# NEGATIVE

## 1nc & Uniq

### 1nc

#### Jackson Vanik will get repealed now – top White House priority – it is separate from Human Rights concerns

Wasson and Needham 5-25. [Erik, Vicki, Hill reporters, “Russia trade, farm bill not on House summer calendar” The Hill -- <http://thehill.com/blogs/on-the-money/1005-trade/229563-russia-trade-farm-bill-not-on-house-summer-calendar>]

Meanwhile, House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Dave Camp (R-Mich.) has said he plans to hold a June hearing on granting permanent normal trade relations to Russia. Camp and Trade Subcommittee Chairman Kevin Brady (R-Texas) have urged the White House to focus its efforts on convincing skeptical lawmakers that the long-standing and outdated Jackson-Vanik should be repealed and normal trade relations granted to Russia as that nation votes to join the World Trade Organization this summer. U.S. trade officials have said that ending Jackson-Vanik is a top priority of the White House because Russia joining the WTO gives the United States a new tool to enforce and handle any disputes over trade laws. Granting Russia permanent normal trade relations does not require the United States to make any changes to its tariffs and, if not completed, would leave U.S. exporters at a disadvantage with other international trading partners that would enjoy reduced duties. President Obama and Russian President Vladimir Putin are scheduled to meet at the Group of 20 meeting next month in Mexico where the topic is likely to be discussed. The Russian Duma has until July 23 to vote on WTO membership and is currently scheduled to adjourn on July 15. Once the Duma votes, and Russia quickly notifies the WTO, its membership goes into effect in 30 days. Camp and Senate Finance Chairman Max Baucus (D-Mont.) have said they would not hold up PNTR with Russia over questions of human-rights issues that they say would only hurt U.S. trade interests by indefinitely delaying lower tariffs for U.S. exporters with Russia. "Our ongoing relationship with Russia is a complex one, but to obtain the benefits of the concessions Russia made to join the WTO, we must grant Russia permanent normal trade relations," Camp said in April.

#### Political capital is key – alienating key voters risks it not passing

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.”

#### PLAN COSTS CAPITAL – INSERT EVIDENCE

#### Repeal key to solve US-Russian relations – they are on the brink of collapse

RT 12 – 26 – 12 [“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 11 Director @ Belfer Center for Science and Int’l Affairs @ Harvard’s Kennedy School, Former Assistant Secretary of Defense, Robert D. Blackwill, Senior Fellow – Council on Foreign Relations [Graham Allison, “10 Reasons Why Russia Still Matters”, Politico -- October 31 -- <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 **U**nited **S**tates 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 resolutions.

### Will Pass

#### Will get repealed – Clinton optimism

AP 6 – 27 – 12 Clinton optimistic over US-Russian relations and repeal of Jackson-Vanik bill, http://www.newser.com/article/d9vlgpd02/clinton-optimistic-over-us-russian-relations-and-repeal-of-jackson-vanik-bill.html

U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton says she's optimistic that relations with Moscow will not suffer despite planned legislation in Congress that would impose tough sanctions on Russian human rights violators.

Clinton says she expects "something to move" on both the repeal of the Jackson-Vanik law and on Congress' concerns about Russian human rights

She told reporters in Finland on Wednesday that the concerns could be expressed "without derailing the relationship (with Moscow) and that is what we are working with our Congress to do and we have every reason to believe we can accomplish that."

The repeal of Jackson-Vanik is necessary if U.S. businesses are to enjoy lower tariffs and increased access to Russian markets when Russia joins the World Trade Organization this summer

Clinton to reporters at newser after talks with Finnish Foreign Minister Erkki Tuomioja:

"We expect something to move on the repeal of Jackson-Vanik and something to move to reflect the Congress' concerns," she told reporters in Helsinki.

"Now, we discussed this directly with President (Vladimir) Putin when I was with President Obama in Mexico. We made it very clear that, you know, we do have concerns about human rights in Russia," Clinton said.

"But again, to go back to original question, we think there is a way of expressing those concerns without derailing the relationship," she said, "and that is what we are working with our Congress to do and we have every reason to believe we can accomplish that."

#### Bipartisan support

JTA 6 – 14 – 12 The Global News Service of the Jewish People [Senators introduce Jackson-Vanik repeal for Russia, http://www.jta.org/news/article/2012/06/14/3098196/senators-introduce-jackson-vanik-repeal-for-russia]

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.

**Jackson Vanik will pass this year – top priority.**

Bloomberg 6-7-12. [“US official urges repeal of Russia trade law” -- <http://www.businessweek.com/ap/2012-06/D9V877M80.htm>]

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.

**JV will pass independent of amendments – administration officials.**

Needham 6-10. [Vicki, reporter, “Human rights concerns complicated efforts to ramp up Russia trade” The Hill -- <http://thehill.com/blogs/on-the-money/1005-trade/231947-human-rights-concerns-complicate-efforts-to-ramp-up-russia-trade>]

Some lawmakers have suggested they would support repealing Jackson-Vanik as a trade-off in exchange for passage of the so-called Magnitsky bill. "There is growing recognition in the business community and on the Hill to do something meaningful and send a message on human rights," Gerwin said. "The Russians are hacked off about it but they can't deny us any trade rights because then they would be in violation of WTO rules," he said. "We've got a good track record at the WTO so it's unlikely Russia would do something blatant." Kirk said repealing Jackson-Vanik is a top priority for his office this year but he is opposed to linking it to a Magnitsky bill. “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,” Kirk said. The administration will "continue our work" with lawmakers concerned about human rights, Kirk said. Senate Finance Chairman Max Baucus (D-Mont.) has talked about linking his chamber's measure. Still, while a human rights bill gives Congress an opportunity to express its dissatisfaction with Russia's track record on human rights, it **is separate from the repeal** and no bearing on the results for businesses of getting rid of Jackson-Vanik, Gerwin said.

### A2 Magnitsky stops it

#### Moving forward – despite Magitsky

AP 6 – 27 – 12 Clinton cites concerns over human rights in Russia, <http://www.foxnews.com/world/2012/06/27/clinton-optimistic-over-us-russian-relations/>

U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton says she's optimistic that relations with Moscow will not suffer despite planned legislation in Congress that would impose tough sanctions on Russian human rights violators.

Clinton says she expects "something to move" on both the repeal of the Jackson-Vanik law and on Congress' concerns about Russian human rights.

She told reporters in Finland on Wednesday that the concerns could be expressed "without derailing the relationship (with Moscow) and that is what we are working with our Congress to do and we have every reason to believe we can accomplish that."

The 1974 Jackson-Vanik Act tied trade with the then-Soviet Union to Moscow's willingness to allow Jews and other minorities to leave the country. The repeal of Jackson-Vanik is necessary if U.S. businesses are to enjoy lower tariffs and increased access to Russian markets when Russia joins the World Trade Organization this summer.

Following talks with Finnish Foreign Minister Erkki Tuomioja, Clinton told reporters that "we discussed this directly with President (Vladimir) Putin when I was with President Obama in Mexico. We made it very clear that, you know, we do have concerns about human rights in Russia."

A Senate panel in Washington moved forward Tuesday on a bill that would impose tough sanctions on Russian human rights violators, a measure certain to be linked to congressional efforts to lift the Cold War-era Jackson-Vanik trade restrictions.

The Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate approved the measure that would impose visa bans and freeze the assets of those held responsible for gross human rights violations in Russia, as well as other human rights abusers.

Specifically, it targets those allegedly involved in the imprisonment, torture and death of lawyer Sergei Magnitsky, who died in a Russian jail in 2009.

Clinton said, "We think there is a way of expressing those concerns without derailing the relationship" with Moscow, and she added that is "what we are working with our Congress to do, and we have every reason to believe we can accomplish that."

"We are very keen in the administration for repealing the Jackson-Vanik bill because we want to open doors to greater trade and investment between our two countries," the secretary said.

"However there is great concern in our country, and in particular in our Congress over human rights in Russia," she added, "and in particular the case of the lawyer Mr. Magnitsky, who died in prison."

"There's a lot of interest in our Congress over a full, transparent investigation of the circumstances of his death in prison," Clinton said. "And so our Congress, while they are being asked by the administration to repeal Jackson-Vanik, want to pass legislation that will require the United States government to take action against any persons who are connected with the death of Mr. Magnitsky."

#### This is the reason capital is key – Obama has to convince them to weaken Magnitsky

Inside US Trade 5 – 17 – 12.

While the Obama administration recognizes the need to pass human rights legislation in Congress in order to gain political support for a separate vote to graduate Russia from the Jackson-Vanik amendment, it is pressing Congress to substantially weaken the legislation such that it would have little effect in practice, congressional sources said. The continuing exchange between administration officials and members supporting the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2012 has included some reasonable suggestions from the administration, but many others that have been unacceptable to the bill's supporters, these sources said. Administration officials are also exerting pressure on the timing of when Congress takes up the Magnitsky bill, in light of their preference that Congress mark up the legislation after Russian President-elect Vladimir Putin and other world leaders conclude their May 18-19 G-8 summit hosted by President Obama at Camp David, sources said. The administration made clear to Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman John Kerry (D-MA) that it does not want action on the Magnitsky bill to overshadow conversations between Putin and Obama. As a consequence, Kerry this week delayed a markup of the bill that had been scheduled for yesterday (April 26), sources said. The Magnitsky legislation requires the administration to publish a public list naming Russian officials who have been banned from entering the United States as a result of being involved in gross violations of human rights. The bill also requires the administration to freeze the assets of Russians included on the visa ban list. The administration, in a recent draft proposal submitted to Congress, has proposed replacing all the mandatory language now included in the bill -- including that the administration "shall" publish the public list naming Russian officials in the first place -- with less binding terms, such as "shall be authorized to," congressional sources said. **Making such a change would essentially maintain the status quo** in terms of what the administration can do to sanction individuals. For instance, the State Department has said it already has the authority to ban visas, and already maintains a list of individuals who cannot enter the United States, although it is not publicly released.

**Obama will stop it – opposition and reforms solve the impact.**

Rogin 6-7. [Josh, reporter, “Magnitsky bill moves forward in the House” Foreign Policy <http://thecable.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/06/07/magnitsky_bill_moves_forward_in_the_house>]

The Obama administration is publicly opposed to the Magnitsky bill, especially the effort to connect it to Jackson-Vanik repeal, and has been working behind the scenes with bill sponsors such as Sen. Ben Cardin (D-MD) to alter the legislation. "From our point of view this legislation is redundant to what we're already doing," U.S. Ambassador Russia Mike McFaul said in March.

### Top of docket

**JV is top of the docket – vote by August.**

Needham 6-10. [Vicki, reporter, “Human rights concerns complicated efforts to ramp up Russia trade” The Hill -- <http://thehill.com/blogs/on-the-money/1005-trade/231947-human-rights-concerns-complicate-efforts-to-ramp-up-russia-trade>]

Russia's decision to vote July 4, ahead of the July 23 deadline, on its WTO accession means lawmakers will have to pass a repeal before the August recess to gain the full benefits. Once the Russian Duma passes the bill, the nation joins the WTO 30 days later. For the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, normalizing trade relations with Russia is the top legislative priority this year, Christopher Wenk, the Chamber's senior director for international policy, told The Hill.

**Top priority**

Russia & CIS Business & Financial Daily 6-6. [lexis]

U.S. Under Secretary of Commerce for International Trade Francisco Sanchez thinks that U.S. and Russian businessmen will equally loose, if WTO rules are not applied to U.S.-Russian relations, which may happen if the Jackson-Vanik amendment remain in effect. "As it relates to who is hurt, if we are no able to move forward in a timely manner, I think there is no question that at least initially American businesses will not have benefits of Russia's accession to the WTO. However, I think that in the long term Russian may loose out on opportunities to engage with American companies that have state-of-the-art technologies and know-how," Sanchez said in an interview with Interfax. "It's all in our interest to move forward on this issue, and the Obama administration is going to continue to work very hard on moving forward with this," he said.

## Link Debate

### PC key

#### Obama’s political capital is key to block the Magnitsky Act --- passage collapses START and US/Russian relatiosn

**Rogin**, **4/24**/2012 (Josh, Kerry delays action on Magnitsky bill, Foreign Policy, p. http://thecable.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/04/24/kerry\_delays\_action\_on\_magnitsky\_bill)

Last month, Kerry indicated that the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2011 would be brought up for a vote at the April 26 SFRC business meeting and he also endorsed the idea of combining the Magnitsky bill with a bill to grant Russia Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) status and repeal the 1974 Jackson-Vanik law. "In good faith, we will move as rapidly as we can, hopefully the minute we're back, but certainly shortly thereafter," Kerry said March 27, just before the last Senate recess. But after what several Senate aides described as intense lobbying from top Obama administration officials, including Deputy National Security Advisor Denis McDonough and Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs Wendy Sherman, Kerry decided not to put the bill on the agenda of the next business meeting, delaying consideration of the bill until May at the earliest, after the visit to the U.S. of Russian President-elect Vladimir Putin. In a statement to The Cable, Kerry said he still supports quick passage of the Magnitsky bill and its linkage to the repeal of Jackson-Vanik, but that he needed more time to iron out differences over the details of the legislation. "I support this effort and, as I said at the last business meeting, passing the Magnitsky legislation out of our committee is not a question of if, only when. I've been trying to get everyone on the same page because that's how you get the best legislative result, and everyone was explicitly very comfortable with where we were. My goal here is to get the best result," Kerry said. But several aides told The Cable that not everybody was comfortable with the delay. The Cable obtained an e-mail sent late last week from the staff of committee Republican Richard Lugar (R-IN) to several Democratic Senate offices including that of Sen. Ben Cardin (D-MD), the bill's main sponsor, in which Lugar protests the delay strongly. "We want to reiterate Senator Lugar's position, as he stated at the last business meeting, that he strongly supports having the Magnitsky Act taken up at the next business meeting (i.e. next week)," the e-mail reads. "As we understand the situation, the White House and State Department have been frantic over the last 24 hours in trying to head off consideration of the bill next week by contacting numerous Democratic offices," Lugar's staff wrote. "Thus, our position remains as it has been: Senator Lugar supports immediate consideration of the Magnitsky bill-next week. If Senators Kerry and/or Cardin do not wish to have it taken up then, that is prerogative of the SFRC Majority, but it is not the position of Senator Lugar." The Obama administration is on the record opposing the Magnitsky bill and believes that its passage could imperil U.S.-Russian cooperation on a range of issues. The Russian government has even threatened to scuttle the New START nuclear reductions treaty if the Magnitsky bill is passed, which would erase the signature accomplishment of the administration's U.S.-Russia reset policy. "Senior Russian government officials have warned us that they will respond asymmetrically if legislation passes," the administration said in its official comments on the bill last July. "Their argument is that we cannot expect them to be our partner in supporting sanctions against countries like Iran, North Korea, and Libya, and sanction them at the same time. Russian officials have said that other areas of bilateral cooperation, including on transit Afghanistan, could be **jeopardized if this legislation passes**." Russian Ambassador Sergey Kislyak said Monday at a lunch with reporters in Washington that passage of the Magnitsky bill would have a "significant negative impact" on the U.S.-Russia relationship and said it was unacceptable for the United States to interfere in the Magnitsky case, which he said was an internal Russian issue. "It's artificially attached to the whole issue of Jackson Vanik... It's politically motivated," he said. "We do not want to be told what to do within the limits of Russian law." Kislyak then said there were human rights violations in the United States that Russia could raise in the context of trade negotiations, but chooses not to. "I could bring up one example that is very much on our minds. Three years of long investigation of the killing of children adopted from Russia, with absolute immunity, but we do not bring that issue into the economic realm," he said. Cardin, meanwhile, has been working with administration behind the scenes to make changes to the Magnitsky bill, and even came up with a new draft version of the legislation last week, before the delay. The Cable obtained an internal document showing exactly what changed in the bill. For example, the new version makes it more difficult to add names to the list of human rights violators that the bill would create. In the previous version, any member of Congress could request to add the name of an alleged human rights violator to the bill. In the new version, both the chair and ranking member of a relevant committee must jointly request someone be added to the list, a high bar in a partisan Congress. Cardin is caught by between his desire to see his legislation passed without being gutted and his desire to work with the administration. In a brief interview with The Cable last week, he insisted he still wants the Magnitsky bill joined with the legislation that will repeal Jackson-Vanik and grant Russia PNTR. "There's a growing support in the Senate to make sure it's part of the PNTR debate," he said. "We'd like SFRC to mark it up and then take it to the Senate Finance Committee and make it part of the PNTR bill." The exact logistics for how the Magnitsky bill is moved in conjunction with the PNTR bill are up in the air. It could be joined in the Senate Finance Committee, or on the Senate floor, or just passed at the same time. But what's clear is that there are several senators ready to hold up PNTR for Russia if the Magnitsky bill isn't considered in conjunction. Among Capitol Hill staffers, there's also concern that the administration may be negotiating to water down the Magnitsky bill now, only **to ultimately oppose it later**. A similar dynamic played out over sanctions on the Central Bank of Iran last December. Then, it was Sen. Robert Menendez (D-NJ) who carried water for the administration before discovering they would ultimately oppose the bill no matter what. Menendez was livid. That bill passed the Senate 100-0.

### Plan costs Capital – Generic

#### Plan guarantees a loss of capital – Obama will have to convince others to spend capital

RUBINSTEIN 3 – 27 – 12 Reporter for Capital New York, has written for Bloomberg Businessweek, the Wall Street Journal, the New York Times, the New York Observer, and the Brooklyn Paper [Dana Rubenstein “When is Obama going to have his Eisenhower moment?” March 27, 2012 http://www.capitalnewyork.com/article/politics/2012/03/5524547/when-obama-going-have-his-eisenhower-moment]

Ask a transportation expert who the last great transportation president was, and you're not bound to find much agreement. Dwight D. Eisenhower, who in the 1950s championed the creation of the Interstate System, is a common choice, though Jimmy Carter merits mention for deregulating the trucking industry and airline and air-freight transportation, and Ronald Reagan, for raising the gas tax and dedicating part of it to mass transit.

On the subject of the current president, there’s more of a consensus. One point of agreement is that he has talked a great game, but has been unable to do much to deliver. Another is that he might be able to do more if he gets a second term, but that even then it would depend on whether the upcoming election produces a Congress that is, one way or another, less hostile to his agenda

“Even Eisenhower didn’t mention transportation as much as this guy,” said Joshua Schank, a former transportation adviser to Hillary Clinton who is now president of the Eno Center for Transportation.

“It’s hard not to be frustrated that he hasn’t acted on it more,” he added

At the moment, it can safely be said that building support for increased transportation spending is not the president's top priority, as he heads into a general election with the economy just showing signs of recovery. Infrastructure funding—and what were once packaged as stimulus projects, generally—have taken a back seat to, say, the price of gas and, by extension, the conspicuously expanded drive for domestic energy resources.

The lesson that Obama and the administration seem to have taken from the times they have pushed hard for spending on big transportation-infrastructure projects is that they're a tougher sell than expected, or at least that voters don't necessarily see them as the economic generators they eventually become

So, for example, the president insisted that the federal stimulus act include $8 billion for high-speed rail, but then absorbed a great deal of grief over ensuing allocations, which were criticized as politically motivated.

And while spending on less costly projects has been easier for the administration, politically, it has also been less rewarding. For instance, the stimulus included $1.5 billion in funding for so-called TIGER grants, a small pot of money (it was later expanded to $2.6 billion) that’s been sprinkled around the country. They hardly got noticed nationally, other than by transportation advocates, who felt they were too small to make any meaningful change to the physical transportation system itself.

(There was a total of $48 billion in stimulus spending on projects around the country, but aside from the high-speed rail component and the TIGER grants, those funds are generally considered to have been inserted at the initiative of Congressional leaders and were not part of a coordinated national transportation strategy.)

The reforms that transportation boosters have in mind are, generally speaking, more profound: an ongoing commitment to paying for large capital projects and maintenance of existing infrastructure; sustainable sources of revenue to offset that cost; alterations to the system of incentives that drive commercial and residential growth, and to the metrics that measure the efficiency and cost of moving people around their regions and across the country.

“The federal tax code subsidizes some really bad development,” says Andrew Goldberg, managing director of government relations at the American Institute of Architects, which has advocated tax-code reforms. “A lot of the funding goes toward sprawl, toward building where land is cheapest."

“I know this isn’t sexy," said Schank, "but he could direct D.O.T. to start doing the research necessary to implement real performance measures and accountability for transportation.”

In other words, the administration could lay out a precise vision for how it would like to see the money it controls spent, and support that vision accordingly.

The American Society of Engineers says there’s a $3 trillion backlog in surface transportation spending. The United States spends a mere 2.4 percent of its G.D.P. on transportation and water infrastructure, compared to Europe’s 5 percent and China’s 9.

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.

In this year’s State of the Union, the president made a strong argument for infrastructure spending.

“During the Great Depression, America built the Hoover Dam and the Golden Gate Bridge,” he said. “After World War II, we connected our States with a system of highways. Democratic and Republican administrations invested in great projects that benefited everybody, from the workers who built them to the businesses that still use them today.”

“In the next few weeks, I will sign an executive order clearing away the red tape that slows down too many construction projects.

"But you need to fund these projects. Take the money we're no longer spending at war, use half of it to pay down our debt, and use the rest to do some nation-building right here at home.”

The “you” in that sentence was Congress.

But the Republican-controlled House is looking to cut transportation spending, not increase it. It will be all the president can do to get them to agree to pass the Senate's version of this year's transportation-spending bill, which more or less extends the status quo.

“The White House hasn’t recommended funding sources, and the Congress has been reluctant to propose new revenues,” says Yaro, of the Regional Plan Association.

House Republicans in particular have staked out a radical position on infrastructure funding, going so far as to propose eliminating mass-transit financing entirely from the gas tax.

### Obama pushing

#### Obama pushing – working on the mark-up now.

THE HILL 7 – 10 – 12 Top US trade official urges congressional action on Russia, http://thehill.com/blogs/on-the-money/1005-trade/236987-top-us-trade-official-urges-congressional-action-on-russia

The nation's top trade official on Tuesday urged Congress to lift a Cold War-era provision to grant Russia permanent normal trade relations.

The call from U.S. Trade Representative Ron Kirk comes on the heels of the Russian Duma’s ratification of its membership into the World Trade Organization (WTO), an 18-year quest.

“We are pleased to hear that Russia has completed this critical first step in its domestic process for approving the terms for becoming a member of the World Trade Organization," Kirk said.

"We reiterate our call on Congress to act now on Jackson-Vanik and Permanent Normal Trade Relations legislation,” he said.

Once the upper chamber of Russia's parliament, the Federation Council, approves the accession package, it then heads to the desk of President Vladimir Putin for his signature, which is expected before the July 23 deadline.

When complete, Russia will gain membership in 30 days and Congress will need to act. That means lawmakers must clear a bill that will give U.S. exporters greater access to the world's ninth largest economy, and biggest outside of the WTO, before the August recess.

"Russia’s membership in the rules-based global trading system of the WTO will contribute to Russia’s economic growth as well as provide us with new opportunities to guide and grow our bilateral economic relationship," Kirk said.

That ramps up pressure on lawmakers in Washington to clear out the Jackson-Vanik provision, which would allow for normal trade relations.

The Senate Finance Committee is planning to mark up legislation, most likely next week, that would combine a repeal of Jackson-Vanik with human-rights legislation known at the Magnitsky bill.

The House Ways and Means Committee has not announced a markup yet, and an aide told The Hill they are still working with the Obama administration and the Senate on how to move forward.

Panel Chairman Dave Camp (R-Mich.) has said he wants to move a clean repeal without any human-rights language.

#### White House pushing to separate the two bills

AP 6 – 13 – 12 U.S. Republicans Fire Back Over Jackson-Vanik Repeal, <http://www.themoscowtimes.com/business/article/us-republicans-fire-back-over-jackson-vanik-repeal/460280.html>

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.

### A2 Winners Win

#### Winners lose – any major win is the quickest way to kill future proposals. The GOP will backlash

**The Economist**, 2/16/**2011** (What’s the equilibrium here?, p. lexis)

The Obama administration's theory of policymaking amid divided government is a frustrating one. What most people want from the president is to lead. And leading, in this case, means giving a speech, getting behind some unpopular ideas, trying to change public opinion... But the White House has come to the conclusion that that type of leadership doesn't work. It believes that the **quickest way to kill a controversial proposal** in a polarized political system is to have the president endorse it. Once a high-profile proposal is associated with the White House, Republicans (correctly) view its passage as a **threat to their political fortunes**. That's why the Obama administration didn't endorse a payroll tax holiday until after the election, when it emerged as part of the tax deal. Endorsing it before the election would've "**poisoned the well**," one administration official told me after. Republicans would have had to attack it, and that would have made it impossible for them to endorse it later. The Obama administration may have a point here. Consider one item that the president has repeatedly, openly pushedinvestment in America's long-neglected intercity rail system. Republican governors are cancelling rail plans as fast as they can. Florida Governor Rick Scott just scrapped a Florida plan, despite the fact that the federal government was going to cover most of the capital costs, while private companies were offering to cover the rest in exchange for the right to operate the line. On the other hand, Mr Obama responded to Republican budget proposals that avoided addressing entitlements by...releasing a budget that avoided addressing entitlements. And lo and behold, Republican congressional leaders are now scrambling to include entitlement reforms in new budget plans. Maybe the president has this whole reverse psychology thing figured out. But I doubt this is a stable equilibrium. The GOP's reflexive **anti-Obama streak** is motivated, one presumes, by a desire to win elections. One supposes that they feel they must **deny him legislative victories** in order to be successful at the ballot box. So for a while, presidential abdication of leadership may create political space for something like honest legislative negotiations over policy. But a grand bargain that takes place under Mr Obama's watch is a **political victory** for Mr Obama, whether or not he led the charge. And the GOP is **unlikely to let the president have such a win**.

#### Controversial wins bleed momentum not build it.

**Politico**, 1/20/**2010** (Obama's first year: What went wrong, p. <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.

## Impact Debate

### Bostrom

#### It’s the only existential threat

**Bostrum**, March **2002** (Nick – prof of philosophy at Oxford University and recipient of the Gannon Award, Existential Risks, Journal of Evolution and Technology, p. http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html)

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] 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.

### Key to Relations

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

**Gvosdev 12**.

(Feb 10 -- 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.

**Russian officials say JV is key to relations.**

**Russia & CIS Newswire 12**. [Dec 27 -- Russia & CIS Business and Financial Newswire, “Yesterday in Brief” -- lexis]

\*\*\* JACKSON-VANIK AMENDMENT MUST BE REPEALED TO IMPROVE RUSSIA-U.S. ECONOMIC RELATIONS - LAVROV A quality change in Russia-U.S. economic relations is possible if the U.S. Congress appeals the Jackson-Vanik amendment, Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov said in an interview with Interfax on Monday. " 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.

**Reverse causal – failure to repeal post-WTO accession jacks relations.**

**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**.

### Relations key to heg

**Collapse of relations jacks heg.**

**Simes 7 [**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.

### Relations Solve – Laundry List

**Russian relations solve every impact**

**National Security Network 9.** [7/1 -- <http://www.nsnetwork.org/node/1354>]

U.S. cooperation with Russia vital not just for nonproliferation, but for other key national security priorities. The U.S. – Russia relationship is too important to rest on the personality politics, as it did during the Bush administration. In order for the U.S. to solve pressing national security dilemmas, it must put its relations with Russia back on solid, strategic footing. After a meeting this week with his Russian counterpart, General Makarov, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Admiral Michael Mullen remarked on the areas of mutual interest in the context of hard security, “There are areas of common interest that we agree we need to work on – Afghanistan – logistic support to the Afghanistan conflict, the issue of counterterrorism, the issue of Iran.” On Afghanistan, Russia hopes to prevent the growth of an insurgency that could threaten its interests. In that spirit, Russia has offered assistance to the U.S. – led international mission to stabilize the country. AFP reports that “[t]he United States and Russia may soon sign a deal boosting the transit of US supplies to Afghanistan through Russia, the Kommersant daily reported Monday, citing diplomatic sources.” The deal would reportedly involve “a dozen US planes flying over Russia each day with military cargos, rather than just rail shipments of non-lethal supplies as Moscow now allows,” according to the original article in the Kommersant Daily. Recent developments have also clarified the importance of Russian involvement in developing an international response to both Iran and North Korea. Russia’s relationship with Iran means that it will be an indispensable interlocutor for any effort to dissuade the country from further developing its nuclear program. Russia has also been cooperative in responding to North Korea’s recent belligerence. According to the New York Times, the latest round of UN sanctions would not have been possible without Russia and also China, which are “the closest thing North Korea has to friends,” both “agreed to a mixture of financial and trade restrictions designed to choke off military development.” Apart from traditional security concerns, Russia is also **at the nexus of energy and climate change**. A recent Center for Naval Analysis report cites Russia’s status as the “world’s largest exporter of natural gas and the second largest exporter of oil” making U.S. – Russia relations a key energy security consideration. In addition, the Center for American Progress points out that “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,” suggesting that “[m]aking Russia a partner on these issues could be critical in order to advance a sound global climate change agenda.” And, as Robert Levgold observes in the latest issue of Foreign Affairs, “attempts to reform international financial and security institutions will be optimized only if Russia is given a chance to contribute constructively.” [Admiral Michael Mullen, 6/29/09. AFP, 6/29/09. NY Times, 6/12/09. CNA, May 2009. CAP, 6/30/09. Foreign Affairs, July/August 2009]

### A2 relations resilient

**The impact is perception based – disproves resiliency.**

**Aron 6.** [Leon, Resident Scholar and Director of Russian Studies at the American Enterprise Institute, “The United States and Russia; Ideologies, Policies, and Relations” American Enterprise Institute -- June -- <http://www.aei.org/outlook/24606>]

The difficulties with the WTO have reopened the old wound of the Jackson-Vanik Amendment. The 1974 legislation denies the normal Most Favored Nation (MFN) trade status to countries with non-market economies that restrict their citizens’ right to emigrate. Post-Soviet Russia has removed all the restrictions on foreign travel and immigration and was found to be in formal compliance with the emigration provision of the amendment in 1994. Even after the effective renationalization of the two largest private oil companies, YUKOS and Sibneft, at least 65 percent of the country’s GDP today is generated in the private sector.[15] Still, unlike China, which was granted the MFN status in 2000 despite the clear noncompliance with both requirements, the **affront to the Russian national dignity** continues in violation of the letter of America’s own laws. **Corroding in and of themselves**, all these **unfulfilled** expectations eat away at the **most important American resources**: equality and respect for Russia. As a result, there have been calls in Moscow to force the United States into arms control negotiations by accelerating the construction and deployment of the Topol-M (SS-25) multi-warhead intercontinental ballistic missiles. As the current Russian cache of strategic weapons is many times over what is required for effective deterrence, the main objective seems to be making the United States reckon with Russia as an equal**.** “Of course, no one is planning to attack Russia,” one of the advocates of this strategy explained on Russian television last March. “But they also refuse to conduct negotiations with her.”16 Two months later, in his 2006 state-of-Russia speech to the joint session of the chambers of the Federal Assembly, President Putin endorsed this position.

**Relations not resilient – collapse possible.**

**Perry and Scowcroft 9**. (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.

### A2 Magnitsky hurts relations

#### Magnitsky is no longer specific to Russia

Borshchevskaya 7 – 6 – 12 assistant director at the Dinu Patriciu Center at the Atlantic Council [Anna Borshchevskaya, Supporting human rights in Russia should be a core strategic interest for US, <http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2012/07/06/supporting-human-rights-in-russia-should-be-core-strategic-interest-for-us/>]

On Tuesday, July 10, the Russian Duma will vote on ratification of the agreement for Russia’s entry into the World Trade Organization (WTO). Policymakers in both countries view Russia’s entry as a foregone conclusion. The question before Congress therefore is how best to pressure Russia to respect human rights following its repeal of the Jackson-Vanik amendment.

Passed in 1974, Jackson-Vanik tied favorable trade to the freedom to emigrate from the Soviet Union. It provided a foundation for Cold War human rights advocacy. The Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act, approved unanimously by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on June 26, was meant to fill the void left by lifting Jackson-Vanik.

Named after a Russian anti-corruption lawyer tortured and killed in prison in 2009 after he uncovered a $230 million embezzlement scheme, it would sanction Russia’s worst human rights violators by denying them U.S. visas and freezing their assets in U.S. banks.

However, at the last minute, in order to assuage the Kremlin, the Committee chose not to single out Russia and passed a watered-down version of the bill, applying it to human rights abusers worldwide. Lost is the original purpose of the Act—to show ordinary Russians that the United States wants to see a better Russia—one that does not abuse its citizens and one that can be a strong partner to the United States, an ally with whom we share values.

#### Magnitsky will not collapse US/Russia relations – overwhelming incentives to cooperate

Russia Beyond the Headlines, 6/19/**2012** (Will the Magnitsky blacklist sour U.S.-Russian relations?, p. <http://rbth.ru/articles/2012/06/19/the_magnitsky_blacklist_may_sour_us-russia_relations_15900.html>)

Russian Presidential Aide Yury Ushakov has also described the bill as unacceptable. Last week, Ushakov said that a response will come from Russia immediately if the U.S. Congress votes in favor of the Magnitsky bill. “If there is no law, there will be no responsive measures and the relations will become better,” he said, encouraging U.S. lawmakers to think twice before voting on the measure. Contrary to the harsh rhetoric from government officials, some experts argue that the Magnitsky bill, if adopted, is hardly likely to seriously affect U.S.-Russia bilateral relations. “This will make our relations worse, but the damage won’t be catastrophic because Russia and the U.S. also have a positive agenda,” said Sergei Markov, rector at the Plekhanov Russian University of Economics and a member of the Public Chamber of Russia. Markov pointed out that Russia and the U.S. work together on a number of important issues, such as combating terrorism and drug trafficking and will undoubtably continue this cooperation. “We also need to develop our economic relations,” said the analyst. Markov believes that Presidents Barack Obama and Vladimir Putin have the potential to develop good personal relations. “Putin had the opportunity to receive evidence that Obama keeps his word. Putin values this most of all,” the analyst said. Markov thinks that Obama, in turn, respects Putin’s leadership potential. Maksim Grigoryev, president of the Foundation for the Study of Problems of Democracy, also believes that U.S.-Russian relations will improve relatively soon, at least after the U.S. presidential elections, should Obama win a second term. Grigoryev thinks that the discussion around the Magnitsky bill is all about political PR. “It is important for Obama to present himself as a strong man on the international arena and neutralize the Republican Party's attacks that he is not hard enough on Russia. For Republicans, it is important to show that they fight against totalitarianism in Russia,” said Grigoryev. “This is a PR move for both the Republicans and Obama.”

# AFFIRMATIVE

## Uniqueness

### Won’t Pass

#### Won’t pass – GOP opposition in the Senate

RT 6 – 13 – 12 Lifting of Russia-US trade barriers faces opposition, http://rt.com/business/news/us-opposes-lifting-restrictions-russia-trade-jackson-vanik-699/

A US Senate plan to lift Cold War restrictions on trade with Russia faced opposition from Senate Republicans who said Congress must first address Russia's poor human rights record and existing economic and political policies.

A group of US senators introduced legislation on Tuesday to lift trade restrictions on Russia. The bill is hoped to be passed before Russia joins the World Trade Organization this summer. The 1974 Jackson-Vanik Act tied trade with the then-Soviet Union to Moscow allowing Jews and other minorities to leave Russia.

The repeal of Jackson-Vanik is seen as beneficial for US businesses which seek lower tariffs and access to Russian markets once the country joins the WTO.

"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 Senate Finance Committee Chairman Max Baucus in a statement.

According to the Senator, "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".

However, Baucus also vowed to incorporate provisions being championed by an increasing number of Democrats and Republicans to punish Russian officials for any human-rights violations.

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.

 Administration officials have called for Congress to pass the trade bill separately from any human-rights legislation.

In case the amendment is cancelled Russia-US trade relations will be regulated by WTO rules once Russia joins the organization.

#### Wont’ pass – push back on multiple issues

REUTERS 6 – 12 – 12 Senators pair Russia trade, human rights bills, <http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2012-06-12/news/sns-rt-us-usa-russia-tradebre85b0w6-20120612_1_human-rights-jackson-vanik-top-trade-priority>

Baucus was joined on the bill to establish "permanent normal trade relations," or PNTR, with Russia by Senate Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman John Kerry, a Massachusetts Democrat, and Senator John McCain, the top Republican on the Senate Armed Services Committee. Senator John Thune, a Republican on the Finance Committee, also attached his name to the bill.

But in a sign of trouble for what the White House has called its top trade priority this year, eight other Finance panel Republicans said Moscow's support for Syrian President Bashar al-Assad's government and a number of other concerns must be "satisfactorily" addressed before action on the trade bill.

"Russia continues to support and enable the Assad regime in Syria through officially condoned arms sales and sustained opposition to United Nations Security Council resolutions, and continues to occupy the Democratic Republic of Georgia," Senator Orrin Hatch, the panel's top Republican, and seven colleagues said in a letter to Baucus.

The Republican senators also expressed concern about Russia's commitment to human rights and the rule of law, its poor record of protecting intellectual property rights and a number of longstanding trade irritants that they feared would not be resolved by Moscow joining the WTO.

Russia, the largest economy still outside the WTO, is expected to enter the Geneva-based trade body by the end of August. That has put pressure on Congress to establish PNTR by removing Russia from a 1974 law known as the Jackson-Vanik amendment, which conditions Russia's eligibility for the most favorable U.S. tariff rates on the rights of Russian Jews and religious minorities to emigrate freely.

**Won’t pass – GOP tricks.**

**Inside U.S. Trade 6-8**. [“Senate Finance Republicans demand additional hearing on Jackson Vanik” -- lexis]

All 11 Republican members of the Senate Finance Committee late last month demanded that Chairman Max Baucus (D-MT) invite administration officials to testify at a new hearing on the implications of graduating Russia from the so-called Jackson-Vanik amendment, which is a key step related to Russia's accession to the World Trade Organization. "While we appreciated the opportunity to hear from U.S. businesses and other non-governmental organizations about the implications of such action on March 15, 2012, we believe that more analysis is warranted before proceeding with a mark-up in the Finance Committee," the senators wrote in a May 24 letter to Baucus, reprinted on this page. "Therefore, we respectfully request that we hold an additional hearing and invite senior members of the Administration to testify before the Finance Committee before considering legislation," they added. According to the letter, there is precedent for having such a hearing with administration officials, as at least four Cabinet secretaries testified before the Congress during the discussions surrounding the accession of China to the WTO. "Gaining a clearer understanding of the Administration's policies toward Russia will help Members of the Committee place in context legislation" to graduate Russia from Jackson-Vanik, the Republicans wrote. However, several observers said the new demand from Republicans could also represent an attempt to get the administration on the record regarding the priority it attaches to graduating Russia from the Jackson-Vanik amendment so that Republicans would be in a better position to extract other concessions the administration in return. Overall, the letter represents a potential **new hurdle** for the process of lifting Russia from the Jackson-Vanik amendment in the Senate. After the March hearing, Baucus said he wanted to mark up Jackson-Vanik legislation in committee within two months, which would have been mid-May (Inside U.S. Trade, March 16).

**No vote until after the election.**

Mizulin et all 6-11.

[Nikolay, int’l and EU trade law lawyer, Partner @ Mayer & Brown law firm, “Russian Federation: The Russian Government finally submits WTO accession protocol to Russian Parliament” Mondaq -- http://www.mondaq.com/x/181432/International+Trade/The+Russian+Government+Finally+Submits+WTO+Accession+Protocol+To+Russian+Parliament]

Thus, for the United States to receive the benefits of many of4 the accession agreement that Russia negotiated with WTO members, the US Congress must affirmatively act to change US law prior to the time that Russia becomes a member of the WTO. However, while there is a small chance the Congress will enact a bill to repeal Jackson-Vanik this summer or fall, **it is more likely to occur after the US election in November.**

### Magnitsky Included

#### Magnitsky will be included

RT 6 – 13 – 12 Lifting of Russia-US trade barriers faces opposition, http://rt.com/business/news/us-opposes-lifting-restrictions-russia-trade-jackson-vanik-699/

A US Senate plan to lift Cold War restrictions on trade with Russia faced opposition from Senate Republicans who said Congress must first address Russia's poor human rights record and existing economic and political policies.

A group of US senators introduced legislation on Tuesday to lift trade restrictions on Russia. The bill is hoped to be passed before Russia joins the World Trade Organization this summer. The 1974 Jackson-Vanik Act tied trade with the then-Soviet Union to Moscow allowing Jews and other minorities to leave Russia.

The repeal of Jackson-Vanik is seen as beneficial for US businesses which seek lower tariffs and access to Russian markets once the country joins the WTO.

"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 Senate Finance Committee Chairman Max Baucus in a statement.

According to the Senator, "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".

However, Baucus also vowed to incorporate provisions being championed by an increasing number of Democrats and Republicans to punish Russian officials for any human-rights violations.

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.

**Magnitsky will be attached to Jackson Vanik Repeal – takes out the impact.**

**Kaminski 6-7**. [Matthew, journalist on WSJ’s editorial board, “Magnitsky Moves” Wall Street Journal -- <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702303918204577448343949479480.html?mod=googlenews_wsj>]

Two years after its introduction, a Russian human-rights bill is now moving toward adoption. The Kremlin detests and the Obama administration opposes the so-called Magnitsky Act, but political winds are against them. The House Foreign Affairs Committee on Thursday marked it up, becoming the first congressional panel to move on the bill. The full House is expected to pass it easily. A bigger test looms in the Senate. Sen. Ben Cardin, a Maryland Democrat, has pushed this legislation to sanction Russian officials implicated in human-rights abuses. His bill freezes the assets and bans from travel to the U.S. Russian judicial officials involved in the 2009 death of Sergei Magnitsky, a lawyer for the investment house Hermitage Capital. Magnitsky uncovered evidence of police corruption and embezzlement; he was jailed and died in prison at the age of 37. From the start, the Obama administration tried to scuttle or water down the measure. At White House behest, Sen. John Kerry has kept it off the Senate Foreign Relations Committee calendar—most recently so as not to spoil the mood ahead of Russian President Vladimir Putin's May visit to the U.S. (In the end, Mr. Putin cancelled the trip, in what came off like a calculated snub to the administration.) Sen. Cardin was pressed to weaken the legislation by narrowing the list of people who would be impacted by the sanctions. He has told aides this spring that he plans to stick firm to keep bipartisan support. The latest Senate draft that he circulated last night continues to give Congress authority to add any Russian rights abusers to the black list in the future. But some of his changes aren't going down well with Republican co-sponsors. The secretary of state gets a waiver to remove anyone from the list on "national security" grounds. The new version also includes a sunset clause that lets the bill expire if individuals responsible for Magnitsky's death are brought to justice. Republican supporters want the act to punish not just Magnitsky's killers but to pressure Russia to respect human rights for years to come. Congress holds the stronger political card. Earlier this spring, a bipartisan group of senators linked the passage of Magnitsky to the repeal of the 1974 Jackson-Vanik amendment. With Russia set to join the World Trade Organization this summer, American companies would be hurt by Jackson-Vanik, which blocks the U.S. from establishing so-called permanent normal trading relations (PNTR) with Moscow. The White House enthusiastically supports PNTR, and Montana Sen. Max Baucus, who chairs the finance committee, is said to be "antsy" to get to move legislation. Mr. Kerry hasn't put Magnistky on his committee's agenda. If he continues to block the path at the Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. Baucus has indicated that he would be willing to attach Magnitsky as an amendment to PNTR and get it to the full Senate vote in a single package. The Kremlin will always complain about Magnitsky, and a Putin spokesman last week issued an unspecified threat of retaliation. But the administration is running out of options to stop the congressional momentum. As much as it fears the damage to its vaunted "reset" in Russia relations from Magnitsky, its adoption has become the sine qua non for the repeal of Jackson-Vanik.

### Magnitsky kills relations

**Magnitsky destroys relations**

**Washington Post 5-30**. [“Moscow warns U.S. over Magnitsky bill” -- lexis]

Russia is prepared to retaliate if the U.S. Congress passes the Magnitsky bill, which would freeze assets of and deny U.S. visas to Russian officials linked to human rights abuses, President Vladimir Putin's top foreign adviser said Tuesday. "We would very much like to avoid it," Yuri Ushakov said. "But if this new anti-Russian law is adopted, then of course that demands measures in response." Ushakov's comments came in an otherwise upbeat briefing on a meeting between Putin and President Obama set for June in Mexico. The Obama administration has been resisting the legislation, introduced by Sen. Benjamin L. Cardin (D-Md.), viewing it as too provocative, even as the State Department has acted on its own to refuse entry to Russian officials associated with the Magnitsky case. But in a recent interview, Cardin said he was sure the bill would pass, adding that he thinks the administration is preparing to accept the legislation if it is paired with another bill granting Russia normal trade-relation status. That is required under the terms of Russia's accession to the World Trade Organization, one of the central achievements of Obama's "reset" of relations with Moscow. The administration has apparently realized that it cannot stop the Magnitsky bill and will have to deal with the anger of the Russian leadership. If Ushakov's remarks were designed to encourage a presidential veto of the bill, they are unlikely to succeed, given the difficulty the White House would face in killing a human rights measure. It could come out of committee as early as next month, according to a congressional official, who spoke on the condition of anonymity because of the sensitivity of the issue. Sergei Magnitsky was a lawyer who accused tax officials of orchestrating a $230 million fraud against the government. He was arrested and charged with the fraud himself and died in jail in 2009, possibly from a beating. Cardin's bill has infuriated top Russian officials, most of whom apparently keep their sizable personal fortunes in dollar bank accounts. "It hits them where it hurts," Cardin said. It is designed to replace the 1974 Jackson-Vanik amendment, which was aimed at forcing the Soviet Union to allow freer emigration of Jews and other religious minorities. Ushakov said Wednesday that Russia would prefer to live with the anti-Soviet Jackson-Vanik measure than to have it replaced by the anti-Russian Magnitsky bill.

## Link Debate

### Obama PC not key - Magnitsky

#### Obama has given up on fighting Magnitsky

WASHINGTON POST 7 – 10 – 12 Russia to join World Trade Organization, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/europe/russia-to-join-wto-after-parliamentary-vote/2012/07/10/gJQAFwolaW_story.html>

A delegation from Russia’s upper house of parliament, the Federation Council, is in Washington meeting with members of Congress over the move to repeal **Jackson**-Vanik. One argument is that Russia and Israel today allow visa-free travel between the two countries.

But there is a proposal to tie repeal of Jackson-Vanik to the passage of what’s called the Magnitsky bill, which places visa and financial sanctions on Russian officials associated with the death in pretrial detention of a whistleblower who unearthed a $230 million tax fraud, only to be charged with the crime himself.

That bill has been vehemently denounced by Russian officials who see it as an intrusion into their domestic affairs and worry about the precedent it would set.

The Obama administration has resisted the bill but is reportedly resigned to its passage.

Russia has a $1.9 trillion economy, making it the largest outside the WTO. According to different calculations, it ranks either ninth or 10th in the world.

#### Obama won’t veto Magnitsky --- too risky

**Washington Post**, 5/29/**2012** (Russia warns of retaliation for U.S. Magnitsky bill, p. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/europe/russia-threatens-retaliation-over-us-magnitsky-bill/2012/05/29/gJQAMWjIzU_story.html>)

The administration has apparently realized that it cannot stop the Magnitsky bill and will have to deal with the anger of the Russian leadership. If Ushakov’s remarks were designed to encourage a presidential veto of the bill, they are unlikely to succeed, **given the difficulty the White House would face in killing a human rights measure**. It could come out of committee as early as next month, according to a congressional official, who spoke on the condition of anonymity because of the sensitivity of the issue.

#### McCain support makes Obama’s capital ineffective

**Rogin**, **6/12**/2012 (Josh – reports on national security and foreign policy for the Cable at Foreign Policy, Magnitsky Act will be linked with Russian trade bill in Senate, Foreign Policy, p. <http://thecable.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/06/12/magnitsky_act_will_be_linked_with_russian_trade_bill_in_senate>)

By gaining McCain's support, Baucus has removed a major obstacle to the passage of PNTR for Russia. But now, with McCain on board, Baucus's PNTR bill is linked to the Magnitsky Act in such a way that if the administration opposes or seeks to water down the Magnitsky bill without McCain's agreement, both pieces of legislation could be in jeopardy.

### Winners-Win

#### WINNERS-Win – victories snowball

SINGER 09 senior writer and editor for MyDD My Direct Democracy, 3-3-09, [http://www.mydd.com/story/2009/3/3/191825/0428](http://www.thespacereview.com/article/499/1))

From the latest NBC News-Wall Street Journal survey: Despite the country's struggling economy and vocal opposition to some of his policies, President Obama's favorability rating is at an all-time high. Two-thirds feel hopeful about his leadership and six in 10 approve of the job he's doing in the White House. "What is amazing here is how much political capital Obama has spent in the first six weeks," said Democratic pollster Peter D. Hart, who conducted this survey with Republican pollster Bill McInturff. "And against that, he stands at the end of this six weeks with as much or more capital in the bank." Peter Hart gets at a key point. Some believe that political capital is finite, that it can be used up. To an extent that's true. But it's important to note, too, that political capital can be regenerated -- and, specifically, that when a President expends a great deal of capital on a measure that was difficult to enact and then succeeds, he can build up more capital. Indeed, that appears to be what is happening with Barack Obama, who went to the mat to pass the stimulus package out of the gate, got it passed despite near-unanimous opposition of the Republicans on Capitol Hill, and is being rewarded by the American public as a result. Take a look at the numbers. President Obama now has a 68 percent favorable rating in the NBC-WSJ poll, his highest ever showing in the survey. Nearly half of those surveyed (47 percent) view him very positively. Obama's Democratic Party earns a respectable 49 percent favorable rating. The Republican Party, however, is in the toilet, with its worst ever showing in the history of the NBC-WSJ poll, 26 percent favorable. On the question of blame for the partisanship in Washington, 56 percent place the onus on the Bush administration and another 41 percent place it on Congressional Republicans. Yet just 24 percent blame Congressional Democrats, and a mere 11 percent blame the Obama administration. So at this point, with President Obama seemingly benefiting from his ambitious actions and the Republicans sinking further and further as a result of their knee-jerked opposition to that agenda, there appears to be no reason not to push forward on anything from universal healthcare to energy reform to ending the war in Iraq.

#### Winners win on controversial policies.

Ornstein 01 (Norman, American Enterprise Institute, “How is Bush Governing?” May 15, [http://www.aei.org/events/filter.,eventID.281/transcript.asp](http://www.aei.org/events/filter.%2CeventID.281/transcript.asp))

The best plan is to pick two significant priorities, things that can move relatively quickly. And in an ideal world, one of them is going to be a little bit tough, where it's a battle, where you've got to fight, but then your victory is all the sweeter. The other matters but you can sweep through fairly quickly with a broad base of support and show that you're a winner and can accomplish something. Bush did just that, picking one, education, where there was a fairly strong chance. Something he campaigned on, people care about, and a pretty strong chance that he could get a bill through with 80, 85 percent support of both houses of Congress and both parties. And the other that he picked, and there were other choices, but he picked the tax cuts. What flows from that as well is, use every bit of political capital you have to achieve early victories that will both establish you as a winner, because the key to political power is not the formal power that you have. Your ability to coerce people to do what they otherwise would not do. Presidents don't have a lot of that formal power. It's as much psychological as it is real. If you're a winner and people think you're a winner, and that issues come up and they’re tough but somehow you're going to prevail, they will act in anticipation of that. Winners win. If it looks like you can't get things done, then you have a steeply higher hill to climb with what follows. And as you use your political capital, you have to recognize that for presidents, political capital is a perishable quality, that it evaporates if it isn't used. That's a lesson, by the way, George W. Bush learned firsthand from his father. That if you use it and you succeed, it's a gamble, to be sure, you'll get it back with a very healthy premium.

## Impact

### Relations resilient - M

**Relations resilient – empirics prove we’ve overcome bigger issues.**

**Pifer 12**. [Steven, Senior Fellow @ Brookings, “The Future Course of the U.S.-Russia Relationship” Brookings Institute -- March 21 -- http://www.brookings.edu/testimony/2012/0321\_arms\_control\_pifer.aspx]

By any objective measure, the U.S.-Russian relationship is stronger today than it was in 2008. Then, sharp differences over the future of strategic arms limitations, missile defense in Europe, NATO enlargement and Georgia dominated the agenda. Relations between Washington and Moscow plunged to their lowest point since the end of the Soviet Union. The bilateral relationship had become so thin that there are no indications that concern about damaging it affected in any way the Kremlin’s decisions regarding military operations against Georgia. The Russian government saw little of value to lose in its relationship with Washington. That was not a good situation from the point of view of U.S. interests. It is different today. There are things in the U.S.-Russian relationship that Moscow cares about, and that translates to leverage and even a restraining influence on Russian actions. This does not mean that all is going well on the U.S.-Russia agenda. Although the rhetoric is less inflammatory than it was four years ago, missile defense poses a difficult problem on both the bilateral and NATO-Russia agendas. The countries clearly differ over Syria. Moscow’s misguided support for Mr. Assad—which stems from the fact that he is one of Russia’s few allies and from the Russian desire to pay NATO back for what they consider the misuse of March 2011 UN Security Council Resolution 1973 on Libya—have led the Kremlin to an unwise policy. It is alienating the Arab world and will position Moscow poorly with the Syrian people once Mr. Assad leaves the scene.

**US-Russian Relations Inevitable – Laundry List.**

**BAZHANOV 10.** [Yevgeny, vice chancellor of research and international relations at the Foreign Ministry’s Diplomatic Academy in Moscow “5 Barriers to a Western Partnership” Moscow Times -- Aug 20]

But despite these significant obstacles, there is still a lot of potential for strengthening Russia’s partnership with the West. The driving force behind this natural convergence is Russia’s pressing need to modernize and diversify its economy. Post-Soviet Russia is committed to build a market economy and a democratic society. As a result, for the first time in history, the Russian economic, social and political models are not antagonistic to the Western model. For its part, the West has an objective — if not self-serving — interest in seeing Russia become a well-functioning civil society with a prosperous market economy. The process of globalization and modernization necessarily means that Russia will never return to Soviet-style isolationism. The economic centers of the modern world — Europe, the United States, China, India and Southeast Asia — are becoming increasingly dependent on one another. If Russia were to reject economic ties with those power centers, the country would become so weak that it would disintegrate. In addition, common security risks and threats — mainly terrorism — will naturally bring Russia and the West together to fight the common enemies on all fronts. One other factor that will help the partnership is that Russia will gradually cure itself of its complex as a “defeated superpower” and will come to terms with its more modest geopolitical role in the global arena. For its part, the West will cease to view Moscow as a geopolitical rival.

### No impact

#### Give Russia war zero probability – politics, military superiority, economic concerns, and nuclear security

Graham 2007 - (Thomas, Russia in Global Affairs, "The dialectics of strength and weakness", <http://eng.globalaffairs.ru/numbers/20/1129.html>, WEA)

An astute historian of Russia, Martin Malia, wrote several years ago that “Russia has at different times been demonized or divinized by Western opinion less because of her real role in Europe than because of the fears and frustrations, or hopes and aspirations, generated within European society by its own domestic problems.” Such is the case today. To be sure, mounting Western concerns about Russia are a consequence of Russian policies that appear to undermine Western interests, but they are also a reflection of declining confidence in our own abilities and the efficacy of our own policies. Ironically, this growing fear and distrust of Russia come at a time when Russia is arguably less threatening to the West, and the United States in particular, than it has been at any time since the end of the Second World War. Russia does not champion a totalitarian ideology intent on our destruction, its military poses no threat to sweep across Europe, its economic growth depends on constructive commercial relations with Europe, and its strategic arsenal – while still capable of annihilating the United States – is under more reliable control than it has been in the past fifteen years and the threat of a strategic strike approaches zero probability. Political gridlock in key Western countries, however, precludes the creativity, risk-taking, and subtlety needed to advance our interests on issues over which we are at odds with Russia while laying the basis for more constructive long-term relations with Russia.