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1NC

Jackson Vanik repeal will pass and top of the docket – bipart support and WTO Vote

Needham 6/21 (Vicki, reporter for the Hill, Reporter for Island Packet, editor for Orange County Register, graduate from Northwestern University, Trinity University, The Hill, “Senators, Obama administration aim for compromise on Russia trade”, http://thehill.com/blogs/on-the-money/1005-trade/234173-senators-obama- administration-aim-for-compromise-on-russia-trade, 6/21/12)

Senate Finance Committee members said Thursday are backing a plan to link legislation repealing Jackson-Vanik, which allow for grant normal permanent normal trade relations (PNTR) with Moscow, with a human rights bill that would punish Russian officials involved with the death of lawyer Sergei Magnitsky, who died in police custody. Obama administration officials, U.S. Trade Representative Ron Kirk and Deputy Secretary of State William Burns, told the Finance panel on Thursday that they prefer separate tracks for the two measures but will continue to work with lawmakers toward a **compromise to pass a measure before the August recess**. Regardless of current differences, lawmakers and Obama administration officials agree that PNTR needs to be granted before Russia joins the World Trade Organization (WTO) in August. Burns acknowledged Thursday that there is a "constructive dialogue" continuing with lawmakers and that the administration's concerns are being considered. He opted to reserve a final opinion on how the administration will react until a bill emerges from the Senate. House Ways and Means Chairman Dave Camp (R-Mich.), who held a Wednesday hearing, is siding with the Obama administration in pressing for a "clean" PNTR bill.

Plan costs capital – transportation spending breeds partisanship, election year

Lowy 5/1 (Joan, Associated Press Financial Wire, 1 May 2012 – lexis)

The bill is driven partly by election-year politics. Both Congress and President Barack Obama have made transportation infrastructure investment the centerpiece of their jobs agendas. But the political imperative for passing a bill has been complicated by House Republicans' insistence on including a mandate for federal approval of the Keystone XL oil pipeline. The White House has threatened to veto the measure if it retains the Keystone provision. And there are other points of disagreement between the GOP-controlled House and Democratic-controlled Senate, including **how to pay for transportation programs and how much leverage the federal government should have** over how states spend their aid money. Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood has said it's unlikely Congress will pass a final bill until after the November elections.

Capital key

Barkley 6/22 (Tom, Reporter at Dow Jones, “U.S., Russia Trade Bill Seen as Tough Going”, http://www.nasdaq.com/article/us-russia-trade-bill-seen-as-tough-going-20120619-01309)

U.S. President Barack Obama said Monday after his bilateral meeting with Russia's President Vladimir Putin on the sidelines of the Group of 20 meeting in Mexico that he emphasized that establishing permanent, normal trade relations with Russia was a priority "so that American businesses can take advantage of the extraordinary opportunities now that Russia is a member of the WTO." But winning passage by August, when Russia is expected to formally join the WTO, will be difficult in an election year given ongoing concerns about issues ranging from Russia's human rights practices to policy differences on Syria and Iran. Republican presidential challenger Mitt Romney recently called Russia "our No. 1 geopolitical foe." Mr. Brady said approving permanent, normal trade relations with Russia will be a "hard lift," and urged the Obama administration to step up its efforts to win over congressional support.

Repeal key to solve relations – on the brink now

RT 12/26 (“Russia urges US to repeal Cold War era legislation” -- http://rt.com/politics/russia-jackson-vanik-lavrov-679/)

With US-Russian relations sliding from reset to regret, one way to brighten the economic and political picture is to repeal the Cold War-era Jackson-Vanik amendment, Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov told reporters on Monday. Interestingly, Lavrov said that Jackson-Vanik is more of a hindrance to American businesses than it is to Russian ones, especially with Russia set to enter the WTO in 2012. “Russia's entry into the WTO opens broad vistas for more intensive business contacts and a quality change of the entire economic relationship, naturally, **on the condition the U.S. Congress repeals the notorious Jackson-Vanik amendment,** which actually makes U.S.business its hostage," the minister said. Lavrov asserted Russia’s dedication to improving bilateral relations with the United States Russia "will continue to improve the atmosphere of bilateral cooperation and build confidence and mutual understanding. We aim for an air dialogue even on the most difficult subjects," he said. The Russian membership in the WTO is a totally new stage of the Russian integration into the world economic system, Lavrov said, which will redound to the world’s benefit. "We are ready to promote global economic stability, efficient solutions to crises, and strengthening of international institutions," the minister said. In 1972, Soviet Premier Leonid Brezhnev introduced the so-called "diploma tax” as a means of covering the cost of would-be emigrants who had received a higher education in the Soviet Union. This move caused US Congress in 1974 to enact Jackson-Vanik, which denied ‘most-favored nation’ status for states limiting the emigration rights of their citizens. In March, 2011, US Vice President Joe Biden urged a repeal of the law.

Nuclear war

Allison 10/31 (Graham, Director – Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard’s Kennedy School, and Former Assistant Secretary of Defense, and Robert D. Blackwill, Senior Fellow – Council on Foreign Relations, “10 Reasons Why Russia Still Matters”, Politico, 2011, http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=161EF282-72F9-4D48-8B9C-C5B3396CA0E6)

That central point is that Russia matters a great deal to a U.S. government seeking to defend and advance its national interests. Prime Minister Vladimir Putin’s decision to return next year as president makes it all the more critical for Washington to manage its relationship with Russia through coherent, realistic policies. No one denies that Russia is a dangerous, difficult, often disappointing state to do business with. We should not overlook its many human rights and legal failures. Nonetheless, Russia is a player whose choices affect our vital interests in nuclear security and energy. It is key to supplying 100,000 U.S. troops fighting in Afghanistan and preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. Ten realities require U.S. policymakers to advance our nation’s interests by engaging and working with Moscow. First, Russia remains the only nation that can erase the United States from the map in 30 minutes. As every president since John F. Kennedy has recognized, Russia’s cooperation is critical to averting nuclear war. Second, Russia is our most consequential partner in preventing nuclear terrorism. Through a combination of more than $11 billion in U.S. aid, provided through the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction program, and impressive Russian professionalism, two decades after the collapse of the “evil empire,” not one nuclear weapon has been found loose. Third, Russia plays an essential role in preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and missile-delivery systems. As Washington seeks to stop Iran’s drive toward nuclear weapons, Russian choices to sell or withhold sensitive technologies are the difference between failure and the possibility of success. Fourth, Russian support in sharing intelligence and cooperating in operations remains essential to the U.S. war to destroy Al Qaeda and combat other transnational terrorist groups. Fifth, Russia provides a vital supply line to 100,000 U.S. troops fighting in Afghanistan. As U.S. relations with Pakistan have deteriorated, the Russian lifeline has grown ever more important and now accounts for half all daily deliveries. Sixth, Russia is the world’s largest oil producer and second largest gas producer. Over the past decade, Russia has added more oil and gas exports to world energy markets than any other nation. Most major energy transport routes from Eurasia start in Russia or cross its nine time zones. As citizens of a country that imports two of every three of the 20 million barrels of oil that fuel U.S. cars daily, Americans feel Russia’s impact at our gas pumps. Seventh, Moscow is an important player in today’s international system. It is no accident that Russia is one of the five veto-wielding, permanent members of the U.N. Security Council, as well as a member of the G-8 and G-20. A Moscow more closely aligned with U.S. goals would be significant in the balance of power to shape an environment in which China can emerge as a global power without overturning the existing order. Eighth, Russia is the largest country on Earth by land area, abutting China on the East, Poland in the West and the United States across the Arctic. This territory provides transit corridors for supplies to global markets whose stability is vital to the U.S. economy. Ninth, Russia’s brainpower is reflected in the fact that it has won more Nobel Prizes for science than all of Asia, places first in most math competitions and dominates the world chess masters list. The only way U.S. astronauts can now travel to and from the International Space Station is to hitch a ride on Russian rockets. The co-founder of the most advanced digital company in the world, Google, is Russian-born Sergei Brin. Tenth, Russia’s potential as a spoiler is difficult to exaggerate. Consider what a Russian president intent on frustrating U.S. international objectives could do — from stopping the supply flow to Afghanistan to selling S-300 air defense missiles to Tehran to joining China in preventing U.N. Security Council

2NC Repeal Will Pass

Extend Needham– Jackson Vanik repeal will pass, business lobbies and bipartisanship, but capital is key

More evidence, Jackson Vanik repeal will pass but polcap is key

The Hill 6/24 (“Business Groups See Progress in Moving Russia Trade Bill,” The Hill, 6/24/12, <http://thehill.com/blogs/on-the-money/1005-trade/234439-business-groups-see-progress-on-russia-trade-bill)//SR>

Business groups say they feel encouraged that Congress will approve Russian trade legislation before the August recess. The groups said **the Obama administration will have to work quickly to bridge their differences** to pass the legislation, but the groups **expressed confidence** it would get done. “A lot of progress was made this week,” said David Thomas, vice president for trade policy, with the Business Roundtable. Lawmakers on Capitol Hill along with trade officials are trying to balance the passage of permanent normal trade relations (PNTR) for Russia with a push by a broad coalition of lawmakers to link the measure with human rights legislation. The latter bill would withhold visas for Russian officials accused of human rights violations. Hearings at the House Ways and Means and Senate Finance committees this week revealed the gap between lawmakers and the White House, which opposes the linkage and finds itself in an unlikely partnership with Capitol Hill Republicans. U.S. Trade Representative Ron Kirk and House Republicans are calling for lawmakers to pass a clean repeal of the Jackson-Vanik provision, which would grant Russia permanent normal trade relations.

Will be repealed– gaining congressional support now

Market Watch 6/12 (“U.S. Senators Push for More Open Relations with Russia”, The Wall Street Journal, http://www.marketwatch.com/story/us-senators-push-for-more-open-trade-with-russia-2012-06-12>.)

A bipartisan group of senators introduced legislation Tuesday to lift trade restrictions on Russia, with the aim of passing the bill along with measures to protect human rights in the country before it joins the World Trade Organization as expected this summer. The bill would approve permanent, normal trade relations with Russia by the August recess, a top trade priority for the Obama administration. But Senate Finance Committee Chairman Max Baucus (D., Mont.) also vowed to incorporate provisions being championed by an increasing number of lawmakers on both sides to punish Russian officials for any human-rights violations. Administration officials have called for Congress to pass the trade bill separately from any human-rights legislation, a plan that has also been supported by Rep. Dave Camp (R., Mich.), chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, which overseas trade issues. Mr. Baucus said that once the Senate passes the bill, he would work with the House to ensure any final version of the legislation includes the full text of the so-called "Magnitsky" bill, named after a lawyer who died in a Russian prison in 2009 after accusing government officials of fraud. "This is an opportunity to double our exports to Russia and create thousands of jobs across every sector of the U.S. economy, all at no cost to the U.S. whatsoever," said Baucus in a statement. Foreign Relations Committee Chairman John Kerry (D, Mass.), who unveiled the legislation along with Mr. Baucus, Sen. John McCain (R, Ariz.) and Sen. John Thune (R, S.D.) said the legislation will "make real progress on the human rights and democratic reform agenda as well." McCain stressed the trade bill must be accompanied by the human-rights legislation. The legislation comes on the same day that a leading business group launched a lobbying and public-relations blitz to push for approval of permanent, normal trade relations with Russia by the August recess. John Engler, president of the Business Roundtable, a group of executives from multinational firms, said the trade bill's **passage appears increasingly achievable** despite the onset of the U.S. elections and growing tensions with Russia over human rights and foreign policy. "This could go quite quickly," Mr. Engler told reporters during an event announcing the lobbying campaign. "On the core issue, there is not fierce opposition, and there is not a political divide." William Lane, Caterpillar Inc.'s (CAT) Washington director, also expressed confidence that the trade bill could be passed by the recess, but said he expected the human-rights legislation to be passed separately. To establish permanent, normal trade relations with Russia, Congress has to repeal Jackson-Vanik, a 1974 measure that prevents the U.S. from granting most-favored-nation status to countries that restrict emigration. Those restrictions have been waived on a yearly basis, but Russian officials have said they must be repealed for the U.S. to receive the same benefits as other countries once it joins the WTO. Russian officials have also warned of retaliation if any legislation imposes new human-rights measures in place of Jackson-Vanik.

Yes repeal, bipartisan and public support

JTA 6/14 (JTA, global Jewish news service, “Senators introduce Jackson-Vanik repeal for Russia” http://www.jta.org/news/article/2012/06/14/3098196/senators-introduce-jackson-vanik-repeal-for-russia 6/14/12)

A bipartisan slate of U.S. senators introduced a bill that would graduate Russia out of Jackson-Vanik trade restrictions. The bill, introduced Tuesday by Sens. Max Baucus (D-Montana), the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee; John Thune (R-S.D.), the senior Republican on the Senate's International Trade subcommittee; John Kerry, the chairman of the Senate's Foreign Relations Committee; and John McCain, the senior Republican on the Armed Services Committee, finds Russia "in full compliance with the freedom of emigration requirements" of the law passed at a time when the former Soviet Union was inhibiting Jewish emigration. Russia wants the 1970s-era restrictions on trade lifted to facilitate its joining the World Trade Organization. The WTO invited Russia to join last November. The Baucus bill is backed by NCSJ: Advocates on Behalf of Jews in Russia, Ukraine, the Baltic States & Eurasia."Russia has satisfied the central requirement of the amendment's intent: the right to emigrate," NCSJ Chairman Richard Stone said in a statement. "Jews are able to decide to emigrate or to choose to remain in Russia, where they can practice Judaism and participate in Jewish culture without reservation." A number of human rights groups oppose lifting Jackson-Vanik, and legislation is under consideration in the U.S. House of Representatives that would sanction officials implicated in human rights abuses.

2NC Repeal Will Pass

JV repeal will pass despite election, WTO rules, and bipartisanship over helping businesses

Herszenhorn 2/27/12 (David M. Herszenhorn, reportor for the New York times, “ U.S.-Russian trade hits political snags: If Congress doesn't end 1974 curbs, Washington would violate global rules, international herald tribune) http://proxy.lib.umich.edu/login?url=http://search.proquest.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/docview/923493773?accountid=14667

If Congress does not repeal restrictions adopted in 1974 to pressure the Soviet Union to allow Jewish emigration and now largely irrelevant, the United States would soon be in violation of W.T.O. rules. With relations between Russia and the United States on edge over Syrian policy and strident anti-American statements by the Russian government in response to political protests here, the Obama administration and its Democratic allies in Congress have begun an aggressive push to end Cold-War-era trade restrictions and make Russia a full trade partner. The seemingly incongruous and politically fraught campaign to persuade the U.S. Congress to grant permanent, normal trade status reflects a stark flip in circumstances: suddenly, after more than 35 years of tussling over trade, Russia has the upper hand. In December, Russia became the last major economy to win admission to the World Trade Organization -- a bid that was supported by the Obama administration because it required Russia to bring numerous laws into conformity with international standards, including tighter safeguards for intellectual property. It was also part of the so-called reset in relations with the Kremlin. But if Congress does not repeal the restrictions, adopted in 1974 to pressure the Soviet Union to allow Jewish emigration and now largely irrelevant, the United States would soon be in violation of W.T.O. rules. American corporations could be put at a serious disadvantage -- paying higher tariffs, for instance, than European and Asian competitors, which would immediately enjoy the benefits of Russia's new status. A number of big-name companies have important interests in Russia, including Caterpillar, John Deere, Boeing and United Technologies. "We would come out a big loser," Senator Max Baucus, a Montana Democrat and chairman of the Finance Committee, said in an interview in Moscow, where he met this week with President Dmitri A. Medvedev and other senior officials, as well as American business leaders, to discuss the trade situation. "Other countries will gain market share in Russia at the expense of the United States."Mr. Baucus, whose committee has jurisdiction over tax and trade policy, arrived in St. Petersburg straight from winning a fierce fight on Capitol Hill to extend a temporary cut in payroll taxes, a fight that illustrated how excruciatingly difficult it is to pass legislation in a divided Congress these days even when Republicans and Democrats agree on the desired outcome. Winning repeal of the 1974 trade restrictions, known as the Jackson-Vanick amendment, and approval of permanent normal trade relations with Russian will probably prove harder still. First, there is the burst of anti-American talk that many observers of Russian-American relations say is the ugliest in recent memory. Prime Minister Vladimir V. Putin, who is running for president, has accused Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton and the United States of stirring political unrest, including the huge street protests that have taken place here in recent months. The newly arrived American ambassador, Michael A. McFaul, who was Mr. Obama's senior adviser on Russia at the White House, has also come under attack, accused of being sent to foment revolution. Then there is Russia's effort to block international intervention in Syria, including its veto, along with China, of a United Nations Security Council resolution calling on President Bashar al-Assad to step down. To the dismay of American officials, Russia has continued to ship weapons, medicine, food and other supplies to Syria, essentially providing both a practical and political lifeline to Mr. Assad's government in the name of respecting Syria's sovereignty. Mr. Baucus raised the American concerns about Syria in his meeting with Mr. Medvedev, who expressed a desire to work with the United States but reiterated a general sentiment among Russian officials that they had been betrayed after agreeing not to block a Security Council resolution authorizing a no-fly zone over Libya to protect civilians. In their view, the resolution was used to justify airstrikes that drove Col. Muammar el-Qaddafi from power. Some officials here suggested that the meetings between Mr. Baucus and senior Russian leaders, including First Deputy Prime Minister Igor I. Shuvalov, Foreign Minister Sergey V. Lavrov, Economic Development Minister Elvira S. Nabiullina and Agriculture Minister Yelena Skrynnik, signaled that the anti-Americanism is largely presidential campaign theatrics intended for Russia's domestic audience and that Moscow is still committed to working with the United States. The W.T.O. sets the rules governing global commerce and provides a forum for resolving disputes. Russia had sought to become a member for most of two decades, and some studies predict that it stands to gain as much as one percentage point in annual economic growth from membership. But even if the anti-Americanism subsides and order is restored in Syria, other obstacles remain. More than two dozen members of Congress have signed on in support of legislation that would deny travel visas to Russian officials, and others around the world, linked to human rights abuses. The bill is named for Sergei L. Magnitsky, a Russian lawyer who was arrested and died in prison after trying to expose a huge tax fraud by government officials. His supporters say he was denied medical care. Sponsors of the bill, including Senator Benjamin L. Cardin, Democrat of Maryland, say they intend to attach it to any legislation to normalize trade relations with Russia. Supporters include Senator John McCain, Republican of Arizona, who is a fierce critic of the Russian government. The Obama administration opposes the bill, saying that it interferes with the State Department and that steps have been taken to deny visas to accused violators of human rights. "There is more that we can do to support human rights, civil society and freedom of expression in Russia," Senator Jeanne Shaheen, Democrat of New Hampshire, said in a recent floor speech. "Passing the Magnitsky bill is one of them." Mr. Magnitsky's legal client, a British financier named William F. Browder, has made it a personal mission to win justice in the case, including approval of the legislation, and has hired a prominent Washington lobbyist to increase the pressure on Capitol Hill. There are also humdrum issues of actual trade policy, including some agreements that need to be reached on regulations on pork products. In trying to overcome the political obstacles, the Obama administration could face opposition from those who say that any concessions to Russia are not worthwhile, given the major disagreements on foreign policy, human rights and concerns about corruption, and especially because the amount of trade with Russia is small. There were slightly more than $8 billion in American exports to Russia in 2011, compared, for instance, with more than $100 billion to China. To highlight the importance of the Russian market to individual companies, Mr. Baucus visited a John Deere factory in Russia, which he said helped support jobs in the United States, including at three suppliers in his home state, Montana. In an interview, Mr. Baucus said that despite the uphill battle of passing any legislation in a presidential election year, he believed that Congress would ultimately see the wisdom of normalizing trade relations with Russia, or at least recognize that failing to do so would only punish American business. "Even though this is an election year, the logic is unassailable," he said. "This makes good sense for America. It will help create more American jobs."

AT: No Repeal- Elections

GOP will compromise despite election

Walsh 2/23 (Kenneth, writer for U.S. News & World Report, “Obama Officials Optimistic as Economy, Public Opinion Improves,” U.S. News and World Report, 2-23-12, <http://www.usnews.com/news/blogs/Ken-Walshs-Washington/2012/02/23/obama-officials-optimistic-as-economy-public-opinion-improves)//SR>

President Obama believes there is a reasonable chance that congressional Republicans will feel enough public pressure to compromise with him on key parts of his 2012 agenda, White House aides say. "They can be productive," a senior White House official told me. "Substantively, there can be accomplishments with Congress even though this is an election year." Among the initiatives that White House officials are considering for possible areas for compromise: more investment in infrastructure projects such as roads and bridges, tax breaks for small businesses, tax breaks for businesses that relocate jobs from overseas to the United States and making it easier for some homeowners to refinance their mortgages at lower interest rates. All of these initiatives are popular with voters, Obama strategists say. The president and his senior advisers were happy that Congress approved an extension of a payroll tax cut and longer-term unemployment benefits last week. They consider this a sign that progress can be made on other issues this year. Overall, administration officials say that Americans seem to be more optimistic about where the economy is headed as unemployment slowly decreases, more private sector jobs are created month-to-month, and the Dow Jones industrial average rises. Americans seem to feel that "things are getting better," a top Obama aide told me, but the president believes "we are not near to being out of the woods."

JV will pass Even though it’s an election year

NYT 2/24 (<http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/25/world/europe/us-russian-trade-ties-hit-political-snags.html?_r=1>)

In an interview, Mr. Baucus said that despite the uphill battle of passing any legislation in a presidential election year, he believed that Congress would ultimately see the wisdom of normalizing trade relations with Russia, or at least recognize that failing to do so would only punish American business. “Even though this is an election year, the logic is unassailable,” he said. “This makes good sense for America. It will help create more American jobs.”

Elections don’t kill compromise – put pressure on GOP

Parker 3/1 (Alex, writer for the Chicago Tribune, http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/sns-201203011028usnewsusnwr201202240229congressmar01,0,5388899.story)

Some Democrats are downright giddy that the low Congressional approval ratings—a February Gallup poll shows that only 10 percent of Americans approve of the job that lawmakers have been doing--and the rising economic tide are not only giving them the upper hand in negotiations, but are also allowing them the chance to control the legislative agenda. Even though the president's hopes for comprehensive tax reform or higher taxes for millionaires still seems unlikely, Democrats are still itching to put Republicans on the spot over issues on the economy, home mortgages, and taxes. "It's creating a situation where some Republicans may start saving face and may try to cut deals with the President and Democrats in order to pass legislation to save their seats," one House Democratic aide says.The parties are still locking horns over issues such as gas prices and contraception, but there are other brief glimpses of comity. On Tuesday party leaders indicated that they would try to move forward with the traditional appropriations process, rather than enter a showdown over the deficit--the playbook from the last several congressional sessions. And in February, the GOP unexpectedly caved early on the payroll tax deal rather than take the issue down to the deadline negotiations of the past. For the most part, Congressional business will be drowned out by the upcoming elections, and that's a big part of why the tides may be shifting. "As much as [the Republican] base likes being just in opposition, I do think that middle of the road voters are disgusted by the partisanship," Tanner says.

Links – General Transportation Funding Unpopular - Spending

Transportation spending unpopular

Newman ’11 (Rick Newman, Chief business correspondent US News and World Report, September 9, 2011, US News, http://www.usnews.com/news/blogs/rick-newman/2011/09/09/who-would-win-under-obamas-jobs-plan)

No industry has suffered more than construction, with nearly two million workers losing their jobs since the recession began at the end of 2007. Obama wants to hire back some of them, by spending $15 billion to refurbish foreclosed homes, $25 billion to modernize 35,000 schools, $5 billion to upgrade community colleges and $50 billion to improve roads, railways, airports bridges and other parts of the nation's infrastructure. He'd also use $10 billion in federal money to seed an "infrastructure bank" that would draw private funds used to invest in more rebuilding projects. Economists generally applaud this kind of spending, because it fixes problems that would go unaddressed if the government didn't tackle them, while boosting the economy and helping improve the backbone of business. Prospects: Weak. When Republicans complain that Obama's plan contains "more of the same," this is what they're talking about. The 2009 stimulus plan that they routinely deride contained about $100 billion in transportation and infrastructure spending, which Republicans contend did nothing to help the economy. It probably did help some, but the difficulty of being able to point to tangible results makes **this kind of spending unpopular among many in Congress.**

Costs capital, transportation funding breeds partisanship

Freemark 1/25 (Yonah, “On Infrastructure, Hopes for Progress this Year Look Glum”, The Transport Politic, 25 January 2012, < http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2012/01/25/on-infrastructure-hopes-for-progress-this-year-look-glum/>)

President Obama barely mentions the need for improvements in the nation’s capital stock in his State of the Union. The contributions of the Obama Administration to the investment in improved transportation alternatives have been significant, but it was clear from the President’s State of the Union address last night that 2012 will be a year of diminished expectations in the face of a general election and a tough Congressional opposition. Mr. Obama’s address, whatever its merits from a populist perspective, nonetheless failed to propose dramatic reforms to encourage new spending on transportation projects, in contrast to previous years. While the Administration has in some ways radically reformed the way Washington goes about selecting capital improvements, bringing a new emphasis on livability and underdeveloped modes like high-speed rail, there was little indication in the speech of an effort to expand such policy choices. All that we heard was a rather meek suggestion to transform a part of the money made available from the pullout from the Afghanistan and Iraq conflicts — a sort of war dividend whose size is undefined — to “do some nation-building right here at home.” If these suggestions fell flat for the pro-investment audience, they were reflective of the reality of working in the context of a deeply divided political system in which such once-universally supported policies as increased roads funding have become **practically impossible to pursue**. Mr. Obama pushed hard, we shouldn’t forget, for a huge, transformational transportation bill in early 2011, **only to be rebuffed by intransigence in the GOP-led House of Representatives and only wavering support in the Democratic Senate**. For the first term at least, the Administration’s transportation initiatives appear to have been pushed aside. Even so, it remains to be seen how the Administration will approach the development of a transportation reauthorization program. Such legislation remains on the Congressional agenda after three years of delays (the law expires on March 31st). There is so far no long-term solution to the continued inability of fuel tax revenues to cover the growing national need for upgraded or expanded mobility infrastructure. But if it were to pass, a new multi-year transportation bill would be the most significant single piece of legislation passed by the Congress in 2012. The prospect of agreement between the two parties on this issue, however, seems far-fetched. That is, if we are to assume that the goal is to complete a new and improved spending bill, rather than simply further extensions of the existing legislation. The House could consider this month a bill that would fund new highways and transit for several more years by expanding domestic production of heavily carbon-emitting fossil fuels, a terrible plan that would produce few new revenues and encourage more ecological destruction. Members of the Senate, meanwhile, have for months been claiming they were “looking” for the missing $12 or 13 billion to complete its new transportation package but have so far come up with bupkis. The near-term thus likely consists of either continued extensions of the current law or a bipartisan bargain that fails to do much more than replicate the existing law, perhaps with a few bureaucratic reforms.

Links – General Transportation Funding Unpopular - Election

Transportation Spending unpopular and drains PC

Szakonyi 3/20 (Mark, Associate Editor for the Journal of Commerce, “Focusing on the Reporting of Rail and Intermodal Issues, Regulation and Policy out of the JOC's Washington, D.C”, Bureau. Journal of Commerce, 20 March 2012 – lexis)

House Republicans are considering a short-term extension of the surface transportation bill instead of adopting the Senate's two-year plan. The decision to seek an extension as the March 31 deadline nears signals that **the fight over transportation spending could become even more partisan** as the presidential election nears. House Republicans are looking to push an extension of current spending for the ninth time, House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman John Mica, R.-Fla., told attendees of an American Association of Port Authorities conference, where he was honored as Port Person of the Year. His statement on Tuesday was a clear sign that Republicans won't heed Senate leaders' and President Obama's call to adopt the Senate's $109 billion plan. Mica said he hoped the extension would be exempt from riders, which helped lead to a shutdown of the Federal Aviation Administration last summer .

Plan is a loss for Obama - GOP won’t give him a win because of the election

The Olympian 6/13 (“GOP Selfish in Stalling Transportation Bill”, The Olympian, 13 June 2012. <http://www.theolympian.com/2012/06/13/2138607/gop-selfish-in-stalling-transportation.html>.)

Democrats and Republicans reached bipartisan support in the U.S. Senate on a transportation spending bill that would send $44 million next year to Washington state for construction on roads, bridges, rail and public transit, creating an estimated 30,000 jobs. The bill merely approves the current transportation spending appropriations, which expire at the end of June. If the bill isn’t passed by the House, $109 billion in federal money for highway projects over the next two years would dry up and scuttle projects ready to go, and pull the rug out from under thousands of construction workers nationwide. After last week’s weak jobs report, you’d think our national leaders couldn’t wait to pass a bill that puts so many Americans back to work. And if U.S. senators reached bipartisan support, what’s the problem? Two words: House Republicans. While the Senate achieved bipartisan support, the GOP-majority in the House didn’t even pass a bill of its own. It has preferred to throw up obstacles to the Senate bill, unless Congress and the Obama administration approve the oil pipeline stretching from Canada to Texas. Political extortion is nothing new in Washington, or even in state legislatures. But holding up a simple extension of transportation appropriations and keeping thousands of workers from the jobs they desperately need is outrageous. Such tactics suggest Republicans are intentionally stalling economic recovery, which they will then shamelessly blame on President Barack Obama in **an effort to weaken his chances at re-election in November**. That’s not just dirty politics. Stalling transportation spending hurts individuals and families who can’t make house or car payments. It hurts local businesses. It forces even more people to seek unemployment benefits, and everyone pays the cost of that. It hurts our nation. Regardless of party politics or individual pet projects, Congress has traditionally cooperated around transportation spending because building infrastructure is not only good for the economy, it’s a commonly accepted role of government. When business can’t move freight and workers can’t commute to their jobs because highways are inadequate, the whole nation suffers. Gov. Chris Gregoire lobbied congressional delegations last month to pass the highways bill. She said if funding is delayed, it will only add to the cost of construction projects that must be eventually completed. There are 1,340 miles of pavement, 34 safety projects, eight bridge replacements and numerous other transportation-related, statewide construction projects dependent on the spending bill, according to the governor’s transportation policy adviser, Jennifer Ziegler. Failure to approve the bill will have disastrous effects on mega-projects, such as the 520 floating bridge replacement, renovation of the Vancouver to Portland crossing of the Columbia River and turning the Alaskan Way Viaduct into a tunnel. Delaying those projects alone could further stall our state’s already lagging economic recovery. Even putting the highways bill in doubt causes uncertainty in a fragile economy. We saw the serious damage that kind of political chicanery can cause during last year’s wrangling over raising the debt ceiling. For the good of the nation, House Republicans should stop their political power play and approve the transportation bill already passed by their Senate colleagues. They are selfishly hurting Americans who need to get back to work.

More evidence- election year means plan is unpopular

Lowy 5/1 (Joan, Associated Press Financial Wire, 1 May 2012 – lexis)

The bill is driven partly by election-year politics. Both Congress and President Barack Obama have made transportation infrastructure investment the centerpiece of their jobs agendas. But the political imperative for passing a bill has been complicated by House Republicans' insistence on including a mandate for federal approval of the Keystone XL oil pipeline. The White House has threatened to veto the measure if it retains the Keystone provision. And there are other points of disagreement between the GOP-controlled House and Democratic-controlled Senate, including **how to pay for transportation programs and how much leverage the federal government should have** over how states spend their aid money. Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood has said it's unlikely Congress will pass a final bill until after the November elections.

Transportation spending is unpopular and drains political capital – election year

Szakonyi 3/20 (Mark, Associate Editor for the Journal of Commerce, “Focusing on the Reporting of Rail and Intermodal Issues, Regulation and Policy out of the JOC's Washington, D.C”, Bureau. Journal of Commerce, 20 March 2012 – lexis)

House Republicans are considering a short-term extension of the surface transportation bill instead of adopting the Senate's two-year plan. The decision to seek an extension as the March 31 deadline nears signals that the fight over transportation spending could become even more partisan as the presidential election nears. House Republicans are looking to push an extension of current spending for the ninth time, House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman John Mica, R.-Fla., told attendees of an American Association of Port Authorities conference, where he was honored as Port Person of the Year. His statement on Tuesday was a clear sign that Republicans won't heed Senate leaders' and President Obama's call to adopt the Senate's $109 billion plan. Mica said he hoped the extension would be exempt from riders, which helped lead to a shutdown of the Federal Aviation Administration last summer .

GOP won’t give Obama a win

Baltimore Sun 6/10 (“Transportation Bill: do Republicans Want to Sabotage the Economy?” The Baltimore Sun, 6-10-12, http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2012-06-10/news/bs-ed-transportation-20120610\_1\_transportation-bill-transportation-projects-transportation-spending)//SR

Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid recently said aloud what many Americans must be thinking these days — that at least some Republicans in Congress would like to see the U.S. economy worsen in order to boost their chances of success in the November election. The evidence? The GOP's continued resistance to approving a multiyear transportation authorization bill. Senator Reid told The Hill that he's heard House Majority Leader Eric Cantor is leading the charge to delay the Senate bill — and the tens of thousands of jobs it would create. pixel pixel House Speaker John Boehner denies the allegation, but he has also announced that he's ready to pull the plug on negotiations over the measure until after the election if the two sides fail to work out an agreement before June 30. That gives negotiators less than three weeks to shake hands on something that's had them at odds for years.

Links – General Transportation Funding Unpopular – Deficit Spending

New transportation spending unpopular– too large and expensive

Puentes 10 (Robert, Senior Fellow at the Metropolitan Policy Program at Brookings, “Moving Past Gridlock: A Proposal for a Two-Year Transportation Law”, December 2010, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media /research/files/blogs /2011/4/18%20transportation%20puentes/1214\_transportation\_puentes.pdf)// KB

Yet the nation’s surface transportation law is caught in political logjam. Despite an unusually rich three year policy discussion and a draft reauthorization proposal from the House of Representatives, the prospects for the passage of a long term law in the near future are bleak. This is partly because of **concerns about the size of the deficit,** a deep philosophical difference between the parties on the proper role of government, and the unwillingness to increase the federal tax on gasoline—the primary source of revenue for the program. The nation is instead facing the prospect of years of unpredictable and erratic extensions to the current law in order to avoid a shutdown of the program. Those extensions have historically made it difficult for states, metropolitan areas, and private contractors to plan for projects, delaying much needed infrastructure improvements and thwarting employment and economic recovery efforts.

Links – General Transportation Funding Unpopular - Public

Public doesn’t care about transportation and is unpopular because no rate payers

Orski ‘12 (Ken, worked professionally in the field of transportation for close to 40 years. served as Associate Administrator of the Urban Mass Transportation Administration. founded a transportation consultancy counseling corporate clients and agencies in federal, state and local government. served on state and federal transportation advisory bodies, http://www.newgeography.com/content/002662-why-pleas-increase-infrastructure-funding-fall-deaf-ears)

Finding the resources to keep transportation infrastructure in good order is a more difficult challenge. Unlike traditional utilities, roads and bridges have no rate payers to fall back on. Politicians and the public seem to **attach a low priority to fixing aging transportation infrastructure** and this translates into a lack of support for raising fuel taxes or imposing tolls. Investment in infrastructure did not even make the top ten list of public priorities in the latest Pew Research Center survey of domestic concerns. Calls by two congressionally mandated commissions to vastly increase transportation infrastructure spending have gone ignored. So have repeated pleas by advocacy groups such as Building America’s Future, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the University of Virginia’s Miller Center. Nor has the need to increase federal spending on infrastructure come up in the numerous policy debates held by the Republican presidential candidates. Even President Obama seems to have lost his former fervor for this issue. In his last State-of-the-Union message he made only a perfunctory reference to "rebuilding roads and bridges." High-speed rail and an infrastructure bank, two of the President’s past favorites, were not even mentioned. Why pleas to increase infrastructure funding fall on deaf ears. There are various theories why appeals to increase infrastructure spending do not resonate with the public. One widely held view is that people simply do not trust the federal government to spend their tax dollars wisely. As proof, evidence is cited that a great majority of state and local transportation ballot measures do get passed, because voters know precisely where their tax money is going. No doubt there is much truth to that. Indeed, thanks to local funding initiatives and the use of tolling, state transportation agencies are becoming increasingly more self-reliant and less dependent on federal funding. Another explanation, and one that I find highly plausible, has been offered by Charles Lane, editorial writer for the Washington Post. Wrote Lane in an October 31, 2011 Washington Post column, "How come my family and I traveled thousands of miles on both the east and west coast last summer without actually seeing any crumbling roads or airports? On the whole, the highways and byways were clean, safe and did not remind me of the Third World countries. ... Should I believe the pundits or my own eyes?" asked Lane ("The U.S. infrastructure argument that crumbles upon examination").

Links – DOT Budget Increase

Increase in DOT budget unpopular among Republicans

Kapsanis 2/14 Writer and Editorial director of Paintsquare, a newspaper reporting on many industries (Karen, “DOT Budget Plan Built on Infrastructure”, Paintsquare, 14 February 2012. <http://www.paintsquare.com/news/?fuseaction=view&id=7174>.)

President Obama has unveiled a 2013 transportation budget proposal that would nearly double infrastructure spending over the next six years and step up the federal investment in pipeline safety. The centerpiece of the $74 billion plan is the roll-out of a six-year surface transportation reauthorization proposal for highway, bridge and mass transit projects. Pipeline safety, a growing national concern, would also see significant additional funding. The Department of Transportation says the budget “would be fully paid for, using half of the six-year savings achieved from ramping down the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, with the other half used to pay down the national debt.” The 2013 DOT budget proposal is a 2 percent increase over 2012. 6 Years, $476B The surface transportation proposal totals $476 billion over six years. It includes: • $305 billion to build and repair U.S. roads and bridges (a 34 percent increase over the previous authorization) using accelerated programs; • $108 billion in funding for what DOT calls “affordable, sustainable, and efficient transit options”—a 105 percent increase over the previous authorization; • $47 billion for high-speed rail; and • $12.3 billion for safety programs. The plan also streamlines many DOT programs, consolidating 55 highway programs into five and five transit programs into two. The initial investment would be $50 billion in 2012. Pipeline & Hazmat Safety The 2013 DOT request also seeks $276 million for the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA), a $75 million increase over the FY 2012 allocation. The request includes $177 million for the administration’s Pipeline Safety Reform initiative, launched in 2011 in the wake of several deadly pipeline explosions and environmentally damaging leaks. The request—$67 million more than allocated in FY2012—would beef up federal pipeline inspection ranks and invest $13 million in R&D. Those funds would allow PHMSA to “amend its project evaluation and decision process so there is no industry participation,” the agency said. Critics have accused PHMSA of being too cozy with the pipeline industry, allowing inspection, testing and maintenance lapses that led to serious accidents. On the hazmat side, additional funding would go for investigators and personnel to review and process hazmat transportation applications. The budget also anticipates a new Special Permit and Approvals user fee from companies that transport hazardous materials. The additional funding request follows bipartisan enactment of the 2011 Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act, which the President signed in January. Maritime Administration The DOT budget proposes $146 million—$10 million less than the 2012 allocation—for the federal Maritime Administration, which includes the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy and six State Maritime Academies. The $10 million requested for ship disposal would add $4 million to that program. The Maritime Security Program would receive $186 million; no additional funds are requested for the Assistance to Small Shipyards program. Cheers, Jeers DOT Secretary Ray LaHood said the plan would “enable us to build the American infrastructure we need for tomorrow while putting people back to work today.” “A strong American economy depends on the roadways, runways, and railways that move people and goods from coast to coast and around the globe,” said LaHood. Republicans immediately denounced the proposal **as election-year pandering.** Senate Republican Leader Mitch McConnell of Kentucky called it a “campaign document” that would “make the economy worse.” “The president is shirking his responsibility to lead and using this budget to divide,” McConnell said in a statement. House Speaker John Boehner called Obama’s budget plan “a gloomy reflection of his failed policies” and a “collection of rehashes, gimmicks, and tax increases” that is “bad for job creation, our economy, and America’s seniors.” Budget Cuts Obama noted that the transportation plan depends in part on cuts from other agencies— “difficult cuts that, frankly, I wouldn’t normally make if they weren’t absolutely necessary,” he said in remarks at Northern Virginia Community College outside Washington, D.C. “What that allows us to do is to invest in the things that will help grow our economy right now,” he said. “We can’t cut back on those things that are important for us to grow. We can’t just cut our way into growth.”

Links - Gas Tax - Congress

Higher gas tax costs capital

Rubinstein 3/27 (Dana, “[When is Obama going to have his Eisenhower moment?](http://www.capitalnewyork.com/article/politics/2012/03/5524547/when-obama-going-have-his-eisenhower-moment),” <http://www.capitalnewyork.com/article/politics/2012/03/5524547/when-obama-going-have-his-eisenhower-moment>)

Many transportation experts also argue for a significantly higher tax on gas. **This is politically difficult, if not impossible**, as illustrated by the way Republicans have latched onto currently high gas prices as an argument against Obama, and the president's high-profile response, cheerleading the expansion of domestic oil and gas exploration as a solution. But the fact is gas here is cheap, relatively speaking: Americans are likely at any given time to be paying about half as much for fuel as Europeans. Yet gas-related revenue is where much of the nation’s infrastructure funding comes from. “We’ve got one of the lowest federal gasoline taxes in the world,” said Robert Yaro, president of the Regional Plan Association. “The other countries that have gasoline taxes as low as ours include Saudi Arabia, Iran, the United Arab Emirates, and Kuwait.” And that’s not the only issue with the gas tax, which is about 18 cents per gallon and which provides much of the funding for the nation's highways and mass transit (New York’s M.T.A. derives some $1 billion from it per year). It's not pegged to inflation, so it provides ever less revenue in real terms. Also, it's a victim of its own success: Today, thanks in part to the fact that the gas tax makes it more expensive to burn fuel, cars are much more fuel-efficient. Less consumption equals less revenue. But while transit-dedicated revenue from gas is going down, the need to spend money on the nation's aging transportation infrastructure is going up. “The interstate system, most of it is already approaching half a century old,” says Yaro. “It’s at the end of its useful life. Big stretches need to be rebuilt and there’s no money to rebuild them, much less create any new capacity in the system." The president, at least rhetorically, recognizes that. He's proposed a half-trillion-dollar, six-year transportation plan. And he’s suggested a $50 billion infrastructure bank that would leverage private funding. As of now, they're still just proposals. “**So far he hasn’t really put his political capital behind it** because he has other priorities,” said Schank

Increasing gas tax is unpopular – spending causes partisanship

BBVA 6/14 (Argentinian Bank, The United States Unit, whose chief economist is Nathaniel Karp in Houston, which focuses on analysis of the US economy and Federal Reserve monetary policy. In macroeconomic analysis, the team creates models and forecasts for growth, inflation and monetary policy. The unit pays special attention to the regional outlook and sector analysis, including the real estate market, the financial system and its regulation. Noteworthy publications include “FED Watch”, which follows Federal Reserve policy, and "US Economic Watch", which provides in-depth analysis on a number of economic subjects. The focus features analyse themes such as credit, unemployment, public finances and local economies, with special emphasis on the Sunbelt states where BBVA has operations.)

http://www.bbvaresearch.com/KETD/fbin/mult/120614\_EconomicWatchEEUU\_170\_tcm348-333692.pdf?ts=2262012)

Increases tax rates for the benefit of society is not always an easy path in the U.S. Take for example the case of highway funding. The public sector spends approximately $175bn per year on highways, with the federal government funding through taxes on gasoline and other motor fuels that accrue into the Highway Trust Fund (HTF). A tax of 18.3 cents per gallon on gasoline and ethanol blended fuels accounts for 65% of HTF revenues. According to CBO, HTF balances have been volatile throughout the past decade. An increase of the gasoline tax in 1993 generated positive balances in the HTF However, by 1998 there was an agreement to spend all the extra money instead of saving the funds for future projects. The Transportation Equity Act for the 21 st Century (TEA-21) accelerated this process and removed the practice of crediting interest to the HTF. As a result, by 2008 the HTF could no longer meet its obligations and Congress had to appropriate $34.5 billion from the general fund. In 2010, Congress passed the Hiring Incentives to Restore Employment Act which reinstated the practice of crediting interest into the fund. The act also shifted refunds from certain tax-exempt fuels so that they would be extracted from the general fund as opposed to the HTF Ultimately, these measures generated a positive balance in the HTF. However, the CBO predicts that the HTF will run an accumulated deficit between $85bn and $115bn between 2011 and 2021. The solution to this problem relies on spending cuts, tax increases, or both. However, neither of them seems like a reasonable option nowadays considering the increasing severity of the political gridlock in the U.S. Spending cuts would only add to the infrastructure deficit, and tax increases are unpopular among many. Not surprisingly, Congress has not increased the gasoline tax since 1993. In the meantime, the cost of building, maintaining and operating highways continues to increase.

Links - Gas Tax - Public

77% of Americans oppose the gas tax increase

Ekins, 1/6 (Reason-Rupe Poll, Emily Ekins is the director of polling for Reason Foundation where she leads the Reason-Rupe public opinion research project, launched in 2011. Emily is working on her PhD thesis in political science at UCLA. Her research concentrations are in American politics, survey methodology, quantitative methodology, and political economy. Her undergraduate degree in political science is from BYU. Emily's professional experience includes quantitative analyses of the Tea Party movement for the Cato Institute and survey analyses for Dr. Peter Tufano at the Harvard Business School.

http://reason.com/poll/2012/01/06/77-percent-of-american-oppose-gas-tax-in

As the number of people using roads and highways steadily increases, cars have also become more fuel-efficient, thus reducing the amount of gas purchased per person. This is good news for consumers; however, transportation spending is largely funded from gasoline taxes, and those receipts are decreasing. The recent Reason-Rupe poll asked Americans how they would prefer to fund transit going forward. Policymakers have considered increasing the federal gas tax, currently 18.4 cents per gallon in efforts to close the spending-funding gap. Yet 77 percent of Americans oppose raising the federal gas tax. Part of the aversion may be a concern that the government will not spend the tax dollars effectively—65 percent of Americans think the government generally spends transportation funding ineffectively.

Links – High Speed Rail

HSR unpopular

The Economist 6/12/12

http://www.economist.com/blogs/gulliver/2012/06/high-speed-rail-california

AS HIGH-SPEED-RAIL projects across America have run into political trouble or been cancelled, California's—the largest and most ambitious—has continued to move forward. Proponents of fast trains hoped that a successful line in California could spur development elsewhere. But now even California's plan is in jeopardy. Its ambition has been scaled back and its projected costs have increased. Even voters have turned on it. A new survey by USC-Dornsife and the Los Angeles Times found that if given a second chance to vote on the 2008 $9 billion bond issue that is funding the early stages of the project, 59% of survey respondents would vote it down. Part of what's happened here is that high-speed rail, like almost everything promoted by President Barack Obama, **has become an intensely partisan issue in America.** Republican governors across the country have criticised high-speed projects and rejected federal money to fund rail development. Mr Obama, meanwhile, has redistributed the rejected money to states like California that are run by Democrats and are more receptive to high-speed rail. All this makes sense. Mr Obama made high-speed-rail funding a big part of his 2008 stimulus package, and political scientists generally believe that a president weighing in on an issue polarises people's opinions about it. In California, 76% of Republicans now oppose the high-speed-rail project, compared to just 47% of Democrats.

Costs capital

McClatchy 4/20 (McClatchy Newspapers, “Congress poised to reject high-speed rail funding,” http://www.mcclatchydc.com/2012/04/20/146185/congress-poised-to-reject-high.html

The Obama administration sought $1 billion for high-speed rail next year; Congress is on track to provide zip. In a bad sign -- but not a killing blow -- for California’s speedy rail ambitions, senators this week joined their U.S. House counterparts in dismissing the administration’s funding request. The bicameral blow-off means a fiscal 2013 transportation spending bill will omit the high-speed rail dollars President Barack Obama wanted. On its face, the omission of new high-speed support does not directly impede California’s program. The state already has received some $3.3 billion in federal funds to get the project started, and no additional funds were planned on for the new fiscal year that starts Oct. 1. “This is something we anticipated,” Dan Richard, chair of the California High-Speed Rail Authority, said in an interview Friday. “In our business plan, we do not expect any additional federal funds for at least three years.”

Links - Bike Initiatives

Bikes cost capital

Clarke 6/22 (Andy, President of the American League of Bicyclists, “Top 10 Resons Sen. Boxer Must Keep Her Word on Bike/Ped Program”, League of American Bicyclists, 22 June 2012. < http://blog.bikeleague.org/blog/2012/06/top-10-reasons-sen-boxer-must-keep-her-word-on-bikeped-programs/>.)

For the past 20 years, local elected officials have been given rare access to state transportation funds through a handful of programs administered by state Departments of Transportation as grant programs. These also happen to be the primary sources of funding for bicycling and walking initiatives: Safe Routes to School, Transportation Enhancements and Recreational Trails. They account for just 1.5 percent of the overall federal transportation bill and have all been heavily over-subscribed since their creation. Despite the overwhelming success and popularity of these programs, House Republican leadership and a handful of influential Senators have waged an unexplained and **inexplicable vendetta against these programs** — not to save the government any money, just to prevent state or local governments spending their money on these specific programs and activities, removing any vestige of local control over transportation investments into the bargain. The threat of elimination provoked a rare display of bipartisanship in both the House and Senate — a bipartisan effort to preserve these programs was narrowly defeated in a heavily-whipped House committee vote by just two votes (29-27) and the equally bi-partisan Cardin-Cochran amendment to the Senate transportation bill was successfully adopted. Remarkably, the single-minded attacks on even the bi-partisan Cardin-Cochran compromise continue. House leadership entered the conference committee process to hammer out a transportation bill (something they couldn’t even get passed in the House itself) with the elimination of funding for bicycling and walking as a top priority. Senate conferees are struggling to hold the line against these attacks, desperate as they are to get a transportation bill — a jobs bill — completed before the summer.

Links – Inland Waterways

Inland Waterways costs massive polcap

MDA ‘11 (Maritime Domain Awareness Information Exchange, government agency for information on maritime affairs)

http://www.mda.gov/2011/12/20/top-ten-news-stories-of-2011/

A long-term funding solution for the nation’s aging inland infrastructure remains elusive, as Congress, skittish about increasing taxes and federal spending, considers two funding proposals that would do just that. The difficulty is that neither of the plans — one offered by the Obama administration, the other by a joint industry-federal advisory board — makes lawmakers feel politically comfortable in an environment **dominated by partisan politics and intense pressure to cut spending and the federal deficit.** The first, floated more than a year ago by the Inland Waterways Users Board (IWUB), envisions more federal spending on lock-and-dam construction while proposing an increase in the diesel fuel tax now paid by the barge industry into the Inland Waterways Trust Fund. The Capital Development Plan (CDP) also calls for significant reforms in how water projects are evaluated and prioritized for funding. The industry plan “is a place to start the discussion,” Rep. Bob Gibbs, R-Ohio, chairman of the House Water Resources and Environment subcommittee, said after a September hearing. “I don’t think it will go forward with a tax increase.” Added Rep. Timothy Bishop, D-N.Y., the panel’s ranking minority member: “I don’t see how this plan can fly unless there is an increase in the Corps budget, and I don’t see that happening.” The second plan, proposed recently by the Obama administration, would collect more funds for inland waterways infrastructure by imposing new fees on commercial vessels that use the nation’s rivers. The plan is expected to raise $1 billion over the next 10 years by using a two-tier fee system — one for all inland waterways operators and a second for those transiting locks — and would supplement the current 20-cent-per-gallon fuel tax. The plan would also expand the definition of inland waterways from 27 to 67 segments that would be subject to the new fees. These differing proposals have set up a perfect storm for a stalemate. The barge industry opposes the Obama plan, saying it is unworkable and unfairly doubles the taxes and fees on commercial shippers. The Obama administration opposes the industry plan, preferring instead its solution that would make commercial users pay more for using inland rivers. Meanwhile, Congress hasn’t shown much enthusiasm for either. No lawmaker has yet come forward to offer legislation on the industry’s plan, only one hearing on Capitol Hill has been held, and several lawmakers have said that any plan that shifts more costs to U.S. taxpayers or increases taxes will not pass Congress. User fees are equally unpopular, with previous proposals being ignored by Congress.

Links – Mass Transit

Mass Transit is unpopular

Chicago Tribune 2/15 (“Mass transit fund debate splits GOP Congress members,”

<http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2012-02-15/news/ct-met-congress-transit-funding-20120214_1_mass-transit-transportation-bill-highway-trust-fund>)

A largely partisan clash in Washington over federal funding for mass transit could jeopardize up to $450 million a year for Chicago-area bus and train projects, transportation officials said Monday. The funding debate also has caused a rift in the ranks of area Republican members of Congress, who find themselves torn between loyalty to GOP leaders in Washington and pressure from Chicago transit agencies. The House is expected to vote this week on a major transportation bill that could drastically change the way agencies such as the CTA, Metra and Pace get money to buy new buses, rebuild tracks and maintain equipment. Officials say long-range, big-ticket projects like Metra's rebuilding of Union Pacific North line bridges and the CTA's plan to rehabilitate Red and Purple Line stations are threatened. The legislation would curtail the use of motor fuel tax money for mass transit. Instead, that revenue would be devoted entirely to roads and bridges. Mass transit would be funded for five years by a one-time general appropriation of $40 billion, the source of which is yet to be determined. Supporters say the measure is needed to keep the federal highway trust fund solvent without raising fuel taxes. Critics such as Democratic U.S. Rep. Dan Lipinski say the bill would endanger mass transit projects and deprive agencies of an assured source of revenue.

AT: Agency Action Doesn’t Link

Obama is Velcro – all agency action sticks to him

Peter Nicholas and Janet Hook, 7-30-2010, “Obama the Velcro president”, LA Times, http://articles.latimes.com/2010/jul/30/nation/la-na-velcro-presidency-20100730

If Ronald Reagan was the classic Teflon president, Barack Obama is made of Velcro. Through two terms, Reagan eluded much of the responsibility for recession and foreign policy scandal. In less than two years, Obama has become ensnared in blame. Hoping to better insulate Obama, White House aides have sought to give other Cabinet officials a higher profile and additional public exposure. They are also crafting new ways to explain the president's policies to a skeptical public. But Obama remains the colossus of his administration — to a point where trouble anywhere in the world is often his to solve. The president is on the hook to repair the Gulf Coast oil spill disaster, stabilize Afghanistan, help fix Greece's ailing economy and do right by Shirley Sherrod, the Agriculture Department official fired as a result of a misleading fragment of videotape. What's not sticking to Obama is a legislative track record that his recent predecessors might envy. Political dividends from passage of a healthcare overhaul or a financial regulatory bill have been fleeting. Instead, voters are measuring his presidency by a more immediate yardstick: Is he creating enough jobs? So far the verdict is no, and that has taken a toll on Obama's approval ratings. Only 46% approve of Obama's job performance, compared with 47% who disapprove, according to Gallup's daily tracking poll. "I think the accomplishments are very significant, but I think most people would look at this and say, 'What was the plan for jobs?' " said Sen. Byron L. Dorgan (D-N.D.). "The agenda he's pushed here has been a very important agenda, but it hasn't translated into dinner table conversations." Reagan was able to glide past controversies with his popularity largely intact. He maintained his affable persona as a small-government advocate while seeming above the fray in his own administration. Reagan was untarnished by such calamities as the 1983 terrorist bombing of the Marines stationed in Beirut and scandals involving members of his administration. In the 1986 Iran-Contra affair, most of the blame fell on lieutenants. Obama lately has tried to rip off the Velcro veneer. In a revealing moment during the oil spill crisis, he reminded Americans that his powers aren't "limitless." He told residents in Grand Isle, La., that he is a flesh-and-blood president, not a comic-book superhero able to dive to the bottom of the sea and plug the hole. "I can't suck it up with a straw," he said. But as a candidate in 2008, he set sky-high expectations about what he could achieve and what government could accomplish. Clinching the Democratic nomination two years ago, Obama described the moment as an epic breakthrough when "we began to provide care for the sick and good jobs to the jobless" and "when the rise of the oceans began to slow and our planet began to heal." Those towering goals remain a long way off. And most people would have preferred to see Obama focus more narrowly on the "good jobs" part of the promise. A recent Gallup poll showed that 53% of the population rated unemployment and the economy as the nation's most important problem. By contrast, only 7% cited healthcare — a single-minded focus of the White House for a full year. At every turn, Obama makes the argument that he has improved lives in concrete ways. Without the steps he took, he says, the economy would be in worse shape and more people would be out of work. There's evidence to support that. Two economists, Mark Zandi and Alan Blinder, reported recently that without the stimulus and other measures, gross domestic product would be about 6.5% lower. Yet, Americans aren't apt to cheer when something bad doesn't materialize. Unemployment has been rising — from 7.7% when Obama took office, to 9.5%. Last month, more than 2 million homes in the U.S. were in various stages of foreclosure — up from 1.7 million when Obama was sworn in. "Folks just aren't in a mood to hand out gold stars when unemployment is hovering around 10%," said Paul Begala, a Democratic pundit. Insulating the president from bad news has proved impossible. Other White Houses have tried doing so with more success. Reagan's Cabinet officials often took the blame, shielding the boss. But the Obama administration is about one man. Obama is the White House's chief spokesman, policy pitchman, fundraiser and negotiator. No Cabinet secretary has emerged as an adequate surrogate. Treasury Secretary Timothy F. Geithner is seen as a tepid public speaker; Energy Secretary Steven Chu is prone to long, wonky digressions and has rarely gone before the cameras during an oil spill crisis that he is working to end. So, more falls to Obama, reinforcing the Velcro effect: Everything sticks to him. He has opined on virtually everything in the hundreds of public statements he has made: nuclear arms treaties, basketball star LeBron James' career plans; Chelsea Clinton's wedding. Few audiences are off-limits. On Wednesday, he taped a spot on ABC's "The View," drawing a rebuke from Democratic Pennsylvania Gov. Edward G. Rendell, who deemed the appearance unworthy of the presidency during tough times. "Stylistically he creates some of those problems," Eddie Mahe, a Republican political strategist, said in an interview. "His favorite pronoun is 'I.' When you position yourself as being all things to all people, the ultimate controller and decision maker with the capacity to fix anything, you set yourself up to be blamed when it doesn't get fixed or things happen." A new White House strategy is to forgo talk of big policy changes that are easy to ridicule. Instead, aides want to market policies as more digestible pieces. So, rather than tout the healthcare package as a whole, advisors will talk about smaller parts that may be more appealing and understandable — such as barring insurers from denying coverage based on preexisting conditions. But at this stage, it may be late in the game to downsize either the president or his agenda. Sen. Richard J. Durbin (D-Ill.) said: "The man came in promising change. He has a higher profile than some presidents because of his youth, his race and the way he came to the White House with the message he brought in. It's naive to believe he can step back and have some Cabinet secretary be the face of the oil spill. The buck stops with his office."

AT: Winners Win

Fights bleed momentum – they don’t generate capital

John Harris and Carol Lee, Staff writers for Politico, 1-20-2010, Obama’s first year, Politico, http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=4DF829C9-18FE-70B2-A8381A971FA3FFC9

Obama believed that early success would be self-reinforcing, building a powerful momentum for bold government action. This belief was the essence of the White House’s theory of the “big bang” — that success in passing a big stimulus package would lead to success in passing health care, which in turn would clear the way for major cap-and-trade environmental legislation and “re-regulation” of the financial services sector — all in the first year. This proved to be a radical misreading of the dynamics of power. The massive cost of the stimulus package and industry bailouts — combined with the inconvenient fact that unemployment went up after their passage — meant that Obama spent the year bleeding momentum rather than steadily increasing public confidence in his larger governing vision. That vision was further obscured for many Americans by the smoke from the bitter and seemingly endless legislative battle on Capitol Hill over health care.

Link outweighs turn – Harder to rebuild capital than lose it

Marrissa Silber, prof of poli sci, samford, 8-30-2007, “What makes a president quack?” Prepared for delivery at the 2007 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association.

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.

Obama thinks that pol cap is finite – he’ll back off controversial issues even if he’s winning

Robert Kuttner, co-editor of The American Prospect and a senior fellow at Demos, author of "Obama's Challenge: America's Economic Crisis and the Power of a Transformative Presidency, “Obama Has Amassed Enormous Political Capital, But He Doesn't Know What to Do with It,” 4-28-2011, http://www.alternet.org/economy/138641/obama\_has\_amassed\_enormous\_political\_capital,\_but\_he\_doesn%27t\_know\_what\_to\_do\_with\_it/?page=entire

We got a small taste of what a more radical break might feel like when Obama briefly signaled with the release of Bush's torture memos that he might be open to further investigation of the Bush's torture policy, but then backtracked and quickly asked the Democratic leadership to shut the idea down. Evidently, Obama's political self wrestled with his constitutional conscience, and won. Civil libertarians felt a huge letdown, but protest was surprisingly muted. Thus the most important obstacle for seizing the moment to achieve enduring change: Barack Obama's conception of what it means to promote national unity. Obama repeatedly declared during the campaign that he would govern as a consensus builder. He wasn't lying. However, there are two ways of achieving consensus. One is to split the difference with your political enemies and the forces obstructing reform. The other is to use presidential leadership to transform the political center and alter the political dynamics. In his first hundred days, Obama has done a little of both, but he defaults to the politics of accommodation.

Obama Push

Top of Docket and Obama Push- meeting with Putin, WTO vote

Needham 6/18 (Reporter of Congress for The Hill, a congressional newspaper that publishes daily when Congress is in session, with a special focus on business and lobbying, political campaigns (Vikki, “Obama Presses for Improved Trade Ties with Russia”, The Hill, 18 June 2012. <http://thehill.com/blogs/on-the-money/1005-trade/233311-obama-presses-for-improved-trade-ties-with-russia>.)

President **Obama urged Congress** on Monday to repeal a human-rights provision that will open up trade for U.S. businesses to Russia. Obama met Monday with Russian President Vladimir Putin and emphasized the need to improve and expand trade ties between the two nations at the Group of 20 summit in Los Cabos, Mexico. "In particular, we discussed the need to expand trade and commercial ties between the United States and Russia, which are still far below where they should be," Obama said during a press conference following the meeting. "And I emphasized my priority of having Congress repeal Jackson-Vanik, provide permanent trade relations status to Russia so that American businesses can take advantage of the extraordinary opportunities now that Russia is a member of the WTO," he said. Russia has scheduled a July 4 vote on its World Trade Organization membership, meaning **Congress will have 30 days to repeal the nearly 40-year-old Jackson-Vanik provision** that will pave the way for permanent normal trade relations (PNTR). Neither leader mentioned in their remarks, a human rights bill under consideration by Congress that could be tied to PNTR legislation.

Top of Docket

Top of Docket and Obama Push- meeting with Putin, WTO vote

Needham 6/18 (Reporter of Congress for The Hill, a congressional newspaper that publishes daily when Congress is in session, with a special focus on business and lobbying, political campaigns (Vikki, “Obama Presses for Improved Trade Ties with Russia”, The Hill, 18 June 2012. <http://thehill.com/blogs/on-the-money/1005-trade/233311-obama-presses-for-improved-trade-ties-with-russia>.)

President Obama urged Congress on Monday to repeal a human-rights provision that will open up trade for U.S. businesses to Russia. Obama met Monday with Russian President Vladimir Putin and emphasized the need to improve and expand trade ties between the two nations at the Group of 20 summit in Los Cabos, Mexico. "In particular, we discussed the need to expand trade and commercial ties between the United States and Russia, which are still far below where they should be," Obama said during a press conference following the meeting. "And I emphasized my priority of having Congress repeal Jackson-Vanik, provide permanent trade relations status to Russia so that American businesses can take advantage of the extraordinary opportunities now that Russia is a member of the WTO," he said. Russia has scheduled a July 4 vote on its World Trade Organization membership, meaning **Congress will have 30 days to repeal the nearly 40-year-old Jackson-Vanik provision** that will pave the way for permanent normal trade relations (PNTR). Neither leader mentioned in their remarks, a human rights bill under consideration by Congress that could be tied to PNTR legislation.

Top of the docket

Vasilyeva 6/7 (Nataliya, AP writer, “US official urges repeal of Russia trade law”, 6/7/12, http://www.sacbee.com/2012/06/06/4544760/us-official-urges-repeal-of-russia.html)//LP

U.S. Trade Representative Ron Kirk said Thursday that the repeal of a U.S. law that can be used to put trade restrictions on Russia is a top priority for his office this year. The Cold War-era Jackson-Vanik amendment denies normal trading arrangements to non-market countries that restrict emigration. It was originally a reaction to hurdles the Soviet Union put up for Jews who wanted to leave the country in the 1970s. Although Russia has not restricted emigration in any way since 1991 and the U.S. has granted Russia annual waivers since 1994, the law remains in force and is an irritant to investors and Russian politicians. Russia has wrapped up negotiations on membership in the World Trade Organization, and its parliament is expected to ratify Russia's membership on July 4. "Once Russia becomes a member of the World Trade Organization, we need to make sure that American businesses have the full advantages of that, and therefore it's necessary for us to lift Jackson-Vanik," Kirk told the American Chamber of Commerce in Russia.

PC High

PC high

Eskew 3/1 (Carter, writer for the Washington Post, “Republicans' new willingness to compromise,” http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-insiders/post/republicans-new-willingness-to-compromise/2012/03/01/gIQAbrujkR\_blog.html)

One sign of President Obama’s mini-political surge: Congressional Republicans’ new willingness to signal compromise on jobs and energy legislation. A recent lunch between Obama, House Speaker John Boehner and Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell suggests the “party of no” is moving to “maybe.” Republican leaders are hedging their bets. They are looking at the train wreck of their presidential primaries and the president’s rising approval ratings and starting to consider saving their own skins. They know that their refusal to work with Obama doesn’t play nearly as well as he gains strength. In fact, if the economy and Obama continue to recover, the Democrats will have a unified national message, something rare in presidential election cycles. Democrats can argue, credibly, that they have made progress despite the best efforts of Republicans to sabotage it. There may be no better bellwether of the president’s political prospects than McConnell. If he is even talking compromise, that’s a leading indicator. He once said the Republican mission was to bring the president down; his real mission has always been something else: to save himself and his allies in Congress. This tentative step to détente is fragile and will turn on the first dip in the president’s polls. But it’s kind of fun to watch.

AT: Pol Cap Low- Health Care

Healthcare didn’t cost Obama much PC – studies prove

UD 6/22 (University of Delaware Center for Political Communication, “Mandate Divisions”, UDaily, 6/22/12, http://www.udel.edu/udaily/2012/jun/health-insurance-mandate-062212.html)//KB

As the United States Supreme Court prepares to rule on the constitutionality of the 2010 health care law, a new National Agenda Opinion Poll by the University of Delaware’s Center for Political Communication reveals Americans are divided along party and ideology lines on a key provision of the law. Democrats and liberals overwhelmingly favor insurance mandates, whereas large majorities of Republicans and conservatives oppose them. The national telephone survey of 906 Americans was conducted by the Center for Political Communication from May 20 to June 6. Professors David C. Wilson and Paul Brewer supervised the study. Wilson, the center’s coordinator for public opinion initiatives, said “the results suggest President Obama may actually **have more political capital** for his health insurance requirement than is widely reported.” The survey asked how much respondents favored or opposed a health insurance mandate using five different wordings. Half of respondents support a mandate when it is presented as a “requirement” or “a federal requirement.” In contrast, 62 percent support “the federal requirement, signed by Obama.”

Pol Cap Key

Pol Cap Key

WSJ 2/29 <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970203753704577254192095999600.html?mod=googlenews_wsj>

The Obama administration on Wednesday began a public push for Congress to permanently lower trade barriers with Russia, arguing the move would benefit U.S. exporters and aid a crack down on trading violations by Moscow. U.S. Trade Representative Ron Kirk told lawmakers on the House Ways & Means Committee that permanently granting Russia "most favored nation" status would enable the U.S. to challenge anti-competitive practices by the country, and ensure that U.S. exporters are on level footing with foreign competitors in tapping the Russian market. "We have been very plain," Mr. Kirk said at a congressional hearing on the administration's trade priorities. "This is something collaboratively we need to achieve." But the White House likely faces a tough slog in getting the Russia measure through the House and Senate later this year, with lawmaker expressing concern over Moscow's positions on Syria and Iran and its own internal political situation. "I think there'll be a lot of resistance in Congress to normalizing trading relations with Russia given their actions in Syria and Iran," said Sen. Lindsey Graham (R., S.C.), a leading voice on foreign policy for the Republican party. Democrats in the House and Senate agreed. "I don't think there's a real sentiment to pass a trade agreement [with Russia] this year," said Sen. Sherrod Brown (D., Ohio). Rep. Sander Levin (D., Mich.), the top Democrat on the ways & means panel, cited Russia's actions over the deteriorating situation in Syria and fears of vote fraud in Russia's March 4 presidential election as complicating factors for a Russia trade vote to pass in Congress. Russia blocked an attempt earlier this month by the U.N. Security Council to take actions against the brutal crackdown on protestors by the Syrian regime. Meanwhile, Vladimir Putin is expected to easily win election as president in the weekend poll, although the results will be closely watched for evidence of manipulation by his government. Russian officials have said the country won't honor WTO commitments with the U.S. if Congress doesn't repeal the trade restrictions. Officials at the Russian Embassy in Washington weren't immediately available for comment. Rep. Dan Burton (R., Ind.), chairman of the House subcommittee on Europe and Eurasia, predicted the Russia measure **will nonetheless pass Congress.** "If you're saying we ought to be doing business with China, how can you say we shouldn't be doing business with a huge emerging market like Russia," Mr. Burton said. Russia is set to join the World Trade Organization by August, and will be required to lower its tariffs by as much as 50% for other countries in the trade organization. The U.S. must in turn repeal a decades-old trade measure preventing Russia from benefitting from lower tariffs on its U.S. exports, or American exporters won't benefit fromRussia's new WTO membership. Several leadership aides this week said there hadn't been any discussions yet about how the Russia matter might be handled in Congress. Senate Finance Chairman Max Baucus (D., Mont.), who just returned from Moscow, called it a "no-brainer" that Congress would permanently normalize relations with Russia. Rep. Dave Camp (R., Mich.), the chairman of the Ways & Means Committee said at Wednesday's hearing that he was looking to "the administration to build confidence and provide leadership on the economic and non-economic issues." One senior House GOP leadership aide said the Obama administration was quietly urging business groups to press the issue with members of Congress. Frank Vargo, vice president for international economic affairs at the National Association of Manufacturing, said that effort was underway.

PC key, Obama needs to persuade Congress

CQ 3/27 <http://public.cq.com/docs/weeklyreport/weeklyreport-000004047667.html>

Russia, however, is not China, and in a bitter election year, Congress seems to be putting foreign policy and human rights concerns before economic expediency. If Russia’s oligarchical economy and its reputation for corruption weren’t enough, Vladimir Putin’s return to the Russian presidency has compounded the concerns of lawmakers wary of Russia’s human rights record and reluctant to take a vote that might be seen as embracing it. That’s particularly true given Russia’s role in blocking U.S.-backed diplomatic efforts in Syria. The House Republican majority has made clear that the onus is on the White House to persuade lawmakers to set aside their foreign policy concerns in favor of the business community’s interests. And in a March 15 hearing, the Senate’s No. 2 Republican, Jon Kyl of Arizona, said that normalizing trade “isn’t a slam dunk.” In response to the arguments from business leaders, Kyl asked, “What has that gotten us in our trade relationship with China?”

Capital key

Moscow Times ’11 [ “U.S. Senators Side With Georgia on WTO Issue” October 21 -- http://www.themoscowtimes.com/business/article/us-senators-side-with-georgia-on-wto-issue/445990.html]

If Russia were to join the WTO, the United States would be required under world trade rules to establish “permanent normal trade relations,” or PNTR, by removing the Jackson-Vanik amendment. The 1974 amendment denies normal trade relations to countries with command economies that restrict emigration. Both the Senate and House of Representatives would have to approve PNTR. That is already expected to be a difficult pair of votes, so the White House cannot afford to alienate lawmakers whose support it will need. Blunt and Inhofe, two usually reliable votes for trade, said in their letter they could only support PNTR if Russia agrees to border and custom procedures that respect “Georgia’s security considerations and future sovereignty.

AT: PC isn’t real (The Klein Article)

PC theory true- empirics prove deal-making matters- Klein is overly pessimistic

Mandel 3/23 (Seth, Assistant Editor of Commentary magazine, <http://www.commentarymagazine.com/2012/03/23/presidential-persuasion-commander-in-chief-obama-reagan-clinton/>)

I want to offer Klein one more note of optimism. He writes: Back-room bargains and quiet negotiations do not, however, present an inspiring vision of the Presidency. And they fail, too. Boehner and Obama spent much of last summer sitting in a room together, but, ultimately, the Speaker didn’t make a private deal with the President for the same reason that Republican legislators don’t swoon over a public speech by him: he is the leader of the Democratic Party, and if he wins they lose. This suggests that, as the two parties become more sharply divided, it may become increasingly difficult for a President to govern—and there’s little that he can do about it. I disagree. The details of the deal matter, not just the party lines about the dispute. There is no way the backroom negotiations Clinton conducted with Gingrich over social security reform could have been possible if we had prime ministers, instead of presidents. The president possesses political capital Congress doesn’t. History tells us there are effective ways to use that capital. One lesson: quiet action on domestic policy, visible and audible leadership on national security.

AT: Dickinson/Ideology

Dickinson is only talking about Supreme Court nominations not congressional legislation

Dickinson concludes neg – prefer this evidence because it’s from a peer-reviewed journal

Dickinson, yes the same damn one, 2009 (Matthew, professor of political science at Middlebury College. He taught previously at Harvard University, where he also received his Ph.D., working under the supervision of presidential scholar Richard Neustadt, We All Want a Revolution: Neustadt, New Institutionalism, and the Future of Presidency Research, Presidential Studies Quarterly 39 no4 736-70 D 2009)

Small wonder, then, that initial efforts to find evidence of presidential power centered on explaining legislative outcomes in Congress. Because scholars found it difficult to directly and systematically measure presidential influence or "skill," however, they often tried to estimate it indirectly, after first establishing a baseline model that explained these outcomes on other factors, including party strength in Congress, members of Congress's ideology, the president's electoral support and/or popular approval, and various control variables related to time in office and political and economic context. With the baseline established, one could then presumably see how much of the unexplained variance might be attributed to presidents, and whether individual presidents did better or worse than the model predicted. Despite differences in modeling assumptions and measurements, however, these studies came to remarkably similar conclusions: individual presidents did not seem to matter very much in explaining legislators' voting behavior or lawmaking outcomes (but see Lockerbie and Borrelli 1989, 97-106). As Richard Fleisher, Jon Bond, and B. Dan Wood summarized, "[S]tudies that compare presidential success to some baseline fail to find evidence that perceptions of skill have systematic effects" (2008, 197; see also Bond, Fleisher, and Krutz 1996, 127; Edwards 1989, 212).     To some scholars, these results indicate that Neustadt's "president-centered" perspective is incorrect (Bond and Fleisher 1990, 221-23). In fact, the aggregate results reinforce Neustadt's recurring refrain that presidents are weak and that, when dealing with Congress, a president's power is "comparably limited" (Neustadt 1990, 184). The misinterpretation of the findings as they relate to PP stems in part from scholars' difficulty in defining and operationalizing presidential influence (Cameron 2000b; Dietz 2002, 105-6; Edwards 2000, 12; Shull and Shaw 1999). But it is also that case that scholars often misconstrue Neustadt's analytic perspective; his description of what presidents must do to influence policy making does not mean that he believes presidents are the dominant influence on that process. Neustadt writes from the president's perspective, but without adopting a president-centered explanation of power.     Nonetheless, if Neustadt clearly recognizes that a president's influence in Congress is exercised mostly, as George Edwards (1989) puts it, "at the margins," his case studies in PP also suggest that, within this limited bound, presidents do strive to influence legislative outcomes. But how? Scholars often argue that a president's most direct means of influence is to directly lobby certain members of Congress, often through quid pro quo exchanges, at critical junctures during the lawmaking sequence. Spatial models of legislative voting suggest that these lobbying efforts are most effective when presidents target the median, veto, and filibuster "pivots" within Congress. This logic finds empirical support in vote-switching studies that indicate that presidents do direct lobbying efforts at these pivotal voters, and with positive legislative results. Keith Krehbiel analyzes successive votes by legislators in the context of a presidential veto and finds "modest support for the sometimes doubted stylized fact of presidential power as persuasion" (1998,153-54). Similarly, David Brady and Craig Volden look at vote switching by members of Congress in successive Congresses on nearly identical legislation and also conclude that presidents do influence the votes of at least some legislators (1998, 125-36). In his study of presidential lobbying on key votes on important domestic legislation during the 83rd (1953-54) through 108th (2003-04) Congresses, Matthew Beckman shows that in addition to these pivotal voters, presidents also lobby leaders in both congressional parties in order to control what legislative alternatives make it onto the congressional agenda (more on this later). These lobbying efforts are correlated with a greater likelihood that a president's legislative preferences will come to a vote (Beckmann 2008, n.d.).

Ideology doesn’t outweigh – presidential success dictates votes

Lebo ‘10 (Matthew J. Lebo, Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, Stony Brook University, and Andrew O'Geen, PhD Candidate, Department of Political Science, Stony Brook University, Journal of Politics, “The President’s Role in the Partisan Congressional Arena” forthcoming, google)

Keeping this centrality in mind, we use established theories of congressional parties to model the  president’s role as an actor within the constraints of the partisan environment of Congress. We also find a  role for the president's approval level, a variable of some controversy in the presidential success literature.  Further, we are interested in both the causes and consequences of success. We develop a theory that views  the president’s record as a key component of the party politics that are so important to both the passage of  legislation and the electoral outcomes that follow. Specifically, theories of partisan politics in Congress argue  that cross-pressured legislators will side with their parties in order to enhance the collective reputation of  their party (Cox and McCubbins 1993, 2005), but no empirical research has answered the question: "of what  are collective reputations made?" We demonstrate that it is the success of the president –  not parties in  Congress – that predicts rewards and punishments to parties in Congress. This allows us to neatly fit the  president into existing theories of party competition in Congress while our analyses on presidential success  enable us to fit existing theories of party politics into the literature on the presidency.

AT: Dickinson/Ideology

Studies prove issues spillover—the president is key

Eshbaugh-Soha ‘08 (policy Priorities and Presidential Success in Congress. Conference Papers -- American Political Science Association, 1-26. Retrieved from Political Science Complete database.

Presidential-congressional relations are a central topic in the scientific study of  politics.  The literature is clear that a handful of variables strongly influence the likelihood of  presidential success on legislation.  Of these variables, party control of Congress is most  important (Bond and Fleisher 1990), in that conditions of unified government increase,  while conditions of divided government decrease presidential success, all else equal.  The  president’s approval ratings (Edwards 1989) and a favorable honeymoon (Dominguez 2005)  period may also increase presidential success on legislation.  In addition, presidential  speeches that reference policies or roll-call votes tend to increase the president’s legislative  success rate (Barrett 2004; Canes-Wrone 2001; Eshbaugh-Soha 2006).    In their landmark examination of presidential success in Congress, Bond and  Fleisher (1990, 230) identify yet another condition that may facilitate presidential success on  legislation when they write that “the president’s greatest influence over policy comes from  the agenda he pursues and the way it is packaged.”  Moreover, the policies that the president  prioritizes have “a major impact on the president’s relationship with Congress.” Taken  together, these assertions strongly suggest that the policy content of the president’s  legislative agenda—what policies the president prioritizes before Congress—should be a  primary determinant of presidential success in Congress.

Your ideology arguments are false – politicians are pragmatic and will vote-swap

Jon Bond, Professor of Political Science @ Texas A&M University, AND, Richard Fleisher, Professor of Political Science @ Fordham University. 1990. *The President in the Legislative Arena*. Pg. 22-23

While political values shared between the president and members of Con­gress provide an important linkage source, the effects of ideology are limited for several reasons. First, most members of Congress are pragmatic poli­ticians who do not have views and preferences at the extremes of a liberal-conservative continuum. Because the typical American voter is not strongly ideological, most representatives’ electoral self-interest is probably best served by avoiding ideological extremes. As noted above, ideology is a less impor­tant voting cue for moderates than it is for ideological extremists (Kingdon 1981, 268). Second, many votes that may be important to the president do not involve ideological issues. Distributive or “porkbarrel” programs, for example, typi­cally do not produce ideological divisions. Even conservatives who want to cut domestic spending and liberals who want to reduce defense spending work to protect domestic and defense programs in their districts. Presidents who attempt to tamper with these programs are likely to find few friends in Con­gress, as President Carter discovered when he opposed several water projects in 1977, and as President Reagan discovered when he vetoed the highway bill in 1987. Finally, ideological voting blocs are relatively informal coalitions com­posed of individuals who have similar values. The “conservative coalition” of Republicans and southern Democrats, for example, appears on certain votes and sometimes has a significant influence on the outcome of floor votes (Shelley 1983; Brady and Bullock 1980; Manley 1973). But this coalition of conservatives has no formal organization with elected leaders to serve as a communication and information center. Although there are several ideologi­cally based caucuses in Congress, these organizations are less institutional­ized than are parties, and their leaders do not command the same status and respect as do party leaders. Without an integrated institutional structure and respected leadership, ideological coalition formation remains relatively ad hoc.

AT: Thumpers- General

Obama is focusing on JV

(Insert Top of Docket cards)

Hold all of their link UQ to a very high threshold---issues don’t cost PC until they’re at the finish line

Drum ‘10 (Kevin, Political Blogger, Mother Jones, http://motherjones.com/kevin-drum/2010/03/immigration-coming-back-burner)

Not to pick on Ezra or anything, but this attitude betrays a surprisingly common misconception about political issues in general. The fact is that political dogs never bark until an issue becomes an active one. Opposition to Social Security privatization was pretty mild until 2005, when George Bush turned it into an active issue. Opposition to healthcare reform was mild until 2009, when Barack Obama turned it into an active issue. Etc. I only bring this up because we often take a look at polls and think they tell us what the public thinks about something. But for the most part, they don't.1 That is, they don't until the issue in question is squarely on the table and both sides have spent a couple of months filling the airwaves with their best agitprop. Polling data about gays in the military, for example, hasn't changed a lot over the past year or two, but once Congress takes up the issue in earnest and the Focus on the Family newsletters go out, the push polling starts, Rush Limbaugh picks it up, and Fox News creates an incendiary graphic to go with its saturation coverage — well, that's when the polling will tell you something. And it will probably tell you something different from what it tells you now. Immigration was bubbling along as sort of a background issue during the Bush administration too until 2007, when he tried to move an actual bill. Then all hell broke loose. The same thing will happen this time, and without even a John McCain to act as a conservative point man for a moderate solution. The political environment is worse now than it was in 2007, and I'll be very surprised if it's possible to make any serious progress on immigration reform. "Love 'em or hate 'em," says Ezra, illegal immigrants "aren't at the forefront of people's minds." Maybe not. But they will be soon.

AT: Magnitsky Thumper

No linkage and JV first - Most recent statements

Sloan 6/17 (Tim, RIA Novosti, “White House Pushes for Jackson-Vanik Repeal Without Reference to Magnitsky Bill”, June 16th, 2012, http://en.ria.ru/russia/20120619/174119356.html)//LP

The U.S. Administration on June 18 said it considers **it necessary to distinguish** between the adoption of the Magnitsky blacklist and the cancellation of the Jackson-Vanik amendment. A group of influential U.S. senators, including former Republican presidential candidate, John McCain, proposed in mid-March to introduce a blacklist of Russian officials allegedly linked to [Hermitage Capital lawyer Magnitsky’s death](http://en.rian.ru/trend/magnitsky_death/" \t "_blank), in a Moscow pre-trial detention center in November 2009, in exchange for the cancellation of the Jackson-Vanik amendment - a 1974 law which denies Russia top U.S. trading status. Moscow has warned the U.S. Administration that replacement of Jackson-Vanik Amendment with the Magnitsky blacklist is 'unacceptable', Russian Presidential Aide Yury Ushakov said on Sunday. The International Committee of the Senate of the Congress will vote on the Magnitsky bill on Tuesday. Russian President, Vladimir Putin, and U.S. counterpart, Barack Obama, held a meeting on the sidelines of G20 summit in Los Cabos, Mexico on June 18. President Obama again called for the U.S. Congress to repeal the Jackson-Vanik amendment. He said the move would stimulate U.S.-Russia trade. “**Our position is – we want the Jackson-Vanik amendment repealed.** We want to establish permanent normal trade relations with Russia, because we believe that it is in the interests of American businesses, American workers and it will help create jobs in the United States. And we would like it to be done separately,” Deputy National Security Adviser for U.S. Strategic Communications, Ben Rhodes, said at a briefing in Los Cabos. “On commercial ties, we're actually in agreement in seeking greater access to Russian markets for U.S. businesses, on seeking the repeal of Jackson-Vanik, for instance, to facilitate that effort. So I think there are areas of agreement and areas where we'd like to make progress, even though we recognize there have been difficulties and tensions in aspects of the relationship in recent weeks,” Rhodes added.

Jackson Vanik before Magnitsky and no linkage

Vasilyeva 6/7/12 (Nataliya Vasilyeva, AP business writer, “US official urges repeal of Russia trade law,” Kansas City Star)

http://www.kansascity.com/2012/06/07/3646516/us-official-urges-repeal-of-russia.html

"Once Russia becomes a member of the World Trade Organization, we need to make sure that American businesses have the full advantages of that, and therefore it's necessary for us to lift Jackson-Vanik," Kirk told the American Chamber of Commerce in Russia. Some U.S. lawmakers have indicated they would support repeal of Jackson-Vanik in exchange for passage of the so-called Magnitsky bill that would bar Russian officials accused of human rights abuses from the United States. That bill calls for publicly identifying Russians tied to human rights abuses, but the Obama administration worries that could affect relations with Moscow. The bill was introduced by two Democrats and also is backed by prominent Republicans, including Sen. John McCain. The bill was named for lawyer Sergei Magnitsky, who had accused Interior Ministry officials of corruption. He died in jail in 2009 from untreated pancreatitis. Proponents of the bill say the death, and allegations of torture in jail, highlight corruption in Russia's judicial system. Prospects for passing the measure as a stand-alone bill are uncertain, and senators saw an opportunity to boost its chances by tying it to the repeal of Jackson-Vanik. Kirk said the two measures should not be linked. "Our priority is for the Congress to lift Jackson-Vanik in a clean bill which deals only with the issue relevant to our ability to maintain our competitiveness," he said, adding the administration will "continue our work" with lawmakers concerned about Russian human rights

Relations from JV turns this --- repeal spurs bilateral NGO ties that protect rights

Kliger 10 (Dr. Sam, American Jewish Committee, “The Jackson-Vanik Amendment and U.S.-Russian Relations”, AJC, 2-4, http://www.ajcrussian.org/site/apps/nlnet/content2.aspx?c=chLMK3PKLsF&b=7718799&ct=8023853)

5) Some human rights groups and NGOs in Russia like the Moscow Bureau for Human Rights and the Civic Chamber of the Russian Federation also express the need for abolishing J-V and suggest that such repeal would contribute to the improvement of U.S. – Russia relations and would enhance the development of civil society in Russia. To ensure continuing emigration freedom and improve the human rights situation in Russia, J-V Amendment could be replaced by cooperation between American and Russian NGOs that would place the amendment’s provisions under civil society control. A move to abolish the amendment would be considered a serious step toward the new approach of “re-setting” relations between the U.S. and Russia, and would contribute to the efforts of the newly established Obama-Medvedev Commission and particularly to its Civil Society Working Group led by Dr. Michael McFaul and Vladislav Surkov, which first met here in Washington last week. This Working Group, for instance, in cooperation with American and Russian NGOs can take control of the amendment’s provisions.

And, Obama won’t agree to it

Martinez 3/14 [Ken, Moscow Times, McFaul Pushes for Trade Status,

<http://www.themoscowtimes.com/business/article/mcfaul-pushes-for-trade-status/454625.html>]

The Obama administration will not support any human rights or democracy legislation in exchange for Congress repealing the 1974 Jackson-Vanik amendment, the U.S. envoy to Russia said in Washington on the eve of a gathering of U.S. ambassadors Tuesday. U.S. Ambassador Michael McFaul spoke about relations with Russia, telling scholars at two think tanks that refusing to lift Jackson-Vanik would not make Russia more democratic. "If you don't believe me, ask Navalny," Ambassador Michael McFaul said, referring to an open letter published on the blog of Vladimir Milov, leader of the Democratic Choice movement, on Monday evening. The letter, which was also signed by Alexei Navalny and other key opposition figures in Moscow, urged the United States to remove the largely symbolic Cold War trade restriction. The signatories included organizers of demonstrations against President-elect Vladimir Putin who recognize the lagging enthusiasm of protesters but have found it nearly impossible to unite around a common policy agenda. The opposition leaders criticized U.S. politicians who argue that the repeal of the 1974 Jackson-Vanik amendment should be tied to improvements in human rights and that Putin and his "cronies" would be the main beneficiaries of a repeal. "Although there are obvious problems with democracy and human rights in modern Russia, the persistence on the books of the Jackson-Vanik amendment does not help to solve them at all," the letter said. The group of opposition leaders wrote that trade restrictions imposed under the amendment inhibit Russia's competitiveness on international markets, discourage diversification from oil and leave Russia "hanging in a petro-state limbo." They argue that this model of development prevents the emergence of an independent middle class that would demand democratic political changes in the future. "Jackson-Vanik is not helpful in any way — neither for the promotion of human rights and democracy in Russia, nor for the economic interests of its people," the group said. "[The amendment] is also a very useful tool for Mr Putin's anti-American propaganda machine," the writers added, "it helps him to depict the United States as hostile to Russia, using outdated Cold War tools to undermine Russia's international competitiveness." Some in Congress support linking the repeal of Jackson-Vanik to the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2011 — legislation proposed to promote human rights and named after an anti-corruption lawyer who died in prison after being beaten, tortured and denied medical care that experts said would have saved his life. The legislation would include visa bans and the freezing of financial assets for a wide range of officials involved in cases of human rights violations. The United States did quietly issue visa bans on dozens of Russian officials, but McFaul says going further would be counterproductive for the "reset" policy and offer no additional benefit. "We believe that we can ban people from coming to this country that do grossly abusive things regarding human rights. And it was strengthened by a human rights executive order last August that we took to give additional authorities. So from our point of view, this legislation is redundant to what we're already doing," McFaul said at an event on Capitol Hill organized by the Foreign Policy Initiative. McFaul, former National Security Council senior director for Russia and a key architect of the administration's reset policy, said repealing the amendment is the administration's top trade priority for 2012 and that he sees no reason for it not to happen. "Jackson-Vanik from our position is a total no-brainer. There's no upside to holding onto Jackson-Vanik right now. Zero. And viewed in human rights terms, there's no upside," the ambassador said.

Ext. Obama Won’t Agree

More ev

PJ Media ’11 (<http://pjmedia.com/blog/obama-takes-putins-side-in-magnitsky-case/>)

For some time now, I have been expressing outrage at the fact that Barack Obama did not actively support the Cardin-McCain Magnitsky Act, named for Sergei Magnitsky, the attorney in question. But I never dared dream that Obama would take the Kremlin’s side and aggressively seek to derail the legislation for his own personal political gain.

More ev

FT ’11 (<http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/8027107e-17a7-11e1-b157-00144feabdc0.html#axzz1np3YyNdS>)

Both Democrats and Republicans in Congress are suggesting that the amendment could be repealed if the White House backed the “Magnitsky Act”. It is named after lawyer Sergei Magnitsky, who died in a Russian jail in 2009 after accusing police of complicity in a $230m tax fraud. The bill, circulated by Ben Cardin, a Senate Democrat, proposes to blacklist Russian officials implicated in human rights abuses such as Mr Magnitsky’s death. The White House is opposed to such legislation, arguing that it already has full authority to blacklist Russian officials. Indeed, many of the officials accused of putting Magnitsky behind bars are already on a visa ban list, according to the state department.

Ext. No Impact

Doesn’t undermine relations

Aslund ‘11 (Anders, Ph.D. – University of Oxford and Senior Fellow – Peterson Institute for International Economics and Gary Clyde Hufbauer, Senior Fellow – Peterson Institute for International Economics, “The United States Should Establish Permanent Normal Trade Relations with Russia”, IEE Policy Brief, November, http://www.iie.com/publications/pb/pb11-20.pdf)

The Jackson-Vanik Amendment to the US Trade Act of 1974 was approved at the height of the Cold War, when Russia generated outrage by barring Jews from emigrating. It was sponsored by Senator Henry M. (“Scoop”) Jackson of Washington and Representative Charles Vanik of Ohio. Free emigration for Russian Jews, however, has not been in question since Russia became independent in 1991. The amendment is an outdated remnant of the politics of a distant era, though it remains a major irritant in relations between Washington and Moscow and a political issue in Congress. Many lawmakers, citing a range of disagreements with Russia over human and legal rights in Russia and various foreign policy issues, say that refusal to lift Jackson-Vanik would send a signal of displeasure over these matters. But other tools exist for exerting pressure on Russia that would be more effective and far less destructive to US economic interests. The US government has alternative bilateral and multilateral mechanisms that can be used to engage Russia on human rights questions and political and religious freedoms, such as the US-Russia Bilateral Presidential Commission and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. If necessary, economic sanctions and tailored penalties, including draconian measures, are readily available under other US statutes, such as the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA).

Compromise means they can eliminate the worst parts

WP 3/27 <http://www.washingtonpost.com/business/policy/cost-could-be-high-for-us-russia-relations-in-winning-repeal-of-decades-old-trade-restrictions/2012/03/27/gIQAWo7bdS_story_1.html>

The administration first wants to deal with trade. It has powerful allies in the U.S. business community supporting the repeal of Jackson-Vanik, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, which calls the repeal its top trade priority this year. Russia soon will get more opportunities for international trade when it joins the World Trade Organization. If the U.S. doesn’t repeal Jackson-Vanik, American companies could be at a competitive disadvantage. But it’s a delicate matter in an election year. Republicans are reluctant to offer Obama any perceived victory by unconditionally repealing the restrictions. And President Barack Obama doesn’t want to appear too critical of the rights measure, which has support from both parties. His likely Republican opponent, Mitt Romney, has attacked Obama for signing a major nuclear arms treaty with Russia. Obama’s handling of relations with Russia became a bigger political issue Monday after he told outgoing Russian President Dmitry Medvedev that he would have more flexibility to deal with the contentious issue of missile defense after the November election. Obama apparently did not realize he was being recorded. Republicans seized on the remarks, demanding an explanation. And on Tuesday, Obama denied having a hidden agenda. “I want to reduce our nuclear stockpiles. And one of the barriers to doing that is building trust and cooperation around missile defense issues,” he said. Jackson-Vanik has long been a thorn in US-Russian relations. It was introduced in 1974 to pressure the Soviet Union to allow Jews to emigrate. Named after its congressional sponsors, Jackson-Vanik denies normal trading relations with communist countries that restrict emigration or punish those trying to leave the country. Russia calls it anachronistic, even though the legislation has had little practical effect since 1994, when the United States began waiving its application. Still, previous calls to repeal it have found little traction among lawmakers critical of Russia’s human rights record. Those rights concerns prompted two Democrats, Rep. James McGovern of Massachusetts and Sen. Ben Cardin of Maryland, to propose the Magnitsky bill, which would make it difficult for Russians suspected of abuses from doing business, including using credit cards, outside their country. It also calls for publicly identifying Russians tied to abuses, a significant escalation that the administration worries could rile relations. The measure also is backed by prominent Republicans, including Sen. John McCain. Personal Post The bill was named for lawyer Sergey Magnitsky, who died in a Russian jail in 2009, when the pancreatitis he developed was left untreated. Proponents of the bill say the death and allegations of torture highlight corruption in Russia’s judicial system. Prospects were uncertain for getting the measure passed as a stand-alone bill. But with the administration and business groups pushing hard to get Jackson-Vanik repealed, senators saw an opportunity to boost its prospects by tying together the two measures, underscoring the link between trade with Russia and human rights. The administration tried to defuse the issue last year by issuing travel bans on 60 unnamed Russian officials believed to be responsible for Magnitsky’s imprisonment, torture and death. Russia later responded by saying it had banned unnamed U.S. officials it claims were involved in abuses related to U.S. counterterror policies. If Congress insists on linking the two bills, the administration wants to drop the provision calling for the naming of rights abusers. They argue that such disclosure would be inconsistent with State Department practice and counterproductive, because it would remove the uncertainty that human rights violators already face about whether they are on a U.S. blacklist.

Magnitsky is NBD- support for it in Russia

Daily Herald ¾ <http://www.heraldextra.com/news/opinion/editorial/around-the-nation/pressing-the-putin-regime/article_f359bd0c-6a8c-5cc4-b916-5fec92e2b4be.html>

The White House is seeking the repeal of a 1974 law known as Jackson-Vanik, which links the trade preferences for Russia to free emigration. Repeal is logical for a couple of reasons: Russia, unlike the former Soviet Union, does not restrict the exit of Jews and others; and if the law is not removed, U.S. companies will be penalized after Russia enters the World Trade Organization later this year. But a bipartisan coalition in Congress is concerned about removing this legacy of U.S. human rights advocacy without addressing the abuses of the Putin regime. Led in part by Sen. Benjamin L. Cardin, D-Md., the group proposes to couple the Jackson-Vanik repeal with a measure that would require the administration to single out Russian officials responsible for gross human rights violations, ban them from traveling to the United States and freeze their assets. This measure could be as effective in its own way as Jackson-Vanik was on the Brezhnev-era Kremlin. Unlike their Soviet predecessors, senior Russian officials crave contact with the West; they vacation in Europe, send their children to U.S. colleges and, not infrequently, transfer their money through U.S. banks. A visa ban and asset freeze would be severe punishment for those involved in persecuting liberal politicians and journalists, or extorting money from U.S. companies. That's why the Russian opposition strongly supports the measure.

AT: Health Care Ruling Thumper

Doesn’t tank capital

CNN 6/25 (“Obamacare’: The Word that Defined the Health Care Debate,” CNN.com, 6/25/12, http://www.cnn.com/2012/06/25/politics/obamacare-word-debate/index.html?eref=rss\_mostpopular)//SR

"It was applied with a negative connotation, but were the Supreme Court to uphold the law, Obamacare might overnight become a positive context," he said. "Just because something is intended to be framed in one way doesn't necessarily mean that it will be interpreted that way forever." The law's most steadfast opponents may not change their views based on the court's ruling. It could have an impact on the way the important November constituencies think about it. "You only have to convince the people who were ambivalent or are in the middle," Medhurst said. But for now, the actual language of the law is not as important as the way it is discussed and debated. "Most of the language people are hearing is not the law itself because nobody has read the law," Medhurst said.

AT: Abortion Thumper

No evidence that Obama is pushing the issue or that it affects his agenda, this is not an election issue, its all about jobs

Their ev is hype and Obama is spinning abortion in his favor

Rolling Stone 2/10 (<http://www.rollingstone.com/politics/blogs/national-affairs/obama-contraception-backtrack-smart-politics-or-screwup-20120210>)

James Fallows has a tremendous longread essay in The Atlantic examining competing narratives about the Obama presidency. Is he a) "a chessmaster," a deeply strategic politician who is constantly thinking three and four steps ahead of his rivals and the media? Or b) "a pawn," an all-too-human politician with middling executive skills who is buffeted by political and economic forces outside of his control? The current dustup over contraception coverage can be viewed through either lens. The realtime evolution of this story points to the "pawn" narrative. Here are the optics: The White House announces a new rule that will require all employers, including Catholic hospitals, to pay for contraception through their health-insurance plans. The move is celebrated by women's health groups, but angers not only conservative Catholics who oppose contraception under any circumstances, but a broader religious community that interprets the move as a bureaucratic assault on religious freedom. The White House, recognizing that it has fouled up big time, backtracks and rewrites the rule so that insurance companies will be forced to swallow the costs of contraception coverage for employers who object as a matter of conscience. An open-and-shut case of political malpractice. Right? But let's scratch deeper here. What is the long-game impact of this dustup, point by point? 1) With the original rule, the White House communicated to its base of progressive women voters: Women's health cannot be subordinated to narrow religious views. We're with you. We get it. 2) The predictable overreaction of the religious right in attacking not only this rule, but women's health rights more broadly, showcased for the same base of progressive women voters: The religious right is still out there. They still want to control your body. You can't be complacent this election. 3) This hoses Mitt Romney. Romney's pitch to voters as an employment Mr. Fix-it has already been undercut by the improving economy. By shifting the national conversation to contraception – and by highlighting that Romney himself instituted the same kind of religiously intrusive policy in Massachusetts (as Obama campaign spokesman Ben Labolt did yesterday) – the White House has trained the focus of the GOP primary campaign squarely on the gap between Romney and social conservatives. 4) By reacting nimbly (by Washington standards) to come up with a solution that protects women's health while allowing for religious objections, Obama says to anyone who is paying attention to this drama: I'm listening; I'm responsive; We hear you. 5) The wedge issue lives ... and continues to hurt the GOP. Social conservatives are now rallying around Rick Santorum, who is himself devoutly anti-contraception: "It's not okay," he's said. "It’s a license to do things in a sexual realm that is counter to how things are supposed to be." On the trail today he's been saying that birth control "shouldn’t be in an insurance plan anyway." If this were a political mistake, Barack Obama seems impossibly lucky to have stumbled into it. Every repercussion is redounding to his favor. Now consider this through the lens of the "chessmaster" narrative. This is an overblown controversy. Even in its original Catholic-hospital offending form, the rule was popular, garnering 61 percent support in a Fox News poll, and 58 percent support among independents. The only groups where majorities disapproved were Republicans (57%) and Tea Partiers (71%). With today's changes, reasonable critics of the original rule are mollified. To fence sitters, it seems a reasonable compromise. If women's health advocates are still up in arms, that anger is directed at religious conservatives who forced the change, not the president who stuck his neck out for them. In his own take on the chessmaster narrative, Andrew Sullivan has a tidier metaphor for Obama. He's the Roadrunner and his opponents are, like Wiley E. Coyote, constantly running full speed out over a cliff. Meep! Meep!

AT: Appropriations Thumper

Despite recent executive actions Obama is coming out relatively unscathed

Politico 1/6 <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0112/71183.html>

The Republican presidential contenders are pummeling one another. Liberals are happier with their president. And the unemployment rate dropped to a three-year low. As Republicans bickered on the campaign trail, President Barack Obama roared into 2012 with some of the best news he has received in months — an 8.5 percent unemployment rate that suggests the economy may not be the overwhelming election-year drag that his team once feared. He bucked up his twitchy Democratic base by unilaterally appointing a new consumer protection chief and three new members to the National Labor Relations Board. He answered long-standing calls from the Hispanic community, a key electoral bloc, to use his executive authority to tweak the nation’s immigration laws, unveiling a rule change that will reduce the time that illegal immigrants are separated from American relatives while pursuing legal status. Obama even emerged relatively unscathed from his announcement of a new military strategy forced by hundreds of billions in budget cuts, a rollout smoothed by images of top military brass literally standing at his side.

AT: Biofuels Thumper

Biofuels backlash is just an election year circus by media pundits

Reuters 3/1 <http://cleantechnica.com/2012/03/01/obamas-algae-biofuels-communications-problem-i-e-leaving-out-global-warming/>

I suppose it was right about the time when college aspirations became snobbish, when electing a presidential candidate could magically reduce the global price of oil, or when environmental protection became a “phony theology.” Welcome to the 2012 campaign circus, arguably the most bizarre in history. And now, adding to the long list of oddball attacks, Republican politicians and media pundits are launching an assault on President Obama’s offer of $14 million for research on algae-based biofuels — calling for a “pond scum czar” and offering the President “the algae in my fish tank” for this “goofy gas.”

No PC lost- it’s a phony election year promise

Energy Boom 2/24 (<http://www.energyboom.com/biofuels/president-obama-addresses-rising-gas-prices-announces-new-funding-algal-biofuel-and-nat-gas>)

As the U.S. federal election begins to heat up and the Republican's close in on choosing a presidential candidate, President Obama and his Administration find themselves under the financial microscope again. The current pressure comes with the recent and steady price increase Americans are paying to fill their vehicles with fuel. Due in part to Iran's threats to withhold its oil supplies from the European Union -- a result of sanctions the EU has imposed related to the Iranian nuclear program -- gas prices are being affected in the U.S. The gas story, however, is larger than the current situation in Iran: the cost of gasoline has increased nearly 12% in the past year. Republicans, in particular presidential hopefuls, are demanding that more oil be drilled at home and claim the current Administration has dropped the ball on domestic oil production. Most recently President Obama declined to approve the proposed Keystone Pipeline that would connect oil sands in Canada to refineries in the Gulf of Mexico. On Thursday, while addressing students at the University of Miami, the President not only disagreed with his Republican counterparts on his efforts to boost domestic oil production but also warned that drilling for more oil is not the answer to solving the energy problem. The President pointed to the fact that "America is producing more oil today than at any time in the last eight years. That’s why we have a record number of oil rigs operating right now -- more working oil and gas rigs than the rest of the world combined." But he was quick to point out that drilling isn't the solution: "You know we can’t just drill our way to lower gas prices. If we’re going to take control of our energy future and can start avoiding these annual gas price spikes that happen every year we’ve got to have a sustained, all-of-the-above strategy that develops every available source of American energy. Yes, oil and gas, but also wind and solar and nuclear and biofuels, and more." An "all-of-the-above" strategy will leave nothing off the table when it comes to creating new and more efficient sources of energy, which includes developing natural gas and biofuel technology as a fuel source for vehicles. Although he stated clearly "there are no silver bullets short term when it comes to gas prices -- and anybody who says otherwise isn't telling the truth," President Obama briefly mentioned that his administration was "launching a program that will bring together the nation’s best scientists and engineers and entrepreneurs to figure out how more cars can be powered by natural gas, a fuel that’s cleaner and cheaper and more abundant than oil." Launching such a program seems highly intuitive to the President: why not leverage an energy source that is found in copious amounts within the United States. "We’ve got more of that. We don’t have to import it. We may be exporting it soon." Shortly after the president's speech the Department of Energy (DOE) released details of the program. Through its Advanced Research Projects Agency – Energy (ARPA-E), which Obama created in 2009, the DOE will make $30 million available to support the development of natural gas for vehicles and $14 million to support the development of algal biofuels (which the president claimed "could replace up to 17 percent of the oil we import for transportation with this fuel"). Though the president concluded his speech by saying that energy will be one of the major challenges for future generations, he encouraged the students in attendance to keep things in perspective. "The easiest thing in the world is to make phony election-year promises about lower gas prices. What’s harder is to make a serious, sustained commitment to tackle a problem. I need you guys to work hard. I need you guys to dream big. I need those of you who are a lot smarter than me to figure out how we’re going to be able to tap into new energy sources," he said.

AT: Budget Thumper

No capital lost from Budget, Obama not pushing

Keith 2/12 (Tamara, NPR's Congressional Reporter on the Washington Desk, “Obama's Budget First Salvo In Expected Political Fight” NPR -- <http://www.wbur.org/npr/146755934/obamas-budget-first-salvo-in-expected-political-fight>)

When President Obama unveils his budget Monday, it will project a $1.3 trillion deficit this year, and just under $1 trillion in 2013. It would increase spending on education, research and development and transportation. It would also increase taxes on the wealthy and cut spending, including on defense. Presidential budgets are almost always aspirational documents. They lay out a vision, not what the president actually thinks will happen. "You know every president's budget is part political statement, part policy document," says Stan Collender, a senior partner at Qorvis Communications, and a longtime federal budget guru. "This is an election [year]; the president is facing a hostile Congress if not very hostile Congress in a hyper-partisan environment," Collender says. "Just like the State of the Union, that makes this year's president's budget a campaign document more than a serious proposal."

AT: CTR Thumper

Obama won’t use PC on it.

Novack 2/22 [Janet, Forbes tax policy writer, “Want Lower Corporate Tax Rates? Pay A Value Added Tax” Forbes -- http://www.forbes.com/sites/janetnovack/2012/02/22/want-lower-corporate-tax-rates-pay-a-value-added-tax/]

But bringing the rate down to 28% (let alone the 25% or lower Republicans want) without increasing the deficit, is no easy trick. In fact, the dirty little secret of corporate tax reform is this: you can’t pay for a low rate just by closing questionable corporate loopholes. There aren’t enough of them. So how would Obama get to 28%? The framework suggests, as the President did in his State of The Union address, some sort of minimum tax on multinationals which park profits overseas. In addition, it rehashes earlier Obama proposals to get rid of last in-first out accounting and to end special breaks for oil and gas companies; for the carried interest earned by hedge fund and private equity managers; for depreciation of corporate jets; and for inside build up of corporate owned life insurance. (Zing to Exxon-Mobil, Blackstone Group CEO Stephen Schwarzman, Gulfstream Aerospace and MetLife.) As the Administration admits, however, if you add all those items up, they still don’t pay for a 28% rate. And so, the framework says, reformers will have to draw from a vague “menu of options” including changing depreciation schedules, limiting deductions for interest and taxing larger “non-corporate” entities. (In a post here, contributor Dean Zerbe explains what this “non-corporate” entities reference might mean for small and medium sized businesses.) The lack of detail isn’t really surprising, even if it is disappointing. “They don’t want to put political capital behind it,’’ observes economist Martin A. Sullivan, a former Treasury and Congressional staffer and author of Corporate Tax Reform: Taxing Profits in the 21st Century. Sullivan, who blogs for Tax Analysts here , isn’t just picking on the Administration, mind you. He finds the same fault with other corporate reform proposals, including from House Ways and Means Committee Chairman David Camp (R-MI). “They advertise lower rates, but nobody is willing to belly up to the bar and say how they’re going to pay for it, and until they do that, you have no real credibility to say you’re serious about reform. It’s like saying, `I’m going to lose 40 pounds.’”

Obama not spending PC on corporate tax reform- Geithner running point, not a detailed proposal, won’t happen in the short term

USA Today 2/22 <http://content.usatoday.com/communities/theoval/post/2012/02/obama-team-to-propose-corporate-tax-cut/1#.T0VLEewmCSo>

Some Republicans denounced the proposed corporate tax cut as nothing more than an election-year ploy. "Time and again, President Obama shows us his every move is determined by his re-election campaign and has nothing to do with principle," said Kirsten Kukowski, spokeswoman for the Republican National Committee. "How else can you explain his sudden desire to talk corporate taxes after three years of failed economic policies?" Manufacturers applauded the goal but not the specifics. "The president suggests some changes that will help, but many of the proposals completely miss the mark and would make U.S. businesses less competitive," said Jay Timmons, president of the National Association of Manufacturers. "In addition, the two-thirds of manufacturers who file as individuals will receive no relief from the current burdensome tax system." The Treasury Department has been working on corporate tax reform for two years, and the decision to roll it out now -- but with Geithner, not Obama, doing the talking -- indicates a desire to take on a difficult issue without being overly specific. Geithner acknowledged that the corporate tax code may have to wait for overall tax reform, including individuals, but said that would take much longer to negotiate with Congress. The last time the tax code was overhauled was in 1986 -- "before the Internet," he said. Very few tax loopholes were singled out for elimination, including some Obama has cited before, such as tax breaks for oil and gas companies, hedge fund managers and owners of corporate aircraft. More expensive and widely used tax breaks, such as accelerated depreciation and reducing the deductibility of interest for corporations, are mentioned only as options. However, the plan notes several of the costlier breaks would have to be wiped out to get the rate down to 28% without raising the deficit. "The president's proposal is designed to start the process," Geithner said. "This process is going to take time. It will be politically contentious. Some are going to say these proposals are too tough on business, and others will say they're not tough enough."

AT: DREAM Thumper

He’ll wait til 2012 for real immigration

Fox News, 2-23-2012 <http://politics.blogs.foxnews.com/2012/02/23/president-obama-confident-hes-got-five-more-years-white-house>

President Obama pressed with confidence about his future at the White House saying, "I've got another five years coming up," when asked why he hasn't passed immigration reform in a radio interview Wednesday with Univision. Univision's Eddie "Piolin" Sotelo said he wondered since the president hasn't made major changes in immigration policies, and if he would still have support of the Latino community, given many are facing deportation and separation from families. After saying declaratively that he's got more years in office to go, Obama added in the interview on immigration reform, "We're going to get this done. And absolutely, we have strong support in the Latino community because they've seen what we've been working on," he said. The president later echoed the five-year line at a fundraiser in Miami Thursday evening, saying "[I]'m not done yet. I need five more years. We need five more years to reform an immigration system that doesn't work and make sure that we are a nation of laws and a nation of immigrants," he said. Obama in the interview aruged that even though he hasn't been able to pass immigration reform, his work on the economy he says has helped millions of Latino families - things like housing initiatives, education platforms, extension of the payroll tax cut and unemployment insurance.

AT: Election Means Nothing Happens

Empirics go neg – legislation will still pass it just supercharges the reasons why capital is key

The Hill 2/21 (<http://thehill.com/opinion/editorials/211877-258-days-to-go>)

Legislating in an election year is not easy, and with both congressional chambers and the White House up for grabs, attempting to pass bills will be viewed through an election prism. House Republicans’ plan, for example, to scuttle portions of Obama’s healthcare reform law and call for more domestic drilling. Similarly, Senate Democrats will vote to raise taxes on millionaires and seek passage of a scaled-back immigration reform measure. None of these bills will pass, but the votes will be ammunition on the campaign trail. The odds are against a sweeping bill becoming law in 2012. Yet lawmakers passed the Civil Rights Act in 1964. Tax reform passed in 1986, welfare reform cleared Congress in 1996 and the Troubled Asset Relief Program became law in 2008. The common thread? They were all election years.

AT: EPA Thumper

Delayed implementation of new rules saves Obama face until after 2012 election

Government Executive 3/27 (<http://www.govexec.com/oversight/2012/03/first-major-climate-regs-obama-epa-sure-stir-political-debate/41580/?oref=river>

The Obama administration is expected to unveil long-awaited global-warming regulations as soon as Tuesday in a move that will make a big splash politically but won’t have real environmental or economic impact until long after the 2012 elections. The controversial rules -- initially setting limits on greenhouse-gas emissions from new power plants -- have been in the works since 2009, when the Environmental Protection Agency determined within a year of President Obama taking office that it had a legal obligation under the Clean Air Act to rein in carbon pollution that scientists say is one of the chief causes of climate change. The planned regulations have been a top political target for just as long: Republicans and the fossil-fuel industry have attacked the proposed controls as a poster child for government overreach, saying they will kill jobs and send electricity prices soaring. Coming in the midst of an election cycle in which energy prices, the EPA, and government regulation are all hot-button issues, the rollout of climate-change rules is likely to ignite a fresh line of political attacks, with GOP campaigns blasting Democrats and the president for hurting the economy and congressional Republicans introducing a slew of bills to block or delay the rules. (House Majority Leader Eric Cantor, R-Va., long ago put them on a list of “Top 10 job-killing regulations” that the Republican-led chamber would push hard to roll back.) On the other side, the Obama reelection campaign hopes that issuing the climate-change rules will help ease frustrations among its liberal environmental base; many environmental groups have been less than enthusiastic in their support for Obama since last summer, when he delayed another major EPA clean air rule regulating smog. And while Obama regained their support after rejecting the controversial Keystone XL pipeline, some green groups remained tepid after Obama signaled that he may eventually approve the pipeline in a second term. “Environmental groups will react very positively to this,” said Frank O’Donnell, president of the advocacy group Clean Air Watch. “Old King Coal may not be dead, but he could be on life support.” On Monday, several environmental groups met with White House officials to discuss a campaign aimed at supporting the new rules once they’re rolled out. But while the climate-change rules could fire up both Obama’s red-state foes and his green-group friends, it appears that neither side will have much to point to in terms of substance -- at least for many years. That’s because the EPA has deftly crafted the rollout to score political points now but delay the environmental and economic impacts until later. According to sources familiar with the rules, the first proposal will only require new coal- and gas-fired power plants to limit emissions of carbon pollution. Rules to control carbon from existing plants won’t come until later, possibly after the November elections. As a result, the first power plant forced to comply with the rules probably won’t even be built for years. There are currently about a dozen proposed power plants going through the licensing and permitting process; these will be grandfathered in and not subject to the new rules, either, said sources who asked to remain anonymous because the rules have not been released. Rolling out the rules this way allows Obama to revitalize his base by standing firm on his commitment to tackle climate change, and it defangs his opposition since the rules will require no existing plants to install expensive new technology or close down.

AT: Highway Thumper

They don’t have card one that Obama is involved in this fight- no pushing it- it’s Boehner’s plan

Will put off tough decisions with a temporary fix

Columbus Dispatch, 2-22-2012 <http://www.dispatch.com/content/stories/local/2012/02/22/highway-funding-plan-stalled.html>

Washington’s inability to figure out a way to pay for the nation’s roadwork probably will result in a three- or four-year temporary fix, U.S. Rep. Steve Stivers said yesterday. The Upper Arlington Republican told a transportation conference sponsored by the Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission that he backs a GOP plan to increase spending on highway repairs and improvements by leasing the rights for oil drilling in five additional areas off the nation’s coasts. President Barack Obama has threatened to veto the five-year, $260 billion House bill because of the oil-drilling and other provisions, including its plan to end dedicated federal funding of public-transit systems. A Senate bill includes other items he opposes, such as approval of an oil pipeline from Canada to Texas. The result, Stivers said, probably will be another “bridging bill” that freezes spending at current levels and leaves the tough decisions for future debate.

AT: Uniqueness O/W Link

Extend our 1nc evidence- JV has support now but capital is key to passage

JV isn’t a slam dunk

Roth 3/20 (Andrew, Russian Profile, <http://russiaprofile.org/international/56157.html>

The clock is ticking for the Jackson-Vanik Amendment of 1974 as Russia prepares to finalize its accession to the World Trade Organization (WTO) this year. The Barack Obama administration, along with U.S. Ambassador to Russia Michael McFaul, has called for the law to be repealed as a relic of the Cold War. Yet conservative lawmakers are uneasy about the plan, citing concerns that lifting Jackson-Vanik will be seen as a sign of weakness by the upcoming Vladimir Putin administration. The opponents are now suggesting deals to take Jackson-Vanik off the books, but not without replacing the law with alternative legislation to censure Russia for corruption and civil rights abuses. Just two days after Vladimir Putin won a disputed 64 percent in Russia’s presidential election, U.S. President Barack Obama announced that Jackson-Vanik, a law passed in 1974 to punish the Soviet Union for its restrictive immigration policy, was on the chopping block. “I think I’ve shown that I will go anywhere in the world to open new markets for American goods. That’s why we worked so hard to secure Russia’s invitation into the WTO. That’s why I have asked Congress to repeal Jackson-Vanik, to make sure that all your companies and American companies all across the country can take advantage of it. And that's something that we're going to need some help on,” Obama told a roundtable of businessmen on March 6. The push to repeal Jackson-Vanik is quickly becoming the next flashpoint for clashes in Congress over U.S. policy toward Russia. Senate Minority Whip Jon Kyl said that supporters of lifting Jackson-Vanik in order to avoid punishing tariffs against American businesses after Russia’s WTO accession present the measure as a “slam dunk.” “But it isn’t a slam dunk,” he told a Finance Committee hearing, conveying concerns over both intellectual property protection and civil rights abuses in Russia. “When the U.S. Ambassador to Russia Michael McFaul suggests that there is no association between a country’s respect for individual liberties and its business environment, he is simply denying reality.”

AT: Obama can do it Unilaterally/Congress Not key

Obama won’t act unilaterally even if he can

Jatras 1/19 (James George Jatras et al 1-19, is the former Foreign Policy Analyst, U.S. Senate Republican Policy Committee, former U.S. Foreign Service Officer, January 19, 2012, “Time to End an Obstacle to U.S. Access to the World's 9th-Largest Economy,” online: http://www.russiablog.org/2012/01/time-to-end-an-jackson-vanik-obama-executive.php)

Congressional Action Not Required to End Jackson-Vanik The December statement from the White House includes the hope that Congress finally will act to end Jackson-Vanik application to Russia. Missing from the statement and from the policy of the Obama Administration is acknowledgement of the fact that nothing in the plain language of the Jackson-Vanik law requires Congress to take any action at all to achieve that end. Instead, the plain language of the law gives that authority solely to the President. In April 2011, Edward Lozansky and another author of this statement, Anthony Salvia, filed suit in U.S. federal district court to require President Barack Obama to use his existing legal authority to remove the Russian Federation permanently from Jackson-Vanik. (Lozansky and Salvia v. Obama, 1:11-cv00737-CKK) In a detailed legal analysis, it was demonstrated to the court that the key operative provision of Jackson-Vanik places the burden solely on the President, not Congress, to free Russia from trade restrictions. Indeed, since 1994 the administrations of Presidents Bill Clinton, George W. Bush, and Barack Obama have agreed that Russia is not in violation of free emigration standards – but they still did not act to remove Russia permanently from Jackson-Vanik trade provisions, inaccurately claiming the need for Congressional action. The Lozansky-Salvia suit decisively demolishes that claim. In the plain language of Jackson-Vanik, no Congressional action is required to ‘graduate’ Russia permanently from trade restrictions. The President can do so solely upon his determination that Russia is no longer in violation of emigration standards. The failure of successive administrations to lift this discriminatory treatment amounts to just passing the buck. In its response to the suit, nowhere did the Obama Department of Justice show where the law requires Congressional action – because it doesn’t. Instead, the Department pointed out that the Congressional route always has been taken in the past when other countries have been removed from Jackson-Vanik trade restrictions. This observation is both accurate and irrelevant. The fact that legislative action has always been used previously has no bearing on whether the President has statutory authority to achieve the same end without Congressional action. Whichever way the Court eventually rules, the case of Lozansky and Salvia v. Obama already has broken significant new legal ground. Even if the Court rules in favor of the Obama Administration on narrow procedural grounds, there is no question of the President’s legal authority to remove permanently Jackson-Vanik discrimination against Russia and thereby to ensure WTO access of American exports to Russia on a par with those of our foreign competitors. Why Does It Matter? Continued application of Jackson-Vanik matters for three reasons: First, as already indicated, the amendment hurts American interests more than Russia. Under WTO rules producers in other countries will be guaranteed access to one of the world’s most important emerging economies. American producers will not. Second, continued misapplication of the Jackson-Vanik amendment violates America’s own commitment to the rule of law. In 1974 the amendment set in place a legal standard, and that standard long since has been met. Yet – over two decades since the fall of communism – the discriminatory law holding hostage America’s trade relations with Russia remains in effect. Even though repeated administrations have claimed to be in favor of “graduating” Russia from Jackson-Vanik, the pretense continues that new and elusive legislation is required – despite the plain language of the law giving the President that authority. Laws should be enforced as they are written. Jackson-Vanik was meant to punish the USSR. Now it mainly hurts the U.S. Third, misuse of Jackson-Vanik against Russia sends a dangerous, negative message about U.S. intentions toward Russia and the future of the “reset” between what remain the world’s two greatest nuclear powers. Singling out Russia for trade discrimination signals that the United States still refuses full normalization of relations with Moscow – more than 20 years after the end of the Soviet regime! Congressional critics (and most of the Republican presidential candidates) are never short of reasons to criticize Russia on human rights, democratic reform, or other matters that can and should be debated on their own merits. Thus, the Administration’s pretense that Congressional action is needed not only bottles up U.S.-Russia trade ties but invites treatment of Russia as a political punching bag. Do political concerns lead to trade barriers with such paragons of democracy and human rights as China (graduated from the amendment in 2000) or Saudi Arabia (never subject to the amendment)? No. But Russia remains locked in a time-warp from the 1970s, still branded as the communist adversary that no longer exists. Mr. Obama, Tear Down This (Trade) Wall! Rather than taking a slap at President Obama, we – all Republicans but supporters of the Obama Administration’s “reset” with Russia – believe the Lozansky and Salvia v. Obama suit helps empower him either to use his existing authority to remove Russia from further Jackson-Vanik restrictions (other than a Congressional reporting requirement that has no effect on Russia’s trade status or on Russia’s WTO treatment of American products), or he can insist that Congress cease its obstructionism and do so itself. Given that Mr. Obama and his predecessors have had no qualms about encroaching on legal authority they don’t have – the power to make war, which properly belongs to Congress – continued reluctance to use clear statutory authority rightly belonging to the President remains a mystery. It’s time for President Obama to show he is willing to act on the positive statement issued from the White House last month. While as a matter of politics Congressional action to graduate Russia is preferable, as a matter of law the Obama Administration should come to the conclusion that the President can act on his own – and is prepared to do so unless Congress moves without further delay.

Empirically proven, Obama doesn’t think he has the authority

Reuters ‘9 (“U.S. Says Russia May Continue With Unilateral WTO Bid”, 7-9, http://kazworld.info/?p=1711)

Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov said on Tuesday that dropping the 1974 Jackson-Vanik amendment would be a priority for the United States administration. But Locke said the ball was now in Russia’s court and the U.S. administration now wanted to see Moscow easing some trade restrictions. “The president (Obama) made it very clear this is something he could not do unilaterally,” he said. “It requires congressional approval and the members of the Congress were looking for some sort of sign of true interest by the Russian government in encouraging U.S. investment and exports into Russia.”

2NC Impact Wall

The DA turns and outweighs case – Allison cites four impacts

1) Relations solve war- only existential risk-

Bostrom 2 (Nick, PhD Philosophy – Oxford University, “Existential Risks: Analyzing Human Extinction Scenarios”, Journal of Evolution and Technology, Vol. 9, March, http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html)

The unique challenge of existential risks Risks in this sixth category are a recent phenomenon. This is part of the reason why it is useful to distinguish them from other risks. We have not evolved mechanisms, either biologically or culturally, for managing such risks. Our intuitions and coping strategies have been shaped by our long experience with risks such as dangerous animals, hostile individuals or tribes, poisonous foods, automobile accidents, Chernobyl, Bhopal, volcano eruptions, earthquakes, draughts, World War I, World War II, epidemics of influenza, smallpox, black plague, and AIDS. These types of disasters have occurred many times and our cultural attitudes towards risk have been shaped by trial-and-error in managing such hazards. But tragic as such events are to the people immediately affected, in the big picture of things – from the perspective of humankind as a whole – even the worst of these catastrophes are **mere ripples** on the surface of the great sea of life. They haven’t significantly affected the total amount of human suffering or happiness or determined the long-term fate of our species. With the exception of a species-destroying comet or asteroid impact (an extremely rare occurrence), there were probably no significant existential risks in human history until the mid-twentieth century, and certainly none that it was within our power to do something about. The first manmade existential risk was the inaugural detonation of an atomic bomb. At the time, there was some concern that the explosion might start a runaway chain-reaction by “igniting” the atmosphere. Although we now know that such an outcome was physically impossible, it qualifies as an existential risk that was present at the time. For there to be a risk, given the knowledge and understanding available, it suffices that there is some subjective probability of an adverse outcome, even if it later turns out that objectively there was no chance of something bad happening. If we don’t know whether something is objectively risky or not, then it is risky in the subjective sense. The subjective sense is of course what we must base our decisions on.[[2]](http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html#_ftn2) At any given time we must use our best current subjective estimate of what the objective risk factors are.[[3]](http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html#_ftn3) A much greater existential risk emerged with the build-up of nuclear arsenals in the US and the USSR. An all-out nuclear war was a possibility with both a substantial probability and with consequences that might have been persistent enough to qualify as **global** and **terminal**. There was a real worry among those best acquainted with the information available at the time that a nuclear Armageddon would occur and that it might annihilate our species or permanently destroy human civilization.[[4]](http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html#_ftn4)  Russia and the US retain large nuclear arsenals that could be used in a future confrontation, either accidentally or deliberately. There is also a risk that other states may one day build up large nuclear arsenals. Note however that a smaller nuclear exchange, between India and Pakistan for instance, is not an existential risk, since it would not destroy or thwart humankind’s potential permanently. Such a war might however be a local terminal risk for the cities most likely to be targeted. Unfortunately, we shall see that nuclear Armageddon and comet or asteroid strikes are mere preludes to the existential risks that we will encounter in the 21st century.

2) Relations key to international agreements which solve prolif – causes extinction

Taylor -02 [Stuart Taylor, Senior Writer with the National Journal and editor at Newsweek, Legal Times, 9-16-2002]

The truth is, no matter what we do about Iraq, if we don't stop proliferation, another five or 10 potentially unstable nations may go nuclear before long, making it ever more likely that one or more bombs will be set off anonymously on our soil by terrorists or a terrorist government. Even an airtight missile defense would be useless against a nuke hidden in a truck, a shipping container, or a boat. [Continues…] Unless we get serious about stopping proliferation, we are headed for "a world filled with nuclear-weapons states, where every crisis threatens to go nuclear," where "the survival of civilization truly is in question from day to day," and where "it would be impossible to keep these weapons out of the hands of terrorists, religious cults, and criminal organizations." So writes Ambassador Thomas Graham Jr., a moderate Republican who served as a career arms-controller under six presidents and led the successful Clinton administration effort to extend the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. The only way to avoid such a grim future, he suggests in his memoir, Disarmament Sketches, is for the United States to lead an international coalition against proliferation by showing an unprecedented willingness to give up the vast majority of our own nuclear weapons, excepting only those necessary to deter nuclear attack by others.

3) Relations solve Russian nuclear sales to terrorists and are key to intel – risks extinction

Sid-Ahmed, 2004 (Mohamed, Managing Editor for Al-Ahali, “Extinction!” August 26-September 1, Issue no. 705, <http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2004/705/op5.htm>)

A nuclear attack by terrorists will be much more critical than Hiroshima and Nagazaki, even if -- and this is far from certain -- the weapons used are less harmful than those used then, Japan, at the time, with no knowledge of nuclear technology, had no choice but to capitulate. Today, the technology is a secret for nobody. So far, except for the two bombs dropped on Japan, nuclear weapons have been used only to threaten. Now we are at a stage where they can be detonated. This completely changes the rules of the game. We have reached a point where anticipatory measures can determine the course of events. Allegations of a terrorist connection can be used to justify anticipatory measures, including the invasion of a sovereign state like Iraq. As it turned out, these allegations, as well as the allegation that Saddam was harbouring WMD, proved to be unfounded. What would be the consequences of a nuclear attack by terrorists? Even if it fails, it would further exacerbate the negative features of the new and frightening world in which we are now living. Societies would close in on themselves, police measures would be stepped up at the expense of human rights, tensions between civilisations and religions would rise and ethnic conflicts would proliferate. It would also speed up the arms race and develop the awareness that a different type of world order is imperative if humankind is to survive. But the still more critical scenario is if the attack succeeds. This could lead to a third world war, from which no one will emerge victorious. Unlike a conventional war which ends when one side triumphs over another, this war will be without winners and losers. When nuclear pollution infects the whole planet, we will all be losers.

4) Russia key to global trade and economy – both impacts go nuclear

Austin ‘09 (Michael, Resident Scholar – American Enterprise Institute, and Desmond Lachman, Resident Fellow – American Enterprise Institute, “The Global Economy Unravels”, Forbes, 3-6, <http://www.aei.org/article/100187>)

Conversely, global policymakers do not seem to have grasped the downside risks to the global economy posed by a deteriorating domestic and international political environment. If the past is any guide, the souring of the political environment must be expected to fan the corrosive protectionist tendencies and nationalistic economic policy responses that are already all too much in evidence. After spending much of 2008 cheerleading the global economy, the International Monetary Fund now concedes that output in the world's advanced economies is expected to contract by as much as 2% in 2009. This would be the first time in the post-war period that output contracted in all of the world's major economies. The IMF is also now expecting only a very gradual global economic recovery in 2010, which will keep global unemployment at a high level. Sadly, the erstwhile rapidly growing emerging-market economies will not be spared by the ravages of the global recession. Output is already declining precipitously across Eastern and Central Europe as well as in a number of key Asian economies, like South Korea and Thailand. A number of important emerging-market countries like Ukraine seem to be headed for debt default, while a highly oil-dependent Russia seems to be on the cusp of a full-blown currency crisis. Perhaps of even greater concern is the virtual grinding to a halt of economic growth in China. The IMF now expects that China's growth rate will approximately halve to 6% in 2009. Such a growth rate would fall far short of what is needed to absorb the 20 million Chinese workers who migrate each year from the countryside to the towns in search of a better life. As a barometer of the political and social tensions that this grim world economic outlook portends, one needs look no further than the recent employment forecast of the International Labor Organization. The ILO believes that the global financial crisis will wipe out 30 million jobs worldwide in 2009, while in a worst case scenario as many as 50 million jobs could be lost. What do these trends mean in the short and medium term? The Great Depression showed how social and global chaos followed hard on economic collapse. The mere fact that parliaments across the globe, from America to Japan, are unable to make responsible, economically sound recovery plans suggests that they do not know what to do and are simply hoping for the least disruption. Equally worrisome is the adoption of more statist economic programs around the globe, and the concurrent decline of trust in free-market systems. The threat of instability is a pressing concern. China, until last year the world's fastest growing economy, just reported that 20 million migrant laborers lost their jobs. Even in the flush times of recent years, China faced upward of 70,000 labor uprisings a year. A sustained downturn poses grave and possibly immediate threats to Chinese internal stability. The regime in Beijing may be faced with a choice of repressing its own people or diverting their energies outward, leading to conflict with China's neighbors. Russia, an oil state completely dependent on energy sales, has had to put down riots in its Far East as well as in downtown Moscow. Vladimir Putin's rule has been predicated on squeezing civil liberties while providing economic largesse. If that devil's bargain falls apart, then wide-scale repression inside Russia, along with a continuing threatening posture toward Russia's neighbors, is likely. Even apparently stable societies face increasing risk and the threat of internal or possibly external conflict. As Japan's exports have plummeted by nearly 50%, one-third of the country's prefectures have passed emergency economic stabilization plans. Hundreds of thousands of temporary employees hired during the first part of this decade are being laid off. Spain's unemployment rate is expected to climb to nearly 20% by the end of 2010; Spanish unions are already protesting the lack of jobs, and the specter of violence, as occurred in the 1980s, is haunting the country. Meanwhile, in Greece, workers have already taken to the streets. Europe as a whole will face dangerously increasing tensions between native citizens and immigrants, largely from poorer Muslim nations, who have increased the labor pool in the past several decades. Spain has absorbed five million immigrants since 1999, while nearly 9% of Germany's residents have foreign citizenship, including almost 2 million Turks. The xenophobic labor strikes in the U.K. do not bode well for the rest of Europe. A prolonged global downturn, let alone a collapse, would dramatically raise tensions inside these countries. Couple that with possible protectionist legislation in the United States, unresolved ethnic and territorial disputes in all regions of the globe and a loss of confidence that world leaders actually know what they are doing. The result may be a series of small explosions that coalesce into a big bang.

2NC Domestic Impact wall

Relations outweigh–solve proliferation, terrorism, regional wars, protectionism and war – all culminate in extinction - Allison

Key to growth, aerospace and small farmers

Moscow Times 3/27/12 (Mike Brown is president of the National Chicken Council, a nonprofit U.S. trade association, Ditching Jackson-Vanik Will Benefit Chicken, http://www.themoscowtimes.com/opinion/article/ditching-jackson-vanik-will-benefit-chicken/455603.html)

If there is one thing the that U.S. Congress can agree on during an election year, it is a policy that will spur job creation, boost economic growth and be budget-neutral at the same time. Here is why authorizing permanent normal trade relations for Russia will accomplish all three. Members of the World Trade Organization formally approved late last year Russia's terms for membership in the organization during a three-day meeting of the WTO's ministerial conference in Geneva. Russia will take its seat at the WTO 30 days after notifying the organization that the State Duma has ratified the membership terms. First Deputy Prime Minister Igor Shuvalov has said he anticipates the accession agreement being sent to the Duma in May. In Russia, retail food and beverage sales are forecast to increase in real terms from just over $200 billion in 2010 to more than $240 billion by 2014 — a 20 percent increase. This is good news for U.S. food exporters as imports are expected to meet some of this growing consumer demand. But while Russia is home to 142 million consumers and maintains the world's ninth-largest economy by nominal value, it is the largest economy not yet formally subject to the global trading rules of the WTO. For U.S. companies to benefit from Russia's accession, it will be necessary for Congress to permanently remove Russia from the Jackson-Vanik amendment to the Trade Act of 1974 and authorize President Barack Obama to extend permanent normal trade relations to Russia. Russia in the past has used arbitrary sanitary and phytosanitary actions that lack scientific justification to limit or even halt U.S. poultry and meat imports. Without the ability to use the WTO's dispute settlement procedures and other mechanisms, the United States will be at a significant disadvantage if Russia chooses to evoke bogus sanitary and phytosanitary measures against U.S. poultry. As a WTO member, Russia is obligated to bind its agricultural import tariffs and tariff-rate quotas. But, if Russia misuses sanitary and phytosanitary provisions, the tariff bindings and tariff-rate quotas will become a secondary concern. Other world poultry competitors will undoubtedly step up and try to replace the United States if the Russian market is disrupted for U.S. poultry exports. The Office of the U.S. Trade Representative notes that U.S. farmers and exporters will have more certain and predictable market access as a result of Russia's commitment not to raise tariffs on any products above the negotiated rates and to apply nontariff measures in a uniform and transparent manner. The National Chicken Council urges Congress to approve permanent normal trade relations with Russia by mid-2012 to help assure the United States can continue to compete in the Russian poultry market. Exporting $300 million of poultry to Russia annually will provide better incomes for more U.S. workers and additional poultry to be produced by a growing number of family farmers across America. The chicken industry is certainly not the only beneficiary of granting permanent normal trade relations to Russia, as there is significant commercial opportunities for other U.S. exporters, including those businesses in the fruit, livestock, agriculture-equipment, aerospace, consumer-goods, high-tech instruments, construction-equipment, textiles and medical-equipment sectors, among others. Congress will not be voting on Russia's WTO accession, rather it will be voting on giving the United States equal accession to general tariff reductions, market-opening measures and the ability of U.S. interests, such as poultry, to seek trade relief, if necessary, through the WTO. A vote for permanent normal trade relations with Russia is a vote for U.S. job creation and economic growth. It makes no sense for the United States to lose access to the world's ninth-largest economy over an outdated law.

Wars go nuclear – competitiveness solves escalation

Friedberg & Schoenfeld 8 (Aaron Friedberg is a professor of politics and international relations at Princeton University's Woodrow Wilson School. Gabriel Schoenfeld, senior editor of Commentary, is a visiting scholar at the Witherspoon Institute in Princeton, N.J., “The Dangers of a Diminished America,” Wall Street Journal, Ocbtober 21, 2008,http://online.wsj.com/article/SB122455074012352571.html]

With the global financial system in serious trouble, is America's geostrategic dominance likely to diminish? If so, what would that mean? One immediate implication of the crisis that began on Wall Street and spread across the world is that the primary instruments of U.S. foreign policy will be crimped. The next president will face an entirely new and adverse fiscal position. Estimates of this year's federal budget deficit already show that it has jumped $237 billion from last year, to $407 billion. With families and businesses hurting, there will be calls for various and expensive domestic relief programs. In the face of this onrushing river of red ink, both Barack Obama and John McCain have been reluctant to lay out what portions of their programmatic wish list they might defer or delete. Only Joe Biden has suggested a possible reduction -- foreign aid. This would be one of the few popular cuts, but in budgetary terms it is a mere grain of sand. Still, Sen. Biden's comment hints at where we may be headed: toward a major reduction in America's world role, and perhaps even a new era of financially-induced isolationism. Pressures to cut defense spending, and to dodge the cost of waging two wars, already intense before this crisis, are likely to mount. Despite the success of the surge, the war in Iraq remains deeply unpopular. Precipitous withdrawal -- attractive to a sizable swath of the electorate before the financial implosion -- might well become even more popular with annual war bills running in the hundreds of billions. Protectionist sentiments are sure to grow stronger as jobs disappear in the coming slowdown. Even before our current woes, calls to save jobs by restricting imports had begun to gather support among many Democrats and some Republicans. In a prolonged recession, gale-force winds of protectionism will blow. Then there are the dolorous consequences of a potential collapse of the world's financial architecture. For decades now, Americans have enjoyed the advantages of being at the center of that system. The worldwide use of the dollar, and the stability of our economy, among other things, made it easier for us to run huge budget deficits, as we counted on foreigners to pick up the tab by buying dollar-denominated assets as a safe haven. Will this be possible in the future? Meanwhile, traditional foreign-policy challenges are multiplying. The threat from al Qaeda and Islamic terrorist affiliates has not been extinguished. Iran and North Korea are continuing on their bellicose paths, while Pakistan and Afghanistan are progressing smartly down the road to chaos. Russia's new militancy and China's seemingly relentless rise also give cause for concern. If America now tries to pull back from the world stage, it will leave a dangerous power vacuum. The stabilizing effects of our presence in Asia, our continuing commitment to Europe, and our position as defender of last resort for Middle East energy sources and supply lines could all be placed at risk. In such a scenario there are shades of the 1930s, when global trade and finance ground nearly to a halt, the peaceful democracies failed to cooperate, and aggressive powers led by the remorseless fanatics who rose up on the crest of economic disaster exploited their divisions. Today we run the risk that rogue states may choose to become ever more reckless with their nuclear toys, just at our moment of maximum vulnerability. The aftershocks of the financial crisis will almost certainly rock our principal strategic competitors even harder than they will rock us. The dramatic free fall of the Russian stock market has demonstrated the fragility of a state whose economic performance hinges on high oil prices, now driven down by the global slowdown. China is perhaps even more fragile, its economic growth depending heavily on foreign investment and access to foreign markets. Both will now be constricted, inflicting economic pain and perhaps even sparking unrest in a country where political legitimacy rests on progress in the long march to prosperity. None of this is good news if the authoritarian leaders of these countries seek to divert attention from internal travails with external adventures. As for our democratic friends, the present crisis comes when many European nations are struggling to deal with decades of anemic growth, sclerotic governance and an impending demographic crisis. Despite its past dynamism, Japan faces similar challenges. India is still in the early stages of its emergence as a world economic and geopolitical power. What does this all mean? There is no substitute for America on the world stage. The choice we have before us is between the potentially disastrous effects of disengagement and the stiff price tag of continued American leadership. Are we up for the task? The American economy has historically demonstrated remarkable resilience. Our market-oriented ideology, entrepreneurial culture, flexible institutions and favorable demographic profile should serve us well in whatever trials lie ahead. The American people, too, have shown reserves of resolve when properly led. But experience after the Cold War era -- poorly articulated and executed policies, divisive domestic debates and rising anti-Americanism in at least some parts of the world -- appear to have left these reserves diminished. A recent survey by the Chicago Council on World Affairs found that 36% of respondents agreed that the U.S. should "stay out of world affairs," the highest number recorded since this question was first asked in 1947. The economic crisis could be the straw that breaks the camel's back.

Small farms are key to human survival

Boyce 4 (James K., Professor of Economics – Political Economy Research Institute and Ph.D. – Oxford University, “A Future for Small Farms? Biodiversity and Sustainable Agriculture”, July, http://www.peri.umass.edu/fileadmin/pdf/working\_papers/working\_papers\_51-100/WP86.pdf)

There is a future for small farms. Or, to be more precise, there can be and should be a future for them. Given the dependence of ‘modern’ low-diversity agriculture on ‘traditional’ high-diversity agriculture, the long-term food security of humankind will depend on small farms and their continued provision of the environmental service of in situ conservation of crop genetic diversity. Policies to support small farms can be advocated, therefore, not merely as a matter of sympathy, or nostalgia, or equity. Such policies are also a matter of human survival. The diversity that underpins the sustainability of world agriculture did not fall from the sky. It was bequeathed to us by the 400 generations of farmers who have carried on the process of artificial selection since plants were first domesticated. Until recently, we took this diversity for granted. The ancient reservoirs of crop genetic diversity, plant geneticist Jack Harlan (1975, p. 619) wrote three decades ago, ‘seemed to most people as inexhaustible as oil in Arabia.’ Yet, Harlan warned, ‘the speed which enormous crop diversity can be essentially wiped out is astonishing.’ The central thesis of this essay is that efforts to conserve in situ diversity must go hand-in-hand with efforts to support the small farmers around the world who sustain this diversity. Economists and environmentalists alike by and large have neglected this issue. In thrall to a myopic notion of efficiency, many economists fail to appreciate that diversity is the **sine qua non** of resilience and sustainability. In thrall to a romantic notion of ‘wilderness,’ many environmentalists fail to appreciate that agricultural biodiversity is just as valuable – indeed, arguably more valuable from the standpoint of human well-being – as the diversity found in tropical rainforests or the spotted owls found in the ancient forests of the northwestern United States.

Aerospace sustains air power

Thompson 9 (David, President – American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, “The Aerospace Workforce”, Federal News Service, 12-10, Lexis)

Aerospace systems are of considerable importance to U.S. national security, economic prosperity, technological vitality, and global leadership. Aeronautical and space systems protect our citizens, armed forces, and allies abroad. They connect the farthest corners of the world with safe and efficient air transportation and satellite communications, and they monitor the Earth, explore the solar system, and study the wider universe. The U.S. aerospace sector also contributes in major ways to America's economic output and high- technology employment. Aerospace research and development and manufacturing companies generated approximately $240 billion in sales in 2008, or nearly 1.75 percent of our country's gross national product. They currently employ about 650,000 people throughout our country. U.S. government agencies and departments engaged in aerospace research and operations add another 125,000 employees to the sector's workforce, bringing the total to over 775,000 people. Included in this number are more than 200,000 engineers and scientists -- one of the largest concentrations of technical brainpower on Earth. However, the U.S. aerospace workforce is now facing the most serious demographic challenge in his 100-year history. Simply put, today, many more older, experienced professionals are retiring from or otherwise leaving our industrial and governmental aerospace workforce than early career professionals are entering it. This imbalance is expected to become even more severe over the next five years as the final members of the Apollo-era generation of engineers and scientists complete 40- or 45-year careers and transition to well-deserved retirements. In fact, around 50 percent of the current aerospace workforce will be eligible for retirement within just the next five years. Meanwhile, the supply of younger aerospace engineers and scientists entering the industry is woefully insufficient to replace the mounting wave of retirements and other departures that we see in the near future. In part, this is the result of broader technical career trends as engineering and science graduates from our country's universities continue a multi-decade decline, even as the demand for their knowledge and skills in aerospace and other industries keeps increasing. Today, only about 15 percent of U.S. students earn their first college degree in engineering or science, well behind the 40 or 50 percent levels seen in many European and Asian countries. Due to the dual-use nature of aerospace technology and the limited supply of visas available to highly-qualified non-U.S. citizens, our industry's ability to hire the best and brightest graduates from overseas is also severely constrained. As a result, unless effective action is taken to reverse current trends, the U.S. aerospace sector is expected to experience a dramatic decrease in its technical workforce over the next decade. Your second question concerns the implications of a cutback in human spaceflight programs. AIAA's view on this is as follows. While U.S. human spaceflight programs directly employ somewhat less than 10 percent of our country's aerospace workers, its influence on attracting and motivating tomorrow's aerospace professionals is much greater than its immediate employment contribution. For nearly 50 years the excitement and challenge of human spaceflight have been tremendously important factors in the decisions of generations of young people to prepare for and to pursue careers in the aerospace sector. This remains true today, as indicated by hundreds of testimonies AIAA members have recorded over the past two years, a few of which I'll show in brief video interviews at the end of my statement. Further evidence of the catalytic role of human space missions is found in a recent study conducted earlier this year by MIT which found that 40 percent of current aerospace engineering undergraduates cited human space programs as the main reason they chose this field of study. Therefore, I think it can be predicted with high confidence that a major cutback in U.S. human space programs would be substantially detrimental to the future of the aerospace workforce. Such a cutback would put even greater stress on an already weakened strategic sector of our domestic high-technology workforce. Your final question centers on other issues that should be considered as decisions are made on the funding and direction for NASA, particularly in the human spaceflight area. In conclusion, AIAA offers the following suggestions in this regard. Beyond the previously noted critical influence on the future supply of aerospace professionals, administration and congressional leaders should also consider the collateral damage to the space industrial base if human space programs were substantially curtailed. Due to low annual production rates and highly-specialized product requirements, the domestic supply chain for space systems is relatively fragile. Many second- and third-tier suppliers in particular operate at marginal volumes today, so even a small reduction in their business could force some critical suppliers to exit this sector. Human space programs represent around 20 percent of the $47 billion in total U.S. space and missile systems sales from 2008. Accordingly, a major cutback in human space spending could have large and highly adverse ripple effects throughout commercial, defense, and scientific space programs as well, potentially triggering a series of disruptive changes in the common industrial supply base that our entire space sector relies on.

Global WMD conflict

Tellis 98 (Ashley, Senior Political Scientist – RAND, Sources of Conflict in the 21st Century, http://www.rand.org/publications/MR/MR897/MR897.chap3.pdf)

This subsection attempts to synthesize some of the key operational implications distilled from the analyses relating to the rise of Asia and the potential for conflict in each of its constituent regions. The first key implication derived from the analysis of trends in Asia suggests that American air and space power will continue to remain critical for conventional and unconventional deterrence in Asia. This argument is justified by the fact that several subregions of the continent still harbor the potential for full-scale conventional war. This potential is most conspicuous on the Korean peninsula and, to a lesser degree, in South Asia, the Persian Gulf, and the South China Sea. In some of these areas, such as Korea and the Persian Gulf, the United States has clear treaty obligations and, therefore, has preplanned the use of air power should contingencies arise. U.S. Air Force assets could also be called upon for operations in some of these other areas. In almost all these cases, U.S. air power would be at the forefront of an American politico-military response because (a) of the vast distances on the Asian continent; (b) the diverse range of operational platforms available to the U.S. Air Force, a capability unmatched by any other country or service; (c) the possible unavailability of naval assets in close proximity, particularly in the context of surprise contingencies; and (d) the heavy payload that can be carried by U.S. Air Force platforms. These platforms can exploit speed, reach, and high operating tempos to sustain continual operations until the political objectives are secured. The entire range of warfighting capability—fighters, bombers, electronic warfare (EW), suppression of enemy air defense (SEAD), combat support platforms such as AWACS and J-STARS, and tankers—are relevant in the Asia-Pacific region, because many of the regional contingencies will involve armed operations against large, fairly modern, conventional forces, most of which are built around large land armies, as is the case in Korea, China-Taiwan, India-Pakistan, and the Persian Gulf. In addition to conventional combat, the demands of unconventional deterrence will increasingly confront the U.S. Air Force in Asia. The Korean peninsula, China, and the Indian subcontinent are already arenas of WMD proliferation. While emergent nuclear capabilities continue to receive the most public attention, chemical and biological warfare threats will progressively become future problems. The delivery systems in the region are increasing in range and diversity. China already targets the continental United States with ballistic missiles. North Korea can threaten northeast Asia with existing Scud-class theater ballistic missiles. India will acquire the capability to produce ICBM-class delivery vehicles, and both China and India will acquire long-range cruise missiles during the time frames examined in this report.

Ext: Solves Russian Relations

Repeal’s key to all areas of cooperation --- spills over to security ties

Teplitskaia ‘02 (Helen, Founder and President – American-Russian Chamber of Commerce and Adjunct Professor – Northwestern University Kellogg Graduate School of Management, “Jackson-Vanik: Fighting an Enemy that No Longer Exists”, <http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=2&cts=1330788184098&> ved=0CDUQFjAB&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.arcci.org%2Fspotlight%2Fspotlight%2520files%2Finterviews%2Fjackson%2520final.doc&ei=6DZST5f3CIH3gge6wZjRDQ&usg=AFQjCNEd\_kXiBnhBHw4meSIuYO1rhYyUMA&sig2=jgOFOjKtllkuIrkNz0oyJg)

Finally, there are powerful geopolitical incentives to rescinding Jackson-Vanik. In the new war against global terrorism the U.S. needs support from Russia on the UN Security Council and in Central Asia. Despite domestic opposition, president Putin has already taken numerous steps to enhance US-Russian security cooperation. Lifting Jackson-Vanik would send a message to all Russia that the U.S. is serious about forging a stronger alliance.

In the new circumstances facing the two countries, and with an urgent need for stronger commercial, political and security cooperation, it is well past time to repeal a cold war relic that is not only outdated but counterproductive.

Commercial ties underpin security and political cooperation --- JV repeal’s key

Aslund ‘11 (Anders, Ph.D. – University of Oxford and Senior Fellow – Peterson Institute for International Economics and Gary Clyde Hufbauer, Senior Fellow – Peterson Institute for International Economics, “The United States Should Establish Permanent Normal Trade Relations with Russia”, IEE Policy Brief, November, http://www.iie.com/publications/pb/pb11-20.pdf)

Russia’s joining the WTO does not require any US legislative action. All conditions for Russia’s accession have been settled. The Russian State Duma has until June 15, 2012 to ratify its accession. Thirty days after Russia’s notification to the WTO of its ratification, Russia will become the 154th member of the WTO. However, US benefits of Russia’s accession to the WTO are not automatic. They will materialize only if the United States Congress grants permanent normal trade relations (PNTR) status to Russia—by repealing application to Russia of the 37-year-old Jackson-Vanik Amendment, which bars favorable trade relations with countries that restrict emigration. President Barack Obama, in a statement issued November 10 after the Working Party’s preliminary approval of Russian accession, said he looked forward to working with Congress “to end the application of the Jackson-Vanik Amendment to Russia in order to ensure that American firms and American exporters will enjoy the same benefits of Russian WTO membership as their international competitors.” It is imperative that Congress respond constructively in the same spirit of bipartisanship that led to the successful approval earlier this year of the Colombia, Korea, and Panama trade accords. Political wrangling, misjudgment, and miscalculations must not be allowed to cost the United States a significant new source of economic growth and cooperation in the future. WHAT THE UNITED STATES WILL GAIN FROM GRANTING RUSSIA PNTR

The potential benefits to the US economy from Russia’s WTO accession are substantial but the United States can enjoy them only if it grants Russia PNTR. US exports to Russia could double over the next five years—from $9 billion in 2010 to $19 billion—adding jobs in the services, agriculture, manufacturing, and high-tech sectors. More generally, with Russia’s accession to the WTO and the United States granting PNTR to Russia, US-Russia commercial relations will be set on a sounder and friendlier footing, facilitating cooperation on national security and political issues. By strengthening the rules-based global trading system, WTO accession and PNTR will discourage Russia from undertaking protectionist measures.

JV collapses US/Russian trade ties and invites follow-on Congressional measures that deck relations

Lozansky ‘12 (Dr. Edward, President and Founder – American University in Moscow, “Time to End an Obstacle to U.S. Access to the World's 9th-Largest Economy”, Russia Blog, 1-19, http://www.russiablog.org/2012/01/time-to-end-an-jackson-vanik-obama-executive.php)

Why Does It Matter? Continued application of Jackson-Vanik matters for three reasons: First, as already indicated, the amendment hurts American interests more than Russia. Under WTO rules producers in other countries will be guaranteed access to one of the world's most important emerging economies. American producers will not. Second, continued misapplication of the Jackson-Vanik amendment violates America's own commitment to the rule of law. In 1974 the amendment set in place a legal standard, and that standard long since has been met. Yet - over two decades since the fall of communism - the discriminatory law holding hostage America's trade relations with Russia remains in effect. Even though repeated administrations have claimed to be in favor of "graduating" Russia from Jackson-Vanik, the pretense continues that new and elusive legislation is required - despite the plain language of the law giving the President that authority. Laws should be enforced as they are written. Third, misuse of Jackson-Vanik against Russia sends a dangerous, negative message about U.S. intentions toward Russia and the future of the "reset" between what remain the world's two greatest nuclear powers. Singling out Russia for trade discrimination signals that the United States still refuses full normalization of relations with Moscow - more than 20 years after the end of the Soviet regime! Congressional critics (and most of the Republican presidential candidates) are never short of reasons to criticize Russia on human rights, democratic reform, or other matters that can and should be debated on their own merits. Thus, the Administration's pretense that Congressional action is needed not only bottles up U.S.-Russia trade ties but invites treatment of Russia as a political punching bag. Do political concerns lead to trade barriers with such paragons of democracy and human rights as China (graduated from the amendment in 2000) or Saudi Arabia (never subject to the amendment)? No. But Russia remains locked in a time-warp from the 1970s, still branded as the communist adversary that no longer exists.

JV’s a symbolic issue and Russia’s top priority

Englund ‘11 (Will, Pulitzer Prize Winning Moscow-Based Columnist – WP, “Russia Close to Gaining Membership to WTO”, Washington Post, 11-9, Lexis)

WTO membership - which would become official in mid-December if things go smoothly in Geneva - is one of the benefits that Russia was seeking in the "reset" of relations with the United States. If it happens, that would leave as Moscow's one remaining major goal a repeal of the Jackson-Vanik amendment, a Soviet-era law that ties trade to Russia's treatment of religious minorities. Jackson-Vanik is a significant, if symbolic, irritant to the Russians. The chances of its repeal seem to be fading.

Repeal of Jackson-Vanik is key to continued US-Russia relations.

Gvosdev ‘12 (World Politics Review, Nikolas K. Gvosdev is the former editor of the National Interest, and a frequent foreign policy commentator in both the print and broadcast media, http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/11441/the-realist-prism-resetting-the-u-s-russia-reset)

An upcoming decision-point could offer a good indication of what to expect. The World Trade Organization is expected to ratify Russia’s accession later this spring. However, American firms will not be able to take advantage of Russia's WTO membership as long as U.S. trade with Russia is still subject to the Cold War-era Jackson-Vanik amendment. Congress would first have to agree to "graduate" Russia from the terms of the legislation, but many members remain hesitant. An unofficial swap would see Russia given permanent normal trading relations status, but with new legislation applying "smart sanctions" against specific Russian individuals and entities accused of condoning human rights abuses, most notably in the death of Russian lawyer Sergei Magnitsky. Whether this Solomonic compromise could work, however, remains to be seen. The Russian government has already responded very negatively to sanctions unilaterally imposed by the State Department and may be quite unwilling to accept such a compromise, even if it means graduating Russia from Jackson-Vanik. At the same time, there remains resistance within Congress to "giving up" one of its last remaining tools to pressure Russia on a whole range of issues, from chicken imports to religious freedom. The fate of the Jackson-Vanik amendment, therefore, is the canary in the coal mine for U.S.-Russia relations. If a successful repeal is negotiated, it bodes well for regenerating the relationship. However, if Obama, like George W. Bush before him, is unable to secure Russia’s graduation, this could end up being a fatal blow to the whole idea of the reset.

Symbolic irritant that spills over to the rest of the relationship

Miller ‘11 (Jacqueline, senior associate, “The WTO and the Reset” EastWest Institute -- April 8 --http://www.ewi.info/wto-and-reset)

It took Barack Obama several months and some tough lobbying to finally win congressional approval for the New START treaty last December, which was seen as the key to the administration’s reset with Russia. Another fight could already be brewing over Obama’s support for Russia’s World Trade Organization (WTO) membership, which is the next big goal of the administration’s Russia policy. Citing Russian human rights abuses and lack of democratic development, congressional critics want to keep Russia subject to the Jackson-Vanik amendment—a Cold War relic that, if left in place, would effectively **nullify** both Russian and U.S. **gains from Russian WTO membership**. But, somewhat surprisingly, the administration could develop a win-win outcome by taking a page from its dealings with China, another country whose human rights practices stir congressional unease. The Jackson-Vanik amendment to the 1974 Trade Act denies permanent normal trade relations (PNTR) to non-market economies that restrict emigration. The amendment was passed unanimously by both houses of Congress to pressure the Soviet Union to allow Soviet Jews to emigrate. In 1994, the Clinton administration found Russia to be in full compliance with the amendment’s freedom-of-emigration requirements. And in 2002, the United States officially began describing Russia as a market economy. Presidents Clinton, Bush, and now Obama all declared their intention to work with Congress to repeal the legislation as it applies to Russia, but no action has been taken. The reason: Congress still sees Jackson-Vanik as a lever to punish Russia for its human rights record even when the executive branch is prioritizing the security aspects of the bilateral relationship. Jackson-Vanik’s ongoing application has been a major symbolic irritant in the relationship, even though the United States has granted Russia a waiver every year since 1992. But once Russia joins the WTO, which could happen next year, Jackson-Vanik will go from being a symbol of mistrust to inflicting actual harm both to Russia and the U.S.-Russia relationship.

Ext: Solves Russian Relations

JV collapses US/Russian trade ties and invites follow-on Congressional measures that deck relations

Lozansky 12 (Dr. Edward, President and Founder – American University in Moscow, “Time to End an Obstacle to U.S. Access to the World's 9th-Largest Economy”, Russia Blog, 1-19, http://www.russiablog.org/2012/01/time-to-end-an-jackson-vanik-obama-executive.php)

Why Does It Matter? Continued application of Jackson-Vanik matters for three reasons: First, as already indicated, the amendment hurts American interests more than Russia. Under WTO rules producers in other countries will be guaranteed access to one of the world's most important emerging economies. American producers will not. Second, continued misapplication of the Jackson-Vanik amendment violates America's own commitment to the rule of law. In 1974 the amendment set in place a legal standard, and that standard long since has been met. Yet - over two decades since the fall of communism - the discriminatory law holding hostage America's trade relations with Russia remains in effect. Even though repeated administrations have claimed to be in favor of "graduating" Russia from Jackson-Vanik, the pretense continues that new and elusive legislation is required - despite the plain language of the law giving the President that authority. Laws should be enforced as they are written. Third, misuse of Jackson-Vanik against Russia sends a dangerous, negative message about U.S. intentions toward Russia and the future of the "reset" between what remain the world's two greatest nuclear powers. Singling out Russia for trade discrimination signals that the United States still refuses full normalization of relations with Moscow - more than 20 years after the end of the Soviet regime! Congressional critics (and most of the Republican presidential candidates) are never short of reasons to criticize Russia on human rights, democratic reform, or other matters that can and should be debated on their own merits. Thus, the Administration's pretense that Congressional action is needed not only bottles up U.S.-Russia trade ties but invites treatment of Russia as a political punching bag. Do political concerns lead to trade barriers with such paragons of democracy and human rights as China (graduated from the amendment in 2000) or Saudi Arabia (never subject to the amendment)? No. But Russia remains locked in a time-warp from the 1970s, still branded as the communist adversary that no longer exists.

Repeal of Jackson-Vanik is key to relations

Gvosdev 2/10/12 (World Politics Review, Nikolas K. Gvosdev is the former editor of the National Interest, and a frequent foreign policy commentator in both the print and broadcast media, http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/11441/the-realist-prism-resetting-the-u-s-russia-reset)

An upcoming decision-point could offer a good indication of what to expect. The World Trade Organization is expected to ratify Russia’s accession later this spring. However, American firms will not be able to take advantage of Russia's WTO membership as long as U.S. trade with Russia is still subject to the Cold War-era Jackson-Vanik amendment. Congress would first have to agree to "graduate" Russia from the terms of the legislation, but many members remain hesitant. An unofficial swap would see Russia given permanent normal trading relations status, but with new legislation applying "smart sanctions" against specific Russian individuals and entities accused of condoning human rights abuses, most notably in the death of Russian lawyer Sergei Magnitsky. Whether this Solomonic compromise could work, however, remains to be seen. The Russian government has already responded very negatively to sanctions unilaterally imposed by the State Department and may be quite unwilling to accept such a compromise, even if it means graduating Russia from Jackson-Vanik. At the same time, there remains resistance within Congress to "giving up" one of its last remaining tools to pressure Russia on a whole range of issues, from chicken imports to religious freedom. The fate of the Jackson-Vanik amendment, therefore, is the canary in the coal mine for U.S.-Russia relations. If a successful repeal is negotiated, it bodes well for regenerating the relationship. However, if Obama, like George W. Bush before him, is unable to secure Russia’s graduation, this could end up being a fatal blow to the whole idea of the reset.

AT: Relations Resilient

No resiliency, crises risk collapse and escalation of tension

Stratfor ‘12 (“Russia and the United States: Pushing Tensions to the Limit?”, 2-6, http://www.stratfor.com/analysis/russia-and-united-states-pushing-tensions-limit)

But Moscow will be careful not to take the threat so far that it triggers a massive crisis and breakdown between the United States and Russia. Moscow might want to make the Europeans uncomfortable during the U.S.-Russian standoff, but it does not want to create a backlash and prompt the Europeans to unify with the United States over regional security. Moreover, Russia does not want Afghanistan to spin out of control, since unrest in the country most likely would spill over into Central Asia. Russia also cannot compete with the United States when it comes to a military buildup.

The Kremlin is unsure of future U.S. policy on Russia, since the U.S. presidential election is also on the horizon. Russia remembers well how ill-prepared it was for a shift in Washington when Ronald Reagan became president after Jimmy Carter. This is not to say such a shift will occur in November, but Moscow cannot be certain that it will not happen. Moscow has an opportunity to escalate tensions with the United States after Russia's presidential election, but Moscow can only push the crisis so far without creating a massive break it cannot control.

Issues spill over

Graham ‘11 (Thomas E., Ph.D. and Senior Associate – Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, “Russia Back at the Center of U.S. Foreign Policy”, http://www.amacad.org/russia/russiaConference.pdf)

First, common challenges do not necessarily translate into common interests, and even where interests are shared, they often rank differently in each country’s priorities. • Iran provides an apt illustration. Russia shares the American interest in preventing Iran from developing nuclear weapons, but not our sense of urgency. At the same time, it fears an American or Israeli military strike that would further destabilize the region along Russia’s southern border, and it is concerned that tough sanctions are a path to a military strike (as was the case with Iraq). While it supports American engagement with Iran, it is concerned that normalization of relations would jeopardize Russia’s own commercial relations with that country and could turn it into a strong competitor in European gas markets, where Russia earns a considerable share of its state revenues. Obtaining Russian support for our approach on the nuclear issue will require taking into account Russia’s full range of interests in Iran, as well as other matters (see the next point). Second, building cooperation will require trade-offs. As much as we would like to work on discrete issues on their merits, for Moscow everything is linked. We will not persuade it to help us on our priorities, unless we are prepared to help it achieve its goals (or, at a minimum, not obstruct its efforts). This will require some tough choices.

Collapse possible

Perry and Scowcroft ‘09 (William and brent, Chairs CFR, april, “US Nuclear Weapons Policy”)

The dangers of nuclear proliferation and nuclear terrorism are real and imminent, and any serious effort to reduce them will require the leadership of the United States. The risk of a new Cold War–like hostility developing between the United States and Russia is also real, and efforts to reduce it will require opening a positive strategic dialogue with Russia, at the same time hedging against the possibility that such a dialogue may not be successful. In short, the nuclear policy of the United States should be to lead when possible and hedge when necessary.

Impact Booster: Relations Brink

Russian relations on the brink – JV repeal key

Voice of Russia ‘11

The decision by the US Senate to vote down Michael McFaul, the delay of voting on the Jackson-Vanik amendment and the stand-off on the American planned missile defense system in Europe show that the reload of the Russian-US relations has not been going that well. The fault here is mostly on the US. Not all the politicians in the US have scrapped the Cold War attitudes. They should be reminded that the Cold War ended 20 years ago with the collapse of the Soviet Union. It is time for a real reload, favorable for both states.

A2: No Relations- Alt Cause

JV Solves Alt Causes

Forbes ’12 (<http://www.forbes.com/sites/markadomanis/2012/03/16/jon-kyls-predictable-and-distressing-foolishness-on-russia/>)

A larger and deeper economic relationship with Russia is precisely what people, like Kyl, who feign concern over its foreign policy ought to be interested in building. Right now Russia’s trade relations with the US are paltry and the Russians have little incentive to take our interests into account because there is very little “ballast“ to the relationship. A Russia that is more linked to the US economically will, by definition, be more receptive to US concerns because it will have something to lose. Additionally, closer economic ties between the two countries will inevitably lead to a reduction in mutual distrust and suspicion: there will be disagreements, even serious ones, but they can be overcome so long as the two sides have some confidence in each other.

A2: JV Doesn’t Spillover

JV keep to deep ties that spill over

VOA ‘12 (<http://www.voanews.com/policy/editorials/americas/Gordon-On-US-Russian-Relations--136702383.html>)

“We recognize that the United States and Russia have many common interests, and we remain guided by the belief that we can engage effectively with Russia’s government and civil society ... without checking our values at the door,” U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs Philip Gordon said recently in his testimony to the U.S. Congress. “Our aim now is to deepen . . . and widen the arc of our cooperation. At the same time, the United States will continue to be outspoken about areas where we disagree with Russia, such as human rights and democracy concerns.” The benefits of engagement are particularly evident in the foreign policy arena. “We signed the New START Treaty. We brought into force a 123 Agreement on civilian nuclear cooperation, and agreed to dispose of enough weapons-grade plutonium for 17,000 nuclear warheads,” Assistant Secretary Gordon said. “We are both key participants in the Six Party talks ... to achieve the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula. We are working together to hold Iran to its international non-proliferation obligations ... Russia remains an important partner ... working to implement the vision for Middle East peace outlined by President Obama in his May 2011 remarks. The United States and Russia still need to expand their economic ties. While two-way trade grew last year, they still reached just $31 billion – less than one percent of total U.S. trade. Russia received its invitation to accede to the World Trade Organization in December and is expected to join the organization this year. “For American companies to take advantage of [Russia’s] market opening, Congress must terminate the application of the Jackson-Vanik Amendment and extend permanent normal trading relations to Russia,” Assistant Secretary Gordon said. President Obama is committed to working with the U.S. Congress to achieve this goal.

A2: Relations Impossible

Russia is willing to cooperate, this issue is key to their trade policy

Kliger ‘10 (Dr. Sam, American Jewish Committee, “The Jackson-Vanik Amendment and U.S.-Russian Relations”, AJC, 2-4, http://www.ajcrussian.org/site/apps/nlnet/content2.aspx?c=chLMK3PKLsF&b=7718799&ct=8023853)

First, fully acknowledging the fact that there are serious violations of human rights in contemporary Russia, there is also a need to acknowledge Russia as a new state and a new player on international arena, a state which is not identical or similar to the Soviet Union. It would be inaccurate to equate today’s Russia with the Soviet Union and to apply approaches similar to those used in dealing with the Soviet Union. Similarities between Russia and the USSR, that some scholars, journalists, and human rights activists emphasize, are rather superficial. Let’s look at a bigger picture. 1) State-sponsored anti-Semitism in Russia simply does not exist; 2) Freedom of immigration is not an issue for the last 20 years; 3) With some minor restrictions and state’s support for the Russian Orthodox Church, religion in Russia can be freely exercised; 4) While it is true that most of the media, and especially national TV channels, are under state control, some basic elements of freedom of press exist (Novaya Gazeta – independent newspaper, often critical of the government; Vremya Novostey – liberal small-circulation newspaper; Nezavisimaya Gazeta – privately owned newspaper; Kommersant; radio Ekho Moskvy –Gazprom owned, editorially independent station; Gazeta.Ru – privately owned web site, often critical of the government; many of the book publishing houses, and most importantly the Internet – are examples).[6] 5) While many of the big corporations are also controlled by the government, small and middle-size business enterprises are privately owned and operated (with corruption as an imminent factor) and people explore the right of ownership and exercise entrepreneurship; 6) With all the negativities of the authoritarian regime of Putin-Medvedev, majority of people in Russia support the sense of “stability and order” associated with this regime (Putin’s approval rating fluctuated between 70% and 85% during all 8 years of his two terms rule, and Medvedev enjoyed a similar rating during 2009, according to the most independent Levada Polling Center)[7]; 7) With some notorious restrictions and pressure that the Russian government applied to NGO’s, many domestic and international human rights groups successfully operate, though in sometimes hostile environment; 8) On international arena, though Russia is still nourishing its imperial ambitions (of which Georgia is a current example) and playing tricky games on some issues like Iranian nuclear aspirations, it is willing to cooperate on some important problems such as arms control, space exploration, and nuclear nonproliferation. Russia—and this is now widely recognized—is not a strategic threat to the U.S.; it is rather an underestimated natural ally.

Co-op’s possible, removing irritants like JV’s key

Sestanovich ‘11 (Stephen, Senior Fellow for Russian and Eurasian Studies – Council on Foreign Relations, “Time to Pause the Reset: Defending U.S. Interests in the Face of Russian Aggression”, Congressional Documents and Publications, 7-7, Lexis)

Three years ago, many experts - in both countries --believed that Russian-American relations were in for a prolonged chill. In the wake of Russian aggression against Georgia, some Washington commentators feared that Moscow's foreign policy might be entering a new phase of confrontation, even conquest. Russian forecasters claimed that the West was out to weaken (and more excitable ones said, to dismember) their country. These expectations have been almost entirely confounded. Russia and the United States have ratified and begun to implement a new treaty on strategic arms reductions. They have cooperated in support of NATO military operations in Afghanistan. They joined in passing a new round of sanctions against Iran in the U.N. Security Council. They have collaborated in efforts to control the proliferation of fissile materials and to limit international narcotics trafficking. Next week, the Russian foreign minister and Secretary of State Clinton will sign agreements on two contentious issues of long standing - visas and child adoptions. Even popular attitudes have seen a change. American officials like to point out that last year the percentage of Russians who had a "favorable" view of the United States reached its highest level - 60% --in a decade and a half. Time and again during this revival of cooperation, many knowledgeable commentators argued that the so-called "reset" had reached its high-water mark. Few further benefits, we heard, could be expected. These predictions have also not held up well. Take one recent example: when Russia abstained on U.N. Security Council Resolution 1973 authorizing military operations against Libya, some saw it as a sign that Moscow would not work with the West in responding to the Arab Spring. Soon enough, however, President Medvedev joined his G-8 colleagues in announcing that it was time for Colonel Qadhafi to go. When I was in Moscow last month, Russian officials actually asked me why NATO's Operation Unified Protector was taking so long to achieve its aims. In expanding their cooperation the two sides, of course, have focused on issues where the practical benefits for both are most clear-cut. For obvious reasons, both Russia and the U.S. like the predictability of drawing down strategic forces by agreement. Both see Iran's nuclear program - and the prospect of state-failure in Afghanistan - as destabilizing. But the fact that the shared benefits of cooperation are obvious does not make them any less real. States do not always act in their own interest. Here, at least, they are doing so. (Other governments have been less cooperative: China, The New York Times recently reported, does not allow its territory to be used to supply NATO operations in Afghanistan.) There are also some tentative signs of Russian readiness to re-think what is in its interest, even when the result is costly. Real money was lost when Moscow canceled the sale of an advanced air-defense system to Iran. The "reset" has served American interests in important ways. Why, then, do so many have such mixed feelings about it? Many - in both countries --are clearly hesitant about taking the next steps that seem to be on the agenda. In the U.S., there is real ambivalence about "graduating" Russia from the coverage of the Jackson-Vanik amendment. And this, even though the problem that the amendment was designed to address - the denial of free emigration to Soviet Jews - long ago ceased to exist. In Russia, there is a similar ambivalence about working with NATO to develop an overlapping system of missile defense - even though the nuclear competition of the Cold War is also long since over. Many observers treat such attitudes as proof that neither country has shaken the legacy of the Cold War. There is perhaps something to this explanation, but to my mind it is not the principal factor. The next steps of the "reset" - whether we're talking about Jackson-Vanik "graduation" or about cooperative missile defense - are simply hard. They require a level of mutual respect and trust that Russia and the U.S. have not developed - and for understandable reasons.

Not inevitable, but Russia favors cooperation

Balcer ‘12 (Adam, Programme Director – demos EUROPA, “The Future of Russia: Modernization or Decline?”, http://carnegieendowment.org/files/demos\_www\_calosc.pdf)

Russia’s main strategic goal lies in the achievement of great power status equal to the US, China or the EU. Therefore, Russia foreign policy focuses on creating a system of international relations in which large states are the primary guardians of the global order based on a general balance of power among themselves (multipolarism), respecting one another’s position within their spheres of inﬂ uence. 2. Russia aspires to be an unique balance holder and intermediary between the West and the rest on the global scene pursuing independent course with equal distance to other poles of power. Its uniqueness is supposed to derive from its locus of belonging in the European cultural community and, simultaneously, its Eurasian and non-western economic and geopolitical character. 18 3. Moscow maintains an important position on the international arena by virtue of its largest nuclear arsenal in the world, permanent membership of the UN Security Council, leverage in the post-Soviet area and abundant natural – particularly energy – resources. However, relatively limited size of its economy and national income per capita, low level of innovativeness, over-dependence on export of resources, high level of corruption and serious structural challenges (e.g. shrinking population and changes of religious structure) seriously undermine Russia’s ambitions. 4. Russia has a peculiar geopolitical position as the largest state on the globe which is a highly multiethnic and multireligous country, very sparsely populated and stretching between Asia and Europe, with very long border with the Muslim world and rising China. In consequence, Russia distinguishes itself against a background of other main players on the global arena in the complex relationship with the outside world. Substantial and multidimensional leverage in the post Soviet space combines with high level of vulnerability to negative regional and global trends (further integration or disintegration of the EU, future of its enlargement, rise of China and Turkey, changes in the energy global market: shale gas, Iran’s relations with the West, decreasing Russia’s leverage in the post Soviet area). The latter will have a crucial impact on Russian foreign policy in the twenty ﬁ rst century . 5. Russia’s foreign policy is decisively Western-centric but at the same time full of contradictions. The NATO countries are perceived by Moscow as the main source of economic and technologic modernization. At the same time, they are ofﬁ cially recognized as the greatest danger to Russia’s security. 6. Despite the multipolar discourse, Moscow intends to built its international position through bilateral relations based on equality with the US, which is still perceived as the most important point of reference in “organizing” the Russian foreign policy. The foundation of this relationship lies in the nuclear potential of Russia. However, an enormous discrepancy 9 of economic power between the US and Russia as well as the rise of China make Moscow’s ambitions to establish bipolarity with Washington an unrealistic option. 7. Objectively, the most important economic and political partner for Russia is the European Union. However, Moscow treats the EU as a secondary player in comparison to the US. A substantial divergence of values and interests between Moscow and Brussels is a serious challenge on the path towards more enhanced cooperation between Moscow and Brussels. 8. Russia has a globalist world-view but its capabilities are predominantly regional. Russia believes that it can only be a pole in the multipolar world if it has a sphere of inﬂ uence. Russia perceives the post-Soviet space as its sphere of interests and demands from the external actors that they recognize its special status. Russia’s eagerness to defend its interests is directly proportional to the rise of the engagement of other actors (China, the EU, Turkey, the US) in the region which is undermining Russia’s leverage. 9. Inspite of Russia’s declarations of equal distance to other poles of global power, a substantial economical and political rapprochement between China and Russia has taken place in the recent years. Yet both countries have not overcome mutual distrust and do not aspire to establish a tangible and close alliance. Nevertheless, as China prepares to become a new superpower in the twenty ﬁ rst century, Russia, the cold war superpower, will have little choice but to accept the rising China as a crucial priority in its foreign policy, independent of Moscow’s relations with the West. 10. The agenda of Russian foreign policy is strongly related to the internal political system based on the authoritarian model and worldview of Russian society. The future of Russia’s foreign policy will strongly depend on its internal developments, namely the scale and character of its democratization. However, “an addiction” to great power mentality will have a substantial impact on Russian foreign policy, even in case of its democratization.10 A vision of greatness: strategic framework of Russian foreign policy Since the fall of communism, the most important goal of the Russian foreign policy has been the achievement of great power status. A great power is a state which will achieve the position of a member of the global multipolar order with equal status to the world principal powers (China, the US and, in the future, possibly the more internally integrated EU). All other aims are subordinated to this number one strategic priority. According to Moscow, the world is currently undergoing an evolution from the unipolar order dominated by the US to the more pluralistic global order. In this new world, smaller states fend for themselves as the main players jockey for inﬂ uence over them. Russia’s vision of the multipolar world order and its own place in it was expressed most clearly in 2008 by the president of Russia Dimitri Medvedev in his famous speech, in which he expressed what became known as the Medvedev doctrine: Firstly, Russia recognizes the primacy of fundamental principles of international law, which deﬁ ne the relations between civilized nations. It will build our relations with other countries within the framework of these principles and the concept of international law. Secondly, the world should be multipolar. A single pole is unacceptable. Domination is something Russia cannot allow. It cannot accept a world order in which one country makes all the decisions, even as serious and inﬂ uential country as the United States of America. Such a world is unstable and threatened with conﬂ ict. Thirdly, Russia does not want confrontation with any country. Russia has no intention of isolating itself. It will develop friendly relations with Europe, the United States of America and other countries as much as possible.

Parameters for relations set

Graham ‘11 (Thomas E., Ph.D. and Senior Associate – Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, “The Future of U.S.-Russian Relations”, Carnegie Council Report, 6-3, <http://www.carnegiecouncil.org/resources/articles_papers> \_reports/0105.html/\_res/id=sa\_File1/The%20Future%20of%20U.S.-Russian%20Relations.pdf)

In short, the reset has normalized U.S.-Russian relations. In almost any other bilateral relationship, normalization would relieve much of the suspense, as the two countries turned to the routine management of affairs. Competition would continue on specific issues, but within limits that did not jeopardize overall relations. The United States and Russia are not just any two countries, however. Confrontational mindsets linger from the bitter Cold-War rivalry—and a longer history of uneasy relations. Consequently, their bilateral relations cannot just drift along in the routine management of affairs. They drift either upward toward closer cooperation or downward toward sharper competition—and eventually conflict.

Competition’s not inevitable, U.S. policy’s key

Graham ‘11 (Thomas E., Ph.D. and Senior Associate – Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, “Russia Back at the Center of U.S. Foreign Policy”, http://www.amacad.org/russia/russiaConference.pdf)

Can We Work with Russia to Advance Our Interests?

What do the new Russia and geopolitical context mean for U.S.-Russian relations? That there is, to be sure, no easy path to constructive relations, particularly given the deep distrust that has grown over the past two decades and the complexity of the challenges we face. Nevertheless, it is also true that nothing in the way Russia defines itself precludes cooperation on issues of high priority to the United States, while the new geopolitical context presents common challenges that could provide the basis for productive interaction, if we pursue our Russia policy with a clear sense of our own interests and Russia’s and with patience and skill. Five considerations should shape our approach.

A2: Putin = No Relations

Putin’s irrelevant for relations

Kuchins ‘12 (Andrew C., Senior Fellow and Director of the Russia and Eurasia Program – Center for Strategic and International Studies and Igor A. Zevelev, Director of the Moscow Office – MacArthur Foundation, “Russian Foreign Policy: Continuity in Change”, Washington Quarterly, 35(1), Winter, p. 159-160)

Like the bilateral relationship, Russian elite perceptions of U.S. power and role in the world have experienced a lot of volatility in the past 20 years. How durable is the current Russian perception that the United States is not only less threatening but also pursuing policies far more accommodating to Russian interests, particularly as we are entering a new Russian (and American) presidential cycle in 2012? There is no definitive answer to this question, but from reviewing the last 10 years or so since Putin first became Russian president, our conclusion is that U.S. policies and Russia’s economic prospects will be far more important factors in affecting Russian leader and elite views of the United States than who the next Russian president is. The Russian perspective on U.S. power and role in the world did not change over the last two years because Dmitri Medvedev replaced Vladimir Putin as president of Russia. The Russian perspective changed because of the impact of the global economic crisis and changes in the Obama administration’s policies that addressed issues of greatest interest to Moscow. Putin’s return to the Kremlin is viewed by many skeptics as a threat to cooperation and a blow for the Obama administration’s ‘‘reset’’ policy. We, however, are more optimistic and believe that unlike two previous U.S.—Russian rapprochements, both of which ended in disappointmentin 1991—1992 after the emergence of the new Russia and in 2001—2002 after 9/11the current warming trend should be more sustainable (unless there is a significant change in U.S. policy if there is a new U.S. administration in January 2013). Russian elites are still unsure about the durability of U.S. power capacity, but they have seen the United States renew itself in the wake of global foreign and economic setbacks beforein the 1980s, for example. Russians are as aware as anybody of the current U.S. fiscal challenges and the questions about whether the U.S. political system will be capable of resolving them. They are also watching closely the political commitment of the United States to stabilize Afghanistan. If the United States makes progress on these domestic and foreign policy fronts, and more importantly continues to pursue a pragmatic set of policies that accommodates some of Russia’s core interests, then the current trend toward a more positive assessment of U.S. power and growing cooperation on a wide variety of issues will continue. In other words, the United States is the critical variable for Russia and its relations with the United States, not Putin’s return. The larger variable for Russian domestic and foreign policy broadly is the global economy. A return to global recession in 2012 would depress the oil price, hurt Russia’s economic performance more than other major economiesas the crisis in 2008—2009 did because of the high dependence on oil and gas revenues for budget stability and economic growthand force significant cutbacks in the Russian budget. If such a downturn were prolonged, the spectrum of possibilities for the Russian economy is wide, ranging from a return to liberalism to a Russian nationalist revanche.

A2: Relations High

Rejection causes immediate Russian retaliation against the U.S.

Aslund ‘11 (Anders, Ph.D. – University of Oxford and Senior Fellow – Peterson Institute for International Economics and Gary Clyde Hufbauer, Senior Fellow – Peterson Institute for International Economics, “The United States Should Establish Permanent Normal Trade Relations with Russia”, IEE Policy Brief, November, http://www.iie.com/publications/pb/pb11-20.pdf)

Can the United States simply continue to operate under the biannual waiver and report process? It cannot. Under WTO rules, that is not allowed. Congress must establish “permanent” normal trade relations, not just normal trade relations to be renewed regularly. Moreover, for Russia, this is an issue of principle: whether to live under the burden of continuous review by Congress or to be taken out of the shadow of an obsolete stigma. Regardless of whether the issue is one of principle or international trade rules, the bottom line is that rejection of PNTR would backfire and US trade with Russia would immediately become potentially worse than the status quo. Russia, for example, would be likely to retaliate by adopting very narrow and stringent interpretations of its obligations under the two existing bilateral agreements on trade with the United States—the US-Russia Bilateral Trade Relations Agreement and the 2006 Bilateral Market Access Agreement.

Repeal of Jackson-Vanik is key to continued US-Russia relations

Gvosdev ‘12 (World Politics Review, Nikolas K. Gvosdev is the former editor of the National Interest, and a frequent foreign policy commentator in both the print and broadcast media, <http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/11441/the-realist-prism-resetting-the-u-s-russia-reset>)

An upcoming decision-point could offer a good indication of what to expect. The World Trade Organization is expected to ratify Russia’s accession later this spring. However, American firms will not be able to take advantage of Russia's WTO membership as long as U.S. trade with Russia is still subject to the Cold War-era Jackson-Vanik amendment. Congress would first have to agree to "graduate" Russia from the terms of the legislation, but many members remain hesitant. An unofficial swap would see Russia given permanent normal trading relations status, but with new legislation applying "smart sanctions" against specific Russian individuals and entities accused of condoning human rights abuses, most notably in the death of Russian lawyer Sergei Magnitsky. Whether this Solomonic compromise could work, however, remains to be seen. The Russian government has already responded very negatively to sanctions unilaterally imposed by the State Department and may be quite unwilling to accept such a compromise, even if it means graduating Russia from Jackson-Vanik. At the same time, there remains resistance within Congress to "giving up" one of its last remaining tools to pressure Russia on a whole range of issues, from chicken imports to religious freedom. The fate of the Jackson-Vanik amendment, therefore, is the canary in the coal mine for U.S.-Russia relations. If a successful repeal is negotiated, it bodes well for regenerating the relationship. However, if Obama, like George W. Bush before him, is unable to secure Russia’s graduation, this could end up being a fatal blow to the whole idea of the reset.

Sustainable relations depend on U.S. policy choices, decline’s possible

Kuchins ‘12 (Andrew C., Senior Fellow and Director of the Russia and Eurasia Program – Center for Strategic and International Studies and Igor A. Zevelev, Director of the Moscow Office – MacArthur Foundation, “Russian Foreign Policy: Continuity in Change”, Washington Quarterly, 35(1), Winter, p. 159-160)

Putin’s return to the Kremlin is viewed by many skeptics as a threat to cooperation and a blow for the Obama administration’s ‘‘reset’’ policy. We, however, are more optimistic and believe that unlike two previous U.S.—Russian rapprochements, both of which ended in disappointmentin 1991—1992 after the emergence of the new Russia and in 2001—2002 after 9/11the current warming trend should be more sustainable (unless there is a significant change in U.S. policy if there is a new U.S. administration in January 2013). Russian elites are still unsure about the durability of U.S. power capacity, but they have seen the United States renew itself in the wake of global foreign and economic setbacks beforein the 1980s, for example. Russians are as aware as anybody of the current U.S. fiscal challenges and the questions about whether the U.S. political system will be capable of resolving them. They are also watching closely the political commitment of the United States to stabilize Afghanistan. If the United States makes progress on these domestic and foreign policy fronts, and more importantly continues to pursue a pragmatic set of policies that accommodates some of Russia’s core interests, then the current trend toward a more positive assessment of U.S. power and growing cooperation on a wide variety of issues will continue. In other words, the United States is the critical variable for Russia and its relations with the United States, not Putin’s return. The larger variable for Russian domestic and foreign policy broadly is the global economy. A return to global recession in 2012 would depress the oil price, hurt Russia’s economic performance more than other major economiesas the crisis in 2008—2009 did because of the high dependence on oil and gas revenues for budget stability and economic growthand force significant cutbacks in the Russian budget. If such a downturn were prolonged, the spectrum of possibilities for the Russian economy is wide, ranging from a return to liberalism to a Russian nationalist revanche.

2NC Relations Solve War

Relations solve nuclear war and turn every impact

Cohen ‘12 (Stephen A., Professor of Russian Studies – New York University, “America's Failed (Bi-Partisan) Russia Policy”, Huffington Post, 2-28, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/stephen-f-cohen/us-russia-policy_b_1307727.htm> l?ref=politics&ir=Politics)

First: Today, as before, the road to America's national security runs through Moscow. No other U.S. bilateral relationship is more vital. The reasons should be known to every policymaker, though they seem not to be: - Russia's enormous stockpiles of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction make it the only country capable of destroying the United States as well as the only other government, along with our own, essential for preventing the proliferation of such weapons. - There is also Russia's disproportionate share of the world's essential resources, not only oil and natural gas but metals, fertile land, timber, fresh water and more, which give Moscow critical importance in the global economy. - In addition, Russia remains the world's largest territorial country. In particular, the geopolitical significance of its location on the Eurasian frontier of today's mounting conflicts between Western and Eastern civilizations, as well as its own millions of Islamic people, can hardly be overstated. - Not to be forgotten are Russia's talented and nationalistic people, even in bad times, and their state's traditions in international affairs. This too means that Russia will play a major role in the world. - And, largely as a result of these circumstances, there is Moscow's special capacity to abet or to thwart U.S. interests in many regions of the world, from Afghanistan, Iran, North Korea and China to Europe, the entire Middle East and Latin America. In short, these inescapable realities mean that partnership with Russia is an American national security imperative.

Relations Good- Laundry List

Relations are crucial to solving multiple scenarios for extinction, including warming

Atlantic ‘08 (November 2008, Medvedev Spoils the Party, <http://www.theatlantic.com/doc/200811u/medvedev-obama>)

Like it or not, the United States cannot solve crucial global problems without Russian participation.  Russia commands the largest landmass on earth; possesses vast reserves of oil, natural gas, and other natural resources; owns huge stockpiles of weapons and plutonium; and still wields a potent brain trust.  Given its influence in Iran and North Korea, to say nothing of its potential as a spoiler of international equilibrium elsewhere, Russia is one country with which the United States would do well to reestablish a strong working relationship—a strategic partnership, even—regardless of its feelings about the current Kremlin government.  The need to do so trumps expanding NATO or pursuing “full-spectrum dominance.” Once the world financial crisis passes, we will find ourselves returning to worries about resource depletion, environmental degradation, and global warming– the greatest challenges facing humanity.  No country can confront these problems alone.  For the United States, Russia may just prove the “indispensable nation” with which to face a volatile future arm in arm.

Relations Good - Hege

Collapsing US-Russian cooperation will increase global missile sales and the risk of conflict—it will destroy U.S. leadership

Simes ‘07 (Dimitri, President of the Nixon Center and Publisher of The National Interest, Foreign Affairs, “Losing Russia; The Costs of Renewed Confrontation,” Nov/Dec – lexis)

But if the current U.S.-Russian relationship deteriorates further, it will not bode well for the United States and would be even worse for Russia. The Russian general staff is lobbying to add a military dimension to the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, and some top officials are beginning to champion the idea of a foreign policy realignment directed against the West. There are also quite a few countries, such as Iran and Venezuela, urging Russia to work with China to play a leading role in balancing the United States economically, politically, and militarily. And post-Soviet states such as Georgia, which are adept at playing the United States and Russia off against each other, could act in ways that escalate tensions. Putin's stage management of Moscow's succession in order to maintain a dominant role for himself makes a major foreign policy shift in Russia unlikely. But new Russian leaders could have their own ideas -- and their own ambitions -- and political uncertainty or economic problems could tempt them to exploit nationalist sentiments to build legitimacy. If relations worsen, the UN Security Council may no longer be available -- due to a Russian veto -- even occasionally, to provide legitimacy for U.S. military actions or to impose meaningful sanctions on rogue states. Enemies of the United States could be emboldened by new sources of military hardware in Russia, and political and security protection from Moscow. International terrorists could find new sanctuaries in Russia or the states it protects. And the collapse of U.S.-Russian relations could give China much greater flexibility in dealing with the United States. It would not be a new Cold War, because Russia will not be a global rival and is unlikely to be the prime mover in confronting the United States. But it would provide incentives and cover for others to confront Washington, with potentially catastrophic results.

Global Nuclear War

Khalilzad ’95(**Zalmay**, RAND, The Washington Quarterly, Spring 1995\_

Under the third option, the United States would seek to retain global leadership and to preclude the rise of a global rival or a return to multipolarity for the indefinite future. On balance, this is the best long-term guiding principle and vision. Such a vision is desirable not as an end in itself, but because a world in which the United States exercises leadership would have tremendous advantages. First, the global environment would be more open and more receptive to American values -- democracy, free markets, and the rule of law. Second, such a world would have a better chance of dealing cooperatively with the world's major problems, such as nuclear proliferation, threats of regional hegemony by renegade states, and low-level conflicts. Finally, U.S. leadership would help preclude the rise of another hostile global rival, enabling the United States and the world to avoid another global cold or hot war and all the attendant dangers, including a global nuclear exchange. U.S. leadership would therefore be more conducive to global stability than a bipolar or a multipolar balance of power system.

Relations Good- Accidents

Relations solve accidents

Martin ’08 (Matthew, is a program officer in Policy Analysis and Dialogue at the Muscatine-based Stanley Foundation, “Avoiding an Accidental Nuclear War”, http://www.stanleyfoundation.org/articles.cfm?id=498

Common sense might indicate that better relations between the two countries would mean that less oversight is needed. But due to the history of the Cold War and the nature of the arsenals as discussed above, precisely the opposite is true, especially if the goal is to reduce the danger of an accidental nuclear launch. Surviving the Cold War without a nuclear exchange demanded intense and sustained efforts on a range of fronts from the political to the military, and as the global community strives to move beyond a Cold War mindset, it is clear that succeeding in this new world will as well. It is good that President Bush has found in Russian president Medvedev a smart colleague who understands the issues. The question is how will these two leaders apply their smarts and understanding in order to avoid an accidental nuclear war.

Extinction

American Prospect ‘01

The bitter disputes over national missile defense (NMD) have obscured a related but dramatically more urgent issue of national security: the 4,800 nuclear warheads -- weapons with a combined destructive power nearly 100,000 times greater than the atomic bomb that leveled Hiroshima -- currently on "hair-trigger" alert. Hair-trigger alert means this: The missiles carrying those warheads are armed and fueled at all times. Two thousand or so of these warheads are on the intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) targeted by Russia at the United States; 1,800 are on the ICBMs targeted by the United States at Russia; and approximately 1,000 are on the submarine-based missiles targeted by the two nations at each other. These missiles would launch on receipt of three computer-delivered messages. Launch crews -- on duty every second of every day -- are under orders to send the messages on receipt of a single computer-delivered command. In no more than two minutes, if all went according to plan, Russia or the United States could launch missiles at predetermined targets: Washington or New York; Moscow or St. Petersburg. The early-warning systems on which the launch crews rely would detect the other side's missiles within tens of seconds, causing the intended -- or accidental -- enemy to mount retaliatory strikes. "Within a half-hour, there could be a nuclear war that would extinguish all of us," explains Bruce Blair. "It would be, basically, a nuclear war by checklist, by rote."

Relations Good- Terrorism

Relations solve terror and nuclear proliferation

Perry and Scowcrof ’09 (William and brent, Chairs CFR, april, “US Nuclear Weapons Policy”)

Despite nearly universal opposition, North Korea has developed a small nuclear arsenal, and Iran appears to be following in its footsteps. Other states, particularly in the Middle East, are starting nuclear power programs modeled after that of Iran. The proliferation of nuclear weapons and fissile materials is thus dangerously close to a tipping point. Beyond this danger, there are still tens of thousands of nuclear weapons in the world. If just one of these thousands of weapons fell into the hands of terrorists, it could be detonated with catastrophic results. So, although the old danger of a massive nuclear exchange between great powers has declined, a new risk looms of a few nuclear detonations being set off by a terrorist group or a nuclear-capable rogue state, or of a nuclear power making a tragic mistake. The threat of nuclear terrorism is already serious, and, as more nations acquire nuclear weapons or the fissile material needed for nuclear weapons, it will increase. Of course, the detonation of a relatively primitive nuclear bomb in one American city would not be equivalent to the type of nuclear exchange that was feared during the Cold War. Nonetheless, the results would be catastrophic, with the devastation extending well beyond the staggering fatalities. The direct economic losses would amount to many hundreds of billions of dollars, but the indirect economic impact would be even greater. The social and political effects are incalculable, especially if the detonation were in Washington, DC, and disabled a significant part of the U.S. government. The terror and disruption would be beyond imagination. High priority should be accorded to policies that serve to prevent such a catastrophe, specifically programs that reduce and protect existing nuclear arsenals and that keep new arsenals from being created. All such preventive programs, by their nature, have international dimensions. Their success depends on the United States being able to work cooperatively with other countries, most notably Russia. That such international cooperation can be successful is illustrated by the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction Program in the 1990s. U.S.-Russian efforts on that program led to thousands of nuclear weapons and their launchers being dismantled and thus made the world safer. But unless U.S.-Russia relations improve, it is difficult to imagine those two governments cooperating on future programs that require such a high level of mutual trust.

Extinction

Sid-Ahmed ‘04 (Mohamed, Managing Editor for Al-Ahali, “Extinction!” August 26-September 1, Issue no. 705, http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2004/705/op5.htm)

A nuclear attack by terrorists will be much more critical than Hiroshima and Nagazaki, even if -- and this is far from certain -- the weapons used are less harmful than those used then, Japan, at the time, with no knowledge of nuclear technology, had no choice but to capitulate. Today, the technology is a secret for nobody. So far, except for the two bombs dropped on Japan, nuclear weapons have been used only to threaten. Now we are at a stage where they can be detonated. This completely changes the rules of the game. We have reached a point where anticipatory measures can determine the course of events. Allegations of a terrorist connection can be used to justify anticipatory measures, including the invasion of a sovereign state like Iraq. As it turned out, these allegations, as well as the allegation that Saddam was harbouring WMD, proved to be unfounded. What would be the consequences of a nuclear attack by terrorists? Even if it fails, it would further exacerbate the negative features of the new and frightening world in which we are now living. Societies would close in on themselves, police measures would be stepped up at the expense of human rights, tensions between civilisations and religions would rise and ethnic conflicts would proliferate. It would also speed up the arms race and develop the awareness that a different type of world order is imperative if humankind is to survive. But the still more critical scenario is if the attack succeeds. This could lead to a third world war, from which no one will emerge victorious. Unlike a conventional war which ends when one side triumphs over another, this war will be without winners and losers. When nuclear pollution infects the whole planet, we will all be losers.

Relations Good- Global Warming

US Russia relations key to solve global warming

Light ‘09 (Andrew, Ph.D., is a Senior Fellow at American Progress specializing in climate, energy, and science policy, http://grist.org/article/2009-07-02-us-russia-climate-cooperation/)

The summit between President Barack Obama and Russian President Dmitri Medvedev in Moscow on July 6-8 comes in the middle of a packed international schedule of bilateral and multilateral meetings for the United States on climate change. In the run up to the critical U.N. climate talks in Copenhagen at the end of this year, when the extension or successor to the existing Kyoto Protocol must be agreed upon, it is crucial that the United States and Russia—both major emitters of greenhouse gases and potentially leaders on this crucial issue—explore ways of working together to ensure a positive outcome at these talks. Enhancing cooperation on climate change and energy efficiency should be a major plank of U.S. Russia policy and should be discussed at the highest levels when President Obama meets with President Medvedev next week. Russia, like the United States, is a significant contributor to global warming. If the European Union is disaggregated Russia is the third-largest emitter of carbon dioxide behind the United States and China and still currently ahead of India. More importantly Russian per capita emissions are on the rise, and are projected at this point to approach America’s top rank as per capita emitter by 2030. Russia is also the third-largest consumer of energy and one of the world’s most energy-intensive economies. Making Russia a partner on these issues could be critical in order to advance a sound global climate change agenda. The Center for American Progress report “After the ‘Reset’: A Strategy and New Agenda for U.S. Russia Policy” will be released on July 2 and outlines three avenues of U.S.-Russia bilateral cooperation on climate and energy issues: cooperation on a new international climate change agreement, building Russia’s capacity for carbon trading, and cooperating on energy efficiency. Here we expand on these proposals. Our approach is based on the principle that the best way to engage Russia on global warming is to frame cooperation as a form of advancing economic modernization. We must convince the Russians that joining the community of nations on this issue is in their best economic interest.

Global warming leads to bio diversity lose and human extinction

IANS ‘10 (cites in the article Ove Hoegh-Guldberg PhD topic focused upon the physiology of corals and their zooxanthellae under thermal stress, and John Bruno Ph.D. from Brown University in Ecology and Evolutionary Biology and was a postdoctoral fellow at Cornell University, http://www.sify.com/news/could-unbridled-climate-changes-lead-to-human-extinction-news-international-kgtrOhdaahc.html)

Sydney: Scientists have sounded alarm bells about how growing concentrations of greenhouse gases are driving irreversible and dramatic changes in the way the oceans function, providing evidence that humankind could well be on the way to the next great extinction. The findings of the comprehensive report: 'The impact of climate change on the world's marine ecosystems' emerged from a synthesis of recent research on the world's oceans, carried out by two of the world's leading marine scientists. One of the authors of the report is Ove Hoegh-Guldberg, professor at The University of Queensland and the director of its Global Change Institute (GCI). 'We may see sudden, unexpected changes that have serious ramifications for the overall well-being of humans, including the capacity of the planet to support people. This is further evidence that we are well on the way to the next great extinction event,' says Hoegh-Guldberg. 'The findings have enormous implications for mankind, particularly if the trend continues. The earth's ocean, which produces half of the oxygen we breathe and absorbs 30 per cent of human-generated carbon dioxide, is equivalent to its heart and lungs. This study shows worrying signs of ill-health. It's as if the earth has been smoking two packs of cigarettes a day!,' he added. 'We are entering a period in which the ocean services upon which humanity depends are undergoing massive change and in some cases beginning to fail', he added. The 'fundamental and comprehensive' changes to marine life identified in the report include rapidly warming and acidifying oceans, changes in water circulation and expansion of dead zones within the ocean depths. These are driving major changes in marine ecosystems: less abundant coral reefs, sea grasses and mangroves (important fish nurseries); fewer, smaller fish; a breakdown in food chains; changes in the distribution of marine life; and more frequent diseases and pests among marine organisms. Study co-author John F Bruno, associate professor in marine science at The University of North Carolina, says greenhouse gas emissions are modifying many physical and geochemical aspects of the planet's oceans, in ways 'unprecedented in nearly a million years'. 'This is causing fundamental and comprehensive changes to the way marine ecosystems function,' Bruno warned, according to a GCI release. These findings were published in Science.

Relations Good- Cyber Security

US Russia relations solve cyber security issues—international response centers

Wolf ‘11 (Jim, journalist, “U.S., Russia work to expand cyberspace cooperation”, http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/12/10/us-russia-usa-cyber-idUSTRE7B901N20111210)

Russia and the United States are planning a regular exchange on "technical threats" that appear to come from computers in each other's territories, a White House spokeswoman said on Friday, even as bilateral ties have come under growing strains. A range of mechanisms aimed at confidence building and crisis prevention are being planned to cope with alarming events in cyberspace, said Caitlin Hayden, a spokeswoman for the White House National Security Council. These include "regular exchanges on technical threats that appear to emanate from one another's territory" as well as "no-fail communications mechanisms to help prevent crisis escalation and build confidence," she said in an emailed reply to a query. Some such links have existed for years, including the Nuclear Risk Reduction Center, but others are "cyber-specific and would begin working with Moscow for the first time," Hayden said, without giving a projected start date. A representative of the Russian Embassy in Washington did not return a phone call seeking comment. Vice President Joe Biden said last month the United States was working with Moscow to link computer emergency response teams and the nuclear risk reduction centers and setting up lines of communication in case of "an alarming incident." "It's a great deal harder to assess another nation's cyber-capabilities than to count their tanks," he told the London Conference on Cyberspace on November 1 by videocast. Howard Schmidt, the White House cybersecurity coordinator, said in a July 12 blog that the United States and Russia planned to have three types of cybersecurity-related cooperative mechanisms in place by the end of this month, including special "24/7" communications links.

Cyber-attack leads to cyber, biological, and nuclear warfare

Lawson ‘09 (Sean, Ph.D. from the Department of Science and Technology Studies at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute dissertation on Nonlinear Science and the Emergence of Information Age Warfare in the United States Military, “Cross-Domain Response to Cyber Attacks and the Threat of Conflict Escalation”, http://www.seanlawson.net/?p=477)

Based on the premise that completely blinding a potential adversary is a good indicator to that adversary that an attack is iminent, Ranum has argued that “The best thing that you could possibly do if you want to start World War III is launch a cyber attack. [...] When people talk about cyber war like it’s a practical thing, what they’re really doing is messing with the OK button for starting World War III. We need to get them to sit the f-k down and shut the f-k up.” [2] He is making a point similar to one that I have made in the past: Taking away an adversary’s ability to make rational decisions could backfire. [3] For example, Gregory Witol cautions that “attacking the decision makerÃ¢â‚â„¢s ability to perform rational calculations may cause more problems than it hopes to resolve. Removing the capacity for rational action may result in completely unforeseen consequences, including longer and bloodier battles than may otherwise have been.” [4] Cross-Domain Response So, from a theoretical standpoint, I think his concerns are well founded. But the current state of U.S. policy may be cause for even greater concern. It’s not just worrisome that a hypothetical blinding attack via cyberspace could send a signal of imminent attack and therefore trigger an irrational response from the adversary. What is also cause for concern is that current U.S. policy indicates that “kinetic attacks” (i.e. physical use of force) are seen as potentially legitimate responses to cyber attacks. Most worrisome is that current U.S. policy implies that a nuclear response is possible, something that policy makers have not denied in recent press reports. The reason, in part, is that the U.S. defense community has increasingly come to see cyberspace as a “domain of warfare” equivalent to air, land, sea, and space. The definition of cyberspace as its own domain of warfare helps in its own right to blur the online/offline, physical-space/cyberspace boundary. But thinking logically about the potential consequences of this framing leads to some disconcerting conclusions. If cyberspace is a domain of warfare, then it becomes possible to define “cyber attacks” (whatever those may be said to entail) as acts of war. But what happens if the U.S. is attacked in any of the other domains? It retaliates. But it usually does not respond only within the domain in which it was attacked. Rather, responses are typically “cross-domain responses”–i.e. a massive bombing on U.S. soil or vital U.S. interests abroad (e.g. think 9/11 or Pearl Harbor) might lead to air strikes against the attacker. Even more likely given a U.S. military “way of warfare” that emphasizes multidimensional, “joint” operations is a massive conventional (i.e. non-nuclear) response against the attacker in all domains (air, land, sea, space), simultaneously. The possibility of “kinetic action” in response to cyber attack, or as part of offensive U.S. cyber operations, is part of the current (2006) National Military Strategy for Cyberspace Operations [5]: Of course, the possibility that a cyber attack on the U.S. could lead to a U.S. nuclear reply constitutes possibly the ultimate in “cross-domain response.” And while this may seem far fetched, it has not been ruled out by U.S. defense policy makers and is, in fact, implied in current U.S. defense policy documents. From the National Military Strategy of the United States (2004): “The term WMD/E relates to a broad range of adversary capabilities that pose potentially devastating impacts. WMD/E includes chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, and enhanced high explosive weapons as well as other, more asymmetrical ‘weapons’. They may rely more on disruptive impact than destructive kinetic effects. For example, cyber attacks on US commercial information systems or attacks against transportation networks may have a greater economic or psychological effect than a relatively small release of a lethal agent.” [6] The authors of a 2009 National Academies of Science report on cyberwarfare respond to this by saying, “Coupled with the declaratory policy on nuclear weapons described earlier, this statement implies that the United States will regard certain kinds of cyberattacks against the United States as being in the same category as nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons, and thus that a nuclear response to certain kinds of cyberattacks (namely, cyberattacks with devastating impacts) may be possible.

2NC Trade impact

Protectionism causes extinction

Pazner ‘08 (Michael J., Faculty – New York Institute of Finance, Financial Armageddon: Protect Your Future from Economic Collapse, p. 137-138)

The rise in isolationism and protectionism will bring about ever more heated arguments and dangerous confrontations over shared sources of oil, gas, and other key commodities as well as factors of production that must, out of necessity, be acquired from less-than-friendly nations. Whether involving raw materials used in strategic industries or basic necessities such as food, water, and energy, efforts to secure adequate supplies will take increasing precedence in a world where demand seems constantly out of kilter with supply. Disputes over the misuse, overuse, and pollution of the environment and natural resources will become more commonplace. Around the world, such tensions will give rise to full-scale military encounters, often with minimal provocation. In some instances, economic conditions will serve as a convenient pretext for conflicts that stem from cultural and religious differences. Alternatively, nations may look to divert attention away from domestic problems by channeling frustration and populist sentiment toward other countries and cultures. Enabled by cheap technology and the waning threat of American retribution, terrorist groups will likely boost the frequency and scale of their horrifying attacks, bringing the threat of random violence to a whole new level. Turbulent conditions will encourage aggressive saber rattling and interdictions by rogue nations running amok. Age-old clashes will also take on a new, more heated sense of urgency. China will likely assume an increasingly belligerent posture toward Taiwan, while Iran may embark on overt colonization of its neighbors in the Mideast. Israel, for its part, may look to draw a dwindling list of allies from around the world into a growing number of conflicts. Some observers, like John Mearsheimer, a political scientists at the University of Chicago, have even speculated that an “intense confrontation” between the United States and China is “inevitable” at some point. More than a few disputes will turn out to be almost wholly ideological. Growing cultural and religious differences will be transformed from wars of words to battles soaked in blood. Long-simmering resentments could also degenerate quickly, spurring the basest of human instincts and triggering genocidal acts. Terrorists employing biological or nuclear weapons will vie with conventional forces using jets, cruise missiles, and bunker-busting bombs to cause widespread destruction. Many will interpret stepped-up conflicts between Muslims and Western societies as the beginnings of a new world war.

Ext. Solves Trade Relations

JV solves trade relations with Russia

Griswold and Peterson ‘11 (Daniel, director of the Herbert A. Steifel Center for Trade Policy Studies at the Cato Institute, Douglas, former research assistant @ CATO, “Trading with the Bear: Why Russia's Entry into the WTO Is in America's Interest” December 6 -- <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=13909>)

From Cold War to Normal Trade Relations For the past several years, the United States has granted Russia conditional normal trade relations status, which has provided the United States with limited trade benefits inferior to those that would be fully available after Russian accession to the WTO. Legally, the conditional normal trade relations may be extended only if the U.S. president decides that the country in question is in compliance with the emigration rights requirements of Jackson-Vanik. Semiannual compliance reviews occur, and U.S.-Russia trade continues to be artificially and legally restrained. As explained above, WTO accession does not necessarily require that the United States grant Russia MFN/PNTR. Rather, the United States may invoke the WTO's nonapplication provision and, by so doing, refrain from a WTO-protected bilateral and reciprocal trade relationship with Russia. However, in order for the United States to fully benefit from Russian accession to the WTO, the United States must grant Russia permanent normal trade relations and most favored nation status, a step that will require approval by Congress. When policymakers weigh the ineffectiveness of the Jackson-Vanik Amendment against all the advantages of ushering Russia into the WTO, denying permanent normal trade relations simply should not be an option. The best policy toward Russia at this stage in our relationship is to repeal any and all Jackson-Vanik Amendment restrictions against Russia immediately and prior to Russia's accession to the WTO. Procedurally, Congress should terminate application of the amendment, thereby enabling President Obama to grant MFN status to Russia, which he should do. When and if Russia accedes to the WTO, the United States should grant Russia permanent normal trade relations and not invoke the WTO's nonapplication principle. Pursuing such a policy would yield immediate and tangible benefits for the American economy without sacrificing any vital foreign policy goals. By any measure, the Jackson-Vanik Amendment has failed in its purpose to promote emigration rights. It was not the amendment that secured those rights for the citizens of the former Soviet Union but rather the system's own collapse in 1989–91 under internal and external pressures. While the desire for improved human rights abroad is laudable, economic sanctions have proven to be an ineffective means by which to promote these human rights goals. Mandating that trade liberalization cannot occur absent emigration freedom is misguided. A more effective strategy for improving human rights, in fact, is to increase trade liberalization, thereby enhancing opportunities for people with limited human rights to enrich themselves and interact more frequently with people with greater human rights. By granting Russia conditional most favored nation status annually beginning in 1994, the United States has implicitly acknowledged that Russia is in full compliance with the Jackson-Vanik Amendment's emigration requirements. Rather than continuing this hollow exercise with no discernable purpose, the United States should formally and officially revoke Jackson-Vanik restrictions as they pertain to Russia. Contrary to popular belief, Jackson-Vanik itself does not prevent Russia from becoming a full member of the WTO. Rather, failure by the United States to revoke Jackson-Vanik restrictions and grant MFN/PNTR (in the light of Russian WTO accession) would mean that the United States must invoke the WTO's nonapplication provision and, by so doing, refrain from a WTO-protected bilateral and reciprocal trade relationship with Russia.

Key to trade relations with Russia

Griswold ‘11 (Daniel, director of the Herbert A. Steifel Center for Trade Policy Studies at the Cato Institute, “Promoting U.S. Exports and the Rule of Law in Russia” CATO – originally in the Washington Times -- <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=13920>)

Although global trade talks are going nowhere, the ministerial meeting of World Trade Organization members in Geneva next week will accomplish at least one item of major importance: admitting Russia to the club. Whether U.S. companies can reap the benefits of a more open Russian market will depend on the repeal of a U.S. law that has become an awkward relic of the Cold War. The law is the 1974 Jackson-Vanik amendment, which was aimed at forcing the Soviet Union to allow Jews to emigrate by withholding "normal trade relations" (NTR) access to the U.S. market. Even though Jackson-Vanik never worked as intended, the law remains on the books two decades after the Soviet Union expired, requiring Congress to renew Russia's NTR status annually. Granting Russia permanent normal trade relations (PNTR) by repealing Jackson-Vanik is key to promoting bilateral trade. If the law remains in effect, Russia will join the WTO within the next month or so, but U.S. companies will be denied the enhanced access to Russia's market that the U.S. government and other WTO members negotiated in Russia's accession protocol. That would be a costly mistake. Russia remains by far the largest economy and the only member of the Group of 20 still outside the WTO. Russia's increasing economic (if not political) liberalization in recent years has coincided with a sharp increase in U.S. exports. Russia is an especially promising market for U.S. computer software and hardware, civilian aircraft, heavy machinery used to extract resources and U.S.-raised beef and poultry. Opponents of granting PNTR point to Russia's abuse of health and safety measures to protect its agricultural sector, its lack of intellectual property protection and restrictions on civil and political liberties. Each of those concerns is real, but withholding PNTR will not address any one of them. In fact, granting PNTR will allow the U.S. government to use the organization's dispute settlement mechanism to challenge any Russian violation of its WTO commitments. Any continued use of regulations as disguised trade barriers could be challenged under the WTO's sanitary and phytosanitary agreement. Violations of intellectual property would be open to challenge through the agreement on trade-related aspects of intellectual property. As for human rights, it is a simple historical fact that trade policy has proved to be an ineffective tool for imposing fundamental political changes in other countries. The World Trade Organization was not set up to enforce human rights but more narrowly to promote trade liberalization among its members. Promoting respect for human rights around the world is a worthy cause, but threatening to withdraw trade access for an entire nation is not a proper human rights tool. Just as WTO member governments pursue a wide range of trade policies, they also represent a wide range of political regimes. Of the organization's 153 members, more than 20 are at least as repressive of civil and political liberties as Russia, as measured in the annual survey by Freedom House. The list of WTO members that, like Russia, are classified as "not free" includes Bahrain, Cambodia, Chad, China, Cuba, Egypt, Jordan, Oman, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Vietnam, the United Arab Emirates and Zimbabwe. It would be inconsistent with the spirit of the WTO, as well as established U.S. policy, to oppose Russia's membership in the organization because of its restrictions on political and civil freedoms. On balance, the United States would benefit more from having Russia in, rather than out of, the transparent, multilateral and rules-based trade system. While no results can be guaranteed, granting Russia permanent normal trade relations would expand the freedom of American companies to reach new customers while further encouraging Russia's uncertain progress toward a more open, modern and globally integrated economy.

2NC Economy Impact

Jackson Vanik key to the economy, reverse causal evidence

Welt ’12 (Cory, Adjunct Fellow at the Center for American Progress and associate director of the Institute for European, Russian and Eurasian Studies at George Washington University’s Elliott School of International Affairs, “Russia, Trade, and Human Rights,” Center for American Progress, 4-30-12, <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2012/04/us_russia_magnitsky.html>)//SR

The U.S. Congress in the coming months will consider whether to grant “permanent normal trade relations” with Russia as part of Russia’s pending accession to the World Trade Organization. Russian membership in the organization is a foregone conclusion, but U.S. trade **relations with Russia would suffer if Congress balks at granting normal trade relations to Moscow** once Russia joins the organization. Further complicating the issue is whether Congress should keep Russia on the list of nations subject to the Soviet-era Jackson-Vanik amendment—which still conditions U.S. trade on a country’s respect for freedom of emigration—or should replace it with a new piece of human rights legislation. Granting permanent normal trade relations to Russia is an economic imperative. This status is the norm that governs U.S. trade relations with virtually all countries in the world, regardless of whether they are allies, adversaries, or sites of serious human rights violations. The U.S. economy will take the hit if the United States fails to grant Russia this status since most of the rest of the world will gain preferable access to the Russian market when Moscow joins the 153-nation World Trade Organization. At the end of 2011, Russia was invited to join the organization, a decision that the United States fully supported. The Russian parliament will ratify Russia’s membership by this summer, after which Russia will become the latest member of the organization. A recent [report](http://bookstore.piie.com/book-store/6208.html) by the Petersen Institute for International Economics estimates that Russia’s entry into the organization could **lead to a doubling in value of U.S. exports** to Russia over just the next few years (from $11 billion in 2011 to $22 billion in 2017). Benefits include lower tariffs on imported U.S. goods to Russia, protection of intellectual property, and arbitration of trade disputes. If the United States does not grant Russia permanent normal trade relations status, then the conditions of Russia’s accession to the organization, many of which were negotiated by the United States, need not apply to U.S.-Russian trade (Russia has already said it will not apply them). **U.S. businesses will sit on the sidelines while Russia’s other trading partners benefit.** The United States will also have no access to mechanisms for the arbitration of trade disputes. Many in Congress, led by Senate Finance Committee Chairman Max Baucus (D-MT), support granting Russia normal trade status. The [U.S. Chamber of Commerce](http://www.uschamber.com/sites/default/files/international/files/17411_INTL_PNTR_Primer.pdf) and the Coalition for U.S.-Russia Trade (which includes major exporting powerhouses such as Boeing Inc., Caterpillar Inc., Citigroup Inc., General Electric Co., Microsoft Corp., and The Procter & Gamble Co.) support it. Even Russian human rights activists and leading opposition figures support normal U.S.-Russian trade relations. The continued application of Jackson-Vanik to Russia and other countries it wasn’t designed for has been a longstanding irritant in U.S.-Russian relations. The Russian government has repeatedly [warned](http://www.rferl.org/content/us_russia_magnitsky/24545755.html) that passing the Magnitsky Act to replace Jackson-Vanik will have a negative impact on U.S.-Russian relations. This would not be reason to avoid passing the bill, of course. But Congress should still consider the negative impact of legislation that implies a U.S. linkage between Russia and the extinct Soviet Union and between Russia and the more adversarial countries to which the United States typically applies such sanctions. As difficult as it can be to secure sustained Russian cooperation on issues such as gross human rights violations in Syria and Iranian nuclear proliferation, it will be far more difficult to do so if the United States insists on placing Russia in the same basket of top-ranked international offenders.

Ext. JV Key to Economy

JV repeal key to econ – WTO, exports, jobs, manufacturing and ag

Aslund and Hufbauer ’11 – both at the Peterson Institute for International Economics (Anders and Gary, “The United States should Establish Normal Trade Relations with Russia,” IDEAS, 11/11, http://www.piie.com/publications/pb/pb11-20.pdf)//SR

However, US benefits of Russia’s accession to the WTO are not automatic. They will materialize only if the United States Congress grants permanent normal trade relations (PNTR) status to Russia—by repealing application to Russia of the 37-year-old Jackson-Vanik Amendment, which bars favorable trade relations with countries that restrict emigration. President Barack Obama, in a statement issued November 10 after the Working Party’s preliminary approval of Russian accession, said he looked forward to working with Congress “to end the application of the Jackson-Vanik Amendment to Russia in order to ensure that American firms and American exporters will enjoy the same benefits of Russian WTO membership as their international competitors.” It is imperative that Congress respond constructively in the same spirit of bipartisanship that led to the successful approval earlier this year of the Colombia, Korea, and Panama trade accords. Political wrangling, misjudgment, and miscalculations must not be allowed to cost the United States a significant new source of economic growth and cooperation in the future. The potential benefits to the US economy from Russia’s WTO accession are substantial but the United States can enjoy them only if it grants Russia PNTR. US exports to Russia could double over the next five years—from $9 billion in 2010 to $19 billion—adding jobs in the services, agriculture, manufacturing, and high-tech sectors. More generally, with Russia’s accession to the WTO and the United States granting PNTR to Russia, US-Russia commercial relations will be set on a sounder and friendlier footing, facilitating cooperation on national security and political issues. By strengthening the rules-based global trading system, WTO accession and PNTR will discourage Russia from undertaking protectionist measures.

Repeal’s key to the economy, boosts manufacturing and agriculture

Hormats ‘12 (Robert D., Undersecretary of State for Economic, Energy and Agricultural Affairs – United States Department of State, CQ Congressional Testimony, 2-16, Lexis)

Integrating Russia into the WTO has the potential to bring enormous benefits to U.S. manufacturers, farmers, and ranchers. While American exports to Russia rose 39 percent in 2011, more than twice as fast as our goods exports to the world as a whole, our exports to Russia, $8.2 billion in 2011, represents only around one-half of one percent of our total exports. We should not underestimate the opportunity to expand U.S. exports further to a country of nearly 145 million people the world's seventh largest economy. It's been estimated that Russia's WTO accession could result in a 20-percent increase in Russia's overall trade in manufactured goods, which could translate into a possible $2 billion increase in bilateral trade in manufactured goods with the United States. And the Commerce Department's International Trade Administration estimates that every billion dollars of U.S. exports supports over 5,000 jobs. President Obama in his most recent State of the Union Address urged Congress to ensure "that no foreign company has an advantage over American manufacturing when it comes to accessing... new markets like Russia." And to improve opportunities for U.S. companies in Russia going forward and support jobs here in the United States, we will need to secure the full benefits of the WTO deal for American business by terminating application of the Jackson-Vanik Amendment to Russia, and by extending permanent normal trade relations to Russia. Of course we have differences with Russia. Its recent veto of a tough UN resolution on Syria was - in the words of Secretary Clinton - a travesty. And the United States remains committed to strong, transparent support for civil society and democratic principles, as the Secretary demonstrated in the wake of the Russian parliamentary elections in December, when she voiced our concerns. But at the same time, we also have had unprecedented cooperation with Russia on Iran and North Korea. Russia has also agreed to greatly expanded use of its territory and airspace as supply lines to Afghanistan. And as indicated in our trade numbers, our economic ties are also expanding. The Jackson-Vanik Amendment -- enacted vis-a-vis the former Soviet Union -- long ago fulfilled its purpose with regard to Russia: to support free emigration, particularly Jewish emigration. No such barriers to emigration exist in Russia today. If Congress does not enact the necessary legislation to terminate Jackson-Vanik with regard to Russia, when Russia becomes a member of the WTO, the U.S. does not get all of the benefits of Russia's WTO membership, even though our competitors will. This puts many of our industries at a serious disadvantage. Unlike other WTO members, the United States will not be able to turn to the WTO mechanisms, including dispute settlement procedures, or ensure compliance on other areas such as intellectual property, services or WTO rules on antidumping. President Obama has established extending Permanent Normal Trade Relations to Russia and terminating application of Jackson-Vanik to Russia as a major priority. Congress can help level the playing field for U.S. businesses and workers by terminating application of Jackson-Vanik to Russia before Russia joins the WTO this summer. Lifting Jackson-Vanik for Russia is about providing jobs and economic growth here in America.

Net-turns the case , manufacturing’s the vital internal link

Vargo ‘03 (Franklin, National Association of Manufacturers, Federal News Service, 10-1, Lexis)

I would like to begin my statement with a review of why manufacturing is vital to the U.S. economy. Since manufacturing only represents about 16 percent of the nation's output, who cares? Isn't the United States a post-manufacturing services economy? Who needs manufacturing? The answer in brief is that the United States economy would collapse without manufacturing, as would our national security and our role in the world. That is because manufacturing is really the foundation of our economy, both in terms of innovation and production and in terms of supporting the rest of the economy. For example, many individuals point out that only about 3 percent of the U.S. workforce is on the farm, but they manage to feed the nation and export to the rest of the world. But how did this agricultural productivity come to be? It is because of the tractors and combines and satellite systems and fertilizers and advanced seeds, etc. that came from the genius and productivity of the manufacturing sector. Similarly, in services -- can you envision an airline without airplanes? Fast food outlets without griddles and freezers? Insurance companies or banks without computers? Certainly not. The manufacturing industry is truly the innovation industry, without which the rest of the economy could not prosper. Manufacturing performs over 60 percent of the nation's research and development. Additionally, it also underlies the technological ability of the United States to maintain its national security and its global leadership. Manufacturing makes a disproportionately large contribution to productivity, more than twice the rate of the overall economy, and pays wages that are about 20 percent higher than in other sectors. But its most fundamental importance lies in the fact that a healthy manufacturing sector truly underlies the entire U.S. standard of living -because it is the principal way by which the United States pays its way in the world. Manufacturing accounts for over 80 percent of all U.S. exports of goods. America's farmers will export somewhat over $50 billion this year, but America's manufacturers export almost that much event month! Even when services are included, manufacturing accounts for two-thirds of all U.S. exports of goods and services. If the U.S. manufacturing sector were to become seriously impaired, what combination of farm products together with architectural, travel, insurance, engineering and other services could make up for the missing two-thirds of our exports represented by manufactures? The answer is "none." What would happen instead is the dollar would collapse, falling precipitously -- not to the reasonable level of 1997, but far below it -and with this collapse would come high U.S. inflation, a wrenching economic downturn and a collapse in the U.S. standard of living and the U.S. leadership role in the world. That, most basically, is why the United States cannot become a "nation of shopkeepers."

Repeal massively boosts growth , multiple sectors will benefit

Aslund ‘11 (Anders, Ph.D. – University of Oxford and Senior Fellow – Peterson Institute for International Economics and Gary Clyde Hufbauer, Senior Fellow – Peterson Institute for International Economics, “The United States Should Establish Permanent Normal Trade Relations with Russia”, IEE Policy Brief, November, http://www.iie.com/publications/pb/pb11-20.pdf)

Russia’s joining the WTO does not require any US legislative action. All conditions for Russia’s accession have been settled. The Russian State Duma has until June 15, 2012 to ratify its accession. Thirty days after Russia’s notification to the WTO of its ratification, Russia will become the 154th member of the WTO. However, US benefits of Russia’s accession to the WTO are not automatic. They will materialize only if the United States Congress grants permanent normal trade relations (PNTR) status to Russia—by repealing application to Russia of the 37-year-old Jackson-Vanik Amendment, which bars favorable trade relations with countries that restrict emigration. President Barack Obama, in a statement issued November 10 after the Working Party’s preliminary approval of Russian accession, said he looked forward to working with Congress “to end the application of the Jackson-Vanik Amendment to Russia in order to ensure that American firms and American exporters will enjoy the same benefits of Russian WTO membership as their international competitors.” It is imperative that Congress respond constructively in the same spirit of bipartisanship that led to the successful approval earlier this year of the Colombia, Korea, and Panama trade accords. Political wrangling, misjudgment, and miscalculations must not be allowed to cost the United States a significant new source of economic growth and cooperation in the future.

WHAT THE UNITED STATES WILL GAIN FROM GRANTING RUSSIA PNTR

The potential benefits to the US economy from Russia’s WTO accession are substantial but the United States can enjoy them only if it grants Russia PNTR. US exports to Russia could double over the next five years—from $9 billion in 2010 to $19 billion—adding jobs in the services, agriculture, manufacturing, and high-tech sectors. More generally, with Russia’s accession to the WTO and the United States granting PNTR to Russia, US-Russia commercial relations will be set on a sounder and friendlier footing, facilitating cooperation on national security and political issues. By strengthening the rules-based global trading system, WTO accession and PNTR will discourage Russia from undertaking protectionist measures.

Uniqueness - Economy Down, Employment Rate Low

Economy on the Brink – consumer confidence and job market

CBN 6/5 (“Poor Economic Reports Spark Dreary US Outlook”, June 5th, 2012, <http://www.cbn.com/cbnnews/finance/2012/June/Poor-Economic-Reports-Spark-Dreary-US-Outlook/>) //LP

The most recent reports on the job market now has many analysts pessimistic about the U.S economic outlook for the rest of the year. "Friday's numbers were very far from where we want them to be, where the president wants them to be," White House press secretary Jay Carney told reporters Monday. On the heels of those gloomy numbers comes more bad economic news this week -- from slow growth in the manufacturing sector to slipping consumer confidence -- and a U.S. stock market that senses the air uncertainty. "We are going to see a prolonged period of volatility," said Kenneth Polcari, a market analyst. The down U.S. economy, coupled with a potential slowdown in China and a Europe that feels on the brink of collapse, is only adding to America's woes. "That global environment across the three main engines of the global economy is looking a lot weaker than a month ago," Adam Boyton with Deutsche Bank said.

2NC Jobs Impact

Repeal boosts job growth

Bloomberg 3/2 (Bloomberg News – via Moscow Times, “White House Sees Repeal of Jackson-Vanik Yielding Jobs”, 2012, http://www.themoscowtimes.com/business/article/white-house-sees-repeal-of-jackson-vanik-yielding-jobs/453958.html)

The Obama administration is pressing Congress to throw out the Soviet-era Jackson-Vanik amendment to restrict trade with Russia, making a plea on behalf of U.S. farmers and manufacturers. The United States will seek to repeal the law “as soon as possible” to give American exporters the same benefits as their overseas competitors, U.S. Trade Representative Ron Kirk told the House Ways and Means Committee on Wednesday. The legislation, passed in 1974, barred favorable U.S. trade with the Soviet Union to punish the nation for blocking emigration for its Jews citizens. Annual waivers have been allowed and widely used since 1993, two years after the communist government collapsed. “We ought to lift it,” Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said Tuesday in testimony to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. “Failing to lift it will put our farmers and manufacturers and our workers at a disadvantage.” Russia is now poised to join the World Trade Organization in May or June, Prime Minister Vladimir Putin said this month. President Barack Obama said he supports Russia becoming a member of the international trade arbiter, which would allow reduced tariffs and greater transparency. U.S. producers won’t benefit from lower trade barriers as long as Jackson-Vanik remains in effect, said Randi Levinas, executive director of the U.S.-Russia Business Council, with members such as General Electric, Caterpillar and Chevron. The United States wouldn’t gain intellectual property protection and adoption of food safety regulations on products from Russia, she said. While waivers have worked for almost two decades, Russia’s joining the WTO would put the United States in violation of the trade arbiter’s rules because Russia wouldn’t get the certainty that trade accords provide, said Joshua Meltzer, a fellow at the Brookings Institution in Washington specializing in global economy and development. The United States wouldn’t be able to complain about any Russian trade violations at the WTO, he said. “We are ready to bring Russia into the rules-based system in a way that gives us more enforcement tools to enable enhanced market access and a level playing field for U.S. exporters,” Kirk told lawmakers. Members of Congress, including Representatives Chris Smith, a New Jersey Republican, and Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, a Florida Republican, question repealing the law and easing trade with Russia, citing its human rights record, including a crackdown on journalists and concerns of fraud in recent elections. Lawmakers also are wary of Russia’s role, with China, in blocking UN Security Council resolutions seeking change in Syria as President Bashar Assad’s loyalists use tanks and artillery to crush a rebellion. Senator Richard Durbin of Illinois, the chamber’s No. 2 Democrat, told reporters Tuesday that Russia’s attitude toward Syria would “definitely” slow debate on overturning the Jackson-Vanik amendment. “A great deal depends on what happens in Syria and what happens with the Russian vote at the United Nations,” Durbin said. The United States had a $19.7 billion trade deficit with Russia in 2010, according to the U.S. Trade Representative’s office. Trade between the nations has increased about sevenfold since the United States began granting the waivers, according to a report by Bloomberg. Normalizing trade with Russia “is a vote to create American jobs,” Clinton told lawmakers yesterday. Increased trade with Russia could help progress toward Obama’s goal of doubling U.S. exports to $3.14 trillion by 2015, from $1.57 trillion in 2009. “Not one thing” is required from the United States to reap the benefits of the trade agreement, Kirk said. “It gives us protection we don’t have now.” The House Ways and Means Committee hasn’t scheduled action on the law, according to Jim Billimoria, the panel’s spokesman. Michael Steel, a spokesman for Speaker of the House John Boehner, an Ohio Republican, declined to comment on the speaker’s intentions for the proposal. In an Oct. 25 speech, Boehner expressed concerns about “significant outstanding commercial issues that must be addressed,” without elaboration. U.S. exports to Russia may more than double in five years, to $19 billion from $9 billion in 2010, under WTO membership, according to a November report from the Peterson Institute for International Economics in Washington. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the nation’s largest business group, is joining the U.S.-Russia Business Council in lobbying lawmakers to repeal the Jackson-Vanik amendment as a way to eliminate a competitive disadvantage.

Stops protectionism

El-Erian ‘09 (Mohamed, chief executive and co-chief investment officer of Pimco, American jobs data are worse than we think, http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/1e06911c-6719-11de-925f-00144feabdc0.html#axzz1RAPfeGsO)

This conventional wisdom is valid most, but not all of the time. There are rare occasions, such as today, when we should think of the unemployment rate as much more than a lagging indicator; it has the potential to influence future economic behaviours and outlooks. Today’s broader interpretation is warranted by two factors: the speed and extent of the recent rise in the unemployment rate; and, the likelihood that it will persist at high levels for a prolonged period of time. As a result, the unemployment rate will increasingly disrupt an economy that, hitherto, has been influenced mainly by large-scale dislocations in the financial system. In just 16 months, the US unemployment rate has doubled from 4.8 per cent to 9.5 per cent, a remarkable surge by virtually any modern-day metric. It is also likely that the 9.5 per cent rate understates the extent to which labour market conditions are deteriorating. Just witness the increasing number of companies asking employees to take unpaid leave. Meanwhile, after several years of decline, the labour participation rate has started to edge higher as people postpone their retirements and as challenging family finances force second earners to enter the job market. Notwithstanding its recent surge, the unemployment rate is likely to rise even further, reaching 10 per cent by the end of this year and potentially going beyond that. Indeed, the rate may not peak until 2010, in the 10.5-11 per cent range; and it will likely stay there for a while given the lacklustre shift from inventory rebuilding to consumption, investment and exports. Beyond the public sector hiring spree fuelled by the fiscal stimulus package, the post-bubble US economy faces considerable headwinds to sustainable job creation. It takes time to restructure an economy that became over-dependent on finance and leverage. Meanwhile, companies will use this period to shed less productive workers. This will disrupt consumption already reeling from a large negative wealth shock due to the precipitous decline in house prices. Consumption will be further undermined by uncertainties about wages. This possibility of a very high and persistent unemployment rate is not, as yet, part of the mainstream deliberations. Instead, the persistent domination of a “mean reversion” mindset leads to excessive optimism regarding how quickly the rate will max out, and how fast it converges back to the 5 per cent level for the Nairu (non-accelerating inflation rate of unemployment). The US faces a material probability of both a higher Nairu (in the 7 per cent range) and, relative to recent history, a much slower convergence of the actual unemployment rate to this new level. This paradigm shift will complicate an already complex challenge facing policymakers. They will have to recalibrate fiscal and monetary stimulus to recognise the fact that “temporary and targeted” stimulus will be less potent than anticipated. But the inclination to increase the dose of stimulus will be tempered by the fact that, as the fiscal picture deteriorates rapidly, the economy is less able to rely on future growth to counter the risk of a debt trap. Politics will add to the policy complications. The combination of stubbornly high unemployment and growing government debt will not play well. The rest of the world should also worry. Persistently high unemployment fuels protectionist tendencies. Think of this as yet another illustration of the fact that the US economy is on a bumpy journey to a new normal. The longer this reality is denied, the greater will be the cost to society of restoring economic stability.

Extinction

Pazner ‘08 (Michael J., Faculty – New York Institute of Finance, Financial Armageddon: Protect Your Future from Economic Collapse, p. 137-138)

The rise in isolationism and protectionism will bring about ever more heated arguments and dangerous confrontations over shared sources of oil, gas, and other key commodities as well as factors of production that must, out of necessity, be acquired from less-than-friendly nations. Whether involving raw materials used in strategic industries or basic necessities such as food, water, and energy, efforts to secure adequate supplies will take increasing precedence in a world where demand seems constantly out of kilter with supply. Disputes over the misuse, overuse, and pollution of the environment and natural resources will become more commonplace. Around the world, such tensions will give rise to full-scale military encounters, often with minimal provocation. In some instances, economic conditions will serve as a convenient pretext for conflicts that stem from cultural and religious differences. Alternatively, nations may look to divert attention away from domestic problems by channeling frustration and populist sentiment toward other countries and cultures. Enabled by cheap technology and the waning threat of American retribution, terrorist groups will likely boost the frequency and scale of their horrifying attacks, bringing the threat of random violence to a whole new level. Turbulent conditions will encourage aggressive saber rattling and interdictions by rogue nations running amok. Age-old clashes will also take on a new, more heated sense of urgency. China will likely assume an increasingly belligerent posture toward Taiwan, while Iran may embark on overt colonization of its neighbors in the Mideast. Israel, for its part, may look to draw a dwindling list of allies from around the world into a growing number of conflicts. Some observers, like John Mearsheimer, a political scientists at the University of Chicago, have even speculated that an “intense confrontation” between the United States and China is “inevitable” at some point. More than a few disputes will turn out to be almost wholly ideological. Growing cultural and religious differences will be transformed from wars of words to battles soaked in blood. Long-simmering resentments could also degenerate quickly, spurring the basest of human instincts and triggering genocidal acts. Terrorists employing biological or nuclear weapons will vie with conventional forces using jets, cruise missiles, and bunker-busting bombs to cause widespread destruction. Many will interpret stepped-up conflicts between Muslims and Western societies as the beginnings of a new world war.

2NC Aerospace Impact

Repeal’s key to aerospace

Griswold ‘11 (Daniel, Director of the Steifel Center for Trade Policy Studies – Cato Institute and Douglas Peterson, Former Research Assistant – Cato Institute, “Trading with the Bear: Why Russia’s Entry into the WTO Is in America’s Interest”, Free Trade Bulletin, No. 46, 12-6, http://www.cato.org/pubs/ftb/FTB-046.pdf)

The stakes are high. Russia is a major yet still underdeveloped market for a range of American exports, from poultry to aircraft. If U.S. exporters are not granted the more favorable access under Russia’s accession protocol, they will face discriminatory tariffs that will put them at a disadvantage against competitors in other major trading nations. That market share, once lost, would be difficult to regain. Granting PNTR to Russia thus becomes important to promoting U.S. trade as a sustainable boost to the sputtering U.S. economy. Expanding U.S.-Russian Commercial Relations Russia has emerged as a major commercial partner of the United States, although the relationship remains underdeveloped relative to the size of Russia’s economy and the considerable economic liberalization following the collapse of the Soviet Union. Through the first three quarters of 2011, Russia ranked 31st among nations as a market for U.S. goods exports, and 16th as a source of U.S. goods imports. In two-way trade (exports plus imports), Russia ranks as America’s 23rd largest trading partner, just below Thailand and Nigeria, 1 even though it is the world’s 11th largest economy in exchange-rate terms. 2 Russia remains by far the largest economy and the only member of the G-20 group of major economies still outside the World Trade Organization. Of the 50 largest economies in exchange-rate terms, the oil-exporting Islamic Republic of Iran is the only other one that is not a member. Trade with Russia has, however, grown significantly over the past decade. From 2000 to 2010, U.S. goods exports to Russia increased by 187 percent and U.S. imports from Russia increased by 235 percent. 3 During the same period, total U.S. exports and imports grew 63 percent and 57 percent respectively. The growth in import value from Russia can be attributed at least partially to an increase in the world prices of natural resources such as oil and natural gas, which account for a large share of U.S. imports from Russia. Over this same time period, world prices for crude oil have increased by 183 percent. 4 U.S. trade with Russia is highly concentrated in a few select industries. In 2010 the top five import categories (according to the 2-digit Harmonized System) made up over 70 percent of total U.S. imports from Russia. 5 These categories included precious stones and metals, inorganic chemicals, mineral fuels, aluminum, iron and steel, and fish and other seafood. Examining the industry concentration of imports using the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) produces an even greater level of concentration: just three NAICS 3-digit categories (petroleum and coal products, oil and gas, and primary metal manufacturing) made up 86 percent of imports from Russia in 2010. 6 U.S. exports to Russia are also highly concentrated: aircraft, machinery, and meat (according to the 2-digit Harmonized System) make up about 60 percent of U.S. exports to Russia. A calculation using comparable NAICS categories yields a figure closer to 54 percent. 7 PNTR Key to Expanding U.S. Exports American producers will be in a better position to expand their exports to Russia if the United States can participate fully in Russia’s membership in the WTO. And that can happen only if Congress grants Russia permanent normal trade relations. Russia’s accession to the WTO would almost certainly result in increased U.S. exports, thereby contributing to President Obama’s National Export Initiative goal to double exports from 2009 to 2014. Following a dip during the “Great Recession” of 2008–09, U.S. exports to Russia have rebounded strongly. The increasing economic liberalization and development of Russia in recent years has coincided with increased U.S. exports, with the growth rate of U.S. exports to Russia twice as large as the growth rate of U.S. exports to the rest of the world. By some estimates, U.S. exports to Russia could double in the five years following its accession to the WTO. 8 Demand within the Russian market for U.S. goods and services is significant and increasing. Moreover, that demand spans across multiple economic sectors, including agriculture, services, capital equipment, manufactures, machinery, and advanced technologies. In 2010, for example, 66 million Russians were Internet users. This number is expected to jump by 20 percent in 2011, stoking demand for U.S.-branded computer software and hardware. 9 As a condition of its WTO entry, Russia has committed to joining the Information Technology Agreement, which eliminates duties on a wide range of IT, communication, and other high-tech hardware. Also, Russia is the 8th largest market for U.S. exports of PVC and other polymers, and exports of these goods grew 500 percent between 2008 and 2010. Furthermore, Russia will require an estimated 960 new civilian aircraft in the next 20 years to replace its aging fleet, and a proposed reduction from 20 percent to 7.5 percent in tariffs on wide body aircraft would benefit U.S. producers significantly. 10 Growing demand for Russia’s vast natural resources—including farming, mining, oil, and energy products—drives Russian demand for heavy and complex machinery, which the United States is in an optimal position to export. Russia has committed to a bound tariff (upon entering the WTO) of 5 percent in this sector. 1

Sustains air power

Thompson ‘09 (David, President – American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, “The Aerospace Workforce”, Federal News Service, 12-10, Lexis)

Aerospace systems are of considerable importance to U.S. national security, economic prosperity, technological vitality, and global leadership. Aeronautical and space systems protect our citizens, armed forces, and allies abroad. They connect the farthest corners of the world with safe and efficient air transportation and satellite communications, and they monitor the Earth, explore the solar system, and study the wider universe. The U.S. aerospace sector also contributes in major ways to America's economic output and high- technology employment. Aerospace research and development and manufacturing companies generated approximately $240 billion in sales in 2008, or nearly 1.75 percent of our country's gross national product. They currently employ about 650,000 people throughout our country. U.S. government agencies and departments engaged in aerospace research and operations add another 125,000 employees to the sector's workforce, bringing the total to over 775,000 people. Included in this number are more than 200,000 engineers and scientists -- one of the largest concentrations of technical brainpower on Earth. However, the U.S. aerospace workforce is now facing the most serious demographic challenge in his 100-year history. Simply put, today, many more older, experienced professionals are retiring from or otherwise leaving our industrial and governmental aerospace workforce than early career professionals are entering it. This imbalance is expected to become even more severe over the next five years as the final members of the Apollo-era generation of engineers and scientists complete 40- or 45-year careers and transition to well-deserved retirements. In fact, around 50 percent of the current aerospace workforce will be eligible for retirement within just the next five years. Meanwhile, the supply of younger aerospace engineers and scientists entering the industry is woefully insufficient to replace the mounting wave of retirements and other departures that we see in the near future. In part, this is the result of broader technical career trends as engineering and science graduates from our country's universities continue a multi-decade decline, even as the demand for their knowledge and skills in aerospace and other industries keeps increasing. Today, only about 15 percent of U.S. students earn their first college degree in engineering or science, well behind the 40 or 50 percent levels seen in many European and Asian countries. Due to the dual-use nature of aerospace technology and the limited supply of visas available to highly-qualified non-U.S. citizens, our industry's ability to hire the best and brightest graduates from overseas is also severely constrained. As a result, unless effective action is taken to reverse current trends, the U.S. aerospace sector is expected to experience a dramatic decrease in its technical workforce over the next decade. Your second question concerns the implications of a cutback in human spaceflight programs. AIAA's view on this is as follows. While U.S. human spaceflight programs directly employ somewhat less than 10 percent of our country's aerospace workers, its influence on attracting and motivating tomorrow's aerospace professionals is much greater than its immediate employment contribution. For nearly 50 years the excitement and challenge of human spaceflight have been tremendously important factors in the decisions of generations of young people to prepare for and to pursue careers in the aerospace sector. This remains true today, as indicated by hundreds of testimonies AIAA members have recorded over the past two years, a few of which I'll show in brief video interviews at the end of my statement. Further evidence of the catalytic role of human space missions is found in a recent study conducted earlier this year by MIT which found that 40 percent of current aerospace engineering undergraduates cited human space programs as the main reason they chose this field of study. Therefore, I think it can be predicted with high confidence that a major cutback in U.S. human space programs would be substantially detrimental to the future of the aerospace workforce. Such a cutback would put even greater stress on an already weakened strategic sector of our domestic high-technology workforce. Your final question centers on other issues that should be considered as decisions are made on the funding and direction for NASA, particularly in the human spaceflight area. In conclusion, AIAA offers the following suggestions in this regard. Beyond the previously noted critical influence on the future supply of aerospace professionals, administration and congressional leaders should also consider the collateral damage to the space industrial base if human space programs were substantially curtailed. Due to low annual production rates and highly-specialized product requirements, the domestic supply chain for space systems is relatively fragile. Many second- and third-tier suppliers in particular operate at marginal volumes today, so even a small reduction in their business could force some critical suppliers to exit this sector. Human space programs represent around 20 percent of the $47 billion in total U.S. space and missile systems sales from 2008. Accordingly, a major cutback in human space spending could have large and highly adverse ripple effects throughout commercial, defense, and scientific space programs as well, potentially triggering a series of disruptive changes in the common industrial supply base that our entire space sector relies on.

Global WMD conflict

Tellis ‘98 (Ashley, Senior Political Scientist – RAND, Sources of Conflict in the 21st Century, http://www.rand.org/publications/MR/MR897/MR897.chap3.pdf)

This subsection attempts to synthesize some of the key operational implications distilled from the analyses relating to the rise of Asia and the potential for conflict in each of its constituent regions. The first key implication derived from the analysis of trends in Asia suggests that American air and space power will continue to remain critical for conventional and unconventional deterrence in Asia. This argument is justified by the fact that several subregions of the continent still harbor the potential for full-scale conventional war. This potential is most conspicuous on the Korean peninsula and, to a lesser degree, in South Asia, the Persian Gulf, and the South China Sea. In some of these areas, such as Korea and the Persian Gulf, the United States has clear treaty obligations and, therefore, has preplanned the use of air power should contingencies arise. U.S. Air Force assets could also be called upon for operations in some of these other areas. In almost all these cases, U.S. air power would be at the forefront of an American politico-military response because (a) of the vast distances on the Asian continent; (b) the diverse range of operational platforms available to the U.S. Air Force, a capability unmatched by any other country or service; (c) the possible unavailability of naval assets in close proximity, particularly in the context of surprise contingencies; and (d) the heavy payload that can be carried by U.S. Air Force platforms. These platforms can exploit speed, reach, and high operating tempos to sustain continual operations until the political objectives are secured. The entire range of warfighting capability—fighters, bombers, electronic warfare (EW), suppression of enemy air defense (SEAD), combat support platforms such as AWACS and J-STARS, and tankers—are relevant in the Asia-Pacific region, because many of the regional contingencies will involve armed operations against large, fairly modern, conventional forces, most of which are built around large land armies, as is the case in Korea, China-Taiwan, India-Pakistan, and the Persian Gulf. In addition to conventional combat, the demands of unconventional deterrence will increasingly confront the U.S. Air Force in Asia. The Korean peninsula, China, and the Indian subcontinent are already arenas of WMD proliferation. While emergent nuclear capabilities continue to receive the most public attention, chemical and biological warfare threats will progressively become future problems. The delivery systems in the region are increasing in range and diversity. China already targets the continental United States with ballistic missiles. North Korea can threaten northeast Asia with existing Scud-class theater ballistic missiles. India will acquire the capability to produce ICBM-class delivery vehicles, and both China and India will acquire long-range cruise missiles during the time frames examined in this report.

Ext. Aerospace – Heg/Econ Impact

Aerospace is key to heg and the economy

Walker ‘02 (Robert, Chair, Commission on the Future of the US Aerospace Industry, http://www.ita.doc.gov/td/aerospace/aerospacecommission/AeroCommissionFinalReport.pdf)

Aerospace will be at the core of America’s leadership and strength in the 21st century. The role of aerospace in establishing America’s global leadership was incontrovertibly proved in the last century. This industry opened up new frontiers to the world, such as freedom of flight and access to space. It provided products that defended our nation, sustained our economic prosperity and safeguarded the very freedoms we commonly enjoy as Americans. It has helped forge new inroads in medicine and science, and fathered the development of commercial products that have improved our quality of life. Given a continued commitment to pushing the edge of man’s engineering, scientific and manufacturing expertise, there is the promise of still more innovations and new frontiers yet to be discovered. It is imperativethat the U.S. aerospace industry remains healthy to preserve the balance of our leadership today and toensure our continued leadershiptomorrow.

2NC Telecom Impact

Repeal’s key to telecom growth

Griswold ‘11 (Daniel, Director of the Steifel Center for Trade Policy Studies – Cato Institute and Douglas Peterson, Former Research Assistant – Cato Institute, “Trading with the Bear: Why Russia’s Entry into the WTO Is in America’s Interest”, Free Trade Bulletin, No. 46, 12-6, http://www.cato.org/pubs/ftb/FTB-046.pdf)

PNTR Key to Expanding U.S. Exports

American producers will be in a better position to expand their exports to Russia if the United States can participate fully in Russia’s membership in the WTO. And that can happen only if Congress grants Russia permanent normal trade relations. Russia’s accession to the WTO would almost certainly result in increased U.S. exports, thereby contributing to President Obama’s National Export Initiative goal to double exports from 2009 to 2014. Following a dip during the “Great Recession” of 2008–09, U.S. exports to Russia have rebounded strongly. The increasing economic liberalization and development of Russia in recent years has coincided with increased U.S. exports, with the growth rate of U.S. exports to Russia twice as large as the growth rate of U.S. exports to the rest of the world. By some estimates, U.S. exports to Russia could double in the five years following its accession to the WTO. 8 Demand within the Russian market for U.S. goods and services is significant and increasing. Moreover, that demand spans across multiple economic sectors, including agriculture, services, capital equipment, manufactures, machinery, and advanced technologies. In 2010, for example, 66 million Russians were Internet users. This number is expected to jump by 20 percent in 2011, stoking demand for U.S.-branded computer software and hardware. 9 As a condition of its WTO entry, Russia has committed to joining the Information Technology Agreement, which eliminates duties on a wide range of IT, communication, and other high-tech hardware. Also, Russia is the 8th largest market for U.S. exports of PVC and other polymers, and exports of these goods grew 500 percent between 2008 and 2010. Furthermore, Russia will require an estimated 960 new civilian aircraft in the next 20 years to replace its aging fleet, and a proposed reduction from 20 percent to 7.5 percent in tariffs on wide body aircraft would benefit U.S. producers significantly. 10 Growing demand for Russia’s vast natural resources—including farming, mining, oil, and energy products—drives Russian demand for heavy and complex machinery, which the United States is in an optimal position to export. Russia has committed to a bound tariff (upon entering the WTO) of 5 percent in this sector. 11 Meat is another area in which Russia’s accession would greatly benefit the United States. Despite a temporary decline in exports to Russia due to a chemical-based ban on U.S. poultry, Russia remained one of the top 10 markets for U.S. poultry exports in 2010. 12 As a member of the WTO, Russia would have to adhere to international standards in regulating its meat imports, ensuring greater predictability for U.S. exports. This is also true for pork products, and U.S. pork exports increased tenfold in the five years preceding the economic crisis. Exports of U.S. beef to Russia also have risen, jumping to $102 million in 2010. Russia’s agreement to bind its tariff and comply with WTO standards in agriculture will both increase the standards of meat within Russia and help to ensure and expand the market for U.S. goods. 13 Russia has also committed to liberalization measures in its financial sector. This has opened up Russia as a potential recipient of considerable foreign direct investment. The U.S. financial sector is poised to gain from Russian accession commitments to allow 100 percent foreign ownership of banks and financial institutions, to liberalize financial services across borders, and to allow internal securities trading by foreign firms. 14 Similarly, such U.S. sectors as telecommunications, professional services providers, and distribution operators would benefit from Russian liberalization of foreign investment and ownership, and several high-tech industries would benefit from Russia’s adherence to the WTO’s Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property (TRIPs) agreement. 15

Sustains growth and tech leadership

Prestowitz ‘06 (Clyde, President – Economic Strategy Institute, “America’s Technology Future At Risk: Broadband and Investment Strategies to Refire Innovation”, http://serv01.clev17.com/~econstra/ images/ESI\_Research\_Reports\_PDF/americas\_technology\_future\_at\_risk.pdf|)

Both as the developer of innovations like the telegraph, telephone, Internet, and semiconductor, and as the central nervous system of the entire economy, the telecommunications industry has long been an indispensable element of America’s technological leadership and economic success. • For example, it is estimated that the industry accounted for half the increase in U.S. issued patents in the decade of the 1990s, and the Federal Reserve Board has shown that about two- thirds of U.S. productivity gains since 1995 have been due to the impact of communications and computer technology.

Tech leadership’s key to heg and solves great power war

Taylor ‘05 (Mark, Professor of Political Science – Massachusetts Institute of Technology, “The Politics of Technological Change: International Relations versus Domestic Institutions”, 4-1, http://www.scribd.com/doc/46554792/Taylor)

Technological innovation is of central importance to the study of international relations (IR), affecting almost every aspect of the sub-field.\* First and foremost, a nation's technological capability has a significant effect on its economic growth, industrial might, and military prowess; therefore relative national technological capabilities necessarily influence the balance of power between states, and hence have a role in calculations of war and alliance formation. Second, technology and innovative capacity also determine a nation's trade profile, affecting which products it will import and export, as well as where multinational corporations will base their production facilities.' Third, insofar as innovation-driven economic growth both attracts investment and produces surplus capital, a nation's technological ability will also affect international financial flows and who has power over them.- Thus, in broad theoretical terms, technological change is important to the study of IR because of its overall implications for both the relative and absolute power of states. And if theory alone does not convince, then history also tells us that nations on the technological ascent generally experience a corresponding and dramatic change in their global stature and influence, such as Britain during the first industrial revolution, the United States and Germany during the second industrial revolution, and Japan during the twentieth century.' Conversely, great powers which fail to maintain their place at the technological frontier generally drift and fade from influence on international scene.0 This is not to suggest that technological innovation alone determines international politics, but rather that shifts in both relative and absolute technological capability have a major impact on international relations, and therefore need to be better understood by IR scholars.

Indeed, the importance of technological innovation to international relations is seldom disputed by IR theorists. Technology is rarely the sole or overriding causal variable in any given IR theory, but a broad overview of the major theoretical debates reveals the ubiquity of technological causality. For example, from Waltz to Posen, almost all Realists have a place for technology in their explanations of international politics.7 At the very least, they describe it as an essential part of the distribution of material capabilities across nations, or an indirect source of military doctrine. And for some, like Gilpin quoted above, technology is the very cornerstone of great power domination, and its transfer the main vehicle by which war and change occur in world politics.' Jervis tells us that the balance of offensive and defensive military technology affects the incentives for war.9 Walt agrees, arguing that technological change can alter a state's aggregate power, and thereby affect both alliance formation and the international balance of threats.10 Liberals are less directly concerned with technological change, but they must admit that by raising or lowering the costs of using force, technological progress affects the rational attractiveness of international cooperation and regimes." Technology also lowers information & transactions costs and thus increases the applicability of international institutions, a cornerstone of Liberal IR theory." And in fostering flows of trade, finance, and information, technological change can lead to Keohane's interdependence\*5 or Thomas Friedman et al's globalization.\*4 Meanwhile, over at the "third debate", Constructivists cover the causal spectrum on the issue, from Katzenstein's "cultural norms" which shape security concerns and thereby affect technological innovation;" toWendt's "stripped down technological determinism" in which technology inevitably drives nations to form a world state.\*4 However most Constructivists seem to favor Wendt, arguing that new technology changes people's identities within society, and sometimes even creates new cross-national constituencies, thereby affecting international politics.17 Of course, Marxists tend to see technology as determining all social relations and the entire course of history, though they describe mankind's major fault lines as running between economic classes rather than nation-states." Finally, Buzan & Little remind us that without advances in the technologies of transportation, communication, production, and war, international systems would not exist in the first place.'9

2NC Gas Diversification Impact

Repeal’s key to U.S. energy diversification

Teplitskaia ‘02 (Helen, Founder and President – American-Russian Chamber of Commerce and Adjunct Professor – Northwestern University Kellogg Graduate School of Management, “Jackson-Vanik: Fighting an Enemy that No Longer Exists”, <http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=2&cts=1330788184098&> ved=0CDUQFjAB&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.arcci.org%2Fspotlight%2Fspotlight%2520files%2Finterviews%2Fjackson%2520final.doc&ei=6DZST5f3CIH3gge6wZjRDQ&usg=AFQjCNEd\_kXiBnhBHw4meSIuYO1rhYyUMA&sig2=jgOFOjKtllkuIrkNz0oyJg)

We obviously live in a different world than twenty-eight years ago when Congress enacted the Jackson-Vanik amendment to use trade restrictions for pressure on the Soviet Union, China and other communist nations to relax their emigration laws. Though Russia is no longer communist and has complied with Jackson-Vanik requirements for years, it is still subject to a humiliating annual review of its trade status under this Cold War relic. It is time to rescind Jackson-Vanik with respect to Russia and grant it "permanent normal trade relations" (PNTR) status. Senator Richard Lugar’s bill S1861 finds that Russia has been in full compliance with emigration requirements of Jackson-Vanik since 1994. Jewish emigrants, the intended beneficiary of the amendment, have been freely emigrating from Russia for over a decade (including this author); there are no more "refusniks." Jewish organizations in the US, including the National Conference on Soviet Jewry comprised of 50 national groups and over 300 local organizations, urges Russia's graduation from Jackson-Vanik. Jewish organizations in Russia have similarly advocated graduation and express dismay that an obsolete cause continues to constrict trade between the two nations and harm U.S.-Russian relations. The World Congress of Russian Jewry with a presence in 22 countries also advocates graduation and states that Jackson-Vanik now hurts its cause. Free elections and peaceful transfer of power are now the norm in Russia. Post-Soviet laws help protect all Russian citizens against hate crimes, although obviously such measures need to be monitored and enforced. Other former Soviet states such as Georgia and Kyrgizstan, as well as communist China with significant ongoing human rights violations, have already been awarded PNTR. To deny the same treatment to Russia, which has made enormous progress in democratization and human rights, is a glaring anomaly. There will be economic and commercial benefits to the US from repeal. Despite continuing economic doldrums worldwide, the Russian economy has averaged six percent growth over the last three years and is now positioned to attract more US exports in manufacturing, energy, telecommunications, transportation and health care. Repealing Jackson-Vanik will also encourage American companies to step up profitable investments in the new Russia. Furthermore, increased access to Russian petroleum and natural gas will become crucial to the U.S. in light of current global events, particularly in the Middle East, and will help diversify our energy supply over the long run.

Key to heg, natural gas’s critical

Freeland ‘11 (Cadet Nathaniel, U.S. Military Academy – West Point, “The Strategic Importance of Shale Gas”, Issue Paper – Center for Strategic Leadership, August, http://www.csl.army.mil/usacsl/publications/IP16\_11.pdf)

We have not adequately advanced priorities like education, energy, science and technology, and health care. We must transform the way we use energy—diversifying supplies….By doing so, we will enhance energy security, create jobs, and fight climate change. —2010 U.S. National Security Strategy Fuel powers the industrial production that strengthens the economy and provides the means to project national power. Reliable sources of energy are imperative to the security of the United States. Aside from coal, conventional natural gas deposits have been the most practical and easiest to recover. Approximately 24% of the United States energy is supplied by natural gas. 1 Broken down by sector, it is a major fuel source for a wide range of industries to include paper, metals, chemicals and food processing. 2 In addition to its industrial uses, natural gas is used to heat, cool, and cook in the residential and commercial sectors of the United States. 3 Due to its cleaner-burning properties, economic availability, and equivalent power to quantity ratio, it has become a favored alternative. 4 In terms of energy output natural gas provides one and one-third times as much energy as gasoline, which is very important in considering alternative fuel sources. 5 However, natural gas supply has been overtaken by the demand of the U.S. economy. Approximately 30% of the global natural gas supply is now traded internationally, mostly within regional markets; this figure represents an increase from 2005 to 2010. 6 In 2009, the United States imported 3.7 trillion cubic feet (tcf) of its 24 tcf consumption, most of which was from Canada. 7 While this figure is not alarming, the future geopolitical implications of an increased need to import natural gas as a result of the widening disparity between domestic supply and demand causes some concern. The conflict with the conventional natural gas supply lies not in the present but the future. This increased reliance on foreign sources could pose at least two problems for the United States: it would decrease U.S. energy security; and it could create a “multi-billion dollar outflow of U.S. wealth to foreign interests,” thus, increasing the U.S. balance of payments deficit and increasing the power of producing countries. 8 In addition, there is concern that strong dependence on coal for electricity production causes environmental problems due to the large amounts of CO2 emissions that are reduced with natural gas.

Global nuclear war

Arbatov ‘07 (Alexei, Member – Russian Academy of Sciences and Editor – Russia in Global Affairs, “Is a New Cold War Imminent?”, Russia in Global Affairs, 5(3), July / September, <http://eng.globalaffairs.ru/numbers/20/1130.html>)

However, the low probability of a new Cold War and the collapse of American unipolarity (as a political doctrine, if not in reality) cannot be a cause for complacency. Multipolarity, existing objectively at various levels and interdependently, holds many difficulties and threats. For example, if the Russia-NATO confrontation persists, it can do much damage to both parties and international security. Or, alternatively, if Kosovo secedes from Serbia, this may provoke similar processes in Abkhazia, South Ossetia and Transdniestria, and involve Russia in armed conflicts with Georgia and Moldova, two countries that are supported by NATO. Another flash point involves Ukraine. In the event of Kiev’s sudden admission into the North Atlantic Alliance (recently sanctioned by the U.S. Congress), such a move may divide Ukraine and provoke mass disorders there, thus making it difficult for Russia and the West to refrain from interfering. Meanwhile, U.S. plans to build a missile defense system in Central and Eastern Europe may cause Russia to withdraw from the INF Treaty and resume programs for producing intermediate-range missiles. Washington may respond by deploying similar missiles in Europe, which would dramatically increase the vulnerability of Russia’s strategic forces and their control and warning systems. This could make the stage for nuclear confrontation even tenser. Other “centers of power” would immediately derive benefit from the growing Russia-West standoff, using it in their own interests. China would receive an opportunity to occupy even more advantageous positions in its economic and political relations with Russia, the U.S. and Japan, and would consolidate its influence in Central and South Asia and the Persian Gulf region. India, Pakistan, member countries of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations and some exalted regimes in Latin America would hardly miss their chance, either. A multipolar world that is not moving toward nuclear disarmament is a world of an expanding Nuclear Club. While Russia and the West continue to argue with each other, states that are capable of developing nuclear weapons of their own will jump at the opportunity. The probability of nuclear weapons being used in a regional conflict will increase significantly. International Islamic extremism and terrorism will increase dramatically; this threat represents the reverse side of globalization. The situation in Afghanistan, Central Asia, the Middle East, and North and East Africa will further destabilize. The wave of militant separatism, trans-border crime and terrorism will also infiltrate Western Europe, Russia, the U.S., and other countries. The surviving disarmament treaties (the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Conventional Armed Forces in Europe Treaty, and the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty) will collapse. In a worst-case scenario, there is the chance that an adventuresome regime will initiate a missile launch against territories or space satellites of one or several great powers with a view to triggering an exchange of nuclear strikes between them. Another high probability is the threat of a terrorist act with the use of a nuclear device in one or several major capitals of the world.

2NC Russia Reforms Impact

Repeal’s key to effective Russian reforms

Griswold ‘11 (Daniel, Director of the Steifel Center for Trade Policy Studies – Cato Institute and Douglas Peterson, Former Research Assistant – Cato Institute, “Trading with the Bear: Why Russia’s Entry into the WTO Is in America’s Interest”, Free Trade Bulletin, No. 46, 12-6, http://www.cato.org/pubs/ftb/FTB-046.pdf)

Finally, Russia’s entry into the WTO would benefit the United States indirectly by spurring economic growth in Russia and institutionalizing economic reforms. Although 2Russia remains a mixed economy with widespread government intervention, it has been liberalizing its trade regime. The average level of import tariffs in Russia has dropped from 14 percent to 8 percent, according to World Bank economist David Tarr. Membership in the WTO would help to lock in those gains. The World Bank also predicts WTO membership would increase the size of the Russian economy by as much as 11 percent in the long run, further boosting demand for U.S. exports. 16

[CONTINUES]

Contrary to popular belief, Jackson-Vanik itself does not prevent Russia from becoming a full member of the WTO. Rather, failure by the United States to revoke Jackson-Vanik restrictions and grant MFN/PNTR (in the light of Russian WTO accession) would mean that the United States must invoke the WTO’s nonapplication provision and, by so doing, refrain from a WTO-protected bilateral and reciprocal trade relationship with Russia. The United States would benefit more from having Russia in, rather than out of, the transparent, multilateral, and rules-based trade system. Application of WTO Article 6 XIII (the nonapplication provision) essentially amounts to an official and legal declaration that any and all WTO privileges, obligations, and mechanisms are nonexistent and inapplicable between the two concerned WTO members. Currently, the Russian economy operates largely outside of the formal, rules-based international system to which the vast majority of countries belong. In doing so, Russia denies American and other foreign firms potential benefits and protections available via WTO-monitored U.S.-Russia trade. Russian accession to the WTO (and U.S. granting of PNTR) thus would impose on Russia new levels of transparency and legal obligations relative to U.S.-Russia trade. Finally, granting Russia MFN trade status prior to WTO accession may function as a source of goodwill, motivating Russia to liberalize more quickly, deeply, and transparently. While no results can be guaranteed, granting Russia permanent normal trade relations would expand the freedom of American companies to reach new customers while further encouraging Russia’s uncertain progress toward a more open, modern, and globally integrated economy.

Russian growth solves extinction

Filger ‘09 (Sheldon, Columnist and Founder – Global EconomicCrisis.com, “Russian Economy Faces Disasterous Free Fall Contraction”, [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/sheldon-filger/russian-economy-faces-dis\_b\_201147.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/sheldon-filger/russian-economy-faces-dis_b_201147.html" \t "_blank))

In Russia, historically, economic health and political stability are intertwined to a degree that is rarely encountered in other major industrialized economies. It was the economic stagnation of the former Soviet Union that led to its political downfall. Similarly, Medvedev and Putin, both intimately acquainted with their nation's history, are unquestionably alarmed at the prospect that Russia's economic crisis will endanger the nation's political stability, achieved at great cost after years of chaos following the demise of the Soviet Union. Already, strikes and protests are occurring among rank and file workers facing unemployment or non-payment of their salaries. Recent polling demonstrates that the once supreme popularity ratings of Putin and Medvedev are eroding rapidly. Beyond the political elites are the financial oligarchs, who have been forced to deleverage, even unloading their yachts and executive jets in a desperate attempt to raise cash. Should the Russian economy deteriorate to the point where economic collapse is not out of the question, the impact will go far beyond the obvious accelerant such an outcome would be for the Global Economic Crisis. There is a geopolitical dimension that is even more relevant then the economic context. Despite its economic vulnerabilities and perceived decline from superpower status, Russia remains one of only two nations on earth with a nuclear arsenal of sufficient scope and capability to destroy the world as we know it. For that reason, it is not only President Medvedev and Prime Minister Putin who will be lying awake at nights over the prospect that a national economic crisis can transform itself into a virulent and destabilizing social and political upheaval. It just may be possible that U.S. President Barack Obama's national security team has already briefed him about the consequences of a major economic meltdown in Russia for the peace of the world. After all, the most recent national intelligence estimates put out by the U.S. intelligence community have already concluded that the Global Economic Crisis represents the greatest national security threat to the United States, due to its facilitating political instability in the world. During the years Boris Yeltsin ruled Russia, security forces responsible for guarding the nation's nuclear arsenal went without pay for months at a time, leading to fears that desperate personnel would illicitly sell nuclear weapons to terrorist organizations. If the current economic crisis in Russia were to deteriorate much further, how secure would the Russian nuclear arsenal remain? It may be that the financial impact of the Global Economic Crisis is its least dangerous consequence.

2NC IPR Impact

Repeal’s key to stop Russian piracy

Griswold ‘11 (Daniel, Director of the Steifel Center for Trade Policy Studies – Cato Institute and Douglas Peterson, Former Research Assistant – Cato Institute, “Promoting U.S. Exports and the Rule of Law in Russia”, Washington Times, 12-7, http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/promoting-us-exports-rule-law-russia)

Opponents of granting PNTR point to Russia's abuse of health and safety measures to protect its agricultural sector, its lack of intellectual property protection and restrictions on civil and political liberties. Each of those concerns is real, but withholding PNTR will not address any one of them.

In fact, granting PNTR will allow the U.S. government to use the organization's dispute settlement mechanism to challenge any Russian violation of its WTO commitments. Any continued use of regulations as disguised trade barriers could be challenged under the WTO's sanitary and phytosanitary agreement. Violations of intellectual property would be open to challenge through the agreement on trade-related aspects of intellectual property.

As for human rights, it is a simple historical fact that trade policy has proved to be an ineffective tool for imposing fundamental political changes in other countries. The World Trade Organization was not set up to enforce human rights but more narrowly to promote trade liberalization among its members. Promoting respect for human rights around the world is a worthy cause, but threatening to withdraw trade access for an entire nation is not a proper human rights tool.

Just as WTO member governments pursue a wide range of trade policies, they also represent a wide range of political regimes. Of the organization's 153 members, more than 20 are at least as repressive of civil and political liberties as Russia, as measured in the annual survey by Freedom House. The list of WTO members that, like Russia, are classified as "not free" includes Bahrain, Cambodia, Chad, China, Cuba, Egypt, Jordan, Oman, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Vietnam, the United Arab Emirates and Zimbabwe. It would be inconsistent with the spirit of the WTO, as well as established U.S. policy, to oppose Russia's membership in the organization because of its restrictions on political and civil freedoms.

On balance, the United States would benefit more from having Russia in, rather than out of, the transparent, multilateral and rules-based trade system. While no results can be guaranteed, granting Russia permanent normal trade relations would expand the freedom of American companies to reach new customers while further encouraging Russia's uncertain progress toward a more open, modern and globally integrated economy.

Undermines organized crime

Krastev ‘09 (Nikola, New York Based Correspondent – RFE/FL, “Report Says Film Piracy, Organized Crime Intertwined In Russia”, Radio Free Europe Free Liberty, 3-21, http://www.rferl.org/content/Report\_Says\_Film\_Piracy\_Organized\_Crime\_Intertwined\_In\_Russia\_/1514434.html)

That's why, according to a new report by the RAND Corporation, a U.S. think tank, film piracy has become a key part of Russian organized crime’s illegal business portfolio, along with drugs, money laundering, extortion, and human smuggling. Gregory Treverton, a co-author of the report, directs the Center for Global Risk and Security at RAND. “What we do know is that the profit margin -- not the profit, but the profit margins -- are much greater for film piracy even than for narcotics," Treverton said. "So, another reason to be involved -- and as we said, yet another reason for crime to be involved -- is because the penalties for piracy are relatively light by comparison, say, to drug trafficking. So, you have something with a very high profit margin, fairly low risk of enforcement -- that seems like a pretty good addition to your criminal portfolio.” Treverton says RAND's objective was to learn more about the relationship between piracy, organized crime, and government officials in producing “protected space” for crime. He says the report’s 14 case studies provide compelling evidence of a broad connection between film piracy and organized crime. The study sought "to use the cases to understand more about how -- for a combination of reasons, starting with corruption but also going to the stakes of politicians -- this protected space for crime gets created in a number of different countries. That’s what we looked at Russia, Mexico, and Japan,” Treverton said. Bribes And Pay-Offs The report says Russia’s widespread corruption, particularly in law enforcement, provides numerous opportunities for pirates to take advantage of weak rule of law. For instance, the officers from the economic crimes squad are known to shut a business down without cause, only to require payment later to restart the business. And if criminals want to preempt a police raid, the going rate for advance warning on an impending search of a piracy outfit is about $30,000. In 2005 alone, 4,269 Russian police officers were charged with corruption-related crimes, according to the report. Mark Esper, the executive vice president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce’s Global Intellectual Property Center in Washington, told RFE/RL that Russia and China top the list for intellectual property-rights violations, according to another report carried out recently by the U.S. government. At the same time, he says, there is some modest improvement in the situation compared to a decade ago. Esper notes that a part of Russia's civil code that covers intellectual property rights went into effect on January 1. "So, it’s fair to say there’s been progress in terms of the legal code; but it’s not clear [if] there’s been progress in terms of enforcement," he said. "When you have a system that’s fraught with some degree of corruption at both the official level and law enforcement level, it’s very challenging to crack down and reduce these violations.” Esper says the weakest point in Russia with regard to intellectual property violations is enforcement. Indeed, the Rand report highlights the close ties of pirates and enforcement officials willing to be paid off. The most notable Russia-related case analyzed in the report is that of Alexander Tarantsev. According to Russian experts on organized crime, Tarantsev controlled pirate markets in Moscow and often used bribery to influence corrupt officials. His case, the report says, highlights the links between pirates and authorities, not only through bribery but also through careful cultivation of relationships with senior politicians and officials. It is also noteworthy for highlighting the continuing violence associated with piracy. Political Will Needed Treverton of RAND Corporation says that in China, there has been improvement on the part of the authorities to enforce internationally adopted rules for intellectual property. But the problem is that these enforcements are ignored at the local level -- and the same is largely true of Russia. “Ten years ago, people would say ‘Why should we worry about some rich Hollywood studio?’" Treverton said. "The language has changed a bit, again [it is] unclear at least to me what their real ability to enforce their will on the various regions of Russia would be even if they wanted to. Probably this is still not an issue on which they’re going to spend many political chips.” Esper of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce says the RAND report underscores the political will of governments as the most important element to weaken or sever the link between film piracy and organized crime. “Without that type of political will, the resolve to address this crime trickles down into law enforcement and into those persons on the ground really dealing with it," he said. But even political will is dependent on another factor: strong legislation. "There have been some improvements in Russia’s civil code and some political commitments made with regard to [WTO] treaty obligations and those are positive steps forward," Esper said. "But you have to have strong legislation, enforcement legislation, and other types of measures to protect this industry from crime, from counterfeiters, from pirates.”

Nuclear war

Cilluffo ‘03 (Frank, Executive Director – Homeland Security Advisory Council, “Dealing with Transnational Threats”, http://www. ndu.edu/inss/books/books%20-%201999/US%20Russian%20Partnership%20July%2099/usrp18.html)

The stranglehold of Russian organized crime on Russian society is immense. Crime is truly usurping the state’s authority to resolve legal disputes. Unable to depend on overburdened or corrupt courts, Russian businesses and individuals are forced to turn to kryshas (protection rackets), many with criminal ties for adjudication. The criminals, on the other hand, do brutally enforce their own criminal code, settling everything from parking tickets to major business disputes. Once ingrained into the Russian ethos, this phenomenon cannot be eradicated overnight. This is precisely why the United States needs to support processes, as opposed to individuals. An independent judiciary, insulated from corruption and politics, is crucial. This is not an issue of simply placing more laws on the books, it is an issue of political will and making the bureaucracy more professional. Crime and corruption have also been the greatest impediments to attracting foreign direct investment, which cannot be treated in isolation of infrastructure modernization, shareholder rights, contract enforcement, Russian customs, and taxation and licensing issues. Russia finds itself in the unpalatable position of depending on foreign investment, given massive capital flight and the wholesale plundering of its natural resources by its oligarchs and organized crime groups. The current fiscal crisis in Russia is, of course, undermining urgently needed maintenance of nuclear command systems and is weakening security and safeguards of nuclear weapons. A former army general and Duma member, the late General Rokhlin, stated that the Russian strategic nuclear forces were nearing extinction for want of funds for maintenance. Both officers and ranks are unpaid, not fed, and unhappy. In this atmosphere the prospect for a criminal diversion of nuclear materials or an unauthorized and perhaps even accidental launch is at an all-time high. This threat may not be as apocalyptic as nuclear war, but nevertheless the likelihood of a nuclear event is greater today than it was during the Cold War.

2NC Russian Democracy Impact

Repeal consolidates Russian democracy

Cowan ‘94 (Kevin M., JD – University of Kansas, “Cold War Trade Statutes: Is Jackson-Vanik Still Relevant?”, Kansas Law Review, Spring, 42 Kan. L. Rev. 737, Lexis)

The second factor in the American Jewish Congress position is that private investment requires a stable environment. 151 Granting MFN treatment to Russia through rescission of Jackson-Vanik will, according to the American Jewish Congress, provide economic stability and will facilitate foreign private investment that will bolster Russia's move toward democracy. 152

Overwhelms alt causes, FDI’s key

Verona ‘11 (Edward S., President and CEO – US-Russia Business Council, “Rule of Law and Human Rights in Russia”, CQ Congressional Testimony, 12-14, Lexis)

Third, encouraging trade, tightening Russia's integration into the global economy and greater access by Russian consumers to transformative technologies (i.e., smartphones and the internet) is likely to contribute to growing societal demands for accountable government and vigorous action to combat corruption, which, first and foremost, affects the average Russian citizen. One should not underestimate the effect of an increase in the size of the middle class on Russia's political and economic system. For example, the World Bank estimates that WTO membership will result in at least a 3.7 percent increase in GDP in the next five years. According to several socio-economic studies, when per capita GDP exceeds roughly $15,000, individuals become more attentive to quality of life issues, including quality of government. Russia's current per capita GDP of nearly $12,000 (at market exchange rates) places it at the threshold of that category.1

Global nuclear war

Goodby ‘02 (James E., Former Fellow – US Institute of Peace, and Piet Buwalda and Dmitriĭ Trenin, A Strategy for Stable Peace: Toward a Euroatlantic Security Community, p. 27-29)

A decade after the Cold War was solemnly buried, there is still no stable peace between Russia and the Western countries. Moreover, from the late 1990s the dynamic of the relationship has taken a negative direc­tion. NATO's expansion to the east, the Kosovo crisis, and the second Chechen war stand out as milestones of the gradual slide toward something alternately described as a "cold peace" and a "new cold war." Frustration is steadily building on both sides. Mutual expecta­tions have been drastically lowered. In the Western world, and in North America in particular, public expectations for Russia and its affairs have plummeted. "Russia fatigue" is widespread in Europe as well. In Russia itself, Western, especially U.S., policies are often described as being aimed at keeping Russia weak and fragmented, with a purpose of subjugating it. It would appear, then, that today is anything but a pro­pitious starting point for an effort to chart the road toward a security community centered on Europe that would include Russia. But such an effort is necessary and should not be delayed. At worst, a Russia that is not properly anchored in a common institu­tional framework with the West can turn into a loose nuclear cannon. If conflicts arise between Russia and its smaller neighbors, the West will not be able to sit them out. And a progressive alienation between Russia and the Western world would have a very negative impact on domestic developments in Russia. Now that the German problem has been solved, the Russian problem looms as potentially Europe's largest. The United States will not be able to ignore Russia's strategic nuclear arsenal, and the European Union can hardly envisage a modi­cum of stability along its eastern periphery unless it finds a formula to co-opt Russia as Europe's reliable associate. RUSSIAN DEMOCRATIZATION In the decade since the demise of the Soviet Union and the commu­nist system, Russia has evolved into a genuinely pluralist society, al­though it is still a very incomplete democracy. To its credit, Russia has a constitution that proclaims separation of powers; it has a work­ing parliament, an executive president, and a nominally independent judiciary. Between 1993 and 2000, three parliamentary and two presi­dential elections were held; for the first time in Russia's long history, transfer of power at the very top occurred peacefully and in accor­dance with a democratic constitution. This is already becoming a pat­tern. Power has been decentralized vertically as well as horizontally. Power monopoly is a thing of the past. Russia's regions have started to form distinct identities. The regional governors, or presidents of re­publics, within Russia are popularly elected, as are city mayors and regional legislatures. The national economy has been largely priva­tized. The media, though not genuinely independent either of the au­thorities or of the various vested interests, are free in principle. There is a large degree of religious freedom, and ideological oppression is nonexistent. Finally, Russians are free to travel abroad. These achievements are significant, and most of them are irre­versible. Yet, Russia's development is handicapped by major hurdles to speedier societal transformation, as is occurring in Poland or Es­tonia. One hurdle is poor governance, stemming from the irresponsi­bility of the elites as much as from sheer incompetence. Toward the end of the Yeltsin era, the state itself appeared privatized, with parts of it serving the interests of various groups or strongmen. Corruption and crime are pervasive. Accustomed to living in an authoritarian state, many Russians began to associate democracy with chaos and thug­gery. Another major problem is widespread poverty and the collapse of the social infrastructure, including health care. Too many Russians believe they have gained little or nothing from the economic and social changes of the past decade. Taken together, these factors work toward the restoration of some form of authoritarian and paternalistic rule.

2NC Russian Protectionism Impact

JV repeal stops Russian protectionism bc it undermines the WTO

Aslund ‘11 (Anders, Ph.D. – University of Oxford and Senior Fellow – Peterson Institute for International Economics and Gary Clyde Hufbauer, Senior Fellow – Peterson Institute for International Economics, “The United States Should Establish Permanent Normal Trade Relations with Russia”, IEE Policy Brief, November, http://www.iie.com/publications/pb/pb11-20.pdf)

Russia’s joining the WTO does not require any US legislative action. All conditions for Russia’s accession have been settled. The Russian State Duma has until June 15, 2012 to ratify its accession. Thirty days after Russia’s notification to the WTO of its ratification, Russia will become the 154th member of the WTO. However, US benefits of Russia’s accession to the WTO are not automatic. They will materialize only if the United States Congress grants permanent normal trade relations (PNTR) status to Russia—by repealing application to Russia of the 37-year-old Jackson-Vanik Amendment, which bars favorable trade relations with countries that restrict emigration. President Barack Obama, in a statement issued November 10 after the Working Party’s preliminary approval of Russian accession, said he looked forward to working with Congress “to end the application of the Jackson-Vanik Amendment to Russia in order to ensure that American firms and American exporters will enjoy the same benefits of Russian WTO membership as their international competitors.” It is imperative that Congress respond constructively in the same spirit of bipartisanship that led to the successful approval earlier this year of the Colombia, Korea, and Panama trade accords. Political wrangling, misjudgment, and miscalculations must not be allowed to cost the United States a significant new source of economic growth and cooperation in the future.

WHAT THE UNITED STATES WILL GAIN FROM GRANTING RUSSIA PNTR

The potential benefits to the US economy from Russia’s WTO accession are substantial but the United States can enjoy them only if it grants Russia PNTR. US exports to Russia could double over the next five years—from $9 billion in 2010 to $19 billion—adding jobs in the services, agriculture, manufacturing, and high-tech sectors. More generally, with Russia’s accession to the WTO and the United States granting PNTR to Russia, US-Russia commercial relations will be set on a sounder and friendlier footing, facilitating cooperation on national security and political issues. By strengthening the rules-based global trading system, WTO accession and PNTR will discourage Russia from undertaking protectionist measures.

Key to Russia trade

Stewart ‘11 (Terence P., Managing Partner – Stewart Associates, “Opportunities and Challenges From Russia’s 2012 Accession to the WTO”, 11-28, <http://www.stewartlaw.com/stewartandstewart/Portals/1/Douments/Russian%2020> 12%20Accession%20to%20the%20WTO.pdf)

Russia is the largest economy, and the only G-20 country, that is not a member of the World Trade Organization (WTO). In world merchandise trade rankings, Russia is 12 th in exports and 18 th in imports. In world commercial services trade rankings, Russia is 23 rd in exports and 16 th in imports. Russia is the 11 th largest economy in the world, with a GDP of roughly $1.5 trillion in 2010. 2 Now, after an 18-year accession process that began in 1993, it appears that Russia will finally become a member of the WTO in the first half of 2012. With a population of over 140 million, Russia’s entry into the WTO presents opportunities to U.S. business interests for increased trade and investment. In 2010, Russia imported $10.7 billion in U.S. goods, making the United States the 4 th largest source of Russian imports. The U.S. accounts for approximately 4.5% of total Russian imports. In 2010, major U.S. goods exports to Russia included: machinery (including oil/gas equipment), aerospace (aircraft), optical and medical instruments, automotive and other transportation vehicles, electrical machinery, meat (poultry and pork), and pharmaceutical products. Russia’s accession to the WTO also presents challenges, as a range of distortions in Russia’s economy are not addressed or not addressed to the satisfaction of every group in the U.S. See, e.g., IPR Industries to Sit Out Russia MFN Vote in Light of WTO Commitments, Inside U.S. Trade (Nov. 25, 2011). Nevertheless, Russia’s membership in the WTO would benefit existing WTO members by providing more stable trade relations with Russia, greater access to Russian markets for their products, and greater opportunities to invest in Russia. WTO membership would benefit Russia in many ways, including: the ability to shape the global trading system through participation in on-going and future negotiations, the ability to address and resolve trade conflicts through consultations with other members and, if necessary, resort to the WTO dispute settlement system, and the ability to access other members’ markets on a non-discriminatory basis. The World Bank has estimated that WTO membership could expand Russia’s economy by 3% in the medium term and by 11% in the long term. The accession process requires non-members who want to join the WTO to negotiate with WTO members the terms and conditions under which the applicant country will be admitted. Because acceding countries are seeking the benefits of membership, including current bound tariff rates and market liberalization commitments in various service sectors, the accession process is all about existing members vetting the acceding country’s system and seeking liberalization commitments from the acceding country to ensure adequate benefits to them in exchange for the acceding country’s entitlement to WTO rights against all of them. The addition of Russia, a large country, to the WTO will have significance if Russia engages in significant trade liberalization and adopts commitments that will make Russia a meaningful player in rules-based global trade.

Global nuclear war

Copley News 99 (Service, 12-1, Lexis)

For decades, many children in America and other countries went to bed fearing annihilation by nuclear war. The specter of nuclear winter freezing the life out of planet Earth seemed very real. Activists protesting the World Trade Organization's meeting in Seattle apparently have forgotten that threat. The truth is that nations join together in groups like the WTO not just to further their own prosperity, but also to forestall conflict with other nations. In a way, our planet has traded in the threat of a worldwide nuclear war for the benefit of cooperative global economics. Some Seattle protesters clearly fancy themselves to be in the mold of nuclear disarmament or anti-Vietnam War protesters of decades past. But they're not. They're special-interest activists, whether the cause is environmental, labor or paranoia about global government. Actually, most of the demonstrators in Seattle are very much unlike yesterday's peace activists, such as Beatle John Lennon or philosopher Bertrand Russell, the father of the nuclear disarmament movement, both of whom urged people and nations to work together rather than strive against each other. These and other war protesters would probably approve of 135 WTO nations sitting down peacefully to discuss economic issues that in the past might have been settled by bullets and bombs. As long as nations are trading peacefully, and their economies are built on exports to other countries, they have a major disincentive to wage war. That's why bringing China, a budding superpower, into the WTO is so important. As exports to the United States and the rest of the world feed Chinese prosperity, and that prosperity increases demand for the goods we produce, the threat of hostility diminishes. Many anti-trade protesters in Seattle claim that only multinational corporations benefit from global trade, and that it's the everyday wage earners who get hurt. That's just plain wrong. First of all, it's not the military-industrial complex benefiting. It's U.S. companies that make high-tech goods. And those companies provide a growing number of jobs for Americans. In San Diego, many people have good jobs at Qualcomm, Solar Turbines and other companies for whom overseas markets are essential. In Seattle, many of the 100,000 people who work at Boeing would lose their livelihoods without world trade. Foreign trade today accounts for 30 percent of our gross domestic product. That's a lot of jobs for everyday workers. Growing global prosperity has helped counter the specter of nuclear winter. Nations of the world are learning to live and work together, like the singers of anti-war songs once imagined. Those who care about world peace shouldn't be protesting world trade. They should be celebrating it.

2NC Russian Nationalism Impact

Repeal stops Russian nationalism

Aslund ‘11 (Anders, Ph.D. – University of Oxford and Senior Fellow – Peterson Institute for International Economics and Gary Clyde Hufbauer, Senior Fellow – Peterson Institute for International Economics, “The United States Should Establish Permanent Normal Trade Relations with Russia”, IEE Policy Brief, November, http://www.iie.com/publications/pb/pb11-20.pdf)

In addition, by voting “no” on PNTR, the US Congress would be missing an opportunity to support liberal voices within the Russian government who advocate political and economic engagement with the West. Over the last three years, the US “reset” policy toward Russia has revived US-Russia relations and has already resulted in the ratification of a new bilateral Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty and the Civilian Nuclear Agreement, both in December 2010. Russia has opened the Northern Delivery Network to Afghanistan and joined in supporting some UN Security Council Resolutions that put economic pressure on Iran to desist from its effort to acquire nuclear weapons. Another danger is that a “no” vote on PNTR would provide fresh arguments to a large group of Russians who believe that the West (and the United States in particular) disdains a “relationship of equals” with Russia and simply cannot be trusted. As President Obama said, “Russia’s WTO accession would be yet another important step forward in our reset of relations with Russia, which has been based upon the belief that the United States and Russia share many common interests, even as we disagree on some issues.” It is time to move beyond the discord of the past and into a new regime that would function not only on trust but on economic interdependence and benefits as well.

Causes Russian lash-out and nuclear war

Pry ‘99 (Peter Vincent, Former US Intelligence Operative, War Scare: U.S.-Russia on the Nuclear Brink)

Russian internal troubles—such as a leadership crisis, coup, or civil war—could aggravate Russia’s fears of foreign aggression and lead to a miscalculation of U.S. intentions and to nuclear overreaction. While this may sound like a complicated and improbable chain of events, Russia’s story in the 1990s is one long series of domestic crises that have all too often been the source of nuclear close calls. The war scares of August 1991 and October 1993 arose out of coup attempts. The civil war in Chechnya caused a leadership crisis in Moscow, which contributed to the nuclear false alarm during Norway’s launch of a meteorological rocket in January 1995. Nuclear war arising from Russian domestic crises is a threat the West did not face, or at least faced to a much lesser extent, during the Cold War. The Russian military’s continued fixation on surprise-attack scenarios into the 1990s, combined with Russia’s deepening internal problems, has created a situation in which the United States might find itself the victim of a preemptive strike for no other reason than a war scare born of Russian domestic troubles. At least in nuclear confrontations of the 1950s–1970s—during the Berlin crisis, Cuban missile crisis, and 1973 Middle East war—both sides knew they were on the nuclear brink. There was opportunity to avoid conflict through negotiation or deescalation. The nuclear war scares of the 1980s and 1990s have been one-sided Russian affairs, with the

2NC Competitiveness Impact

JV repeal key to trade and econ

McQuillen ‘12 (William, reporter, “Cold-War Law Blocks Doubling U.S. Trade With Russia Under WTO” Bloomberg -- <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2011-12-13/-74-law-blocks-doubling-u-s-trade-with-russia.html>)

The U.S. risks losing out on a potential doubling of exports to Russia unless Congress repeals a Cold War-era law passed to punish the Communist Soviet Union. The World Trade Organization’s pending approval of Russia’s membership may leave the U.S. unable to take advantage of a 22 percent reduction in tariffs that European and Asian nations will enjoy. The obstacle is the Jackson-Vanik amendment, passed by Congress in 1974 to bar favorable trade relations with the Soviet Union because it wouldn’t let Jewish citizens emigrate. Lawmakers such as Representatives Chris Smith and Ileana Ros- Lehtinen have questioned repealing the law and easing trade with Russia because of its human-rights and economic policies. “Unless Congress passes a repeal, the U.S. business community is not on equal footing with European and Asian competitors,” Randi Levinas, executive vice president of the U.S.-Russia Business Council, with members such as Boeing Co. (BA), General Motors Co. and Exxon Mobil Corp. (XOM), said in an interview. “They won’t get the same benefits when Russia joins.”

Causes nuclear war

Friedberg & Schoenfeld ‘08 (Aaron Friedberg is a professor of politics and international relations at Princeton University's Woodrow Wilson School. Gabriel Schoenfeld, senior editor of Commentary, is a visiting scholar at the Witherspoon Institute in Princeton, N.J., “The Dangers of a Diminished America,” Wall Street Journal, Ocbtober 21, 2008,<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB122455074012352571.html>]

With the global financial system in serious trouble, is America's geostrategic dominance likely to diminish? If so, what would that mean? One immediate implication of the crisis that began on Wall Street and spread across the world is that the primary instruments of U.S. foreign policy will be crimped. The next president will face an entirely new and adverse fiscal position. Estimates of this year's federal budget deficit already show that it has jumped $237 billion from last year, to $407 billion. With families and businesses hurting, there will be calls for various and expensive domestic relief programs. In the face of this onrushing river of red ink, both Barack Obama and John McCain have been reluctant to lay out what portions of their programmatic wish list they might defer or delete. Only Joe Biden has suggested a possible reduction -- foreign aid. This would be one of the few popular cuts, but in budgetary terms it is a mere grain of sand. Still, Sen. Biden's comment hints at where we may be headed: toward a major reduction in America's world role, and perhaps even a new era of financially-induced isolationism. Pressures to cut defense spending, and to dodge the cost of waging two wars, already intense before this crisis, are likely to mount. Despite the success of the surge, the war in Iraq remains deeply unpopular. Precipitous withdrawal -- attractive to a sizable swath of the electorate before the financial implosion -- might well become even more popular with annual war bills running in the hundreds of billions. Protectionist sentiments are sure to grow stronger as jobs disappear in the coming slowdown. Even before our current woes, calls to save jobs by restricting imports had begun to gather support among many Democrats and some Republicans. In a prolonged recession, gale-force winds of protectionism will blow. Then there are the dolorous consequences of a potential collapse of the world's financial architecture. For decades now, Americans have enjoyed the advantages of being at the center of that system. The worldwide use of the dollar, and the stability of our economy, among other things, made it easier for us to run huge budget deficits, as we counted on foreigners to pick up the tab by buying dollar-denominated assets as a safe haven. Will this be possible in the future? Meanwhile, traditional foreign-policy challenges are multiplying. The threat from al Qaeda and Islamic terrorist affiliates has not been extinguished. Iran and North Korea are continuing on their bellicose paths, while Pakistan and Afghanistan are progressing smartly down the road to chaos. Russia's new militancy and China's seemingly relentless rise also give cause for concern. If America now tries to pull back from the world stage, it will leave a dangerous power vacuum. The stabilizing effects of our presence in Asia, our continuing commitment to Europe, and our position as defender of last resort for Middle East energy sources and supply lines could all be placed at risk. In such a scenario there are shades of the 1930s, when global trade and finance ground nearly to a halt, the peaceful democracies failed to cooperate, and aggressive powers led by the remorseless fanatics who rose up on the crest of economic disaster exploited their divisions. Today we run the risk that rogue states may choose to become ever more reckless with their nuclear toys, just at our moment of maximum vulnerability. The aftershocks of the financial crisis will almost certainly rock our principal strategic competitors even harder than they will rock us. The dramatic free fall of the Russian stock market has demonstrated the fragility of a state whose economic performance hinges on high oil prices, now driven down by the global slowdown. China is perhaps even more fragile, its economic growth depending heavily on foreign investment and access to foreign markets. Both will now be constricted, inflicting economic pain and perhaps even sparking unrest in a country where political legitimacy rests on progress in the long march to prosperity. None of this is good news if the authoritarian leaders of these countries seek to divert attention from internal travails with external adventures. As for our democratic friends, the present crisis comes when many European nations are struggling to deal with decades of anemic growth, sclerotic governance and an impending demographic crisis. Despite its past dynamism, Japan faces similar challenges. India is still in the early stages of its emergence as a world economic and geopolitical power. What does this all mean? There is no substitute for America on the world stage. The choice we have before us is between the potentially disastrous effects of disengagement and the stiff price tag of continued American leadership. Are we up for the task? The American economy has historically demonstrated remarkable resilience. Our market-oriented ideology, entrepreneurial culture, flexible institutions and favorable demographic profile should serve us well in whatever trials lie ahead. The American people, too, have shown reserves of resolve when properly led. But experience after the Cold War era -- poorly articulated and executed policies, divisive domestic debates and rising anti-Americanism in at least some parts of the world -- appear to have left these reserves diminished. A recent survey by the Chicago Council on World Affairs found that 36% of respondents agreed that the U.S. should "stay out of world affairs," the highest number recorded since this question was first asked in 1947. The economic crisis could be the straw that breaks the camel's back.

Ext. JV Solves Econ/Competitiveness

Key to solve the economy – laundry list

Griswold and Peterson ‘11 (Daniel, director of the Herbert A. Steifel Center for Trade Policy Studies at the Cato Institute, Douglas, former research assistant @ CATO, “Trading with the Bear: Why Russia's Entry into the WTO Is in America's Interest” December 6 -- http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=13909)

Russia is poised to join the World Trade Organization (WTO), solidifying its transition from a closed communist economy to a full participant in the global marketplace. The only question is whether the United States will embrace Russia as a fellow WTO member or forfeit the benefits for the sake of an outdated policy rooted in the Cold War. Russia's petition to join the WTO dates back to 1993. Since that time it has negotiated accession agreements with all major WTO members, including the United States, committing to open its economy further and to accept WTO rules on nondiscrimination, dispute settlement, intellectual property, and a range of other trade-related issues. WTO members are expected to approve Russia's admission at the organization's ministerial meeting in Geneva, Switzerland, December 15–17. To enjoy the enhanced access to Russia's market, the U.S. government will need to grant permanent normal trade relations (PNTR) to the Russian Federation. Under the 1974 Jackson-Vanik Amendment, Congress is required annually to pass a special exemption for Russia extending it conditional access to the U.S. market. The law was originally intended to withhold normal-trade-relations status from communist countries that did not allow Jewish citizens to freely emigrate. Even after the fall the Berlin Wall in 1989 and the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991, the law continued to apply to most former communist countries because of their continued status as "nonmarket economies." As a condition of membership in the WTO, all members are expected to grant unconditional most-favored nation (MFN) status to all other members. This means each WTO member must offer the same level of market access to other members without attaching special conditions to that access. Continued application of Jackson-Vanik to Russia would be a violation of unconditional MFN status, since it depends on Congress granting renewal each year. If Congress does not grant PNTR to Russia by repealing Jackson-Vanik, then the enhanced market-access commitments Russia has made in its accession protocol would not apply to exports from the United States. Producers in the other 150-plus members would enjoy those benefits but not producers in the United States. The stakes are high. Russia is a major yet still underdeveloped market for a range of American exports, from poultry to aircraft. If U.S. exporters are not granted the more favorable access under Russia's accession protocol, they will face discriminatory tariffs that will put them at a disadvantage against competitors in other major trading nations. That market share, once lost, would be difficult to regain. Granting PNTR to Russia thus becomes important to promoting U.S. trade as a sustainable boost to the sputtering U.S. economy. Expanding U.S.-Russian Commercial Relations Russia has emerged as a major commercial partner of the United States, although the relationship remains underdeveloped relative to the size of Russia's economy and the considerable economic liberalization following the collapse of the Soviet Union. Through the first three quarters of 2011, Russia ranked 31st among nations as a market for U.S. goods exports, and 16th as a source of U.S. goods imports. In two-way trade (exports plus imports), Russia ranks as America's 23rd largest trading partner, just below Thailand and Nigeria,1 even though it is the world's 11th largest economy in exchange-rate terms.2 Russia remains by far the largest economy and the only member of the G-20 group of major economies still outside the World Trade Organization. Of the 50 largest economies in exchange-rate terms, the oil-exporting Islamic Republic of Iran is the only other one that is not a member. Trade with Russia has, however, grown significantly over the past decade. From 2000 to 2010, U.S. goods exports to Russia increased by 187 percent and U.S. imports from Russia increased by 235 percent.3 During the same period, total U.S. exports and imports grew 63 percent and 57 percent respectively. The growth in import value from Russia can be attributed at least partially to an increase in the world prices of natural resources such as oil and natural gas, which account for a large share of U.S. imports from Russia. Over this same time period, world prices for crude oil have increased by 183 percent.4 U.S. trade with Russia is highly concentrated in a few select industries. In 2010 the top five import categories (according to the 2-digit Harmonized System) made up over 70 percent of total U.S. imports from Russia.5 These categories included precious stones and metals, inorganic chemicals, mineral fuels, aluminum, iron and steel, and fish and other seafood. Examining the industry concentration of imports using the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) produces an even greater level of concentration: just three NAICS 3-digit categories (petroleum and coal products, oil and gas, and primary metal manufacturing) made up 86 percent of imports from Russia in 2010.6 U.S. exports to Russia are also highly concentrated: aircraft, machinery, and meat (according to the 2-digit Harmonized System) make up about 60 percent of U.S. exports to Russia. A calculation using comparable NAICS categories yields a figure closer to 54 percent.7

Key to US exports.

Griswold and Peterson ‘11 (Daniel, director of the Herbert A. Steifel Center for Trade Policy Studies at the Cato Institute, Douglas, former research assistant @ CATO, “Trading with the Bear: Why Russia's Entry into the WTO Is in America's Interest” December 6 -- http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=13909)

PNTR Key to Expanding U.S. Exports American producers will be in a better position to expand their exports to Russia if the United States can participate fully in Russia's membership in the WTO. And that can happen only if Congress grants Russia permanent normal trade relations. Russia's accession to the WTO would almost certainly result in increased U.S. exports, thereby contributing to President Obama's National Export Initiative goal to double exports from 2009 to 2014. Following a dip during the "Great Recession" of 2008–09, U.S. exports to Russia have rebounded strongly. The increasing economic liberalization and development of Russia in recent years has coincided with increased U.S. exports, with the growth rate of U.S. exports to Russia twice as large as the growth rate of U.S. exports to the rest of the world. By some estimates, U.S. exports to Russia could double in the five years following its accession to the WTO.8 Demand within the Russian market for U.S. goods and services is significant and increasing. Moreover, that demand spans across multiple economic sectors, including agriculture, services, capital equipment, manufactures, machinery, and advanced technologies. In 2010, for example, 66 million Russians were Internet users. This number is expected to jump by 20 percent in 2011, stoking demand for U.S.-branded computer software and hardware.9 As a condition of its WTO entry, Russia has committed to joining the Information Technology Agreement, which eliminates duties on a wide range of IT, communication, and other high-tech hardware. Also, Russia is the 8th largest market for U.S. exports of PVC and other polymers, and exports of these goods grew 500 percent between 2008 and 2010. Furthermore, Russia will require an estimated 960 new civilian aircraft in the next 20 years to replace its aging fleet, and a proposed reduction from 20 percent to 7.5 percent in tariffs on wide body aircraft would benefit U.S. producers significantly.10 Growing demand for Russia's vast natural resources — including farming, mining, oil, and energy products — drives Russian demand for heavy and complex machinery, which the United States is in an optimal position to export. Russia has committed to a bound tariff (upon entering the WTO) of 5 percent in this sector.11 Meat is another area in which Russia's accession would greatly benefit the United States. Despite a temporary decline in exports to Russia due to a chemical-based ban on U.S. poultry, Russia remained one of the top 10 markets for U.S. poultry exports in 2010.12 As a member of the WTO, Russia would have to adhere to international standards in regulating its meat imports, ensuring greater predictability for U.S. exports. This is also true for pork products, and U.S. pork exports increased tenfold in the five years preceding the economic crisis. Exports of U.S. beef to Russia also have risen, jumping to $102 million in 2010. Russia's agreement to bind its tariff and comply with WTO standards in agriculture will both increase the standards of meat within Russia and help to ensure and expand the market for U.S. goods.13 Russia has also committed to liberalization measures in its financial sector. This has opened up Russia as a potential recipient of considerable foreign direct investment. The U.S. financial sector is poised to gain from Russian accession commitments to allow 100 percent foreign ownership of banks and financial institutions, to liberalize financial services across borders, and to allow internal securities trading by foreign firms.14 Similarly, such U.S. sectors as telecommunications, professional services providers, and distribution operators would benefit from Russian liberalization of foreign investment and ownership, and several high-tech industries would benefit from Russia's adherence to the WTO's Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property (TRIPs) agreement.15 It is important politically (if not economically) to note that Russia exports mainly natural resources, energy products, and high-value goods, which typically face low to zero tariffs already. Those who misguidedly argue that increased U.S. trade with countries such as China, Mexico, and smaller, less-developed countries has had a detrimental impact on certain more labor-intensive U.S. industries need not worry that liberalized trade with Russia will produce similar results. Moreover, Russia seeks to import U.S. technologies, capital equipment, and advanced machinery. In sum, U.S.-Russia trade is significantly less competitive than it is collaborative and complementary. Finally, Russia's entry into the WTO would benefit the United States indirectly by spurring economic growth in Russia and institutionalizing economic reforms. Although Russia remains a mixed economy with widespread government intervention, it has been liberalizing its trade regime. The average level of import tariffs in Russia has dropped from 14 percent to 8 percent, according to World Bank economist David Tarr. Membership in the WTO would help to lock in those gains. The World Bank also predicts WTO membership would increase the size of the Russian economy by as much as 11 percent in the long run, further boosting demand for U.S. exports.16

2NC Russian Econ Impact

Repeal is critical to Russian economic recovery – Obama capital key

Charap ‘09 (Samuel, visiting fellow in the CSIS Russia and Eurasia Program) and Andrew C. Kuchins (senior fellow and director of the program, “Economic Whiplash in Russia: An Opportunity to Bolster U.S.-Russia Commercial Ties?”, http://csis.org/files/media/csis/pubs/090218\_charap\_econwhiplashrussia\_web.pdf)

The global economic crisis has hit Russia extremely hard. Its main stock market index, the Russian Trading System (RTS), has lost over 70 percent of its value since its peak in May 2008, the worst performance among emerging markets.2 After a remarkable decade of robust growth, economic performance is expected to stagnate this year or even decline.3 Since early August 2008, Russia spent more than a third (more than $200 billion) of its reserves on implementing various stimulus measures and supporting the ruble.4 Industrial production in December 2008 plunged 10.3 percent year-on-year, while the number of unemployed in Russia increased by 20 percent from October 1 to mid-January.5 Recent estimates suggest that if the average price of oil is below $35 per barrel this year, the Russian budget, after a decade of surpluses, could run a deficit of more than 10 percent of gross domestic product (GDP).6 In 2008, capital flight was an astonishing $129.9 billion, which is over five times the previous high recorded in 2000.7 The political impact of the downturn has been amplified by the speed and degree of Russia’s economic descent—the crisis hit when Russia’s economy was at its post-Soviet peak. From the economic crisis of 1998 to the summer of 2008, Russia underwent a macroeconomic revolution. Whereas it had defaulted on its external debt in 1998, by 2005 it had become a net creditor in the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and by May 2008 it held around $600 billion in currency reserves, the third largest in the world.8 Its nominal dollar GDP had increased by more than eight times from 1999 to 2008. By 2008, Russia’s stock market capitalization was over $1 trillion, the highest among emerging markets. The government’s strategic plan saw Russia becoming the largest economy in Europe and the fifth largest in the world after the United States, China, Japan, and India by 2020.9 It was from this position of economic might and policymaker confidence that Russia fell into what may be a drawn-out economic downturn.10 It is important that U.S. policymakers understand the implications of this unprecedented economic whiplash. The crisis could have a major impact on Russia’s external behavior and therefore on U.S. interests. As of this writing, many analysts many have already concluded that the crisis will spur a new period of aggressiveness in Moscow’s external stance.11 Most agree with Dimitri Simes’s maxim that “In Russia, hard times normally produce hard lines.”12 Thus far the crisis has indeed correlated with assertiveness in Russian foreign policy. For example, Russia has engaged in a highly destructive “gas war” with Ukraine, at one point going so far as to completely cut off deliveries to Europe, which caused rationing in some countries, such as Bulgaria, that are completely dependent on Russian gas. The recent announcement that Kyrgyzstan would close the U.S. military base at Manas under apparent Russian pressure would also indicate a more assertive line. Moscow seems at least in part motivated by a revanchist instinct to keep its “near abroad” under tighter political control. Despite these assertive moves, it is too early to draw definitive conclusions about the future trajectory of Russian policy. History provides evidence that economic downturns in Russia have often corresponded with periods of greater cooperation. Economic stagnation in the late 1980s was associated with the end of the Cold War, and the contraction of the early 1990s correlated with an accommodating foreign policy under Boris Yeltsin. Although nothing is predetermined, this historical perspective suggests that the current economic downturn could push Russia toward a more cooperative stance vis-à-vis the West, especially in terms of economic cooperation. Just nine months ago when oil was over $140 per barrel, Moscow had fewer incentives to engage with the West on economic issues. Russia was such an attractive market that it did not need to make an effort to lure Western investors; money flowed into its markets regardless of its policies. Its economy grew at a rapid clip despite the stagnation of the economic reform agenda, and it no longer needed financing from international institutions to ensure fiscal health. In short, Russia’s boom provided little incentive to reach out to the West on economic matters. With its economy in deep trouble and oil now under $50 per barrel, this situation has changed significantly. Clearly economic troubles are not exclusive to Russia, but the whiplash factor has altered the incentive structure to perhaps a greater degree than in other countries. Recovery from the crisis could require a considerably greater degree of economic engagement with the West than the boom did. In sharp contrast to the pre-crisis period, Russia may now need resources that only international, and particularly Western, investors, institutions, and trading partners can provide. This is a potentially powerful incentive for pursuing greater cooperation. Four examples illustrate the point. First, since its budget appears likely to run a large deficit this year, Moscow may need to turn to international lenders to shore up its fiscal position, especially if its stabilization funds and foreign currency reserves continue to be depleted at such a rapid clip. After having paid off virtually all its debts to other states and international financial institutions ahead of schedule in the first few years of this decade—a move intended both to prevent incoming oil and gas revenues from spurring inflation and to increase geopolitical freedom of maneuver—Russia could now once again turn to international markets and lenders for credits. According to the World Bank, Russia will be forced to do so if oil prices average below $30 per barrel for the year.13 Second, Russia’s stock market can only recover if foreign, and particularly Western, investors return.14 The massive expansion of Russia’s market over the course of the period from 1998 to mid-2008 was to a significant extent driven by Western investors. Many Russian firms held initial public offerings (IPOs) in London and New York, some listing directly on Western exchanges. After the “ring fence” that prevented foreigners from trading in its shares on the Russian market was lifted in December 2005 and the government consolidated its 51 percent stake, leaving the remainder to be purchased by private investors, Gazprom rapidly became one of the most desirable stocks in emerging markets. In May 2008, its market value peaked at $315 billion, making it the third-largest company by market capitalization in the world. In this period, Russia was viewed as one of the most attractive emerging markets. Portfolio foreign investment stood at $4.2 billion in 2007, a 31.8 percent increase from the previous year.15 Russia’s stock market expansion came despite such incidents as the “YUKOS affair,” the term used to refer to the events that began with the arrests of its parent company’s top shareholders, Platon Lebedev and Mikhail Khodorkovsky, in June and October 2003 respectively. At the time, YUKOS was Russia’s largest company and top oil producer. Since the arrests, the company has been gradually dismantled by the authorities and sold off to state-controlled enterprises. In a lawsuit filed in a U.S. court, American holders of YUKOS shares alleged that they lost $6 billion due to the wiping out of YUKOS’s share value and the nationalization of its assets.16 Relations between Russia and the West suffered, and the affair became a regular subject of discussion in high-level government-to-government meetings. Such economic and political uncertainty would usually scare off investors, but Russia was such an attractive market that the attack on YUKOS made little difference. After an initial dip, the RTS recovered in a matter of months. The economic circumstances that allowed the Russian government to interfere in the market with impunity are long gone. In the context of the current economic crisis and the bottoming out of the RTS at around 500 points (compared to its high of approximately 2,500 points in May 2008), Russia needs to attract foreign, and particularly Western, investors back to the market. Without a return of foreign capital, the Russian market is unlikely to recover in the medium term. Even if oil prices increase significantly, investors have little money to spend, and if Russia remains a risky investment they will be loath to spend it there. Third, Russian corporations and financial institutions need to refinance loans obtained from Western lenders. Russian firms obtained nearly $500 billion in private credits in the years of plenty leading up to the crisis.17 UBS estimates that around 40 percent of that went to the energy sector, mostly to Gazprom and Rosneft.18 Western lenders competed fiercely with one another to finance Russian companies’ rapid expansion, tempted by the impressive cash flows on their balance sheets. When the value of collateralized assets sank as investors fled the Russian stock market over the summer of 2008, Russian companies scrambled to make their (dollar-denominated) repayment schedules. Credit dried up fast and margin calls on 10 of the 25 wealthiest owners of large private companies forced even more asset sell-offs. As one brokerage house put it, “Russia has a solvency problem. Simply put, in August Moscow was flooded with international bankers competing to provide funding to Russian entities. By October, the only financiers visiting were those trying to get their money back.”19 In addition to cash shortage problems, Russian corporations will face difficulties refinancing as a result of the global credit crunch. Russian firms have about $100 billion in debt coming due in 2009, double the total owed by the governments and companies of Brazil, India, and China combined.20 So far, they have survived the initial wave of debt payments, in part thanks to a $50-billion government aid package specifically targeted for refinancing of foreign loans.21 Some analysts argue that Russia has weathered the worst of the corporate debt-repayment storm.22 However, debt transactions in Russia, which often involve off-shore entities, tend to be nontransparent; the $100-billion figure could be a vast underestimate. There is a significant probability that Russian firms will face serious difficulties repaying their debts. As Clifford Gaddy and Barry Ickes put it, “With no Western financial intermediation to roll over old corporate debts, Russia is itself in an acute crisis without any way out on its own.”23 Russia may well have few alternatives to Western lending sources if it wants to resolve its “solvency problem.” Fourth, as Russia’s leaders themselves have argued, the path out of the crisis depends to some degree on economic reform and, in the long term, diversification of the economy. President Dmitry Medvedev has repeatedly and publicly argued that “the only way to stabilize the economy and sustain growth...is through transparency, competition, accountability, and protection of property rights.”24 In a recent interview, Prime Minister Vladimir Putin maintained that the crisis will force the government to return to the reform agenda: “The global financial crisis is even helpful to us, since it makes us act in a more rational way. It makes us apply new technologies, like in energy saving. It makes us think of optimizing production and providing additional personnel training and re-training. All this makes us think about leaving this time of crisis as a more mature country with better prospects for development.”25 In other words, there are indications that the Russian leadership has recognized that a return to the structural reform agenda—largely neglected for the past five years—can be a key component of a recovery plan.26 While greater integration and economic cooperation with the West may not be necessary for Russia to push ahead with such reforms, closer ties can create conditions consistent with their implementation. Measures such as WTO membership will bring increased competition to the Russian market, force firms to restructure and produce higher-quality goods, and reinforce norms of transparency and protection of property rights. Increased Western foreign direct investment (FDI) can provide the know-how and technology transfer necessary for modernization and the resources to upgrade Russia’s aging infrastructure.27 In other words, economic integration is likely to facilitate reform. Further, as the government acknowledged in its recent strategic economic policy plan, deeper economic integration will be crucial for Russia to achieve optimal growth rates and diversify the sources of growth in the long term.28 In short, the crisis has created significant incentives for Russia to work with Western partners on economic issues; Russia may need the economic resources that Western investors, financial institutions, and trading partners can provide in order to facilitate its recovery from the crisis. As a result, there could well be a greater emphasis on economic cooperation as opposed to confrontation and assertive geopolitics in Russian foreign policy. Incentives clearly do not translate directly into policies; the key issue is whether the Russian leadership will react to the incentives or to their often conservative, anti-Western instincts. If the Russians respond to the incentives, they are likely to seek cooperation with the West on economic issues. This presents a valuable opportunity for the administration of President Barack Obama to expand the role of commercial ties in its broader strategy of engagement with Russia. Currently such ties are extremely weak. Despite significant increases following 1998, Russia accounted for only 1.1 percent of U.S. imports and 0.4 percent of U.S. exports in 2006. In the same year, the United States accounted for 3.1 percent of Russian exports and 4.4 percent of Russian imports.29 In 2007, trade turnover between the two countries totaled $27 billion, versus almost $387 billion between the United States and China.30 In 2007, U.S. FDI in Russia accounted for 5 percent of the total. These numbers are proportionally quite low. In terms of FDI, the 5 percent number should be four times as high if it were to reflect the proportion of U.S. FDI in the total global FDI stock.32 Despite this considerable potential to increase trade and investment, the economic aspect of U.S.- Russia policy has long been underemphasized in favor of such issues as arms control, nonproliferation, and counterterrorism. The Obama administration should respond to possible overtures from Moscow on economic cooperation and seek to strengthen commercial ties in the bilateral relationship. Even though arms control and other security issues will rightly remain the main priorities, there should be much more focus on economic measures than in the past. Policy Recommendations The following are suggestions for concrete steps that the administration can take to solidify the economic relationship with Moscow. First, the United States should continue to promote Russia’s integration into international economic institutions. By bringing Russia into structures such as the OECD and the WTO, the United States can foster rules-based international norms of economic behavior that can shape Russian policy and increase bilateral trade. Participation in these institutions carries with it obligations such as observance of international standards relating to rule of law, transparency, and property rights that are key to improving the investment climate and thus boosting bilateral commercial ties over the medium term. In the U.S.-Russia Strategic Framework Declaration (the so-called Sochi Declaration) signed by Presidents George W. Bush and Vladimir Putin in April 2008, the United States pledged to push for WTO accession and OECD membership.33 However, these efforts were derailed by the August war in Georgia, when most bilateral initiatives were shelved. Subsequently Russia reversed itself on several obligations it had taken on in bilateral WTO negotiations, by, for example, increasing quotas on chicken imports. Recently its top WTO negotiator issued an ultimatum stating that Russia would no longer observe any such obligations if it does not become a member of the organization by 2010.34 Despite these setbacks, Prime Minister Putin still maintains that WTO membership is a priority and seeks to push forward with it “on standard and acceptable terms.”35 He singled out the United States as the key actor in furthering WTO accession: “Joining the WTO is still on our agenda. We will continue talks with our American partners, and we hope they will support Russia in joining the WTO.”36 Although the two countries took a major step forward in November 2006 when they signed a bilateral agreement for Russia’s accession to the WTO, the United States still must play a role as an advocate for Russian membership in the organization, both publicly and in the multilateral negotiating process. Despite the recent hiccups, relatively few technical issues remain in the multilateral negotiations. It appears that the main impediment to moving forward is Georgia, which in 2006 pulled out of a bilateral agreement on WTO accession it had previously signed with Russia. Given the current climate of relations between the two countries, there is little chance that such an agreement can be worked out without intervention from the United States and other Western nations. Although Russia’s actions in Georgia and its recognition of South Ossetia and Abkhazia should not be excused, the United States, together with European allies, should work with Georgia and Russia to help the two sides overcome the present stalemate. Second, the United States should graduate Russia from the Jackson-Vanik Amendment to the Trade Act of 1974 and grant it permanent normal trade relations (PNTR). The amendment is an anachronistic Cold War relic that no longer serves any purpose other than to antagonize the Russians.37 It forces the executive to certify annually to Congress that there are no restrictions on freedom-of-emigration from Russia in order to grant Moscow most-favored-nation status.38 The original intention was to compel the Soviet Union to lift limits on the emigration of minority groups, in particular Jews.39 Today, Russia imposes no such limits. Several other post-Soviet countries—Georgia, Ukraine, Kyrgyzstan, and Armenia—have already been graduated from the amendment’s provisions. Presidents Bill Clinton and George W. Bush both promised to graduate Russia from the Jackson- Vanik Amendment but did not follow through on their pledges. Repealing Jackson-Vanik would send a clear message that the United States is serious about strengthening commercial ties between the two countries and would create general goodwill by removing an irritant in the relationship. For U.S. companies, PNTR would add stability to the investment environment. The Obama administration should encourage congressional leaders to reintroduce relevant legislation and should publicly push for its passage.

Extinction

Filger ‘09 (Sheldon, Columnist and Founder – Global EconomicCrisis.com, “Russian Economy Faces Disasterous Free Fall Contraction”, [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/sheldon-filger/russian-economy-faces-dis\_b\_201147.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/sheldon-filger/russian-economy-faces-dis_b_201147.html" \t "_blank))

In Russia, historically, economic health and political stability are intertwined to a degree that is rarely encountered in other major industrialized economies. It was the economic stagnation of the former Soviet Union that led to its political downfall. Similarly, Medvedev and Putin, both intimately acquainted with their nation's history, are unquestionably alarmed at the prospect that Russia's economic crisis will endanger the nation's political stability, achieved at great cost after years of chaos following the demise of the Soviet Union. Already, strikes and protests are occurring among rank and file workers facing unemployment or non-payment of their salaries. Recent polling demonstrates that the once supreme popularity ratings of Putin and Medvedev are eroding rapidly. Beyond the political elites are the financial oligarchs, who have been forced to deleverage, even unloading their yachts and executive jets in a desperate attempt to raise cash. Should the Russian economy deteriorate to the point where economic collapse is not out of the question, the impact will go far beyond the obvious accelerant such an outcome would be for the Global Economic Crisis. There is a geopolitical dimension that is even more relevant then the economic context. Despite its economic vulnerabilities and perceived decline from superpower status, Russia remains one of only two nations on earth with a nuclear arsenal of sufficient scope and capability to destroy the world as we know it. For that reason, it is not only President Medvedev and Prime Minister Putin who will be lying awake at nights over the prospect that a national economic crisis can transform itself into a virulent and destabilizing social and political upheaval. It just may be possible that U.S. President Barack Obama's national security team has already briefed him about the consequences of a major economic meltdown in Russia for the peace of the world. After all, the most recent national intelligence estimates put out by the U.S. intelligence community have already concluded that the Global Economic Crisis represents the greatest national security threat to the United States, due to its facilitating political instability in the world. During the years Boris Yeltsin ruled Russia, security forces responsible for guarding the nation's nuclear arsenal went without pay for months at a time, leading to fears that desperate personnel would illicitly sell nuclear weapons to terrorist organizations. If the current economic crisis in Russia were to deteriorate much further, how secure would the Russian nuclear arsenal remain? It may be that the financial impact of the Global Economic Crisis is its least dangerous consequence.

A2: Human Rights Impact Turns

JV undermines US human rights pressure, no incentive for compliance

Pifer 3/21/12 (Stephen, is director of the Brookings Arms Control Initiative. A former ambassador to Ukraine <http://www.brookings.edu/testimony/2012/0321_arms_control_pifer.aspx?rssid=foreign+policy&utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=feed&utm_campaign=Feed%3A+BrookingsRSS%2Fprograms%2Fforeignpolicy+%28Brookings%3A+Programs+-+Foreign+Policy%29&utm_content=Google+Reader>)

Moreover, Russia long ago met the requirements of Jackson-Vanik. The amendment was approved in 1974 to press the Soviet Union to allow free emigration for Soviet religious minorities, particularly Soviet Jews. In the early 1990s, Russia opened the flood gates for emigration, and hundreds of thousands of Russian Jews left. The only people who had problems securing emigration permission were a small handful who had had access to classified information; in most cases, they were permitted to leave after a few years. While the overall trend on human rights in Russia has been negative since Mr. Putin first became president in 2000, the government has not restricted the freedom to emigrate. Jackson-Vanik has thus achieved its aims with regard to Russia. It no longer offers the United States leverage with Russia. The American Jewish community over a decade ago expressed its support for Russia’s graduation. The leaders of Russian opposition groups support graduation. Its continued application will hurt American business and diminish the impact of threats of future Congressional sanctions against Russia. Should Congress consider sanctions in the future, the reaction in Moscow is likely to be: Why bother to comply? We met the requirements of Jackson-Vanik in the mid-1990s and 15 years later still remain under its sanction.

No human rights downside

Griswold ‘11 (Daniel, Director of the Steifel Center for Trade Policy Studies – Cato Institute and Douglas Peterson, Former Research Assistant – Cato Institute, “Trading with the Bear: Why Russia’s Entry into the WTO Is in America’s Interest”, Free Trade Bulletin, No. 46, 12-6, http://www.cato.org/pubs/ftb/FTB-046.pdf)

When policymakers weigh the ineffectiveness of the Jackson-Vanik Amendment against all the advantages of ushering Russia into the WTO, denying permanent normal trade relations simply should not be an option. The best policy toward Russia at this stage in our relationship is to repeal any and all Jackson-Vanik Amendment restrictions against Russia immediately and prior to Russia’s accession to the WTO. Procedurally, Congress should terminate application of the amendment, thereby enabling President Obama to grant MFN status to Russia, which he should do. When and if Russia accedes to the WTO, the United States should grant Russia permanent normal trade relations and not invoke the WTO’s nonapplication principle. Pursuing such a policy would yield immediate and tangible benefits for the American economy without sacrificing any vital foreign policy goals. By any measure, the Jackson-Vanik Amendment has failed in its purpose to promote emigration rights. It was not the amendment that secured those rights for the citizens of the former Soviet Union but rather the system’s own collapse in 1989–91 under internal and external pressures. While the desire for improved human rights abroad is laudable, economic sanctions have proven to be an ineffective means by which to promote these human rights goals. Mandating that trade liberalization cannot occur absent emigration freedom is misguided. A more effective strategy for improving human rights, in fact, is to increase trade liberalization, thereby enhancing opportunities for people with limited human rights to enrich themselves and interact more frequently with people with greater human rights. By granting Russia conditional most favored nation status annually beginning in 1994, the United States has implicitly acknowledged that Russia is in full compliance with the Jackson-Vanik Amendment’s emigration requirements. Rather than continuing this hollow exercise with no discernable purpose, the United States should formally and officially revoke Jackson-Vanik restrictions as they pertain to Russia.

Other mechanisms of pressure solve

Borshchevskaya ‘11 (Anna, Assistant Director of the Dinu Patriciu Eurasia Center – Atlantic Council, “Human Rights, Russia, and the WTO”, The American – Magazine of the American Enterprise Institute, 12-6, http://www.american.com/archive/2011/december/human-rights-russia-and-the-wto)

Congress should indeed repeal the Jackson-Vanik Amendment. But the United States should still embrace the spirit of the amendment, and Congress should exert pressure on Russia to address its human rights shortcomings through other mechanisms. Legislation might sanction Russian officials responsible for human rights abuses by freezing their U.S. assets. The United States can only benefit from Russia’s WTO accession if it grants Russia normal trade relations status, which requires repeal of Jackson-Vanik. WTO members are generally required to treat each others’ imports equally, thus Jackson-Vanik would violate WTO rules. It is possible for Russia to join the WTO without Congress repealing Jackson-Vanik—the Amendment still applies to some former communist countries who are now WTO members. But doing so would allow Russia, under WTO rules, to deny the United States most-favored status and enable it to discriminate against U.S. companies—something Russia will not hesitate to do. Should Russia join the WTO without any American repeal of Jackson-Vanik, U.S. businesses will be at a competitive disadvantage to their international competitors seeking trade with Russia. The Jackson-Vanik Amendment’s cancellation would also deprive Russia of its ability to accuse the United States of not shedding its Cold War mentality. All U.S. presidents since Bill Clinton have supported repealing the Jackson-Vanik Amendment. Indeed, after the Cold War and change in Russia’s emigration policies, the White House has regularly granted Russia a waiver from its provisions after an annual review certifies that Russia meets minimal emigration standards. Passage of the Jackson-Vanik Amendment was among the most effective congressional actions of the Cold War. Its passage was hard-fought and controversial; it became a formative battle between foreign policy realists, who did not want to impede détente regardless of how the Soviet Union treated its citizenry, and neoconservatives, who argued that human rights advocacy would advance core American interests. The Jackson-Vanik Amendment has remained an important symbol ever since, even if its bite largely ended with the Cold War. As Russia’s rulers once against embrace their Soviet legacy, they are irritated by the continued existence of such an important and effective anti-Soviet symbol. WTO membership will require Russia to treat other countries with more respect by adhering to international trade standards rather than treating countries arbitrarily. During the Cold War, the Amendment sent a message not only to the Kremlin, but also to Soviet citizens—my family among them—that the United States cared about human rights and was willing to stand up for them. Its passage gave the oppressed minorities in the Soviet Union hope and strengthened their courage to demand their rights, and the Kremlin found it harder to ignore the message. Today, the Russians feel that the Americans are hypocritical to continue with Jackson-Vanik—Washington preaches about the need for Russia to dispense with its Cold War mentality, yet it does not do the same. Russia is a very different place in 2011 than it was under communist dictatorship in 1975, and Russia’s membership in the WTO will benefit both Russia and the United States. WTO membership will require Russia to follow international trade standards, make Russia subject to international trade dispute procedures, and help reduce corruption in the country. These changes will require Russia to treat other countries with more respect by adhering to international trade standards rather than treating countries arbitrarily. Membership could increase annual economic growth in Russia significantly. The Soviet Union has been in the rubbish bin of history for almost two decades, and Russia no longer restricts the emigration of its citizens the way it did in the Soviet era. However, human rights are still poor in Russia. The State Department’s annual human rights report criticizes the Russian government for severe corruption, torture, and lack of rule of law and due process. Reporters without Borders ranks Russia among the world’s worst offenders of press freedom. Western silence will convince Moscow that it can dictate the rules and the human rights situation in Russia will only continue to deteriorate. It would be a mistake to assume that simply bringing Russia into the international trade system will create incentives for it to reform politically and begin to care about its people. This has not worked in either China or Saudi Arabia, both WTO members, whose governments embrace the material wealth they acquired from their entry and access to the West, but not Western values. The WTO takes a purist approach to trade and does not seek to leverage the trade relationship to make countries respect individual liberty or become better global citizens. Therefore, there is an opening for Congress to pressure the Kremlin. Legislation might sanction Russian officials responsible for human rights abuses by freezing their U.S. assets. Or the Senate might tie foreign assistance to press freedom. Similar measures have been effective elsewhere. The United States has given several billion dollars in aid to Russia since 1992, and even though Russia has rebounded since that period, annual American aid remains tens of millions of dollars.

Relations turns this, repeal spurs bilateral NGO ties that protect rights better

Kliger ‘10 (Dr. Sam, American Jewish Committee, “The Jackson-Vanik Amendment and U.S.-Russian Relations”, AJC, 2-4, http://www.ajcrussian.org/site/apps/nlnet/content2.aspx?c=chLMK3PKLsF&b=7718799&ct=8023853)

Some human rights groups and NGOs in Russia like the Moscow Bureau for Human Rights and the Civic Chamber of the Russian Federation also express the need for abolishing J-V and suggest that such repeal would contribute to the improvement of U.S. – Russia relations and would enhance the development of civil society in Russia. To ensure continuing emigration freedom and improve the human rights situation in Russia, J-V Amendment could be replaced by cooperation between American and Russian NGOs that would place the amendment’s provisions under civil society control. A move to abolish the amendment would be considered a serious step toward the new approach of “re-setting” relations between the U.S. and Russia, and would contribute to the efforts of the newly established Obama-Medvedev Commission and particularly to its Civil Society Working Group led by Dr. Michael McFaul and Vladislav Surkov, which first met here in Washington last week. This Working Group, for instance, in cooperation with American and Russian NGOs can take control of the amendment’s provisions.

History proves trade leverage fails

Griswold ‘11 (Daniel, Director of the Steifel Center for Trade Policy Studies – Cato Institute and Douglas Peterson, Former Research Assistant – Cato Institute, “Trading with the Bear: Why Russia’s Entry into the WTO Is in America’s Interest”, Free Trade Bulletin, No. 46, 12-6, http://www.cato.org/pubs/ftb/FTB-046.pdf)

As for human rights, it is a simple historical fact that trade policy has proved to be an ineffective tool for imposing fundamental political changes in other countries. The World Trade Organization was not set up to enforce human rights but more narrowly to promote trade liberalization among its members. Promoting respect for human rights around the world is a worthy cause, but threatening to withdraw trade access for an entire nation is not a proper human rights tool.

No risk of mass human rights violations

Kliger ‘10 (Dr. Sam, American Jewish Committee, “The Jackson-Vanik Amendment and U.S.-Russian Relations”, AJC, 2-4, http://www.ajcrussian.org/site/apps/nlnet/content2.aspx?c=chLMK3PKLsF&b=7718799&ct=8023853)

Now, 35 years since the JVA was signed into law, it is time to reevaluate the triangle of human rights issue, the U.S. – Russian relations, and the JVA in the context of both. First, fully acknowledging the fact that there are serious violations of human rights in contemporary Russia, there is also a need to acknowledge Russia as a new state and a new player on international arena, a state which is not identical or similar to the Soviet Union. It would be inaccurate to equate today’s Russia with the Soviet Union and to apply approaches similar to those used in dealing with the Soviet Union. Similarities between Russia and the USSR, that some scholars, journalists, and human rights activists emphasize, are rather superficial. Let’s look at a bigger picture. 1) State-sponsored anti-Semitism in Russia simply does not exist; 2) Freedom of immigration is not an issue for the last 20 years; 3) With some minor restrictions and state’s support for the Russian Orthodox Church, religion in Russia can be freely exercised; 4) While it is true that most of the media, and especially national TV channels, are under state control, some basic elements of freedom of press exist (Novaya Gazeta – independent newspaper, often critical of the government; Vremya Novostey – liberal small-circulation newspaper; Nezavisimaya Gazeta – privately owned newspaper; Kommersant; radio Ekho Moskvy –Gazprom owned, editorially independent station; Gazeta.Ru – privately owned web site, often critical of the government; many of the book publishing houses, and most importantly the Internet – are examples).[6] 5) While many of the big corporations are also controlled by the government, small and middle-size business enterprises are privately owned and operated (with corruption as an imminent factor) and people explore the right of ownership and exercise entrepreneurship; 6) With all the negativities of the authoritarian regime of Putin-Medvedev, majority of people in Russia support the sense of “stability and order” associated with this regime (Putin’s approval rating fluctuated between 70% and 85% during all 8 years of his two terms rule, and Medvedev enjoyed a similar rating during 2009, according to the most independent Levada Polling Center)[7]; 7) With some notorious restrictions and pressure that the Russian government applied to NGO’s, many domestic and international human rights groups successfully operate, though in sometimes hostile environment; 8) On international arena, though Russia is still nourishing its imperial ambitions (of which Georgia is a current example) and playing tricky games on some issues like Iranian nuclear aspirations, it is willing to cooperate on some important problems such as arms control, space exploration, and nuclear nonproliferation. Russia—and this is now widely recognized—is not a strategic threat to the U.S.; it is rather an underestimated natural ally.

Aff- Health Care Thumper

Health Care repeal Thursday, tanks capital

Fox News 6/25 (“Supreme Court Expected to Roll Out ObamaCare Ruling Thursday,” FoxNews.com, 6/25/12, http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2012/06/25/supreme-court-expected-to-roll-out-obamacare-ruling-thursday/)//SR

The world will have to wait a few more days to hear the verdict on ObamaCare. After ruling Monday on Arizona's immigration law, the Supreme Court appears likely to rule on the federal health care overhaul on Thursday. That's the next day justices are scheduled to announce opinions, and is expected to be the final day for rulings. In releasing the health care verdict, the Supreme Court will be ending a momentous session. The health care ruling, as campaign advisers are well aware, has the potential to re-shape this year's presidential race. For weeks, each party has been positioning itself to make the best of whatever outcome emerges from the tight-lipped justices. And the implications go far beyond the 2012 election. The outcome of the health care case, involving one of the most divisive domestic policies in modern times, will affect millions of Americans. Calling for the law's survival, supporters trumpet the expanded consumer protections and subsidies that make insurance more available and affordable. Calling for its defeat, critics blast what they describe as an unconstitutional requirement to buy health insurance, and warn the law will pummel businesses with its mandates and fines. In the run-up to the historic ruling, each party is crafting a game-plan. House Speaker John Boehner this past week cautioned the GOP ranks against "spiking" the ball if the mandate is struck down. He and other Republicans say the party will remain focused on repealing whatever parts of the law remain following the upcoming ruling. And, they say, they'll pursue "step-by-step" reforms to replace the law no matter the court's decision. Lawmakers are dealing with plenty of other matters this week. In addition to Monday's decision reining in Arizona on its immigration law, the House could vote to hold Attorney General Eric Holder in contempt. On health care, they're trying to game out all scenarios. In a memo to colleagues, House GOP Conference Chairman Jeb Hensarling, R-Texas, urged members to prepare for three possible rulings: a full repeal, a partial repeal involving the mandate or a law left intact. He advised members to schedule time to read the entire decision, prepare statements for all three scenarios and consider scheduling tele-town halls with constituents. "No matter how the Supreme Court rules, this is going to be a seismic decision," said Michael Cannon, of the Cato Institute. "If they uphold the individual mandate, if they strike down the individual mandate -- either way, they will be **defining the relationship between the government and the citizens for decades to come.**" While publicly expressing confidence that the law will be upheld, both the White House and congressional Democrats are said to be quietly planning for the possibility of at least a repeal of the mandate. House Democratic Leader Nancy Pelosi admitted that this outcome could threaten the entire law. "You have to have the mandate in order for this to work from a financial standpoint," she said. Because new coverage requirements put a financial burden on insurance companies, the mandate was meant to allay that strain by sending millions of new customers their way. Without the mandate, that formula falls apart. Democrats, though, are holding out hope that benefits of the health care law will stand regardless of the decision. Pelosi suggested that if the federal mandate goes, states might still be able to step in with their own individual requirements -- citing the mandate in Massachusetts, the state Mitt Romney used to govern. Rep. Xavier Becerra, D-Calif., speaking on ABC's "This Week," said some of the protections are here to stay no matter what. "I believe most Americans will say, 'we're never going to go back to those days where my child could be denied access to my health insurance because he or she has a pre-existing condition,'" he said. Becerra also questioned whether people will wonder if the Supreme Court has "become a political body" should it strike down the law. The comment underscored how Democrats may react should the decision come down in Republicans' favor -- by vilifying the court itself. The political implications of the ruling, though, are unclear. If the court strikes down all or part of the law, **it's a major blow to Obama**, but also diminishes the issue as a wedge for Romney in the 2012 campaign. If the court upholds the law, it's a victory for Obama but also ensures Romney can run on a promise to repeal the law in 2013.

It’s inevitable

Yahoo News 6/20 (“Insider Poll: Legal Experts now Expect Supreme Court to Strike Down Individual Mandate,” Yahoo! News, 6-20-12, http://news.yahoo.com/blogs/ticket/insider-poll-legal-experts-now-expect-supreme-court-123441478.html)//SR

The Supreme Court will soon announce its ruling on the constitutionality of President Barack Obama's health care law passed in 2010, and for many legal observers who have worked in the court and argued cases before the justices, the federal government's defense of the measure in March did not inspire confidence. A new insider survey of 58 legal experts conducted after the oral arguments concluded found that most predict that the court will strike down the so-called individual mandate, a central provision within the law requiring that every American purchase a government-approved form of health insurance. The same expert survey was conducted before the hearings began, which found the opposite: Most thought the law would be upheld. The survey was paid for the American Action Forum, a right-leaning organization and Center Forward, a centrist group, both based in Washington, D.C. It was conducted by Purple Insights, a bipartisan consulting firm. The pollsters received input from former clerks who have worked for justices on both sides of the ideological spectrum: Eleven clerked for traditionally liberal Justices Stephen Breyer, Ruth Bader Ginsburg, Elena Kagan and Sonia Sotomayor, 18 clerked for justices on the right, Samuel Alito, John Roberts, Antonin Scalia, and Clarance Thomas and nine worked for Anthony Kennedy. Using a scale from 0 to 100, the pollsters asked the 38 former clerks of current Supreme Court justices and 18 attorneys who have argued before the court to rate the probability that the individual mandate provision would be declared unconstitutional. The insiders provided an average rating of 57 percent, a significant jump from the pre-hearing survey, when the average was just 35 percent. "This is a fascinating snapshot of how true experts believe the Supreme Court will act on the future of American healthcare," said American Action Forum President Douglas Holtz-Eakin, who served as Director of the Congressional Budget Office under President George W. Bush. "Experts believe the oral arguments revealed significant insights into the court's thinking." The notion that the entire law would be struck down if the individual mandate is declared unconstitutional received an average rating of 31 percent in the new poll, an increase of four percentage points from the pre-hearing survey. The average prediction that the law would remain even if the individual mandate is removed dropped to 21 percent from 36 percent in the new survey. **"**I feel like a dope,"one of the experts said in the comments section of the survey, "because I was one of those who predicted that the court would uphold the statute by a lopsided majority--maybe even 8-1. Although you never know, it now appears pretty likely that this prediction was way off." After observing the justices during the health care hearings, seven out of ten of the experts said they felt the line of questioning "indicated that they were more skeptical about the law's constitutionality" than they expected. No one who participated in the survey said they thought the justices appeared "less skeptical" than they anticipated. Although none of those polled have precise knowledge of how the justices will rule on the provisions related to the health care law, their predictions--especially given the significant drop on confidence after watching the oral arguments--could foreshadow the fate of the law. At the latest, the justices will announce their decisions on the health care law on June 28, although it could come earlier.

Aff- Uniqueness- Won’t Pass – GOP and Magnitsky

Magnitsky linkage and GOP opposition means won’t pass

Associated Press 6/12 (“US Bill for Normal Trade with Russia Opposed,” Fox News, 6-12-12, <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2012/06/12/us-bill-for-normal-trade-with-russia-opposed/)//SR>

A Senate plan to lift Cold War restrictions on trade with Russia drew immediate resistance from Senate Republicans who said Congress must first address Russia's poor human rights record and existing economic and political policies. Senate Finance Committee Chairman Max Baucus, a Democrat, on Tuesday introduced bipartisan legislation to normalize trade relations with Russia by repealing the 1974 Jackson-Vanik act that tied trade with the then-Soviet Union to Moscow's allowing Jews and other minorities to leave the country. The repeal of Jackson-Vanik is necessary if U.S. businesses are to enjoy the lower tariffs and increased access to Russian markets that will become available when Russia joins the World Trade Organization this summer. Supporters of normalized trade said it could lead to a doubling of U.S. exports to Russia. "Jackson-Vanik served its purpose during the Cold War, but it's a relic of another era that now stands in the way of our farmers, ranchers and businesses pursuing opportunities to grow and create jobs," Baucus said in a statement. Baucus was joined in sponsoring the bill by Senate Foriegn Relations Committee chairman John Kerry, a Democrat andRepublicans John McCain and John Thune. But eight Finance Committee Republicans, led by ranking Republican Orrin Hatch, wrote a letter to Baucus saying that Congress cannot ignore current issues with Russia in moving to normalize trade relations. "Many aspects of the U.S.-Russia relationship are troubling," they said, naming the "flawed election and illegitimate regime of Vladimir Putin," the suppression of public protests, Russia's support for the Syrian government and its threats to attack U.S.-led NATO missile defense sites in Eastern Europe. The letter also raised Russia's theft of U.S. intellectual property and its pervasive problems with bribery and corruption and questioned whether Russia would comply if the WTO handed down adverse rulings on its economic policies. The Republican senators also warned against any weakening of human rights legislation now moving through both the House and the Senate and likely to be linked to repeal of Jackson-Vanik. The legislation, named after Russian lawyer Sergey Magnitsky, who died in a Russian jail in 2009 after allegedly being subject to torture, would impose sanctions such as visa bans and asset freezes on Russian officials involved in human rights violations including the Magnitsky case. The House Foreign Affairs Committee last week approved the bill by voice vote. In the Senate the main sponsor is a Democrat, Ben Cardin. The Russian government has voiced strong objections to the bill and suggested that there would be retaliatory measures if it becomes law. Major U.S. business groups, which say normalizing trade with Russia is a top priority for this year, have also expressed concerns about connecting the trade bill to the human rights issue. The White House, which prefers a clean trade bill, would like to drop a provision in the Magnitsky bill that calls for the naming of rights abusers. McCain, the top Republican on the Armed Services Committee, said that while he supports the trade bill, "the extension of permanent normal trade relations status and the repeal of the Jackson-Vanik amendment must be accompanied by the passage of the Magnitsky Act." U.S. exports to Russia are now about $9 billion a year, and economists predict that could double within five years with normal trade relations. The legislation would not require the United States to lower any of its tariffs to take advantage of Russian concessions once it joins the WTO.

Aff - Not Unique and No Link

Not unique and no link – debate in congress next week over transportation funding, and plan won’t cost capital because transportation is perceived as jobs spending

Lawders 6/21 (David, Reuters, “US Lawmakers Voice Optimism on Transportation Bill Talks,” Chicago Tribune, 6-21-12, <http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2012-06-21/news/sns-rt-us-usa-congress-transportationbre85k1s6-20120621_1_transportation-bill-transportation-projects-transportation-measure)//SR>

Prospects for a deal to fund U.S. transportation projects over the long term appeared to brighten somewhat on Thursday as key House and Senate lawmakers described their negotiations in more optimistic terms. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid said the talks had improved in the last 24 hours and he was hopeful for an agreement before current authority for road, bridge and rail funding expires on June 30. http://articles.chicagotribune.com/images/pixel.gif http://articles.chicagotribune.com/images/pixel.gif Congress has been struggling to approve a long-term transportation bill since last fall. Nearly 3 million construction jobs depend on the outcome. House of Representatives Republicans have insisted on consolidating some federal transportation programs and streamlining environmental reviews of road projects in order to speed up construction. They also want to drop a proposal to use gasoline taxes to help pay for ancillary transportation "enhancements" such as bicycle lanes, flower beds and other streetscape improvements. After marathon meetings over the past two days, the top negotiators on the measure, Democratic Senator Barbara Boxer and Republican Representative John Mica, issued a joint statement voicing optimism. "The conferees have moved forward toward a bipartisan, bicameral agreement on a highway reauthorization bill. Both House and Senate conferees will continue to work with a goal of completing a package by next week," they said. Mica and Boxer did not provide any details on the progress they have made towards a deal. The basis of their negotiations is a two-year, $109 billion measure passed by the Democratic-controlled Senate. Representative Bill Shuster, a key House Republican negotiator on the transportation measure, said on the House floor the conference committee was moving toward accepting some Republican demands for funding reforms. Earlier this week several lawmakers negotiating on Senate and House of Representatives differences over the highway funds had said they could not be done by the deadline and another stop-gap extension of current funding was inevitable. "I don't think we'll need an extension. I hope not," Reid told reporters on Thursday. "I can't guarantee to anyone here that we're going to get a highway bill, but we're certainly in much better shape than we were 24 hours ago." But the negotiations on the core highway and rail funding policy have thus far not tackled the thornier issue of whether to include the Republican proposal to approve the Canada-to-Texas Keystone XL oil pipeline. Democrats and President Barack Obama oppose fast-tracking approvals for the $7 billion project until environmental review can be completed. If Republicans still insist on Keystone's inclusion, the talks are more likely to collapse. http://articles.chicagotribune.com/images/pixel.gif House Speaker John Boehner also acknowledged "some movement" in the talks since he met with Reid on the deadlock on Tuesday. Earlier this month, Boehner floated the idea of a six-month extension of current funding, which would remove the threat of a halt in road and rail construction until after the November 6 elections. Democrats have balked at that idea, saying it would deplete the Highway Trust Fund because falling gasoline tax collections were insufficient to fund current projects. They say U.S. states also would delay the start of new longer-term projects - and the hiring of hundreds of thousands of workers - due to the lack of funding certainty.

Aff- No Impact

JV doesn’t solve relations

\*Mitt Romney statement, protests and Magnitsky

Brooke 3/27/12 (james, Russia/former Soviet Union Bureau Chief for voice for America newspaper , and 24 year reporter for new York times, ”human rights bill roils us-russia relations” voice of America news/FIND http://proquest.umi.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/pqdweb?did=2620076961&Fmt=3&clientId=17822&RQT=309&VName=PQD)

First, Russia's prime minister, Vladimir Putin, accused Washington of backing protests against him. Then, on Monday, Mitt Romney, the leading U.S. Republican candidate, told CNN that Russia is Washington's "number one geopolitical foe." The incidents stand as another roadblock to better U.S.-Russia relations. Russia is finally set to join the World Trade Organization in August, after 20 years of talks. When it does, American companies could lose out because of a law passed almost four decades ago that restricted trade with the Soviet Union over its refusal to allow Jews to emigrate. The Soviet Union no longer exists. There is visa-free tourism between Israel and Russia. But a Cold War relic - the 1974 Jackson-Vanick Amendment - would result in higher tariffs for American exports to Russia. U.S. Ambassador to Russia Michael McFaul speaks of the impact. "Now that Russia is joining the World Trade Organization, if we still have Jackson-Vanick on the books, then our companies will be at a disadvantage vis-a-vis other European, Chinese, Brazilian companies doing business here in Russia," said McFaul. But before repealing this old law, the U.S. Congress is considering a new human rights law for Russia - one that is already roiling relations between the United States and Russia. The Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act would freeze American bank accounts and deny U.S. visas to corrupt officials and human rights violators around the world**. The Kremlin sees the law as aimed at Russia, and in many ways it is.** Sergei Magnitsky was a Moscow lawyer who uncovered a $230-million tax fraud, allegedly by government officials. His employer, American-born investor Bill Browder, charges that these very same officials engineered Magnitsky's arrest and death in a Moscow jail in 2009. He says Magnitsky was denied medical treatment for 11 months, and in November 2009, was handcuffed to a prison bed and beaten to death by eight riot policemen. Sergei Markov, director of the Institute of Political Studies, a pro-government think tank, complains that the case only gets attention because of the American connection: "Hundreds of people are dead in Russian prisons because of violation of law from prison authorities, but nobody investigates against, except Mr. Magnitsky. Why? Because he's only one whose death has been connected with Mr. Browder," said Markov. In Russia's season of middle-class discontent, however, the Magnitsky murder has struck a chord. One Internet survey found 19,000 stories on the case in the Russian press. Michael Weiss, spokesman for the Henry Jackson Society, a London-based think tank, explains why he thinks the case has had such an impact.

Aff- No Impact

Doesn’t solve relations, purely symbolic

The Moscow Times 1/25 (“Obama Hints at Jackson-Vanik Repeal,” http://www.themoscowtimes.com/business/article/obama-may-push-for-jackson-vanik-repeal/451707.html)

The impact of the amendment is actually more symbolic than practical — since the fall of the Soviet Union U.S. presidents have granted Russia "temporary" normal trade relations in the form of an annual "waiver" verified by Congress. With Russia's accession to the World Trade Organization in December, America will be in breach of WTO rules requiring members to give each other permanent normal trade relations. As a result, without a repeal "U.S. companies will be denied the full enjoyment of Russia's improved market access and tariff reductions, and thus be placed at a competitive disadvantage versus their European, Asian and Latin American competitors," Andrew Somers, head of the American Chamber of Commerce in Russia, argued in a recent article. "That gives the Obama administration strong arguments to put to Congress, but it is really a matter of domestic politics," said Fyodor Lukyanov, editor-in-chief of Russia in Global Affairs, who predicted a combination of political point-scoring by Republicans accusing Obama of going soft on Russia and pragmatic moves to attach conditions relating to anything from sanitary restrictions on imports of U.S. chicken legs to missile defense, if the president asks Congress to repeal the amendment. Other lawmakers may seek to balance any repeal with a replacement law — for example one imposing travel bans on officials accused of involvement in the death of Hermitage Capital lawyer Sergei Magnitsky — that expresses their dissatisfaction with Russia's human rights record.

No impact- doesn’t collapse overall relations

Institute of Modern Russia ’11 (founded by experts to study U.S.-Russia relations, (“Jackson-Vanik is ‘Next Big Question in U.S.-Russian Relations,’” Institute of Modern Russia, 9-15-11, <http://imrussia.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=107%3Ajackson-vanik-is-next-big-question-in-us-russian-relations&catid=57%3Aus-russia&Itemid=104&lang=en>)

On September 13, a panel of prominent American experts convened at the Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs to discuss the Jackson-Vanik amendment **that has been a stumbling block in U.S.-Russian relations for 37 years.** According to the expert discussants, the amendment will finally be lifted as a Cold War-era relic upon Russia’s accession to the World Trade Organization. The Jackson-Vanik amendment to the Trade Act of 1974 affects U.S. trade relations with non-market countries — originally, communist or former communist countries — that restrict freedom of emigration and other human rights. It was enacted as a response to the “diploma tax” on higher education imposed by the Soviet Union on Soviet Jews who were attempting to emigrate. Although the Soviet Union collapsed 20 years ago and Russia has been trying to build a market economy ever since, the amendment continues to impact relations between the two countries. All the experts agreed that the amendment is an out-of-date policy, especially in relation to Russia. They also agreed that it had to be repealed soon. In a certain sense, Jackson-Vanik should not be applied to Russia because it is now a market economy with no emigration problem, Matlock said. The problem is that the amendment has been used on trade issues with Russia since the first Bush administration. There is a perception that the Magnitsky Act could be a quid-pro-quo solution for the repeal of Jackson-Vanik. But the panel’s experts were reluctant to agree. As Matlock said, “if we press the human rights, Russia can do the same; we can’t interfere in what they see as internal affairs.” “There has been a lot of discussion,” Prof. Sestanovich said. “This is the next big question in U.S.-Russian relations after the START treaty.”

Aff- PC Not Real

Political capital isn’t real – votes are ideological

The Daily Home ’10 (Daily newspaper serving the Talladega and and St. Clair Counties since 1867. It is the leading newspaper for the 2 counties as well as much of the surrounding area (“There is no Such Thing as ‘Political Capital’”, The Daily Home, 27 January 2010. < http://www.dailyhome.com/view/full\_story/5680369/article-There-is-no-such-thing-as-‘political-capital’?instance=home\_opinion>)

After winning one of the closest presidential races in the history of the United States in 2004, President Bush proclaimed, “I earned capital in the campaign, political capital, and now I intend to spend it.” The president and the GOP thought they had a sure bet. They were wrong. In following elections, the American voters yanked the rug out from under them, first giving Democrats a majority in Congress, then giving them the White House in 2008. In turn, the Democrats, bolstered by those elections, made the same mistake the Republicans did, believing that they had some grand mandate from voters to push their agenda through. Now, if two recent elections are any indication, the pendulum is once again swinging the other way, with Republicans gaining ground. And once again, we are hearing from GOP party leaders that they have earned some “political capital.” Too bad for both parties “political capital” does not exist — never has. In fact, it’s hugely insulting to Americans as a whole for one party or the other to make such a claim. On average, the United States is split about evenly between Republicans and Democrats, conservatives and liberals, with a broad margin of moderates between the extremes. And most people are, in real-world situations, conservative on some issues and liberal on others. Very few Americans want unrestricted government spending, which is traditionally a conservative view point, but at the same time, most of those people would support the government providing food to starving children, which is traditionally a liberal approach. So any time one political party thinks it has the upper hand, as the Democrats most recently did, they are wrong. The Democrats mostly won elections because of a national dissatisfaction among moderates with how the GOP majority had managed the country — NOT because the United States had suddenly become a country of Democrats. It was foolish then for Democrat leaders like Speaker Nancy Pelosi to think otherwise and it is equally foolish now for the GOP to repeat that mistake. American voters want government that advances the best interest of its people and its businesses, instead of focusing on one party’s agenda. Given the state of the nation today, neither party has done much to earn anything like “political capital” and certainly neither has any to spend.

Aff- AT: PC Key- Votes are Ideological

Congress will always vote based on ideologies, not on other influences

Jenkins ‘00 (Professor and director of graduate studies in the Woodrow Wilson department of politics at the University of Virginia (Jeffrey, “Examining the Robustness of Ideological Voting: Evidence from the Confederate House of Representatives”, Michigan State University, 2000. < https://www.msu.edu/~jenki107/AJPSfinal2.pdf>.)

A majority of work on Congressional voting behavior finds that members of Congress establish **ideological positions and maintain them throughout the entirety of their careers**, regardless of how their career aspirations, political positions, or underlying constituencies change. Based on this evidence, Poole (1998) concludes that members of Congress “die in their ideological boots.” I examine the robustness of the “ideological-boots thesis” more closely, using vote-scaling techniques and roll-call voting data from a different American legislative system: the Congress of the Confederate States of America. Initial results run contrary to the ideological-boots thesis, as I uncover low levels of cross-system stability among members who moved from the U.S. House to the Confederate House. Examining further, I argue that high levels of ideological stability follow from a strong party system being in place to structure voting, which has traditionally been the case in the two-party U.S. House but was not the case in the party-less Confederate House. This result aside, I do find a moderate but increasing level of ideological stability among members of the Confederate House in a session-by-session analysis, which is robust to a serious “shock” (Federal invasion) to the constituency-representative linkage underlying the electoral connection. This latter finding suggests that as long as there are electoral incentives associated with ideological labels, then ideologies will develop, regardless of party structure.

Aff - No Pol Cap - Health Care

PC low – health care

Mardell 6/20- (Mark, Editor of BBC America, “President Obama faces tough choices on healthcare”, 6/20/12,

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-us-canada-18500166,//KR> )

The Supreme Court is expected to rule soon on his changes to America's healthcare system. Obamacare, as his opponents call it, is hugely controversial. [In a recent poll by Rasmussen](http://www.rasmussenreports.com/public_content/politics/current_events/healthcare/health_care_law), 53% of Americans say they wanted it scrapped. But it is President Obama's single biggest domestic achievement. And he chose to do it. He had to deal with the economy. He didn't have to reform the healthcare system. But providing comprehensive healthcare for all Americans has been a dream of liberals [for more than a century](http://www.pnhp.org/facts/a_brief_history_universal_health_care_efforts_in_the_us.php). Teddy Roosevelt couldn't do it. FDR couldn't do it. The Clintons failed spectacularly. Obama succeeded. His first year in office was consumed with the struggle. He **spent enormous amounts of political capital** and rather ruined his reputation as a man who would change the way business was done in Washington, not doing grubby deals.

PC low- health care

Viser ‘12 – Reporter, The Boston Globe (Matt, “Ruling may pose test for candidates,” Politics, 3/29, http://www.boston.com/news/politics/articles/2012/03/29/candidates\_weigh\_political\_fallout\_from\_possible\_supreme\_court\_rejection\_of\_barack\_obama\_health\_law/?page=2)//RK

As a whole, Obama’s health law is unpopular with the American public. But many components of the law are very popular - one that bars health insurers from denying coverage to those with preexisting conditions is favored by 85 percent of respondents in a New York Times/CBS News poll. Yet, the Obama administration contends this provision may have to be stripped from the law if the individual mandate is disallowed. No insurers would agree to the provision, without a mandate to bring in healthier participants. Romney has said he would use legislative and executive means to repeal Obama’s law - if the courts do not do so beforehand - and replace it with a new version. One component of Romney’s new law would prohibit insurance companies from denying coverage because of a previously unknown condition. But he would allow this only for those who have been continuously insured for a fixed period of time. The uncertainties over health care could breathe new life into Rick Santorum’s presidential campaign. The former Pennsylvania senator in recent weeks has increased his criticism of Romney, saying the issue should illustrate to voters the perils of nominating someone whose signature health care legislation in Massachusetts provided a blueprint for the federal law. “Obamacare and Romneycare crush jobs and are an affront to our freedoms,’’ Santorum said in Sparta, Wis. “Republicans need a nominee with the credibility to take on President Obama on an issue so important to the voters, and I am that person.’’ Santorum may be able to capitalize on the issue in the short run, but he still faces an uphill battle against Romney, and the Supreme Court ruling will not come until June, when it could be too late to give him an advantage in the Republican nominating contest. The risks of the high court challenge are significant for Obama, who expended vast political capital to pass a health care law that had no Republican support and was controversial from the start. If his signature law is overturned, it would be a deep political setback.

Aff - Public Link Turn

It’s popular with the public

MNTR 6/22 (The Minnesota National Transit Research Consortium, Panel of experts: Asha Weinstein Agrawal, PhD, is director of the MTI National Transportation Finance Center and an associate professor and chair of urban and regional planning at San Jose State University, Hilary Nixon, PhD, is an associate professor of urban and regional planning at San Jose State University- Vinay Murthy is an independent researcher who has worked for several academic and nonprofit research programs, including the Survey + Policy Research Institute and the Urban Strategies Council, “[Would Americans Support Increased Taxes to Improve Highways, Streets, and Transit?](http://www.supplychaindigital.com/press_releases/would-americans-support-increased-taxes-to-improve-highways-streets-and-transit)”, Supply Chain Digital, 22/6/2012, <http://www.supplychaindigital.com/press_releases/would-americans-support-increased-taxes-to-improve-highways-streets-and-transit>)

The Minnesota National Transit Research Consortium ([transweb.sjsu.edu/mntrc](http://transweb.sjsu.edu/mntrc)) has released a peer-reviewed research report, [What Do Americans Think about Federal Tax Options to Support Public Transit, Highways, and Local Streets and Roads? Results from Year 3 of a National Survey](http://transweb.sjsu.edu/project/1128.html). The report was conducted by the Minnesota Transportation Institute. It summarizes the results of a national random-digit-dial public opinion poll that asked 1,519 respondents if they would support various tax options for raising federal transportation revenues. Special focus was placed on understanding what would motivate people to support increased revenues for public transit. The study authors were Asha Weinstein Agrawal, PhD, Hilary Nixon, PhD, and Vinay Murthy. The free 88-page report is available for download at [transweb.sjsu.edu/project/1128.html](http://transweb.sjsu.edu/project/1128.html) (Logo: <http://photos.prnewswire.com/prnh/20100318/MTILOGO> ) "Over several decades, the transportation revenues from state and federal fuel taxes have fallen significantly, especially in terms of inflation-adjusted dollars per mile traveled," said Dr. Agrawal. "At the same time, the transportation system requires critical and expensive upgrades. This dilemma means that the U.S. must dramatically lower its goals for system preservation and enhancement, or new revenues must be raised. If the latter is to happen, legislators must be convinced that increasing taxes or fees is politically feasible. When legislators decide whether to raise new revenues, they must consider likely public support for – or opposition to – raising different kinds of taxes. This report helps them understand public sentiment." The survey results show that: **A majority of Americans would support higher taxes for transportation**, but only under certain conditions. For example, a gas tax increase of 10 cents per gallon to improve road maintenance was supported by 58 percent of respondents. Support levels dropped to just 20 percent if revenues were to be used more generally to maintain and improve the transportation system: For tax options where revenues were to be spent for undefined transportation purposes, support levels varied considerably by what kind of tax would be imposed, with a sales tax much more popular than either a gas tax increase or a new mileage tax. American public opinion about the tax options tested has changed very little in the past two years. The 2012 survey found Americans about as willing to support tax increases for transportation as they were in 2010 and 2011. With respect to public transit, the survey results from all three years show that most people want good public transit service in their state. However, the 2012 questions exploring different methods to raise new revenues to improve and expand public transit found relatively low levels of support for all of them. Large minorities of respondents did not know that all levels of government – local, state, and federal – support public transit. The federal government was the least widely recognized source of support. The researchers tested eleven specific tax options: variations on raising the federal gas tax rate and creating a new mileage tax, plus creating a new federal sales tax.  Other questions probed various perceptions related to public transit, including knowledge and opinions about federal taxes to support transit. In addition, the survey collected data on standard socio-demographic factors, travel behavior (public transit use, annual miles driven, and vehicle fuel efficiency), and attitudinal data about how respondents view the quality of their local transportation system and their priorities for government spending on transportation in their state. All of this information was used to assess support levels for the tax options among different population subgroups.

Aff - JV Doesn’t Solve Relations - Alt Causes

Alt causes to relations-

A. Iran

Presstv.com 6/18 (“US sanctions on Iran will harm Russia-US relations: Putin's aide”, <http://presstv.com/detail/2012/06/18/246748/iran-sanctions-will-mar-russiaus-ties/>)

A top foreign policy advisor to Russian President Vladimir Putin says the United States’ unilateral sanctions on Iran over its nuclear energy program **will "deal a blow" to US-Russia relations**. Yuri Ushakov told reporters on Sunday that the US sanctions on Iran "run against international law and affect third countries." Moscow cannot accept that Russian firms and banks become the potential victims of such unilateral actions from the United States, the Kremlin aide warned. The remarks come as President Putin is expected to hold a meeting with his US counterpart Barack Obama on the sidelines of the G20 summit in the Mexican city of Los Cabos on Monday. Russia's Deputy Foreign Minister Sergei Ryabkov also noted on June 15 that Moscow is against the unilateral sanctions against Iran over the Islamic Republic’s nuclear energy program. Ryabkov's remarks echoed earlier comments made by Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov during a press conference with his Iranian counterpart Ali Akbar Salehi in Tehran on June 13. “Our stance regarding unilateral sanctions is clear. We are opposed to any unilateral sanctions,” Lavrov said. The United States and some of its allies have imposed sanctions against Iran since the beginning of 2012, claiming that the country's nuclear energy program includes a military component. Tehran refutes the allegation, noting that frequent inspections by the International Atomic Energy Agency have never found any diversion in Iran's nuclear energy program toward military purposes.

B. Magnitsky

RIA NOVOSTI 6/17/12 (Russian newspaper, “Kremlin: Replacement of Jackson-Vanik with Magnitsky Bill Unacceptable” <http://en.ria.ru/russia/20120617/174086727.html>)

Moscow has warned the U.S. Administration that replacement of Jackson-Vanik Amendment with Magnitsky blacklist is 'unacceptable', Russian Presidential Aide Yuri Ushakov said on Sunday. A group of influential U.S. senators, including former Republican presidential candidate, John McCain, proposed in mid-March to introduce a blacklist of Russian officials allegedly linked to Hermitage Capital lawyer Magnitsky’s death, in a Moscow pre-trial detention center in November 2009, in exchange for the cancellation of the Jackson-Vanik amendment. The amendment limits trade with Russia and is an obstacle to the application of World Trade Organization (WTO) rules between the two countries. The restrictions imposed by Jackson-Vanik are often waived, but remain in place and are a thorn in the side of Russia-U.S. trade relations. “We’ve warned the U.S. administration that replacement of Jackson-Vanik with Magnitsky bill is unacceptable,” Ushakov said ahead of a meeting between the Russian president and his U.S. colleague that will be held at the sidelines of the upcoming G8 summit in Los Cabos. The projected Magnitsky bill is an ostentatious anti-Russian move and if this bill is passed Russia will introduce retaliatory measures, Ushakov continued. “Many countries… deny entry to undesirable persons. This is done not publicly and is a common diplomatic practice. But now the issue is about an ostentatious anti-Russian move, they [the congress] are trying to assign an expanded value to the bill, first of all, to use this law when the U.S. is dissatisfied with Russia,” Ushakov said. “Everybody understands that it [the Magnitsky blacklist] is a negative element in the bilateral ties. Everybody understands that retaliatory Russian measures would be inevitable, but we would like to avoid them,” he added. Magnitsky was arrested on tax evasion charges in November 2008, just days after accusing police investigators in a $230 million tax refund fraud, and died after almost a year in the Matrosskaya Tishina pre-trial detention center in Moscow.