincere in his talk about the need for immigriaton reform** in the second term, and we think he'll have a receptive House and Senate who want to look at that issue as well," said Mark Heesen, the president of the National Venture Capital Association, an industry group. One factor may help explain the tech community's optimism that Obama will prioritize their issues in his next term: the industry made sizable contributions to his campaign. Obama raised $7.1 million

And

U.S. is at a disadvantage in cybersecurity IT. High tech Visa’s solve.

**McLarty** 9 (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 United States, 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.** 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 technology 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 [**the] 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.**

Cyber security is key to preventing bad people from getting access to nukes and destroying infrastructure that human life depends on.

**Ken** 10 (writer for modern survival blog, Ausbry Ken, “Cyber Terrorism-Nuclear Power plants-Grids”, October 18th 2010, http://modernsurvivalblog.com/nuclear/cyber-terrorism-nuclear-power-plants-grid///DG)

The recent discovery of the “Stuxnet” computer worm **cyber-weapon[s]**, apparently designed and used to infect Iran’s nuclear development control systems**, present**s **a very powerful** and dangerous **new threat** to our current way of life. Stuxnet, first discovered during June 2010 is the first worm of its kind to take aim at the foundation of critical industrial systems. It was uniquely written to spy on, reprogram, and attack the systems used to control and monitor industrial processes, while at the same time hiding the changes it makes. The bulk of the media reporting on Stuxnet has been focused on its apparent design to target Iranian nuclear control systems because it contains specific code to hack the underlying “Siemens” hardware and software used within the Iranian systems. Although this particular targeting may be true, the Siemens systems are used far and wide to manage other types of industrial facilities including water supplies, oil rigs, and power plants in many parts of the world. Now that Stuxnet is out in the open, the door is wide open for much wider spread and disastrous possibilities, given the will to do harm. It could conceivably be used as a blueprint, and tailored or modeled to inflict a extreme catastrophe. Think of this… a modified Stuxnet worm is introduced into the network of an operational nuclear power plant, where it silently reprograms the control systems of the nuclear reactor and waits until a pre-determined time to enact its devastating plan, a nuclear meltdown. Imagine the same worm being inserted or replicated in multiple nuclear reactor networks, all executing their devastating code at the same time, creating not only a nuclear meltdown emergency of epic proportions, but quite possibly bringing the entire electrical power grid system down from cascading tripping circuit breakers as the instantaneous demand for re-routed power is not met. To consider such possibility is not alarmist. Instead it is a responsible process to think, speak openly, and to consider the vast network of control systems that underlie our dependence on infrastructure, and to plan ahead for a cyber-weapon similar to Stuxnet that could conceivably bring it all down and change our lives in ways that we cannot imagine. While industries scramble to cope with this new threat, it would serve us all well to consider our own survival plans in this rapidly changing world of uncertain times.

And causes extinction

**Discovery News 9**. By [Jennifer Viegas](http://news.discovery.com/contributors/jennifer-viegas/) Wed Nov 11, 2009 01:39 AM ET. Human Extinction: How Could It Happen? Discovery News. http://news.discovery.com/human/human-extinction-doomsday.html

Humans could [become extinct](http://science.howstuffworks.com/evolution/extinction.htm), a new study concludes, but no single event, aside from [complete destruction of the globe](http://news.discovery.com/space/ray-villard-doomsday-theories.html), could do us in, and all extinction scenarios would have to involve some kind of intent, either malicious or not, by people in power. The determinations suggest that the human race itself will ultimately determine its fate. "I think the ability to adapt very quickly is singular to humanity," project leader Tobin Lopes told Discovery News. "Species progress and evolve to enhance their chances, but it's done over a very long period of time." "Instinct guides a lot of what we do early in our lives, but the capacity to learn different behaviors as a result of different environments makes humanity capable of survival," added Lopes, who is associate director of global energy management programs at the University of Colorado Denver. For the study, accepted for publication in the journal Futures, **Lopes** and his team **used** a standardized approach for scenario planning called **"intuitive logics,"** which is normally applied to predict business, economic and certain other outcomes. "The intuitive logics approach, and scenario planning as a practice, starts with the present and works forward to an unknown future," he explained. Co-authors served as "stakeholders," just as they would in planning a business, and identified key concerns that may adversely affect them. The concerns were ranked according to possible impact and uncertainty before being plugged into the model, which also incorporated known outcomes, such as attack response times, prior pandemic death percentages, and detection-to-cure time frames. **The result** was three **scenarios in which humans could go extinct**. Each consists of multiple events, such as pandemic, warfare, global warming-related occurrences and a meteor strike, which occur in relative succession and result in equally destructive domino effects, **such as societal breakdowns leading to economic decline and escalated terrorism.** While any number and combination of doom-and-gloom happenings could destroy the human race**,** the researchers outlined four, more general types of events that may also serve as "signposts," or events that may signal the unfolding of a defined scenario. In this case, that defined scenario is human extinction. "**The types** **[included**] were non-war human-caused -- whether accidental or intended or purposeful, natural-viral, natural-environmental, and finally **nuclear or near nuclear war**/engagement between any two nations," Lopes said.

# Terrorism w/rollback

Immigration reform is key to solving terrorism.

Stock Margaret, American Immigration Lawyers Association, Associate Prof. Dept. of Law, US Military Academy, West Point, “The Need for Comprehensive Immigration Reform: Strengthening Our National Security”, Statement before Senate Judiciary Committee, <http://kyl.senate.gov/legis_center/subdocs/051705_stock.pdf>)

Before I focus on the issues of comprehensive immigration reform and its relationship to national security, however, I want to reiterate two points I made during an earlier appearance before the Immigration, Border Security, and Citizenship Subcommittee: We best enhance our security by enhancing our intelligence capacity. National security is most effectively enhanced by improving the mechanisms for identifying actual terrorists, not by implementing harsher immigration laws or blindly treating all foreigners as potential terrorists. Policies and practices that fail to properly distinguish between terrorists and legitimate foreign travelers are ineffective security tools that waste limited resources, damage the U.S. economy, alienate those groups whose cooperation the U.S. government needs to prevent terrorism, and foster a false sense of security by promoting the illusion that we are reducing the threat of terrorism. Reforming our immigration laws will help us to identify those who seek to enter our country or are already residing here. We need to make our borders our last line of defense. The physical borders of the United States should be our last line of defense because terrorism does not spring up at our borders. In fact, we need to re-conceptualize how we think about our “borders,” because in our modern world they really start at our consulates abroad.

Terrorism causes nuclear war

Speice Patrick F., Jr., JD Candidate at The College of William and Mary, “NEGLIGENCE AND NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION: ELIMINATING THE CURRENT LIABILITY BARRIER TO BILATERAL U.S.-RUSSIAN NONPROLIFERATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS,” William & Mary Law Review, February 2006, 47 Wm and Mary L. Rev. 1427

Accordingly, there is a significant and ever-present risk that terrorists could acquire a nuclear device or fissile material from Russia as a result of the confluence of Russian economic decline and the end of stringent Soviet-era nuclear security measures. 39 Terrorist groups could acquire a nuclear weapon by a number of methods, including "steal[ing] one intact from the stockpile of a country possessing such weapons, or ... [being] sold or given one by [\*1438] such a country, or [buying or stealing] one from another subnational group that had obtained it in one of these ways." 40 Equally threatening, however, is the risk that terrorists will steal or purchase fissile material and construct a nuclear device on their own. Very little material is necessary to construct a highly destructive nuclear weapon. 41 Although nuclear devices are extraordinarily complex, the technical barriers to constructing a workable weapon are not significant. 42 Moreover, the sheer number of methods that could be used to deliver a nuclear device into the United States makes it incredibly likely that terrorists could successfully employ a nuclear weapon once it was built. 43 Accordingly, supply-side controls that are aimed at preventing terrorists from acquiring nuclear material in the first place are the most effective means of countering the risk of nuclear terrorism. 44 Moreover, the end of the Cold War eliminated the rationale for maintaining a large military-industrial complex in Russia, and the nuclear cities were closed. 45 This resulted in at least 35,000 nuclear scientists becoming unemployed in an economy that was collapsing. 46 Although the economy has stabilized somewhat, there [\*1439] are still at least 20,000 former scientists who are unemployed or underpaid and who are too young to retire, 47 raising the chilling prospect that these scientists will be tempted to sell their nuclear knowledge, or steal nuclear material to sell, to states or terrorist organizations with nuclear ambitions. 48 The potential consequences of the unchecked spread of nuclear knowledge and material to terrorist groups that seek to cause mass destruction in the United States are truly horrifying. A terrorist attack with a nuclear weapon would be devastating in terms of immediate human and economic losses. 49 Moreover, there would be immense political pressure in the United States to discover the perpetrators and retaliate with nuclear weapons, massively increasing the number of casualties and potentially triggering a full-scale nuclear conflict.

And

Access to the country makes it easier to network and smuggle nukes in.

And

Nuclear war causes extinction.

**Discovery News 9**. By [Jennifer Viegas](http://news.discovery.com/contributors/jennifer-viegas/) Wed Nov 11, 2009 01:39 AM ET. Human Extinction: How Could It Happen? Discovery News. http://news.discovery.com/human/human-extinction-doomsday.html

Humans could [become extinct](http://science.howstuffworks.com/evolution/extinction.htm), a new study concludes, but no single event, aside from [complete destruction of the globe](http://news.discovery.com/space/ray-villard-doomsday-theories.html), could do us in, and all extinction scenarios would have to involve some kind of intent, either malicious or not, by people in power. The determinations suggest that the human race itself will ultimately determine its fate. "I think the ability to adapt very quickly is singular to humanity," project leader Tobin Lopes told Discovery News. "Species progress and evolve to enhance their chances, but it's done over a very long period of time." "Instinct guides a lot of what we do early in our lives, but the capacity to learn different behaviors as a result of different environments makes humanity capable of survival," added Lopes, who is associate director of global energy management programs at the University of Colorado Denver. For the study, accepted for publication in the journal Futures, **Lopes** and his team **used** a standardized approach for scenario planning called **"intuitive logics,"** which is normally applied to predict business, economic and certain other outcomes. "The intuitive logics approach, and scenario planning as a practice, starts with the present and works forward to an unknown future," he explained. Co-authors served as "stakeholders," just as they would in planning a business, and identified key concerns that may adversely affect them. The concerns were ranked according to possible impact and uncertainty before being plugged into the model, which also incorporated known outcomes, such as attack response times, prior pandemic death percentages, and detection-to-cure time frames. **The result** was three **scenarios in which humans could go extinct**. Each consists of multiple events, such as pandemic, warfare, global warming-related occurrences and a meteor strike, which occur in relative succession and result in equally destructive domino effects, such as societal breakdowns leading to economic decline and escalated terrorism. While any number and combination of doom-and-gloom happenings could destroy the human race**,** the researchers outlined four, more general types of events that may also serve as "signposts," or events that may signal the unfolding of a defined scenario. In this case, that defined scenario is human extinction. "**The types** **[included**] were non-war human-caused -- whether accidental or intended or purposeful, natural-viral, natural-environmental, and finally **nuclear or near nuclear war/engagement** between any two nations," Lopes said.

And they have no offense-threat of terrorism makes the cjs retributive. Aff gets rolled back.

Roach Kent, Global Anti-Terrorism Law and Policy, Cambridge University Press, 2005, <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1177282>, [University of Toronto, Faculty of Law] Edited by Victor V. Ramraj, Michael Hor, and Kent Roach

**Reactive anti-terrorism laws** fit into a pattern that Jonathan Simon has coined 'governing through crime'. Writing in the American context, Simon observed that even as crime rates decrease, media and governments have been drawn to 'crime as the preferred metaphor for all forms of social anxiety and **highlight**ed acts of punishment or **retribution as the primary way of resolving disputes of almost any kind'**. I have suggested elsewhere that **the focus on crime has led to a 'criminalization of politics' in which criminal law reform has been offered as a symbolic** and relatively cheap responseto a broad range of social, economic and cultural problems. **The** new **emphasis on** the criminal sanction and **retributive punishment is** also **tied to a sense that 'nothing works' except** perhaps **punishment.** There is an impatience' with strategies that address the broader causes and determinants of crimes or that compare the harms of crime with other threats to human security such as disease and poverty. This process also fits into a retrenchment from the welfare state and increasing privatization of many services. L'1 such an environment, criminal law becomes an even more important focus of formal state activity. It becomes the primary means for the neo-liberal state to be seen as doing something about social problems and to communicate society's disapproval of crime and its solidarity with victims.

# Nr answers

### a/t Obama has no pol cap

Obama has pol cap for immigration. Prefer my evidence it’s issue specific.

**NPR, 4-17,** 13, <http://www.npr.org/blogs/itsallpolitics/2013/04/17/177655484/obama-uses-and-loses-political-capital-on-gun-control>

If Obama couldn't get an important win in a Democratic-controlled Senate on a measure that had overwhelming public support, according to polls, **what's in store for other issues?**¶ **"He's using political capital**, and when you use political capital this way and you lose, it hurts," **said** James **Thurber, an American University political science professor** and director of the school's Center for Presidential and Congressional Studies.¶ **But, Thurber added: "There will be new policies, new events that will come that will help him. He isn't a total lame duck**, even though it's his second term. **He still has a lot of power in certain areas, and certainly in the area of immigration he's going to have some leverage** in terms of helping to bring a bill through the Senate and the House."

### a/t gun control thumper

Biden pushed gun control, not Obama

**USA Today, 4-17**, 13, <http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2013/04/17/analysis-obama-failed-gun-vote/2092003/>

But **Obama responded to them that he had to try, and he was willing to put his political capital into** it. The White House was also concerned about how to use the president to keep the issue in the public sphere without burning out the public, the official said. **When it came to the political fight necessary to move this legislative mountain, however, Obama left much of the heavy lifting to** Vice President **Biden. Biden**, a 36-year veteran of the Senate, **was the one who met with the National Rifle Association, victims of gun violence and other stakeholders as he crafted recommendations for the president's gun-safety agenda. He was the president's bulldog** who lamented the "black helicopter crowd" that accused Obama of wanting to take Americans' guns away. **Biden was the one who shamed lawmakers** worried about their NRA scoring, telling them to get some "courage" like the parents of the Sandy Hook victims.

### a/t gun control means immigration fails

Immigration is different. It’s not just a sensational even that caused it.

**ABC News, 4-18**, 13, <http://abcnews.go.com/ABC_Univision/Politics/gun-control-fail-doom-immigration-reform/story?id=18990183#.UXigZ7Uqbzw>

**Unlike gun control, immigration reform isn't at the front of the agenda because of a single even**t. A mix of interest groups want to see it happen, and Washington is listening.¶ They can't afford not to. Since the mid-2000s, **reform supporters have been assembling a broad coalition in support of a bill. Immigrant rights groups, big businesses, labor unions, universities, tech companies and agriculture** are all in favor of some type of immigration reform.¶ **There's also a political imperative**. After Republicans lost the presidential election this November, it became clear that the party could not continue to allow Democrats to take more than 70 percent of the Latino and Asian vote. If they do, demographics will make their party obsolete.¶ Immigration reform enjoys a degree of bipartisan support, which isn't the case for gun control right now. **Most observers seem to think it will cruise through the Senate, and find its real challenge in the Republican-controlled House. But even there, a bill will** [**have its supporters**](http://abcnews.go.com/ABC_Univision/Politics/house-immigration-group-promises-bill/story?id=18977670#support)**.**¶ **Another difference between the two issues is the power of the National Rifle Association (NRA),** something that Matt Barreto, a co-founder of the public opinion firm Latino Decisions, mentioned in a conference call today on immigration reform.¶ "My perspective is that the gun bill is entirely about the influence of the NRA," he said. That's not the case when it comes to immigration, he said. "There's not a huge group like the NRA that can go and push its muscle around in Washington."¶ Finally, the immigration bill isn't entirely an Obama imperative. True, he marked it as a top priority in his second term and has drafted his own legislation. But the bills drafted in Congress -- with support of both Democrats and Republicans -- are the only ones expected to have a realistic chance of passage.

### a/t uniqueness overwhelms

Barnes 4-24WSJ, , 13 Fred, Barnes. Fred Barnes: Immigration Reform Is Starting to Roll

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324874204578441133717872550.html?mod=googlenews\_wsj

Yet **the favorable climate for changing the U.S. immigration system doesn't mean it's a cinch to pass. There are formidable opponents**. Sen. Jeff Sessions of Alabama, probably the most underrated Republican on Capitol Hill, is already a dogged critic of the legislation drafted by the Gang of Eight. So is Ted Cruz of Texas, the smart and outspoken Senate freshman.¶ **In the House, "it's going to be a lift," says** Florida Rep. Mario **Diaz-Balart, a member of a bipartisan group developing a bill expected to be similar to the Gang of Eight's. "It's super-emotional and technically very difficult."**

### a/t healthcare thumper

**The Hill, 4-24**, 13, <http://thehill.com/blogs/floor-action/house/295909-house-advances-obamacare-bill-passage-still-uncertain>

Lacking the votes, House Republican leaders on Wednesday postponed action on a bill that would have changed President Obama’s healthcare law. The move was a blow to Majority Leader Eric Cantor (R-Va.), who took the lead in pushing for the legislation, and represents yet another example of House GOP

### a/t budget thumper

**Benac,** Nancy http://www.planning.org/news/daily/story.htm?story\_id=184904360, 4/25/1313,

As for those lofty aspirations for a "grand bargain," Collender says, "We're talking years, not months" of negotiations.¶ There are plenty of other big issues swirling on Capitol Hill with better odds for producing results that threaten to distract legislators.¶ "**The danger here is that everybody will forget about the budget and turn now to immigration** and guns, **and we leave the budget until the next crisis hits," says** **Bob Bixby****, executive director of the Concord Coalition, which advocates balanced budgets.**

### a/t climate thumper

New York Times, 4-25, 13 http://www.nytimes.com/2013/04/25/business/energy-environment/slow-start-on-environment-in-obamas-2nd-term.html?\_r=0

SHORTLY after winning re-election in November, President **Obama** **promised** **assertive leadership on climate change and energy.** In his State of the Union address in February, he vowed that if the assembled lawmakers failed to pass broad climate legislation, he would act unilaterally. And yet in the ensuing months, little more has been heard from the president or his cabinet on the matter.¶ Agreement is broad on near-term executive actions to address climate change, including imposing strict caps on greenhouse-gas emissions at all power plants, tightening efficiency standards for appliances and limiting methane leakage from gas wells and pipelines. The President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology presented him with a nine-page letter in March with specific policies, many not requiring Congressional approval.¶ The panel recommended steps to better prepare the nation for extreme weather events like Hurricane Sandy; cut carbon emissions, particularly from electricity generators; speed research on carbon capture and storage and increase government support for renewable and low-carbon energy.¶ These measures would represent an expanded regulatory effort, yet the administration has taken only small steps toward them. A long-awaited initiative to reduce sulfur content in gasoline has been announced, but a more significant regulation on power plant carbon emissions has been delayed.¶ After a flurry of environmental rule-making in Mr. Obama's first term, including doubling vehicle fuel efficiency by 2025 and a stricter regime for policing drilling on public lands and waters, the engine of the regulatory state appears to have stalled.¶ So what is Mr. Obama's second-term energy and environmental agenda, and why is it proceeding so slowly?¶ The second question is easier to answer than the first.¶ **Washington is consumed with debates on** gun control, **immigration** and federal spending, not to mention challenges like terrorism and North Korea. In addition, all three cabinet-level agencies that address climate change and energy -- the Interior and Energy Departments and the Environmental Protection Agency -- will have new leaders for the second term.

### a/t polls w/issue linkage or vote delay

1. Polls mean nothing-it’s a question of issue linkage not what the public wants.
2. Even if people like rehab they’d be upset with legislation that has nothing to do with them.

Trinick Why Won’t The Candidates Talk About Prisons? By Richard | October 17, 2012

It’s politically toxic. Any move to alter the current tough stance on criminal justice is inevitably viewed as being ‘soft on crime’, regardless of how much sense a new policy might make or how much it might reduce crime in the long-run. No politician, especially one running in a race as close as the current match-up, wants to be seen as ‘soft on crime’. For Republicans, “the party of law and order”, it would be sacrilege to even suggest a change in policy. For Democrats, especially Obama, the aim appears to be [is] to avoid looking “weak and liberal”and avoid alienating middle-class white voters. In addition, it lacks appeal — few voters (read ‘people likely to vote in swing states’) care about the issue as they perceive that it does not affect them and it requires hard choices to be made.

### a/t polls with pol cap

1.Prefer trinick to polls-political capital isn’t a question of what policies people like in the abstract it’s a question of what issues they find important. Even if people like rehab they don’t like it ruining the squo agenda.

1. Their polls don’t say people want federal government action on the cjs. Cjs reform has always been at the state level which means usfg reform would have a significantly different poll reaction.

### a/t winners win

1.Empirically denied-presidential approval historically goes down over time. People nit pick over every bill.

2. Even if he gets pol. Cap eventually he will lose it at first and gain it back if the aff is successful in the long run.

3.This assumes a political capital link. Obama’s political capital isn’t relevant.

### a/t won’t pass house

**The Hill, 4-24**, 13, <http://thehill.com/homenews/house/296041-house-pulls-immigration-to-the-right>

Publicly, members voiced optimism about reaching an agreement. Gutiérrez will join a Republican negotiator, Rep. John Carter (R-Texas), for an event in San Antonio, Texas, to build support for immigration reform. It will come a week after Gutiérrez made a joint appearance to discuss the topic in Chicago with Rep. Paul Ryan (R-Wis.), and it will be the first time two members of the House group will appear together in public.¶ **“We’re almost there,” Carter said.** Carter would not rule out releasing a final bill before Monday, but several other officials with knowledge of the negotiations said it was unlikely the legislation would be finished before May. The coalition only formally acknowledged its existence — which had been an open secret in Washington since the beginning of the year — last week after the Gang of Eight released its legislative text. “We didn’t come out of the closet. We were dragged out,” Carter joked. **The four Democratic members of the group briefed the House Democratic caucus on Wednesday. “This isn’t a Democratic bill. This is a compromise bill**,” Gutiérrez warned his colleagues, according to a person in the closed-door meeting. Frank Sharry, a reform advocate and executive director of America’s Voice, said he has more concerns about the possible differences with the Senate on the guest-worker program than on the path to citizenship. The Senate deal won the support of both the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the AFL-CIO. Fighting between the two sides in 2007 has been blamed for the failure of immigration reform legislation during the George W. Bush administration. “Minor differences with respect to the path to citizenship wouldn’t be a deal-breaker, but changes to the business-labor deal might well be. There is no wiggle room,” Sharry said. “If [Republicans] demand too much, they could easily upset the delicate balance the Senate bill represents.” With a conservative Republican majority, the way forward for immigration reform in the House is more uncertain than in the Senate. GOP leaders have not decided whether to move a single bill or break it into pieces to improve its chances for passage. Leaders of the House Judiciary Committee, who have reacted coolly to the Senate proposal, plan to detail their plans for legislation on Thursday morning. A Democrat in the House immigration group, Rep. Xavier Becerra (Calif.), cited the indecision of the Republican leadership as an obstacle. “Unfortunately, on the House side, it looks like some Republicans are getting tied up in knots. I’m not sure how they want to proceed,” Becerra, chairman of the House Democratic Caucus, said during a press briefing in the Capitol. But he also suggested that **the eight members in the coalition had never been closer to a deal “than we are today.”**

### a/t republicans block

1.Republicans support.

Barnes 4-24WSJ, , 13 Fred, Barnes. Fred Barnes: Immigration Reform Is Starting to Roll http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324874204578441133717872550.html?mod=googlenews\_wsj

It is rare in Washington for the trend lines on a controversial issue to come together as favorably as they have for immigration reform.¶ Public support is roughly around 70%, according to various polls, with Gallup having it at 72%. Senate **Republicans blocked an overhaul of immigration laws in 2007 but now a substantial bloc of Republicans, alarmed by the GOP's shrunken share of the Hispanic vote in the 2012 election, are eager to enact "comprehensive" reform legislation**

2. Rubio makes republicans support.

**The Hill, 4-25**, <http://thehill.com/homenews/senate/296039-critics-see-a-rerun-of-healthcare>

**Rubio’s job is to sell the controversial bill to the GOP’s conservative base. So far, he’s done a good job**, according to Republican colleagues, **as the emerging opposition is only a fraction of what there was in 2007, when the Senate last debated immigration reform.**¶Sen. Jeff Flake (R-Ariz.), another member of the Gang of Eight, said he expects critics to take shots at the bill. He said if there weren’t waivers granted to Napolitano, the bill would be criticized for being too inflexible.