## File Notes

#### Specific links and links answers are in the respective affirmative and negative files.

## Jackson-Vanik Scenario

### 1nc Jackson-Vanik

#### Support is building to repeal Jackson-Vanik --- it’s a top priority

Barkley, 6/12 (Tom, Dow Jones International News, 6/12/2012, “3rd UPDATE: Senators Introduce Bill to Lift Russian Trade Limits,” Factiva, JMP)

WASHINGTON--A bipartisan group of senators launched an effort Tuesday to lift trade restrictions on Russia, an opening salvo in a fight that could inflame U.S. tensions with the country during fights over human rights and national security.

The senators introduced a bill designed to ease the path for U.S. corporations to operate in Russia after the nation enters the World Trade Organization in the coming weeks. But the legislation comes as some lawmakers push for aggressive action on Russia's human rights record, while the Obama administration presses Moscow on policies related to Iran and Syria.

The bill would approve permanent, normal trade relations with Russia, with the aim of winning passage by the August recess, a top trade priority for the Obama administration.

But the race to get the bill done by August, when Russia is expected to formally join the WTO, won't be downhill in an election year. Republican presidential challenger Mitt Romney recently called Russia "our No. 1 geopolitical foe."

Sen. Richard Durbin (D., Ill.), the assistant majority leader, told Dow Jones Newswires that Democratic leaders hadn't discussed when the Russia bill could be brought to the floor. But he said it would be tough to fit it in the agenda since "there's a lot of unfinished business out there."

Complicating the effort, Senate Finance Committee Chairman Max Baucus (D., Mont.), who introduced the legislation, vowed to incorporate provisions being championed by an increasing number of lawmakers in both parties to punish Russian officials for any human-rights violations.

The White House reiterated Tuesday that it prefers a "clean" trade bill, though spokeswoman Caitlin Hayden said the administration shares the lawmakers' concerns about the human rights issues in Russia. She said the White House would continue to work with lawmakers to address concerns about the case of Sergei Magnitsky, a lawyer who died in a Russian prison in 2009 after accusing government officials of fraud. The human-rights bill is named after Mr. Magnitsky.

Still, some members of business community have gained confidence in recent weeks that there will be enough votes to pass their top trade priority before the August recess, which many see as the only window for approval this year.

"We think the stars are starting to align for a late July vote," said William Lane, Caterpillar Inc.'s (CAT) Washington director, who is helping to launch a lobbying blitz this week.

#### <Insert specific link evidence>

#### Political capital is key --- other fights will wreck passage

Allison & Blackwill, 11 --- \*director of the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard’s Kennedy School, AND \*\*senior fellow for U.S. foreign policy at the Council on Foreign Relations and served as U.S. ambassador to India and as deputy national security adviser for strategic planning in the Bush administration (October, Graham Allison and Robert D. Blackwill, “Russia and U.S. National Interests: Why Should Americans Care?” http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/Russia-and-US-NI\_final-web.pdf)

Finally, given the disparities between U.S. and Russian interests and governance, lasting cooperation is unlikely if not impossible without determined leadership from far-sighted leaders in the executive and legislative branches, particularly the President. To take the difficult steps necessary to build a foundation for a sustainable U.S.-Russian relationship, the White House must not only discipline the executive branch and focus its efforts, but also spend political capital in the U.S. Congress. Preoccupation with domestic priorities in a highly polarized domestic political environment cannot but limit the administration’s ability to build a bipartisan consensus on a controversial topic like American policy toward Russia.

#### Repeal is key to overall relations

Gvosdev, 12 --- on the faculty of the U.S. Naval War College (Nikolas, “The Realist Prism: Resetting the U.S.-Russia Reset,” 2/10/2012, <http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/11441/the-realist-prism-resetting-the-u-s-russia-reset>)

After a period of healthier ties following the much-heralded reset, U.S.-Russia relations appear to be deteriorating. Whether it was the war of words between U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and Russian Prime Minister Vladimir Putin last December over the flaws in the Russian Duma elections, or the harsh language used by U.N. Ambassador Susan Rice after Russia vetoed a draft Security Council resolution last week calling on Syrian President Bashar al-Assad to step down, the optimism engendered by the Obama administration's reset with Russia has dissipated.

Nor does the immediate future bode well for "resetting the reset." Putin is expected to reclaim the Russian presidency after next month’s election, and he has not forgotten or forgiven the Obama team's public relations effort back in 2009 to categorize President Dmitry Medvedev as the wave of the future and America's preferred interlocutor. At the same time, Putin and members of his immediate circle, who consistently expressed concerns about the "reset," feel that their doubts have been justified. In their narrative, Russia made many compromises to American preferences over the past few years, including relegating concerns about missile defense to a nonbinding preamble in the New START agreement; agreeing to much stronger sanctions on Iran and suspending a lucrative contract to provide Tehran with an advanced air defense system; and acquiescing to the U.N. Security Council resolution authorizing a no-fly zone for Libya. But these produced no real quid pro quos for Russian interests. Given the skepticism with which Putin is viewed in the U.S., not only by President Barack Obama but also by all the Republican challengers, there is little chance that, after March, there will be particularly warm and strong personal relations between the U.S. and Russian presidents.

But does this mean that the U.S.-Russia relationship is doomed to fall back to a more confrontational posture, as occurred in 2007 and 2008, when analysts were warning of a "new Cold War"? That depends on several factors.

The first is what happens in Russia in the aftermath of the Russian presidential elections. If there is evidence of widespread fraud, and if the government takes a hard line against the resulting protest movements, it will be very difficult for any U.S. administration to continue to deepen and broaden cooperation with Russia. That could change if Putin pursues a reform agenda. In a campaign op-ed in Kommersant that was reprinted in the Washington Post, he promised to restore direct elections of governors, increase local-self government and implement stringent new measures to combat corruption. If he is serious, it might take the steam out of the "White Revolution" and enable a U.S. administration to bank on "progress" being made. But the reality is that the political establishment in Washington is not prepared to extend to Russia the type of relationship the U.S. has with states like China or Saudi Arabia, where economic considerations routinely trump human rights concerns.

The second is how extensive Putin plans to shake up the Russian government. Many expect that after resuming the presidency, Putin is prepared to make significant personnel and policy changes. What is not clear is whether long-serving Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov will continue as the primary steward of Russia's foreign relations, and whether outgoing President Medvedev will be asked to become prime minister or assume another role to allow some form of the tandem to continue. If Medvedev retains a good degree of influence, then some of the Obama-Medvedev partnership might be salvaged, and a new foreign minister could initiate a fresh start with his counterparts in Washington, leaving behind some of the baggage that has accumulated in the interactions between Clinton and Lavrov.

 The third is whether some of the new foundations in the U.S.-Russia relationship have solidified to the point that they can help weather the current storms. In contrast to the situation in 2008, there are now some important institutional connections in place. The Northern Distribution Network could represent enough ballast -- both in terms of the income generated for Russia and the safe route it offers the U.S. and NATO for the war effort in Afghanistan and for egress once the drawdown begins in the coming year -- to help prevent the relationship from veering out of control. The partnership between Exxon and Rosneft to develop both the Russian Arctic and additional projects in North America creates another set of incentives to keep ties on a level basis, as does the immense potential of a fully realized partnership between Russian and American firms in the nuclear power industry. American car manufacturers have found Russia to be a booming export market, while the U.S. space program is now dependent on Russia to ferry astronauts and cargo to maintain America’s manned presence in space. In short, there are a growing number of interests that depend on the preservation of healthy U.S.-Russia relations for their own success. But it is not yet clear whether they have sufficient clout to outweigh the naysayers on both sides.

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.

#### Relations solve several scenarios for extinction

Allison & Blackwill, 11 --- \* director of the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard’s Kennedy School, AND \*\*senior fellow for U.S. foreign policy at the Council on Foreign Relations and served as U.S. ambassador to India and as deputy national security adviser for strategic planning in the Bush administration (10/30/2011, Graham Allison and Robert D. Blackwill, “10 reasons why Russia still matters,” <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/1011/67178.html>)

House Speaker John Boehner recently delivered a fiery indictment of Russia and the Obama administration’s entire “reset” in Russian policy.

From the vantage point of two longtime Russia watchers — one a Republican who served in the George W. Bush administration and the other a Democrat who served in the Pentagon under President Bill Clinton — Boehner misses the point.

That central point is that Russia matters a great deal to a U.S. government seeking to defend and advance its national interests. Prime Minister Vladimir Putin’s decision to return next year as president makes it all the more critical for Washington to manage its relationship with Russia through coherent, realistic policies.

No one denies that Russia is a dangerous, difficult, often disappointing state to do business with. We should not overlook its many human rights and legal failures. Nonetheless, Russia is a player whose choices affect our vital interests in nuclear security and energy. It is key to supplying 100,000 U.S. troops fighting in Afghanistan and preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons.

Ten realities require U.S. policymakers to advance our nation’s interests by engaging and working with Moscow.

First, Russia remains the only nation that can erase the United States from the map in 30 minutes. As every president since John F. Kennedy has recognized, Russia’s cooperation is critical to averting nuclear war.

Second, Russia is our most consequential partner in preventing nuclear terrorism. Through a combination of more than $11 billion in U.S. aid, provided through the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction program, and impressive Russian professionalism, two decades after the collapse of the “evil empire,” not one nuclear weapon has been found loose.

Third, Russia plays an essential role in preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and missile-delivery systems. As Washington seeks to stop Iran’s drive toward nuclear weapons, Russian choices to sell or withhold sensitive technologies are the difference between failure and the possibility of success.

Fourth, Russian support in sharing intelligence and cooperating in operations remains essential to the U.S. war to destroy Al Qaeda and combat other transnational terrorist groups.

Fifth, Russia provides a vital supply line to 100,000 U.S. troops fighting in Afghanistan. As U.S. relations with Pakistan have deteriorated, the Russian lifeline has grown ever more important and now accounts for half all daily deliveries.

Sixth, Russia is the world’s largest oil producer and second largest gas producer. Over the past decade, Russia has added more oil and gas exports to world energy markets than any other nation. Most major energy transport routes from Eurasia start in Russia or cross its nine time zones. As citizens of a country that imports two of every three of the 20 million barrels of oil that fuel U.S. cars daily, Americans feel Russia’s impact at our gas pumps.

Seventh, Moscow is an important player in today’s international system. It is no accident that Russia is one of the five veto-wielding, permanent members of the U.N. Security Council, as well as a member of the G-8 and G-20. A Moscow more closely aligned with U.S. goals would be significant in the balance of power to shape an environment in which China can emerge as a global power without overturning the existing order.

Eighth, Russia is the largest country on Earth by land area, abutting China on the East, Poland in the West and the United States across the Arctic. This territory provides transit corridors for supplies to global markets whose stability is vital to the U.S. economy.

Ninth, Russia’s brainpower is reflected in the fact that it has won more Nobel Prizes for science than all of Asia, places first in most math competitions and dominates the world chess masters list. The only way U.S. astronauts can now travel to and from the International Space Station is to hitch a ride on Russian rockets. The co-founder of the most advanced digital company in the world, Google, is Russian-born Sergei Brin.

Tenth, Russia’s potential as a spoiler is difficult to exaggerate. Consider what a Russian president intent on frustrating U.S. international objectives could do — from stopping the supply flow to Afghanistan to selling S-300 air defense missiles to Tehran to joining China in preventing U.N. Security Council resolutions.

So next time you hear a policymaker dismissing Russia with rhetoric about “who cares?” ask them to identify nations that matter more to U.S. success, or failure, in advancing our national interests.

### 2nc Uniqueness

#### Evaluate the link first --- Obama’s investment of capital makes passage possible this time

Frolov, 12 (Vladimir, 3/23/2012, Russia Profile, “Russia Profile Weekly Experts Panel: Will Russia Graduate From the Jackson-Vanik Amendment?” Factiva)

During the post-Soviet period, all U.S. administrations, from Bill Clinton to George Bush, promised to graduate Russia from Jackson-Vanik, only to see little congressional support for the measure. None ventured to spend much political capital on pushing it through a reluctant Congress. In the meantime, several post-Soviet states – Ukraine, Georgia, and Kyrgyzstan – were graduated from Jackson-Vanik and granted PNTR when they joined the World Trade Organization.

Now, Russia is joining the WTO and the Barack Obama administration has jumped on this opportunity to do away with this last legacy of the Cold War in U.S.-Russian relations. This time around, it is the United States that would benefit more from Russia's graduation.

If the Jackson-Vanik Amendment is still on the books by the time Russia officially joins the WTO this summer, U.S. companies will find themselves at a disadvantage in the Russian market. Unlike competitors from other countries, they will not be protected by WTO rules and Moscow could choose to retaliate against American companies with tariffs and other barriers.

Senate Finance Committee Chairman Max Baucus, who traveled to Russia last month, is leading the drive in the Senate to repeal the law. "We must pass permanent normal trade relations, or PNTR, to ensure that our exporters can access the growing Russian market," Baucus said. "If the United States passes PNTR with Russia, U.S. exports to Russia are projected to double within five years. If Congress doesn't pass PNTR, Russia will join the WTO anyway and U.S. exporters will lose out to their Chinese and European competitors."

The Obama administration is solidly behind the effort to graduate Russia from the provisions of Jackson-Vanik, and has launched an aggressive effort in Congress and inside the U.S. business community. Last week, during a meeting with U.S. business leaders, President Barack Obama emphasized that granting PNTR to Russia is necessary for American companies to benefit from Russia's entry into the WTO. Senior officials, such as Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and U.S. Trade Representative Ron Kirk, sent a similar message to Capitol Hill.

But there is still serious opposition in Congress to lifting all trade restrictions on Russia. Some republican and democratic lawmakers want to link the trade issue and issues of human rights and corruption in Russia, arguing that Russia's graduation from Jackson-Vanik should be linked to the passage of the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2011, named for the anti-corruption lawyer who died in a Russian prison more than two years ago. This position has gotten support from the democracy promotion camp.

David Kramer, head of the Freedom House think tank, said last week at an event sponsored by the Foreign Policy Initiative: "Politically, in light of the environment in Russia, which has been deteriorating, to simply lift Jackson-Vanik without some replacement would be viewed by Russian leadership as a sign of weakness on the part of the United States – again, that we need this relationship more than they do. And if we don't replace it, then we would, in their minds, be rewarding them despite their bad behavior by not going after them. To me, this has to be a package deal."

U.S. Ambassador to Russia Mike McFaul and Assistant Secretary of State Phillip Gordon told Congress that the administration does not see the need for new human rights legislation on Russia, while the State Department has the authority to implement visa restrictions against foreign citizens suspected of human rights violations. McFaul said last week that the administration no longer believes any such "weird linkage" is necessary to accompany the repeal of Jackson-Vanik.

Leading Russian opposition figures – Vladimir Milov, Boris Nemtsov, Garry Kasparov, Ilya Ponomarev and Alexei Navalny – signed a letter to Congress arguing that repealing Jackson-Vanik would be good for Russian democracy.

#### Will pass for several reasons --- support is building, it’s a top administration priority and the business community is increasingly confident. That’s Barkley.

#### Also:

#### --- Momentum is growing

Politi, 6/13 (James, 6/13/2012, Financial Times, “US moves closer to normal trade ties with Russia,” Factiva, JMP)

Momentum is growing in Congress for legislation to normalise US trade relations with Russia in connection with its looming accession to the World Trade Organisation.

A bipartisan group of influential senators introduced a bill yesterday that would grant "permanent normal trade relations" status to Russia, calling for fellow lawmakers to approve the legislation over the next two months.

The bill - sponsored by Max Baucus, chairman of the Senate finance committee - would also repeal the Jackson-Vanik amendment, a provision of US law designed in the 1970s to restrict trade with countries that restrict emigration.

"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," said Mr Baucus. "We owe it to American workers and businesses to enable them to take advantage of the doors opening in Russia."

The move comes amid persistent concerns harboured by many US lawmakers about Russia's foreign policy - particularly with regard to Syria - as well as the pace of political and economic reforms, and human rights in the country. In fact, Mr Baucus said he planned to introduce an amendment to the PNTR legislation called the "Magnitsky" bill - which is opposed by Russia - allowing the US to freeze assets and deny entry to Russian officials deemed responsible for human rights abuses.

The Obama administration has said it would prefer a "clean" bill, not tying PNTR with the Magnitsky rule, but nonetheless "welcomed" introduction of the legislation in the Senate. "We will continue to work with Congress so Americans can reap the full benefits of Russia's WTO membership," said Ron Kirk, US trade representative.

But despite the bipartisan move in the Senate, and support from corporate America, which has intensified lobbying in favour of PNTR, parts of Congress are showing signs of unease. Eight Republican members of the Senate finance committee sent a letter to Mr Baucus yesterday outlining "several important concerns" that still needed to be addressed. These include suppression of public protests and Moscow's support of the Syrian regime. "We believe it will be necessary to satisfactorily address these and other issues if Congress is to successfully navigate a path toward granting PNTR," said the letter, led by Orrin Hatch, the Utah senator.

An important voice could be Mitt Romney's, Republican nominee for president, who has called Russia "without question our number one geopolitical foe". An adviser to Mr Romney declined to comment on his stance regarding PNTR with Russia - but he is expected to appear before an audience of lobbyists and executives today in Washington and may have to clarify his views.

#### --- Business leaders are confident

Needham, 6/12 (Vicki, 6/12/2012, “Senate Republicans urge closer look at Russia's practices before normalizing trade relations,” <http://thehill.com/blogs/on-the-money/1005-trade/232379-senate-republicans-urge-closer-look-at-russias-practices-before-normalizing-trade-relations>,” JMP)

Earlier Tuesday, Baucus introduced a bipartisan measure to repeal Jackson-Vanik and extend Permanent normal trade relations to Russia and, at the same time, announced in a letter that he will back a plan to pair that legislation with the so-called Magnitsky bill on the move in the House and the Senate that would freeze assets and deny U.S. visas to Russian officials linked to human-rights abuses.

Ahead of the unveiling of that measure, the Business Roundtable (BRT) said it was expecting lawmakers to move the trade and human-rights bills on separate tracks.

Business groups, including BRT and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, are ramping up their efforts to get Congress to pass a bill before time runs out.

John Engler, BRT's president, said Tuesday he is confident Congress will get a bill done by the end of July.

#### --- Congress is pushing to get it done

Inside U.S. Trade, 6/15 (“CONGRESS PUSHES TO ADVANCE RUSSIA MFN BILL, AIMING FOR AUGUST PASSAGE,” 6/15/2012, Factiva, JMP)

Both House and Senate trade committees this week pushed ahead with an effort to have Congress grant Russia permanent most-favored nation (MFN) trade status before the August recess, but sources said it remained an open question whether that could be achieved by then or even before the November elections.

In addition, the Business Roundtable (BRT) announced this week that it is intensifying its campaign for the Russia vote by the August recess with a 50-day effort that will involve lobbying by chief executive officers of member companies.

One congressional aide said there is a "real effort" underway to get the Russia vote done before the August recess, but that it is an open question whether congressional Republicans are willing to give President Obama support for a Russia vote, which they view as a foreign policy victory for the administration.

In the Senate, Finance Committee Chairman Max Baucus (D-MT) on June 12 introduced bipartisan legislation that would lift the application of the Jackson-Vanik amendment to Russia and thereby extend MFN status.

He did so with a written pledge to incorporate into a human rights bill that would penalize foreign government officials involved in human rights abuses with a ban on U.S. visas and a freeze of their U.S. assets. The pledge was expressed in a letter to the supporters of the human rights bill.

Baucus told Inside U.S. Trade on June 12 that he hopes to hold a markup of the MFN bill in July and hopes to see Senate floor action before the August recess.

He added that he had not yet spoken with Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) about scheduling floor time, but expressed hope that he could meet his goal of a vote before August recess, provided that the bill garners strong support. "I don't think that's going to be an issue ... if we get a good markup," he said in an apparent reference to garnering bipartisan support.

In the House, Ways and Means Committee Chairman Dave Camp (R-MI) this week announced the panel's first hearing on the Russia MFN bill will take place June 20. The announcement did not identify the witnesses but sources have said the hearing will feature two senior administration officials (Inside U.S. Trade, June 8). The committee has not announced its markup, but sources speculated it will likely take place in July.

The Finance Committee announced late yesterday (June 14) it will hold its second Russia MFN hearing on June 21 with administration officials. Such a hearing was demanded by all Finance Committee Republicans in an effort to put the administration on the record before a markup. The committee held a Russia MFN hearing in March, but invited only witnesses from the private sector and non-governmental organizations.

#### --- Its a top priority and push for clean bill

Vasilyeva, 6/7 (Nataliya, The Canadian Press, “US trade representative says repeal of trade restriction that upsets Russia is a priority,” Factiva, JMP)

MOSCOW \_ 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.

Some U.S. lawmakers have indicated they would support repeal of Jackson-Vanik in exchange for passage of the so-called Magnitsky bill that would bar Russian officials accused of human rights abuses from the United States.

That bill calls for publicly identifying Russians tied to human rights abuses, but the Obama administration worries that could affect relations with Moscow. The bill was introduced by two Democrats and also is backed by prominent Republicans, including Sen. John McCain.

The bill was named for lawyer Sergei Magnitsky, who had accused Interior Ministry officials of corruption. He died in jail in 2009 from untreated pancreatitis.

Proponents of the bill say the death, and allegations of torture in jail, highlight corruption in Russia's judicial system.

Prospects for passing the measure as a stand-alone bill are uncertain, and senators saw an opportunity to boost its chances by tying it to the repeal of Jackson-Vanik.

Kirk said the two measures should not be linked.

``Our priority is for the Congress to lift Jackson-Vanik in a clean bill which deals only with the issue relevant to our ability to maintain our competitiveness,'' he said, adding the administration will ``continue our work'' with lawmakers concerned about Russian human rights.

#### --- Obama push ensures passage

Sanati, 3/19 (Cyrus, 3/19/2012, Fortune, “The biggest winners of a new Russia trade deal,” http://finance.fortune.cnn.com/2012/03/19/russia-trade/)

While Russia was accepted into the club in December, the United States still has in place Cold War-era trade sanctions against Russia. The U.S. Senate met last Thursday to discuss dropping these laws so that they could normalize trade relations before Russia formally joins the WTO this summer. The main argument against lifting the so-called Jackson-Vanik amendment derives from Russia's abominable human rights record and its questionable commitment to democracy. Republicans tried to voice their concerns but it was the Democrats that shut them down. President Obama has made the lifting of the amendment a key pillar of his trade policy. So while the Republicans are raising some noise in the Senate, the amendment will almost surely be lifted on Russia, leading to a normalization of trade relations between the two countries.

U.S. and European companies will likely benefit the most from an open Russia. The reduction in tariffs on certain goods, especially in the service industry, is expected to benefit U.S. companies hoping to tap the burgeoning Russian middle class. Major interest groups, like the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, along with 173 US companies, have sent letters to Congress demanding the normalization of trade with Russia.

Some of the big companies behind the push include General Electric (GE), Deere (DE) and Boeing (BA). GE has been especially vocal, saying that tariffs on its jet engines would fall from 20% to 5% if trade was normalized between the two nations. That would deliver a sizable boost to its profit margin and increase the availability of top-notch products to the Russian market.

Companies in the agricultural space and the automotive space will also benefit as Russia will no longer be able to bar the importation of certain food stuffs and automobiles. This could be a great boost for major US factory farm companies like ConAgra (CAG) and ADM (ADM) as well as car manufacturers like Ford (F), GM (GM) and Chrysler.

Wall Street stands to benefit from all this new investment in Russia too. If Russia is seen as a solid place to invest capital, institutional investors will demand greater access to it. This could lead to a large influx of equity and debt capital into Russia's domestic market, all of which would yield juicy fees for Wall Street bankers.

On the flip side, the large Russian companies that currently see London as a base of operation could be lured into moving some of their operations to New York. Currently, most large Russian companies, even the quasi-state owned ones, choose to list their stock in London and even Hong Kong over Moscow given their investor bases. As more of their investor base moves to the western hemisphere it will make more sense to list in the liquid New York markets. The NYSE has been courting Russian companies -- full trade normalization will most likely accelerate this nascent process.

And while some Russian companies might move operations to Wall Street, U.S. banks may see new opportunities in Moscow. The WTO rules allow for 100% foreign-owned banks to open in Russia for the first time. The only limit is that 50% of the entire banking sector must remain in Russian hands.

But while the benefits of full trade normalization are real, it will be many years before all the changes are implemented. Fearing a shock to some of its industries, Russia will be decreasing its tariffs over a 7-year period and will not be phasing them out. On average, Russian tariffs on imported goods are expected to decrease from 10% to 7.8% when all is said and done. Russia agreed to lower 33% of its tariffs from the date at which they enter the WTO. It will drop them another 25% after three years.

Some industries will have much longer lead times than others. Tariffs in the automotive and airline industries will drop in seven years, with the tariff on autos going from 9.5% to 7.3%. Meanwhile some agricultural products have an eight year time lag, with the average agricultural tariff falling from 13.2% to 10.8%. And while the new agreement will allow foreign investment in Russia's insurance industry for the first time ever, it will be nine years before that market is open to investors.

The Senate is expected to continue debating Russian trade for a few more weeks, with passage expected in the next few months, according to Senate Democrats. Both U.S. and Russian politicians are cautiously optimistic about this new level of openness and what it might produce. But the net benefits for both countries seem to be solid. The only wild card is whether or not Russia will truly play by the WTO rules. Only time will tell.

### AT: Nothing Will Pass Before Election

#### This is one issue that can pass before the election

Brown, 3/21 --- President of the National Chicken Council (3/21/2012, “Trade relations with Russia will be a boost to the U.S.” http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/foreign-policy/217251-mike-brown-president-national-chicken-council)

If there is one thing Congress can agree on during an election year, it is a policy that will spur job creation, boost economic growth and be budget neutral at the same time. Here is why authorizing permanent normal trade relations (PNTR) for Russia will accomplish all three.

Members of the World Trade Organization (WTO) formally approved late last year Russia’s terms for membership in the organization during a three-day meeting of the WTO’s ministerial conference in Geneva. Russia will take its seat at the WTO 30 days after notifying the organization that the Russian Duma has ratified the membership terms.

Russian Deputy Prime Minister Igor Shuvalov is on record saying that he anticipates the accession agreement being sent to the Duma in May.

In Russia, retail food and beverage sales are forecast to increase in real terms from just over $200 billion in 2010 to more than $240 billion by 2014—a 20 percent increase. This is good news for U.S. food exporters as imports are expected to meet some of this growing consumer demand. But while Russia is home to 142 million consumers and maintains the world’s eleventh largest economy, it is the largest economy not yet formally subject to the global trading rules of the WTO.

For U.S. companies to benefit from Russia’s accession, it will be necessary for Congress to permanently remove Russia from the Jackson-Vanik amendment to the Trade Act of 1974 and authorize the president to extend PNTR to Russia. Jackson-Vanik requires Russia and seven other former Soviet states and non-market economies to comply with free emigration policies before enjoying normal trade relations with the United States. Since 1994, the United States has certified annually that Russia complies with the amendment’s provisions and has conferred normal trade relations (NTR) status.

Russia at times in the past has used arbitrary sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) actions that lack scientific justification to limit or even halt poultry and meat imports from the United States. Without the ability to use WTO’s dispute settlement procedures and other related mechanisms, the United States will be at a very significant disadvantage if Russia chooses to evoke bogus SPS measures against U.S. poultry. As a member of the WTO, Russia is obligated to bind its agricultural import tariffs and tariff-rate quotas (TRQs). But, if Russia misuses SPS provisions, the tariff bindings and TRQs will become a secondary concern. Other world poultry competitors will undoubtedly step up and try to replace the United States if the Russian market is disrupted for U.S. poultry exports.

USTR notes that U.S. farmers and exporters will have more certain and predictable market access as a result of Russia’s commitment not to raise tariffs on any products above the negotiated rates and to apply non-tariff measures in a uniform and transparent manner.

The National Chicken Council urges Congress to approve PNTR for Russia by mid-2012 to help assure the United States can continue to compete in the Russian poultry market. Exporting $300 million of poultry to Russia annually will provide better incomes for more U.S. workers and additional poultry to be produced by a growing number of family farmers across America.

The chicken industry is certainly not the only beneficiary of granting Russia PNTR, as there is significant commercial opportunities for other U.S. exporters, including those businesses in the fruit, livestock, agriculture equipment, aerospace, consumer goods, high tech instruments, construction equipment, textiles and medical equipment sectors, among others.

Congress will not be voting on Russia’s WTO accession, rather it will be voting on giving the United States equal accession to general tariff reductions, market opening measures and the ability of U.S. interests, such as poultry, to seek trade relief, if necessary, through the WTO.

A vote for Russia PNTR is a vote for U.S. job creation and economic growth. It makes no sense for the United States to lose access to the world’s eleventh largest economy over an outdated law.

#### Trade is the exception --- area of bipartisan agreement

Mondaq Business Briefing, 3/8 (Drinker Biddle Customs & International Trade Practice Group, “Bipartisanship Necessary To Move Narrow Trade And Customs Agenda In Congress: 2012 Legislative Outlook,” Factiva)

In January, the 2nd Session of the 112th Congress convened; and with the November elections looming, the prospects for major legislative achievements are small.1 While the political tension probably means that large – and potentially controversial – bills, such as a miscellaneous tariff suspension (see below for details), are likely off the table for 2012, a number of trade agreements, and related issues, are expected to be considered this year. Given the bipartisan concern regarding the economy and the nation's standing in the global marketplace, trade often is one area of rare bipartisan agreement and legislative action.

Legislative Outlook

Trade Agency Consolidation: In an effort to streamline government operations and reduce duplicative federal efforts, President Obama has recommended that the business-related functions of the Department of Commerce be merged with the Small Business Administration, the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, the Export-Import Bank, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, and the Trade and Development Agency. Combining these agencies requires Congressional approval. Many Members of Congress, including House Speaker John Boehner (R-OH), have supported exploring the consolidation2, but the inclusion of the U.S. Trade Representative is likely a sticking point. A joint statement released by House Ways and Means Chairman Dave Camp (R-MI) and Senate Finance Committee Chairman Max Baucus (D-MT) in response to the President's proposal says that "Taking USTR, one of the most efficient agencies that is a model of how government can and should work, and making it just another corner of a new bureaucratic behemoth would hurt American exports and hinder American job creation."3

Trade Enforcement: President Obama's fiscal year (FY) 2013 budget proposal calls for an expansion of the International Trade Administration and the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, as well as an increase in funding to ensure fair trade practices at the border.4 Specifically, the budget includes more than $500 million to promote exports and enforce international export laws and an additional $13 million for enhanced customs and border enforcement to restrict the importation of pirated goods.5 Approximately $26 million of these funds will be used to establish the new Interagency Trade Enforcement Center, which will advocate the use of international rules and U.S. laws to challenge unfavorable trade policies. The main focus of this effort is toward combating Chinese industrial subsidies and violation of intellectual property rights.6 The President formally established the Interagency Trade Enforcement Center by Executive Order on February 28.

Chinese Tariffs: Last December, a federal appellate court ruling restricted the ability of the Department of Commerce to impose countervailing tariffs on imports subsidized by the Chinese government.7 In response, the United States Trade Representative, Ron Kirk, has called upon Congress to enact legislation to overrule the decision. House and Senate Democrats have come out strongly in favor of such a proposal, and House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Camp has indicated that he would support a "narrowly targeted" bill that could "pass the House and Senate without complications."8 The Department of Commerce only has until March 5th to cease assessing the countervailing duties, which may accelerate action on legislation.

Russian Trade Sanctions: In his State of the Union address, President Obama declared "this Congress should make sure that no foreign company has an advantage over American manufacturing when it comes to accessing finance or new markets like Russia."9 With the Russians seeking admission into the World Trade Organization (WTO), the Administration is asking Congress to lift the Jackson-Vanik amendment, which, since 1974, has imposed trade sanctions against Russia. This change would allow U.S. exporters to reap the benefits of reduced tariffs in Russia, once it is under the WTO agreement.10 However, there is strong resistance among some Republicans to eliminating Jackson-Vanik, due to ongoing concerns about Russian human rights abuses.

### AT: Magnitsky

#### Administration and business groups are working to make human rights legislation less objectionable to Russia

Palmer, 6/5 (Doug, Reuters News, 6/5/2012, “US business warns against Russian sanctions bill,” Factiva, JMP)

WASHINGTON, June 5 (Reuters) - A bill to punish Russian officials for alleged human rights abuses would badly damage U.S.-Russian ties and hurt U.S. exports, business groups said on Tuesday, two days before a key congressional panel will vote on the measure.

The bill would require the United States to deny visas and freeze the assets of Russians linked to the detention and death of Sergei Magnitsky, an anti-graft lawyer who died in a Russian jail in 2009 under suspicious circumstances.

The legislation is expected to win approval on Thursday in the House of Representatives Foreign Relations Committee, clearing the way for the full House to take up the measure, either on its own or part of a trade bill.

Bill Reinsch, president of the National Foreign Trade Council, whose members include major U.S. exporters such as Boeing, Microsoft and Caterpillar, told reporters on Tuesday the Magnitsky bill was "seriously flawed."

He argued it would make it even harder to get Russia's cooperation on issues ranging from Iran's nuclear ambitions to Syria's bloody crackdown on dissent.

U.S. companies also fear they will lose sales coming from Russia's entry into the WTO because Moscow will retaliate by turning to other suppliers, Reinsch said.

The issue is coming to head because the White House wants Congress to establish "permanent normal trade relations" (PNTR) with Russia by removing the former Soviet republic from a Cold War-era human rights law known as the Jackson-Vanik amendment.

That measure tied bilateral trade relations to the right of Russia Jews to emigrate freely, which the White House says is no longer needed and inconsistent with the rules of the World Trade Organization, which Russia is expected to join in coming months.

While the House panel is acting first on the measure, the legislation was largely crafted by Senator Ben Cardin, a Maryland Democrat, in response to Magnitsky's death.

"Our preference is for Congress to lift Jackson-Vanik in a clean trade bill, but we understand the intent of Senator Cardin's bill regarding Sergei Magnitsky and share the same goals of promoting respect for human rights in Russia, and specifically seeking accountability for those implicated in the wrongful death of Mr. Magnitsky," Caitlin Hayden, a spokeswoman for the White House National Security Council said.

"We continue to consult with Senator Cardin and other Members of Congress on how to most effectively address this case," Hayden said, noting the administration has already used existing authorities "to ensure that no one implicated in Mr. Magnitsky's death can travel to the United States."

ALTERNATIVES MOOTED

Many members of Congress don't want to drop Russia from the older human rights law without replacing it with new human rights legislation. Meanwhile, Russian officials have made clear the Magnitsky bill is unacceptable.

USA Engage, a broader business coalition of 670 member companies and trade associations, also warned against the bill, which they fear could move through Congress on a faster track than the legislation to establish PNTR.

However, Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman John Kerry did not follow through on an earlier plan for action on the legislation in May and still has not scheduled a vote in his committee. Both the full House and the full Senate would have to approve the measure for it to become law.

"The history of these things is once they get to the floor, they pass overwhelmingly," so business groups are hoping to modify the legislation to make it less objectionable to Moscow before it reaches that point, Reinsch said.

One alternative might be for lawmakers to drop the asset freeze and focus simply on the visa ban, said Cory Welt, associate director of the Institute for European, Russian and Eurasian Studies at George Washington University's Elliott School of International Affairs.

That could be modeled after an executive order issued by President Barack Obama in August 2011, which spelled out the administration's intention to deny visas for individuals guilty of human rights violations, Welt said.

The United States has already used that authority to impose visa restrictions on some Russian officials believed to be involved in Magnitsky's death, Welt told reporters at a lunch organized by the business groups.

It would be "unprecedented" for the United States to go further than and impose economic sanctions, in the form of the proposed asset freeze, for an individual crime, Welt said.

#### Obama pushing to water down Magnitsky

Abrams, 6/12 (Jim, 6/12/2012, “Bill for normal trade with Russia meets opposition,” <http://www.usnews.com/news/politics/articles/2012/06/12/bill-for-normal-trade-with-russia-meets-opposition>, JMP)

Major U.S. business groups, which say normalizing trade with Russia is a top priority for this year, have also expressed concerns about connecting the trade bill to the human rights issue. The White House, which prefers a clean trade bill, would like to drop a provision in the Magnitsky bill that calls for the naming of rights abusers.

McCain, the top Republican on the Armed Services Committee, said that while he supports the trade bill, "the extension of permanent normal trade relations status and the repeal of the Jackson-Vanik amendment must be accompanied by the passage of the Magnitsky Act."

#### Changes will minimize the impact on U.S.-Russia relations

Inside U.S. Trade, 4/27 (“RUSSIAN AMBASSADOR: MAGNITSKY BILL COULD IMPERIL RELATIONS WITH U.S.,” 4/27/2012, Factiva, JMP)

Realizing that a Jackson-Vanik vote cannot occur without a version of the Magnitsky bill, the Obama administration has apparently backed off its position of complete opposition to the legislation and is working with the author of the measure, Sen. Ben Cardin (D-MD), on ways to minimize its impact on the U.S.-Russia relationship (Inside U.S. Trade, April 6).

#### Obama push solves --- working to weaken human rights legislation

Inside U.S. Trade, 4/27 (“ADMINISTRATION PUTS PRESSURE ON SUBSTANCE, TIMING OF MAGNITSKY BILL,” Factiva, JMP)

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.

In its current form, the Magnitsky bill is different in that it would force State to publish that list for all banned people falling under the scope of the legislation. It would also create a mechanism to force State to at least consider adding individuals to that list at the request of members of Congress.

The administration, in its input on the bill, also wants to strip out the authority that would be granted to congressional members to submit a written request on whether an individual meets the criteria to be added to the list, according to congressional sources.

One congressional aide said supporters of the bill in the Senate agreed to limit the members who would be able to make such a request, such that this ability would be limited to the chairman and ranking members of committees that have jurisdiction over this area of the law. They are also willing to require an agreement between the chairman and ranking member before any request would be submitted, the aide said.

However, the aide said that Sen. Ben Cardin (D-MD) and other key Senate supporters of the bill are not willing to eliminate all congressional authority to make requests, because the legislation is intended to give Congress oversight over human rights violations.

Another change the administration is pressing for is the ability to keep lists of sanctioned officials classified. The bill's supporters consider the ability to publicly name officials vital to the legislation and a red line issue, according to congressional sources.

Senate supporters of the Magnitsky legislation are willing to accept "thoughtful, technical changes" from the administration, but not "radical" alterations that would render the bill toothless, the aide said.

One Senate aide said the unrealistic demands put forth by the administration signal that the White House is still fundamentally opposed to the bill on principle. Although the bill may ultimately passing Congress, the administration wants the ability to blame Congress if the legislation creates any negative fallout for U.S.-Russia relations. In the end, the White House can tell the Kremlin it did not capitulate to Congress on this legislation, was opposed to it all along and had tried to suggest changes that would have maintained the status quo, the aide said.

In an April 24 press briefing, State Department Spokeswoman Victoria Nuland said the administration supports the goals of the Magnitsky legislation, but noted that there are programs already in place to sanction individuals responsible for human rights abuses. "We are continuing our dialogue with the Congress about how we can appropriately make the views of the Congress and the American people known," Nuland said.

Nuland added that lawmakers believe that putting the forward legislation on the issue will create a "systemic, routine way of dealing with it, and a clear set of guidelines that the Congress and the administration agree to and that are clear on the Russian side."

The administration's tough negotiating stance, combined with its pressure to delay a Senate markup on the legislation, could also reflect its general desire to not have the Magnitsky legislation to get too far ahead of a vote on lifting Russia from the Jackson-Vanik amendment, sources speculated. Congress must vote to graduate Russia from the Jackson-Vanik amendment in order for the president to grant permanent most favored nation (MFN) status to Russia. This, in turn, will allow the U.S. to take advantage of all the trade concessions Russia made in order to join the World Trade Organization.

Senate Finance Committee Chairman Max Baucus (D-MT) has not yet held a markup for legislation lifting Russia from the Jackson-Vanik amendment. In the House, Ways and Means Committee Chairman Dave Camp (R-MI) announced only this week that he would schedule a June hearing on permanent MFN status for Russia.

A new version of the Magnitsky bill was introduced last week in the House, reflecting most of the changes that are in a Senate draft bill would have been considered this week in the Foreign Relations Committee had that gone forward.

An older, original form of the Magnitsky bill had been first introduced in the Senate, with companion legislation in the House. Cardin has been working since last summer on a new version of the bill, although he only has the draft so far and has not formally introduced a new bill with the changes, most of which are reflected in the new House bill.

#### Changes being made to avoid explicitly targeting Russia

Inside U.S. Trade, 4/27 (“KEY MEMBERS SIGN ON TO HOUSE VERSION OF MAGNITSKY LEGISLATION,” 4/27/2012, Factiva, JMP)

A bipartisan group of 15 House lawmakers, including key members of the Ways and Means and Foreign Affairs committees, has signed on to a bill introduced last week that would target human rights abusers in Russia. Passage of such a bill is widely seen as a key requirement before Congress can move forward with a vote that would enable the president to grant Russia permanent most-favored nation (MFN) trading status.

Rep. James McGovern (D-MA) on April 19 introduced the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2012 (H.R. 4405), which largely mirrors a draft version of Senate legislation authored by Sen. Ben Cardin (D-MD). Cardin has led efforts on Capitol Hill on the Magnitsky bill and linking it with a congressional willingness to vote to remove Russia from the application of the Jackson-Vanik amendment, which must occur before the president can grant Russia permanent MFN status.

Co-sponsors of the House bill include Ways and Means Ranking Member Sander Levin (D-MI) and committee members Jim McDermott (D-WA), Charles Rangel (D-NY) and Pete Roskam (R-IL). Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (R-FL) also co-sponsored the bill, along with committee members Christopher Smith (R-NJ), Dan Burton (R-IN), Ed Royce (R-CA) and Gerald Connolly (D-VA).

H.R. 4405 is meant to address human rights in Russia by publicly naming Russian officials who been banned from entering the United States as a result of committing gross violations of human rights. In addition to a visa ban, the bill would also freeze U.S.-based assets of these officials. The legislation is named after a Russian attorney who died in police custody after uncovering public tax fraud.

The bill's contents reflect changes Cardin intends to make from a version of the legislation he introduced in the Senate last year. These changes are meant to make the bill more palatable to the Obama administration, which generally **opposes any targeted human rights legislation against Russia** for fear of retaliation in other areas of the bilateral relationship.

However, Cardin has not yet formally introduced a new version of his bill that reflects these changes. For that reason, the House bill introduced this week is the first time that these changes have appeared in formal legislative language.

Cardin, who is the architect of the Magnitsky legislation in Congress, is currently in talks with administration officials on further changes that could potentially make the bill more acceptable to the White House (Inside U.S. Trade, April 6). The latest draft of the Senate legislation obtained by Inside U.S. Trade is nearly identical to what has been introduced in the House, but makes it more explicit that its provisions would apply to human rights violators "anywhere in the world." The House version omits specific mention of a worldwide application.

The new House bill reflects other changes Cardin has made to his draft bill. These include limiting the members of Congress who can submit names to the visa ban list, allowing the administration to respond confidentially to such requests, and containing a broad exception from applying the sanctions to individuals on national security grounds.

Specifically, H.R. 4405 allows Congress to request that a person be included on the list, but limits these requests to the chairmen and ranking members of the relevant committees. In the House, these include the Armed Services, Financial Services, Foreign Affairs, Homeland Security and Judiciary committees. The relevant Senate committees include Armed Services; Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs; Foreign Relations; Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; and Judiciary.

Limiting the requests to committee leaders was done to ease fears that the State Department would be forced to deal with potentially arbitrary requests from the broader membership of Congress, congressional sources have said.

### AT: Waivers

#### Waivers will no longer be effective

McQuillen, 3/4 (William, 3/4/2012, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, “U.S. SEEKS REPEAL OF SOVIET-ERA TRADE BAR FOR FARMERS,” Factiva)

While waivers have worked for almost two decades, Russia's joining the Geneva-based WTO would put the United States in violation of the trade arbiter's rules because Russia wouldn't get the certainty that trade accords provide, Brookings Institution fellow Joshua Meltzer, a specialist in global economy and development, said in an interview. The United States wouldn't be able to complain about any Russian trade violations at the WTO, he said.

"We are ready to bring Russia into the rules-based system in a way that gives us more enforcement tools to enable enhanced market access and a level playing field for U.S. exporters," Mr. Kirk told lawmakers.

### 2nc Capital Key

#### A major push from Obama is key to passage

Palmer, 4/26 (Doug, 4/26/2012, Reuters News, “UPDATE 2-US Republican urges Obama push on Russia trade bill,” Factiva, JMP)

WASHINGTON, April 26 (Reuters) - A top Republican lawmaker pressed President Barack Obama to intensify efforts to win approval of a controversial trade bill with Russia and said separate human rights legislation might be needed to help round up votes.

"It is time for the White House to get out front on this issue," Dave Camp, chairman of the House of Representatives Ways and Means Committee, said in a speech at the Center for Strategic and International Studies.

With Russia set to enter the World Trade Organization by late July or August, the Obama administration has identified passage of "permanent normal trade relations" - or PNTR - with Russia as one of its top trade priorities for the year.

But Camp, who announced plans to hold a hearing on the legislation in June, said the Obama administration has not engaged "strongly enough" to overcome resistance in Congress to passing the bill, which is also a top priority for U.S. business groups.

With a major push from the White House, "it's possible" the bill could be passed by the August recess, Camp said. However, some trade policy analysts think the hot-button issue could be delayed until after the U.S. elections in November.

Representative Sander Levin, a senior Democrat, said Camp's plan for a hearing was "long overdue" because the Democratic-led Senate was already preparing legislation "to address outstanding issues with regard to normalizing trade relations with Russia."

The U.S. Trade Representative's office said Obama and other administration's official have "repeatedly" called for action on the bill and said it "looked forward to working with Congress on this important step for American businesses and workers."

#### Obama’s time investment and capital are key to passage --- business interests alone not enough

Inside U.S. Trade, 1/13 (“WHITE HOUSE UNDER PRESSURE TO DO HEAVY LIFTING ON RUSSIA MFN VOTE,” 1/13/2012, Factiva)

Permanent MFN for Russia is coming to the forefront as Russia prepares to enter into the World Trade Organization. If the United States does not graduate Russia from the Jackson-Vanik amendment, U.S. exporters cannot gain the full benefits of Russia's trade concessions as a WTO member.

Russia's WTO entry is part of the Obama administration's "reset" policy with Russia that seeks to strengthen the strategic relationship between the two countries. This policy is controversial with Republican congressional leaders, such as House Speaker John Boehner (R-OH).

U.S. Chamber of Commerce President Tom Donohue yesterday (Jan. 12) publicly signaled that he wants the administration to be more visible in the fight for Russia MFN and that trade and economic arguments are unlikely to carry the day in Congress.

"There are no pure economic arguments on the Hill," he said at a press conference after his state of American business address. Business will work to focus attention on economics, but "everyone's thinking about political implications," according to Donohue.

"I think the administration will probably have to be motivated, particularly in an election year, to put its oar in the water here, but we're going to push them to do it because its not a very good idea to leave all that trade to somebody else," Donohue said.

The commercial benefits of Russia's WTO entry are small. U.S. exports to Russia are lagging behind those to Panama, with $6.006 billion worth of goods exported to Russia in 2010, according to Commerce Department statistics.

The top five goods the United States exported to Russia in 2010 were civilian aircraft, engines and related parts; poultry meat and offal; machinery parts; passenger cars and vehicles; and polymers of vinyl chloride also known as PVC plastics, according to the Commerce Department.

But the business message that the White House needs to take the lead may also be influenced by informal signals from Republican aides in Congress that the commercial arguments will not generate the necessary votes for the Jackson-Vanik legislation and that it is more effective to let the administration to make the foreign policy case.

In the Senate, both Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-KY) and Finance Committee Ranking Member Orrin Hatch (R-UT) are perceived as being cool to the idea of extending permanent MFN this year. Hatch, for instance, appears interested in first securing stronger protections for intellectual property rights.

But a Senate Democratic aide charged that congressional Republicans want to see the administration work for this vote and incur the political costs for securing it.

Other sources said some Republicans want to make any "victories" for President Obama in an election year as difficult as possible, and a Senate Republican aide said that Republicans "will do anything" to deprive Obama of a foreign policy victory this year.

Sources said that until business groups pressure Republican leaders to support Russia MFN, nothing will happen. A Senate Republican aide said that if executives from large multinational companies such as Boeing visit key Republican offices asking for this vote, it would be more difficult to ignore.

So far, senior executives of major companies have been absent from the Russia lobbying push, which has been left largely to association lobbyists who do not carry the same clout, this aide said.

#### Capital is key --- Obama must build confidence and provide leadership

Boles, 2/29 (Corey, 2/29/2012, “White House Pushes for Russia Trade Agreement,” <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970203753704577254192095999600.html?mod=googlenews_wsj>)

WASHINGTON—The Obama administration on Wednesday began a public push for Congress to permanently lower trade barriers with Russia, arguing the move would benefit U.S. exporters and aid a crack down on trading violations by Moscow.

U.S. Trade Representative Ron Kirk told lawmakers on the House Ways & Means Committee that permanently granting Russia "most favored nation" status would enable the U.S. to challenge anti-competitive practices by the country, and ensure that U.S. exporters are on level footing with foreign competitors in tapping the Russian market.

"We have been very plain," Mr. Kirk said at a congressional hearing on the administration's trade priorities. "This is something collaboratively we need to achieve."

But the White House likely faces a tough slog in getting the Russia measure through the House and Senate later this year, with lawmaker expressing concern over Moscow's positions on Syria and Iran and its own internal political situation.

"I think there'll be a lot of resistance in Congress to normalizing trading relations with Russia given their actions in Syria and Iran," said Sen. Lindsey Graham (R., S.C.), a leading voice on foreign policy for the Republican party.

Democrats in the House and Senate agreed.

"I don't think there's a real sentiment to pass a trade agreement [with Russia] this year," said Sen. Sherrod Brown (D., Ohio).

Rep. Sander Levin (D., Mich.), the top Democrat on the ways & means panel, cited Russia's actions over the deteriorating situation in Syria and fears of vote fraud in Russia's March 4 presidential election as complicating factors for a Russia trade vote to pass in Congress.

Russia blocked an attempt earlier this month by the U.N. Security Council to take actions against the brutal crackdown on protestors by the Syrian regime. Meanwhile, Vladimir Putin is expected to easily win election as president in the weekend poll, although the results will be closely watched for evidence of manipulation by his government.

Russian officials have said the country won't honor WTO commitments with the U.S. if Congress doesn't repeal the trade restrictions. Officials at the Russian Embassy in Washington weren't immediately available for comment.

Rep. Dan Burton (R., Ind.), chairman of the House subcommittee on Europe and Eurasia, predicted the Russia measure will nonetheless pass Congress. "If you're saying we ought to be doing business with China, how can you say we shouldn't be doing business with a huge emerging market like Russia," Mr. Burton said.

Russia is set to join the World Trade Organization by August, and will be required to lower its tariffs by as much as 50% for other countries in the trade organization. The U.S. must in turn repeal a decades-old trade measure preventing Russia from benefitting from lower tariffs on its U.S. exports, or American exporters won't benefit from Russia's new WTO membership.

Several leadership aides this week said there hadn't been any discussions yet about how the Russia matter might be handled in Congress.

Senate Finance Chairman Max Baucus (D., Mont.), who just returned from Moscow, called it a "no-brainer" that Congress would permanently normalize relations with Russia. Rep. Dave Camp (R., Mich.), the chairman of the Ways & Means Committee said at Wednesday's hearing that he was looking to "the administration to build confidence and provide leadership on the economic and non-economic issues."

#### Past votes prove capital is key

Moscow Times, 12/14 (“Russia in WTO: U.S. Congress Not Ready For Russian WTO Entry,” 12/14/2011, http://www.themoscowtimes.com/business/article/russia-in-wto-us-congress-not-ready-for-russian-wto-entry/449843.html)

WASHINGTON — The White House faces a major challenge next year persuading the U.S. Congress to permanently normalize trade relations with Russia due to concerns about human rights and Moscow's relations with Iran, a senior Republican lawmaker said Tuesday.

"I've counted a lot of trade votes in my time in Congress. This will be a hard lift," Representative Kevin Brady said in a speech to the Washington International Trade Association. "Even among our pro-trade members there is skepticism about Russia."

Members of the World Trade Organization meeting later this week in Geneva are expected to approve Russia's entry into the world trade body after nearly 18 years of negotiations.

That would require the United States to establish permanent normal trade relations (PNTR) by revoking a Cold War provision known as the Jackson-Vanik amendment that tied U.S. trade relations with state-controlled economies to the rights of religious minorities to emigrate freely.

Brady, who chairs the House of Representatives Ways and Means subcommittee on trade, said it was possible Congress could vote on PNTR for Russia in the first half of 2012, provided that the White House lays the ground for a vote.

Unless Congress revokes the provision, trade experts say Russia would be entitled under WTO rules to deny the United States most or all of the market-opening concessions Moscow made to join the WTO. That would put U.S. companies at disadvantage in the Russian market to other suppliers.

Brady said it is "important for the Obama administration, for our private sector, business and agriculture, and the Russian government to educate Congress, to build a foundation as to why Russia's WTO accession is in our interest, in both countries' interest, so that we can get beyond the general distrust that members of Congress feel today."

He compared the upcoming vote on Russia to the bitter debate in 2000 over China's accession to the WTO. Congress approved PNTR for China but only after a major push by the administration of President Bill Clinton.

Members of Congress will use the PNTR debate to raise concerns on a number of issues "related to Russia, even if they are not related to trade, such as human rights, foreign and security policy and Iran," Brady said.

### AT: Klein Ev (Political Capital Fails)

**\*\*\*1nc / 2nc Political Capital Key evidence can also be used to answer this argument.**

#### Isn’t unique --- Obama is already pushing for Jackson-Vanik repeal --- only a chance that capital can swing those on the margins.

#### Obama lobbying is necessary on this issue

Barkley, 5/31 (Tom, Dow Jones International News, 5/31/2012, “Congress Readies To Take Up Russia Trade, Human Rights Issues As WTO Entry Looms,” Factiva, JMP)

An aide to Senate Finance Chairman Max Baucus (D., Mont.) said he still hopes to complete congressional action before Russia joins the WTO. But House Republicans warn that getting it done over the summer is going to require more lobbying by administration officials.

"A lot depends on how aggressively the White House weighs in, at least on our side of the Capitol," Rep. Kevin Brady (R., Texas), chairman of the House Ways and Means trade subcommittee, told reporters earlier this month.

Ways and Means Committee Chairman Dave Camp (R., Mich.), who plans to hold a hearing on Russia trade next month, has also called for the administration to intensify its efforts to get the bill passed. Legislation is unlikely to be introduced in the House until after the hearing, a Republican aide said.

A spokeswoman from the U.S. Trade Representative's office said administration officials are still discussing timing with the congressional committees.

But with the presidential election gathering steam, supporters of the Russia trade bill say time is running out to get it done this year. Even if Congress tries to deal with the issue after the November elections in a "lame duck" session, it will have to take a back seat to a number of important tax measures.

"We have a very narrow window of opportunity to get Russia PNTR done before the election this fall," said Christopher Wenk, senior director of international policy at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

#### History proves that capital is effective --- backroom negotiations can produce agreements

Mandel, 3/23 --- Assistant Editor of Commentary magazine (Seth, 3/23/2012, “Contentions Lessons of Presidential Persuasion: Be the Commander-In-Chief,” http://www.commentarymagazine.com/2012/03/23/presidential-persuasion-commander-in-chief-obama-reagan-clinton/)

I want to offer Klein one more note of optimism. He writes:

Back-room bargains and quiet negotiations do not, however, present an inspiring vision of the Presidency. And they fail, too. Boehner and Obama spent much of last summer sitting in a room together, but, ultimately, the Speaker didn’t make a private deal with the President for the same reason that Republican legislators don’t swoon over a public speech by him: he is the leader of the Democratic Party, and if he wins they lose. This suggests that, as the two parties become more sharply divided, it may become increasingly difficult for a President to govern—and there’s little that he can do about it.

I disagree. The details of the deal matter, not just the party lines about the dispute. There is no way the backroom negotiations Clinton conducted with Gingrich over social security reform could have been possible if we had prime ministers, instead of presidents. The president possesses political capital Congress doesn’t. History tells us there are effective ways to use that capital. One lesson: quiet action on domestic policy, visible and audible leadership on national security.

### AT: Winners Win

#### Can’t win all the time – if every victory bred another one, Obama would be a superhero by now – some issues drain his capital – this is one of them <explain>

#### Fights on other issues prevent Obama from building a bipartisan consensus on Russia. That’s Allison and Blackwell.

#### Limited bargaining chips – Fighting for passage of the plan FORCES a trades off with other agenda priorities

Beckmann & Kumar, 11 --- Department of Poli Sci and UC Irvine (Matthew N. Beckmann and Vimal Kumar, Journal of Theoretical Politics, “How presidents push, when presidents win: A model of positive presidential power in US lawmaking,” SAGE Journals Database)

2. The Wellsprings of Positive Presidential Power When it comes to presidents’ negative power, that is, the veto, its source is plain enough: the Constitution. By contrast, the wellsprings of presidents’ positive power are far less definite, far less durable. Although the Constitution authorizes the president to ‘recommend . . . measures as he shall deem necessary and expedient’ (Article 2, section 3), it does not require that lawmakers afford those measures any special consideration, or any consideration at all. Such a tenuous institutional anchor is what led Richard Neustadt to characterize presidents’ positive power as ‘hard to consolidate, easy to dissipate, rarely assured’ (Neustadt, 1990: ix). However, to say the wellsprings of positive presidential power are extra-constitutional and variable is not to say they are unknowable or idiosyncratic. In fact, Neustadt himself characterized their essence: ‘presidential power is the power to persuade’ (1990: xi) or ‘the power to bargain’ (1990: 32). Presidents’ positive position in lawmaking, then, is not a formal, constitutional role, but rather an informal lobbying role, one that Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson advocated, and all presidents since Franklin Roosevelt have implemented (see Collier (1997)). Harry Truman summarized the outlook: ‘The legislative job of the President is especially important…I sometimes express it by saying the President is the only lobbyist that [most] Americans have’ (25 October 1956). As with all lobbyists, presidents looking to push legislation must do so indirectly by pushing the lawmakers whom they need to pass it. Or, as Richard Nesustadt artfully explained: The essence of a President’s persuasive task, with congressmen and everybody else, is to induce them to believe that what he wants of them is what their own appraisal of their own responsibilities requires them to do in their interest, not his…Persuasion deals in the coin of self-interest with men who have some freedom to reject what they find counterfeit. (Neustadt, 1990: 40) Fortunately for contemporary presidents, today’s White House affords its occupants an unrivaled supply of persuasive carrots and sticks. Beyond the office’s unique visibility and prestige, among both citizens and their representatives in Congress, presidents may also sway lawmakers by using their discretion in budgeting and/or rulemaking, unique fundraising and campaigning capacity, control over executive and judicial nominations, veto power, or numerous other options under the chief executive’s control. Plainly, when it comes to the arm-twisting, brow-beating, and horse-trading that so often characterizes legislative battles, modern presidents are uniquely well equipped for the fight. In the following we employ the omnibus concept of ‘presidential political capital’ to capture this conception of presidents’ positive power as persuasive bargaining.1 Specifically, we define presidents’ political capital as the class of tactics White House officials employ to induce changes in lawmakers’ behavior.2 Importantly, this conception of presidents’ positive power as persuasive bargaining not only meshes with previous scholarship on lobbying (see, e.g., Austen-Smith and Wright (1994), Groseclose and Snyder (1996), Krehbiel (1998: ch. 7), and Snyder (1991)), but also presidential practice.3 For example, Goodwin recounts how President Lyndon Johnson routinely allocated ‘rewards’ to ‘cooperative’ members: The rewards themselves (and the withholding of rewards) . . . might be something as unobtrusive as receiving an invitation to join the President in a walk around the White House grounds, knowing that pictures of the event would be sent to hometown newspapers . . . [or something as pointed as] public works projects, military bases, educational research grants, poverty projects, appointments of local men to national commissions, the granting of pardons, and more. (Goodwin, 1991: 237) Of course, presidential political capital is a scarce commodity with a floating value. Even a favorably situated president enjoys only a finite supply of political capital; he can only promise or pressure so much. What is more, this capital ebbs and flows as realities and/or perceptions change. So, similarly to Edwards (1989), we believe presidents’ bargaining resources cannot fundamentally alter legislators’ predispositions, but rather operate ‘at the margins’ of US lawmaking, however important those margins may be (see also Bond and Fleisher (1990), Peterson (1990), Kingdon (1989), Jones (1994), and Rudalevige (2002)). Indeed, our aim is to explicate those margins and show how presidents may systematically influence them.

#### Legislative style – Obama gets too involved too publically – he has to trade away too much

Galston 10 (William, Senior Fellow for Governance Studies – Brookings Institution, “President Barack Obama’s First Two Years: Policy Accomplishments, Political Difficulties”, 11-4, http://www.brookings.edu/papers/2010/110 4\_obama\_galston.aspx)

Rather than doing this, President Obama allowed himself to get trapped in legislative minutia, even as the country remained mired in a kind of economic slump that most Americans had never experienced and could not understand. Their reaction combined confusion and fear, which the president did little to allay. Ironically, a man who attained the presidency largely on the strength of his skills as a communicator did not communicate effectively during his first two years. He paid a steep political price for his failure. From the beginning, the administration operated on two fundamental political premises that turned out to be mistaken. The first was that the economic collapse had opened the door to the comprehensive change Obama had promised. As incoming Chief of Staff Rahm Emanuel famously put it, “you never want a serious crisis to go to waste.” In fact, as Emanuel himself came to realize, there was a tension between the steps needed to arrest the economic decline and the measures needed to actualize the president’s vision of fundamental change. The financial bailout and the stimulus package made it harder, not easier, to pass comprehensive health reform. Second, the administration believed that success would breed success—that the momentum from one legislative victory would spill over into the next. The reverse was closer to the truth: with each difficult vote, it became harder to persuade Democrats from swing districts and states to cast the next one. In the event, House members who feared that they would pay a heavy price if they supported cap-and-trade legislation turned out to have a better grasp of political fundamentals than did administration strategists.

 The legislative process that produced the health care bill was especially damaging. It lasted much too long and featured side-deals with interest groups and individual senators, made in full public view. Much of the public was dismayed by what it saw. Worse, the seemingly endless health care debate strengthened the view that the president’s agenda was poorly aligned with the economic concerns of the American people. Because the administration never persuaded the public that health reform was vital to our economic future, the entire effort came to be seen as diversionary, even anti-democratic. The health reform bill was surely a moral success; it may turn out to be a policy success; but it is hard to avoid the conclusion that it was—and remains—a political liability. Indeed, most of the Obama agenda turned out to be very unpopular. Of five major policy initiatives undertaken during the first two years, only one—financial regulatory reform—enjoyed majority support. In a September 2010 Gallup survey, 52 percent of the people disapproved of the economic stimulus, 56 percent disapproved of both the auto rescue and the health care bill, and an even larger majority—61 percent—rejected the bailout of financial institutions.[[v]](http://www.brookings.edu/papers/2010/1104_obama_galston.aspx%22%20%5Cl%20%22_edn5) Democrats’ hopes that the people would change their minds about the party’s signature issue—universal health insurance—after the bill passed were not fulfilled.  (It remains to be seen whether sentiment will change in coming years as provisions of the bill are phased in—that is, if they survive what will no doubt be stiff challenges in both Congress and the states.)

#### Polarization – Success embitters his opponents – they are better at spin than Obama

Purdum, 10 – Award winning journalist who spent 23 years with the NY Times (12/20/10, Todd S., Vanity Affair, “Obama Is Suffering Because of His Achievements, Not Despite Them,” <http://www.vanityfair.com/online/daily/2010/12/obama-is-suffering-because-of-his-achievements-not-despite-them.html>)

With this weekend’s decisive Senate repeal of the military’s “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” policy for gay service members, can anyone seriously doubt Barack Obama’s patient willingness to play the long game? Or his remarkable success in doing so? In less than two years in office—often against the odds and the smart money’s predictions at any given moment—Obama has managed to achieve a landmark overhaul of the nation’s health insurance system; the most sweeping change in the financial regulatory system since the Great Depression; the stabilization of the domestic auto industry; and the repeal of a once well-intended policy that even the military itself had come to see as unnecessary and unfair. So why isn’t his political standing higher?

Precisely because of the raft of legislative victories he’s achieved. Obama has pushed through large and complicated new government initiatives at a time of record-low public trust in government (and in institutions of any sort, for that matter), and he has suffered not because he hasn’t “done” anything but because he’s done so much—way, way too much in the eyes of his most conservative critics. With each victory, Obama’s opponents grow more frustrated, filling the airwaves and what passes for political discourse with fulminations about some supposed sin or another. Is it any wonder the guy is bleeding a bit? For his part, Obama resists the pugilistic impulse. To him, the merit of all these programs has been self-evident, and he has been the first to acknowledge that he has not always done all he could to explain them, sensibly and simply, to the American public. But Obama is nowhere near so politically maladroit as his frustrated liberal supporters—or implacable right-wing opponents—like to claim. He proved as much, if nothing else, with his embrace of the one policy choice he surely loathed: his agreement to extend the Bush-era income tax cuts for wealthy people who don’t need and don’t deserve them. That broke one of the president’s signature campaign promises and enraged the Democratic base and many members of his own party in Congress. But it was a cool-eyed reflection of political reality: The midterm election results guaranteed that negotiations would only get tougher next month, and a delay in resolving the issue would have forced tax increases for virtually everyone on January 1—creating nothing but uncertainty for taxpayers and accountants alike. Obama saw no point in trying to score political debating points in an argument he knew he had no chance of winning. Moreover, as The Washington Post’s conservative columnist Charles Krauthammer bitterly noted, Obama’s agreement to the tax deal amounted to a second economic stimulus measure—one that he could never otherwise have persuaded Congressional Republicans to support. Krauthammer denounced it as the “swindle of the year,” and suggested that only Democrats could possibly be self-defeating enough to reject it. In the end, of course, they did not. Obama knows better than most people that politics is the art of the possible (it’s no accident that he became the first black president after less than a single term in the Senate), and an endless cycle of two steps forward, one step back. So he just keeps putting one foot in front of the other, confident that he can get where he wants to go, eventually. The short-term results are often messy and confusing. Just months ago, gay rights advocates were distraught because Obama wasn’t pressing harder to repeal “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell.” Now he is apparently paying a price for his victory because some Republican Senators who’d promised to support ratification of the START arms-reduction treaty—identified by Obama as a signal priority for this lame-duck session of Congress—are balking because Obama pressed ahead with repealing DADT against their wishes. There is a price for everything in politics, and Obama knows that, too. Finally, Obama is hardly in anything close to disastrous political shape. Yes, the voters administered a shellacking to his party in December, but there are advantages to working with a hostile Republican Congress as a foil, instead of a balky Democratic one as a quarrelsome ally. His own personal likeability rating remains high—much higher than that of most politicians—and his job approval rating hovers at just a bit below 50 percent, where it has held for more than a year, nowhere near the level of a “failed presidency.” Sarah Palin’s presence for the moment assures an uncertain and divided Republican field heading into the 2012 election cycle, and the one man who could cause Obama a world of trouble if he mounted an independent campaign—Mayor Mike Bloomberg of New York—has recently made statements of non-candidacy that sound Shermanesque (even as he has remained outspokenly critical of business as usual by both parties in Washington).

### 2nc U.S. Aerospace Impact

#### Key to U.S. aerospace industry, Russian Democracy and relations

Blank, 1/23 --- head of Dechert's Russia Practice, has been acting for domestic and multinational clients on matters throughout Russia and the CIS since 95 (Laura M., “Brank: Embracing Russia's WTO Entry,” 1/23/2012, http://www.cnbc.com/id/46101625)

The U.S. should embrace the Russian government’s commitment to adopting international rules of trade -- rules that the U.S. had a large role in developing -- by finally granting Russia PNTR and graduating Russia from the outdated Jackson-Vanik amendment, which denies Russia most favored nation trading status. These actions would **send a positive message** that the U.S. isn’t trying to exclude Russia from the international economic community. Moreover, U.S. industry has a lot to gain both from Russia joining the WTO and from Russia’s continuing integration into the global economy as indicated by the quick endorsements by numerous trade organizations such as the U.S. Russia Business Council. Russia’s tariffs on imports will be reduced (in some cases by up to 10 percent), and U.S. companies will benefit from the elimination of many non-tariff barriers to trade and better protection of their intellectual property in Russia. The U.S. aerospace, agricultural, automotive and financial services industries, in particular, will greatly benefit from Russia joining the WTO, but only if Congress acts to finally graduate Russia from Jackson-Vanik.

Keeping Russia isolated is an outdated policy with its roots in the past. The U.S will ultimately achieve more in its diplomatic relations with Russia and its goal of **promoting the rule of law and democracy in Russia** by having Russia adapt its rules to international standards.

#### Declining aerospace leadership directly facilitates the emergence of hostile global rivals

Snead, 7 Aerospace engineer and consultant focusing on Near-future space infrastructure development (Mike, “How America Can and Why America Must Now Become a True Spacefaring Nation,” Spacefaring America Blog, 6/3, http://spacefaringamerica.net/2007/06/03/6--why-the-next-president-should-start-america-on-the-path-to-becoming-a-true-spacefaring-nation.aspx)

Great power status is achieved through competition between nations. This competition is often based on advancing science and technology and applying these advancements to enabling new operational capabilities. A great power that succeeds in this competition adds to its power while a great power that does not compete or does so ineffectively or by choice, becomes comparatively less powerful. Eventually, it loses the great power status and then must align itself with another great power for protection. As the pace of science and technology advancement has increased, so has the potential for the pace of change of great power status. While the U.S. "invented" powered flight in 1903, a decade later leadership in this area had shifted to Europe. Within a little more than a decade after the Wright Brothers' first flights, the great powers of Europe were introducing aeronautics into major land warfare through the creation of air forces. When the U.S. entered the war in 1917, it was forced to rely on French-built aircraft. Twenty years later, as the European great powers were on the verge of beginning another major European war, the U.S. found itself in a similar situation where its choice to diminish national investment in aeronautics during the 1920's and 1930's—you may recall that this was the era of General Billy Mitchell and his famous efforts to promote military air power—placed U.S. air forces at a significant disadvantage compared to those of Germany and Japan. This was crucial because military air power was quickly emerging as the "game changer" for conventional warfare. Land and sea forces increasingly needed capable air forces to survive and generally needed air superiority to prevail. With the great power advantages of becoming spacefaring expected to be comparable to those derived from becoming air-faring in the 1920's and 1930's, a delay by the U.S. in enhancing its great power strengths through expanded national space power may result in a reoccurrence of the rapid emergence of new or the rapid growth of current great powers to the point that they are capable of effectively challenging the U.S. Many great powers—China, India, and Russia—are already speaking of plans for developing spacefaring capabilities. Yet, today, the U.S. retains a commanding aerospace technological lead over these nations. A strong effort by the U.S. to become a true spacefaring nation, starting in 2009 with the new presidential administration, may yield a generation or longer lead in space, not just through prudent increases in military strength but also through the other areas of great power competition discussed above. This is an advantage that the next presidential administration should exercise.

#### The aerospace industry is the biggest internal to the US economy

Douglass 11 – president and CEO emeritus of the Aerospace Industries Association, member of the commission on the future of the Aerospace industry, regular consultant with congress and the DoD on aerospace systems, national speaker on aerospace manufacturing [John, speech given at the Ohio Aerospace Day for the Aerospace Industries Association, March 10, 2011, [www.ohioaerospaceday.com/presentations.../JDouglassSpeechOhio.doc](http://www.ohioaerospaceday.com/presentations.../JDouglassSpeechOhio.doc), DavidK]

The U.S. aerospace industry is a true economic engine for the United States. It provides the foundation for this country’s economic and national security and drives the technological innovation that keeps the United States competitive. Ohio is a vital contributor to this industry. Aerospace is one of the most important manufacturing industries in Ohio, producing world-class products and services and providing thousands of Ohioans with highly-skilled, well paying jobs in a wide range of fields, most on the cutting-edge of technology. Over the past two years, despite what many economists have called The Great Recession, U.S. aerospace has returned solid results, leading all manufacturers in trade surplus. The aerospace and defense industry is a true economic engine for the U.S. economy. It supports more than two million middle-class jobs and 30,000 suppliers from all 50 states. Total aerospace sales in 2010 rose to $216 billion, a new record for the seventh straight year. The economic benefits from aerospace include a $53 billion positive trade balance fueled by $81 billion in exports. Looking forward, total aerospace sales are forecast to improve again in 2011, reaching nearly $220 billion.

### --- XT: Aerospace Impact

#### Aerospace jobs are key to competitiveness and the economy

National Aerospace Week 10 (September 18,) National Aerospace Week “Aerospace and Defense: The Strength to Lift America,” <http://www.nationalaerospaceweek.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/04/whitepaper.pdf>)

As the U.S. economy moves through uncertain times, **America’s aerospace industry remains a powerful, reliable engine of employment, innovation and export income**. Aerospace contributed $81.2 billion in export sales to America’s economy last year. 1 Conservatively, **U**.**S. aerospace sales alone account for three to five percent of our** country’s **gross domestic product**, and every aerospace dollar yields an extra $1.50 to $3 in further economic activity. 2 **Aerospace products and services are the bedrock of our** nation’s security and **competitiveness.** We strongly believe that keeping this economic workhorse on track is in America’s best interest. To accomplish this, government policies must support a level playing field abroad, our industrial base and a workforce that is aging and needs an infusion of younger employees. This paper explains what’s at stake and how to ensure that the economic benefits of our industry are bolstered and broadened. A High-Skilled People Business The aerospace and defense industry directly employs 819,000 Americans, located in every state of the union — and supports more than two million jobs in related fields. 3 Our people bring a diverse set of skills and capabilities to their jobs: engineers on the cutting edge of advanced materials, structures and information technology; machinists fabricating complex shapes and structures; and technicians from almost every degree field, testing, applying and integrating the latest technologies.

### Key to U.S. Economy

#### Repeal is key to U.S. economy --- Russia is a key market

Verona, 3/29 --- president & CEO of the U.S.-Russia Business Council (3/29/2012, Ed, “The True Cost of Jackson-Vanik,” <http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/the-true-cost-jackson-vanik-6702>)

Free-Trade Watershed Diverted?

Russia’s imminent accession to the World Trade Organization (WTO) changes all that. Jackson-Vanik became materially relevant once again when Russia was invited to join the WTO last December; this time not because of any restrictions on emigration but because of its inadmissibility under WTO rules. The WTO requires members to extend one another unconditional free trade. Any member country unable to do so must publicly notify the others. In turn, the incoming member is under no obligation to extend MFN to that country. This is the case with the United States and Russia, and it will be so for as long as Jackson-Vanik stays on the books.

If that obtains after Russia becomes a full-fledged WTO member, U.S. business is likely to lose out in what has been until now a very lucrative market. U.S. exports to Russia have grown at an average annual rate of 15 percent in the past decade, reaching $8.3 billion in 2011. According to a recent Peterson Institute study, U.S. exports to Russia could double over the next five years as a result of that country acceding to the WTO. Approximately fifty thousand American jobs are directly or indirectly attributable to exports to Russia, with a likely doubling of that number if the United States has unimpeded access to the Russian market after it joins the WTO.

U.S. exports to Russia cover a broad range of goods. American consumer products, many of which enjoy virtually iconic status, are in heavy demand from the prosperous and rapidly growing Russian middle class. U.S. automobile brands are popular, and for several years running the best-selling model of foreign car has been the Ford Focus. Boeing commercial aircraft have been extremely successful in Russia and are poised to take a significant portion of the market as Russian airlines phase out their remaining Soviet-era aircraft. Infrastructure spending is expected to result in major orders for railroad locomotives, highly efficient power-generation technology and smart-grid equipment, to name just a few sectors. These are all areas where American companies are especially competitive and have worked diligently to develop market share and strong reputations.

But American competitiveness in Russia is now in jeopardy. Russia invoked reciprocity in response to the United States notifying the WTO that Washington could not extend unconditional MFN status. In case the point was lost, Foreign Minister Lavrov explicitly stated that his government will not extend to those WTO members who have not granted Russia MFN status (i.e. the United States) any of the benefits of Russia’s commitments under its accession agreement. Ironically, this means that companies from the other 152 WTO member countries (not counting the United States and Russia) will be able to take advantage of the concessions that the United States achieved during the protracted negotiation process. These concessions cover intellectual-property rights, agricultural-products standards, financial services and other regulatory and legal commitments that are crucial to American business. Moreover, the United States would not be able to hold Russia accountable for failure to adhere to its trade obligations under WTO dispute-resolution procedures.

Policy Solutions

In January, the Obama administration publicly stated that lifting Jackson-Vanik and extending Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) to Russia is now its top trade priority. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, U.S. Trade Representative Ron Kirk and other officials have testified on Capitol Hill in support of such action. Business has intensified its congressional-lobbying efforts over the past three months, briefing members and staff on the urgency of action to prevent damage to U.S. commercial interests and the loss of American jobs. The National Council on Soviet Jewry (NCSJ), a leading proponent of Jackson-Vanik during the debate over its adoption, has joined the Coalition for U.S.-Russia Trade in calling for the amendment to be lifted. Hearings have been held in the Senate Foreign Relations, Senate Finance and House Foreign Affairs Committees focusing on Russia, including Jackson-Vanik. Senators and Representatives with whom I have spoken overwhelmingly accept the economic and commercial rationale for lifting Jackson-Vanik and extending PNTR.

At the same time, most of those Senators and Representatives express strong reservations about many aspects of Russia’s foreign and domestic policies. In addition, they largely hold the view that lifting Jackson-Vanik without replacing it with more relevant legislation in the area of human rights would amount to acquiescence in the face of human-rights violations and the weak rule of law in Russia. Discussion on Capitol Hill revolves around the Sergey Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act (S.1039), a bill sponsored by Senator Benjamin Cardin (D-Maryland) which as of this writing now has thirty-one cosponsors. Essentially, that bill would deny visas and impose financial sanctions on Russian officials allegedly responsible for the wrongful incarceration and death of a Russian lawyer working for an American law firm, apparently in reprisal for his denunciation of official corruption.

It is up to Congress and the administration to determine the merits of the Magnitsky bill or other measures that may be introduced in conjunction with the lifting of Jackson-Vanik. An association such as the U.S.-Russia Business Council is reluctant to take a stand on an issue beyond our commercial and economic remit. But we are confident that failure to take action on Jackson-Vanik would place U.S. businesses and workers at a serious disadvantage once Russia becomes a member of the WTO, certain to occur no later than the end of August. It is abundantly clear that Jackson-Vanik provides no leverage on the Russian government now that the country is joining the WTO. On the contrary, Jackson-Vanik may even serve as a convenient anti-American foil for hard-liners within the Russian political establishment, as was asserted in recent open letters by leading members of Russia’s political opposition.

The U.S. economy cannot afford to lose export markets and the jobs they create for American workers. This is why it is imperative that Congress act to lift Jackson-Vanik and extend PNTR to Russia—not for Russia, but for America.

#### Key to U.S. industries --- manufacturing, farmers and ranchers

Hormats, 2/20 --- Under Secretary of State (Robert D., SKRIN Newswire, 2/20/2012, “Under Secretary of State Robert Hormats on cooperation with Russia,” Factiva)

February 16, 2012 The following is an excerpt from testimony delivered by Under Secretary of State Robert D. Hormats at a hearing of the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs.

On Russia, Europe worked with both us and the Russians last year through the long and complicated process of negotiating Russia’s accession to the WTO, completing the process after 18 years of negotiation. This painstaking work resulted in an invitation to Russia to accede to this global rules-based trading system. Russia’s WTO accession was a key step in putting our relations with Russia on a more constructive course, which is one of President Obama’s top priorities.

Integrating Russia into the WTO has the potential to bring enormous benefits to U.S. manufacturers, farmers, and ranchers. While American exports to Russia rose 39 percent in 2011, more than twice as fast as our goods exports to the world as a whole, our exports to Russia, $8.2 billion in 2011, represents only around one-half of one percent of our total exports.

We should not underestimate the opportunity to expand U.S. exports further to a country of nearly 145 mln people-the world’s seventh largest economy. It’s been estimated that Russia’s WTO accession could result in a 20-percent increase in Russia’s overall trade in manufactured goods, which could translate into a possible $2 billion increase in bilateral trade in manufactured goods with the United States. And the Commerce Department’s International Trade Administration estimates that every billion dollars of U.S. exports supports over 5,000 jobs.

President Obama in his most recent State of the Union Address urged Congress to ensure 4that no foreign company has an advantage over American manufacturing when it comes to accessing… new markets like Russia.And to improve opportunities for U.S. companies in Russia going forward and support jobs here in the United States, we will need to secure the full benefits of the WTO deal for American business by terminating application of the Jackson-Vanik Amendment to Russia, and by extending permanent normal trade relations to

Russia.

Of course we have differences with Russia. Its recent veto of a tough UN resolution on Syria was - in the words of Secretary Clinton - a travesty. And the United States remains committed to strong, transparent support for civil society and democratic principles, as the Secretary demonstrated in the wake of the Russian parliamentary elections in December, when she voiced our concerns. But at the same time, we also have had unprecedented cooperation with Russia on Iran and North Korea. Russia has also agreed to greatly expanded use of its territory and airspace as supply lines to Afghanistan. And as indicated in our trade numbers, our economic ties are also expanding.

The Jackson-Vanik Amendment -- enacted vis-a-vis the former Soviet Union -- long ago fulfilled its purpose with regard to Russia: to support free emigration, particularly Jewish emigration. No such barriers to emigration exist in Russia today.

If Congress does not enact the necessary legislation to terminate Jackson-Vanik with regard to Russia, when Russia becomes a member of the WTO, the U.S. does not get all of the benefits of Russia’s WTO membership, even though our competitors will. This puts many of our industries at a serious disadvantage. Unlike other WTO members, the United States will not be able to turn to the WTO mechanisms, including dispute settlement procedures, or ensure compliance on other areas such as intellectual property, services or WTO rules on antidumping.

### 2nc Competitiveness Impact

#### Repeal key to competitiveness

Podorova, 1/26 (Marina, 1/26/2012, “Obama may push for Jackson-Vanik repeal,” Bizekon-Russica Izvestia, Factiva )

The Jackson-Vanik amendment was adopted in 1974 in response to Soviet policies curbing Jewish emigration. It forbids the United States from offering most favored nation status to countries with nonmarket economies that restrict emigration.

The impact of the amendment is actually more symbolic than practical - since the fall of the Soviet Union U.S. presidents have granted Russia "temporary" normal trade relations in the form of an annual "waiver" verified by Congress.

With Russia's accession to the World Trade Organization in December, America will be in breach of WTO rules requiring members to give each other permanent normal trade relations.

As a result, without a repeal "U.S. companies will be denied the full enjoyment of Russia's improved market access and tariff reductions, and thus be **placed at a competitive disadvantage** versus their European, Asian and Latin American competitors," Andrew Somers, head of the American Chamber of Commerce in Russia, argued in a recent article.

"That gives the Obama administration strong arguments to put to Congress, but it is really a matter of domestic politics," said Fyodor Lukyanov, editor-in-chief of Russia in Global Affairs, who predicted a combination of political point-scoring by Republicans accusing Obama of going soft on Russia and pragmatic moves to attach conditions relating to anything from sanitary restrictions on imports of U.S. chicken legs to missile defense, if the president asks Congress to repeal the amendment.

#### Impact is great power war

Khalilzad Former US Ambassador to Iraq ‘11 (Zalmay, February 8, “The Economy and National Security” National Review, http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/259024/economy-and-national-security-zalmay-khalilzad)

Today, economic and fiscal trends pose the most severe long-term threat to the United States’ position as global leader. While the United States suffers from fiscal imbalances and low economic growth, the economies of rival powers are developing rapidly. The continuation of these two trends could lead to a shift from American primacy toward a multi-polar global system, leading in turn to increased geopolitical rivalry and even war among the great powers.

### 2nc Key to Relations

#### Repeal is key to regenerate the overall relationship --- it’s the canary in the coal mine for U.S.-Russia relations. That’s Gvosdev.

#### **Economic ties key to overall relationship --- allows us to manage disagreements**

Adomanis, 3/16 **(Mark, 3/16/2012, “Jon Kyl's Predictable and Distressing Foolishness on Russia,”** [**http://www.forbes.com/sites/markadomanis/2012/03/16/jon-kyls-predictable-and-distressing-foolishness-on-russia/**](http://www.forbes.com/sites/markadomanis/2012/03/16/jon-kyls-predictable-and-distressing-foolishness-on-russia/)**)**

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

#### Repeal will ratchet down tensions and boost relations

Foust, 2/21 --- fellow at the American Security Project (2/21/2012, Joshua, “It's Time for the U.S. to Finally Make Economic Peace With Russia,” <http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2012/02/its-time-for-the-us-to-finally-make-economic-peace-with-russia/253278/>)

But Congress can take a strong position supporting Russia's inclusion to -- and constraint by -- international financial and trade norms by voting to permanently normalize trade relations with Russia. It would be an important part of further ratcheting down tensions and creating common interests between Washington and Moscow, and would benefit American companies looking for new markets. It is a win-win all around.

#### Repeal key to facilitate broader relations

Pifer, 3/21 --- director of the Brookings Arms Control Initiative and former ambassador to Ukraine (3/21/2012, Steve, “The Future Course of the U.S.-Russia Relationship,” http://www.brookings.edu/testimony/2012/0321\_arms\_control\_pifer.aspx)

Fifth, Washington should seek to expand the trade and investment part of the bilateral relationship with Moscow. It remains significantly underdeveloped for economies the size of those of the United States and Russia. Expanded economic relations would not only generate new export possibilities, but could provide economic ballast to the broader relationship, much as the economic ties between the United States and China provide a cushion for that relationship. The U.S. government should work with Moscow to facilitate a successful Russian entry into the World Trade Organization.

Achieving a boost in bilateral trade and investment links, however, will depend more than anything on steps that Moscow takes to improve the business and investment climate within Russia. While the growing Russian market attracts American companies, many are put off by the absence of rule of law, rampant corruption, corporate-raiding and complex tax, customs and regulatory systems. The cases of Hermitage Capital and Sergey Magnitsky sadly testify to the daunting challenges of doing business in Russia, and lead investors and trading companies to turn to other markets. If the Russian government wants to modernize its economy and enjoy the benefits of full integration into the global economic system, it will have to come to grips with these problems.

One thing that Congress can do to improve economic relations is to graduate Russia from the provisions of the Jackson-Vanik amendment and grant Russia permanent normal trade relations status. That will increase U.S.-Russian trade; one estimate suggests that American exports to Russia could double. If, on the other hand, the amendment is still in place when Russia accedes to the World Trade Organization this summer, American companies that wish to export to Russia will be disadvantaged. They will not be able to make use of WTO tariff benefits or trade dispute resolution mechanisms. Other countries’ exporters to the Russian market of 143 million people will gain a comparative advantage over their American counterparts.

### AT: Relations Alt Causes

#### U.S. can still promote relations even if there is disagreement on some issues

Pifer, 3/21 --- director of the Brookings Arms Control Initiative and former ambassador to Ukraine (3/21/2012, Steve, “The Future Course of the U.S.-Russia Relationship,” http://www.brookings.edu/testimony/2012/0321\_arms\_control\_pifer.aspx)

A Policy Agenda for the U.S. Relationship with Russia

Looking forward, a positive relationship with Russia can advance U.S. interests, even if Washington and Moscow differ on some issues and if the United States is frustrated about corruption and the democracy and human rights situation in Russia. Russian support remains critical to achieving key Washington policy goals such as sustaining pressure on the nuclear rogue states and supporting coalition military operations in Afghanistan. There are a number of issues on which Moscow can play a spoiler role if it believes the United States is not paying due regard to Russian interests.

### AT: Putin Tanks Relations

#### Putin won’t undermine relations

Pifer, 3/21 --- director of the Brookings Arms Control Initiative and former ambassador to Ukraine (3/21/2012, Steve, “The Future Course of the U.S.-Russia Relationship,” http://www.brookings.edu/testimony/2012/0321\_arms\_control\_pifer.aspx)

As for foreign policy, Washington has grown comfortably accustomed to dealing with Mr. Medvedev over the past three years. Mr. Putin’s return portends a more complicated U.S.-Russian relationship, but there is no reason to expect that relations will plunge over a cliff. There are a number of considerations to bear in mind regarding Mr. Putin and Russia’s approach to the United States.

First, Mr. Putin as prime minister was nominally number two to Mr. Medvedev, but no one doubts who held real power in Moscow. As the American Embassy reportedly put it, Mr. Putin played Batman to Mr. Medvedev’s Robin—a comparison that Mr. Putin undoubtedly enjoyed in private. He kept a close eye on things. It is inconceivable that the New START Treaty, expanded supply routes through Russia for NATO forces in Afghanistan, and Moscow’s support for an arms embargo on Iran would have happened had Mr. Putin opposed them. There is no reason to assume that his return to the presidency will mean a major change in the strategic course of Russian foreign policy. We should expect a significant degree of continuity.

### AT: Election Rhetoric Hurts Relations

#### Anti-Americanism rhetoric in Russia won’t hurt relations

RIA Novosti, 3/23 (“U.S. Baffled by Russian America-Bashing – McFaul,” 3/23/2012, Factiva)

MOSCOW, March 23 (RIA Novosti) – The rise of anti-Americanism during the Russian presidential campaign came as an unpleasant surprise to the United States but would likely do no damage to long-term bilateral relations, said U.S. Ambassador to Moscow, Michael McFaul.

The White House will counter the hostile rhetoric through “real diplomacy,” McFaul said in an interview to Voice of America radio published late Thursday. He did not elaborate.

“We don’t want a throwback to some kind of ‘Cold War’ and acrimonious rhetoric. We don’t think it serves American interests,” McFaul was cited as saying in the interview, which is only available in Russian translation.

He also said that the media backlash has allowed opponents of U.S. President Barack Obama to question the “reset” in Russian-American relations, which McFaul helped mastermind in 2009, when he was advisor to Obama.

However, Russian officials said in informal talks that they prefer to continue dialogue with the United States, the ambassador said.

### AT: Missile Defense & Syria Hurts Relations

#### U.S. working to convince Russia on missile defense and Syria

RIA Novosti, 3/23 (“U.S. Baffled by Russian America-Bashing – McFaul,” 3/23/2012, Factiva)

The United States will continue with their efforts to convince Moscow that U.S. missile defense shield, which is to be deployed in Eastern Europe, poses no threat to Russia, McFaul said.

America will also try to reconcile its position on Syria and Iran with Russia, McFaul said. He admitted considerable differences on both issues but cited successful past compromises, as well as Russia’s support of the U.S. mission in Afghanistan, as reasons for optimism.

### AT: Funding Russian NGOs Hurts Relations

#### NGO funding won’t hurt relations

RIA Novosti, 3/23 (“U.S. Baffled by Russian America-Bashing – McFaul,” 3/23/2012, Factiva)

McFaul met with leaders of opposition protests in Moscow in January, shortly after arriving to Russia. The meeting prompted pro-government media to accuse the opposition of being funded by the U.S. State Department.

McFaul denied the allegations in his interview, saying that the United States is only sponsoring Russian non-political nongovernment organizations, involved in building the civil society, including ecological groups and independent vote monitors.

Obama plans no major changes to his Russian policy and expects president-elect Vladimir Putin to support the decision, McFaul said. He added that the two presidents intend to meet on American soil in May to discuss bilateral relations.

### AT: Relations Now / Resilient

**\*\*\*Make sure to read 2nc Key to Relations**

#### Backsliding in relations is possible --- will undermine productive cooperation

Allison & Blackwill, 11 --- \*director of the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard’s Kennedy School, AND \*\*senior fellow for U.S. foreign policy at the Council on Foreign Relations and served as U.S. ambassador to India and as deputy national security adviser for strategic planning in the Bush administration (October, Graham Allison and Robert D. Blackwill, “Russia and U.S. National Interests: Why Should Americans Care?” http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/Russia-and-US-NI\_final-web.pdf)

The Consequences of Failure

Just as the United States should expect Russia to adjust many of its policies to achieve a sustainable cooperative relationship, Washington should recognize that Moscow is unlikely to support U.S. policy goals if the U.S.-Russian relationship significantly deteriorates. As a result, the failure to establish an ongoing working relationship with Russia would be quite costly for the United States.

As a practical matter, even a stalled relationship could be problematic. The United States and Russia are both motivated to improve relations largely on the basis of hopes for what a stronger relationship could produce. If the prospects for realizing those hopes become too remote, it is uncertain whether what has been accomplished so far is sufficient to prevent our substantial remaining differences from tearing the U.S.-Russian relationship apart.

U.S. officials must carefully weigh not only the American national interests in working more closely with Russia, but also the costs and benefits of failing to do so, keeping in mind Moscow’s capacity to act as a spoiler in a number of areas and on a number of issues that are of vital national interest to Washington. In our considered judgment, the choice is clear: the United States should pursue a sustainable cooperative relationship with Russia to advance vital American national interests, but do so without illusions regarding either Moscow’s sometimes neo-imperial ambitions, or the pace of democratic change in Russia.

#### Relations improving but U.S. and Russia still need to expand economic ties

VOA News, 1/4 (“Gordon On U.S.-Russian Relations,” 1/4/2012, <http://www.voanews.com/policy/editorials/americas/Gordon-On-US-Russian-Relations--136702383.html> )

“We recognize that the United States and Russia have many common interests, and we remain guided by the belief that we can engage effectively with Russia’s government and civil society ... without checking our values at the door,” U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs Philip Gordon said recently in his testimony to the U.S. Congress. “Our aim now is to deepen . . . and widen the arc of our cooperation. At the same time, the United States will continue to be outspoken about areas where we disagree with Russia, such as human rights and democracy concerns.”

The benefits of engagement are particularly evident in the foreign policy arena. “We signed the New START Treaty. We brought into force a 123 Agreement on civilian nuclear cooperation, and agreed to dispose of enough weapons-grade plutonium for 17,000 nuclear warheads,” Assistant Secretary Gordon said. “We are both key participants in the Six Party talks ... to achieve the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula. We are working together to hold Iran to its international non-proliferation obligations ... Russia remains an important partner ... working to implement the vision for Middle East peace outlined by President Obama in his May 2011 remarks.

The United States and Russia still need to expand their economic ties. While two-way trade grew last year, they still reached just $31 billion – less than one percent of total U.S. trade. Russia received its invitation to accede to the World Trade Organization in December and is expected to join the organization this year. “For American companies to take advantage of [Russia’s] market opening, Congress must terminate the application of the Jackson-Vanik Amendment and extend permanent normal trading relations to Russia,” Assistant Secretary Gordon said. President Obama is committed to working with the U.S. Congress to achieve this goal.

Along with these successes, we have welcomed the Russian authorities’ acceptance of peaceful political protests, but also emphasized Secretary Clinton’s message that “Russian voters deserve a full investigation of electoral fraud and manipulation,” and urged authorities to act on the election reforms proposed by the OSCE observer mission.

Assistant Secretary Gordon concluded his testimony noting, “We expect to continue our successful approach of cooperating with Russia when it is in our interests, addressing our disagreements honestly, building links to Russian society and government, and maintaining the United States’ long-held commitment to keep our values at the center of our foreign policy.”

#### US-Russian relations remain fragile and prone to risks

Sergey Karaganov, 11 --- Dean of the School of the World Economy and International Affairs at the National Research University–Higher School of Economics (March 2011, “analytical report by the russian Group of the Valdai international discussion club”, <http://vid-1.rian.ru/ig/valdai/US-Russia%20relations_eng.pdf>)

However, the U.S.—Russian relations have not yet reached a state of stable partnership; they remain fragile and are prone to many risks of both home- and foreign-policy nature. Prospects for preserving even the current level of partnership efficiency depend on the political positions of the Obama administration.

### Relations Good --- Laundry List

#### Relations solve multiple scenarios for extinction

Tayler, 8 (11/14/2008, Jeffrey, The Atlantic, “Medvedev Spoils the Party; It will take more than Obama's electoral triumph to improve the United States' strained relations with Russia,” http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2008/11/medvedev-spoils-the-party/7130/?single\_page=true)

Like it or not, the United States cannot solve crucial global problems without Russian participation. Russia commands the largest landmass on earth; possesses vast reserves of oil, natural gas, and other natural resources; owns huge stockpiles of weapons and plutonium; and still wields a potent brain trust. Given its influence in Iran and North Korea, to say nothing of its potential as a spoiler of international equilibrium elsewhere, Russia is one country with which the United States would do well to reestablish a strong working relationship—a strategic partnership, even—regardless of its feelings about the current Kremlin government. The need to do so trumps expanding NATO or pursuing “full-spectrum dominance.”

Once the world financial crisis passes, we will find ourselves returning to worries about resource depletion, environmental degradation, and global warming – the greatest challenges facing humanity.No country can confront these problems alone. For the United States, Russia may just prove the “indispensable nation” with which to face a volatile future arm in arm.

#### Relations are key to solve nuclear conflict, warming, global prolif, war on terror and economy

Collins & Rojansky, 10 – \* U.S. Ambassador to the Russian Federation from 1997 to 2001, AND \*\*deputy director of the Russia and Eurasia Program at the Carnegie Endowment (8/18/10, James F. Collins, Matthew Rojansky, Foreign Policy, “Why Russia Matters,” <http://www.carnegieendowment.org/publications/index.cfm?fa=view&id=41409> )

A year and a half after Barack Obama hit the "reset" button with Russia, the **reconciliation is still fragile, incomplete, and politically divisive**. Sure, Russia is no easy ally for the United States. Authoritarian yet insecure, economically mighty yet technologically backward, the country has proven a challenge for U.S. presidents since the end of the Cold War. Recent news hasn't helped: The arrest in July of a former deputy prime minister and leader of the Solidarity opposition movement, Boris Nemtsov, provoked some of the harshest criticism of Russia yet from the Obama administration. Then last Wednesday, Russia announced that it had moved anti-aircraft missiles into Abkhazia, the region that broke off from Georgia during the August 2008 war. The announcement was hardly welcome news for the United States, which has tried to defuse tensions there for the last 24 months.

Yet however challenging this partnership may be, Washington can't afford not to work with Moscow. Ronald Reagan popularized the phrase, "Trust, but verify" -- a good guiding principle for Cold War arms negotiators, and still apt for today. Engagement is the only way forward. Here are 10 reasons why:

1. **Russia's nukes are still an existential threat.**

Twenty years after the fall of the Berlin Wall, Russia has thousands of nuclear weapons in stockpile and hundreds still on hair-trigger alert aimed at U.S. cities. This threat will not go away on its own; cutting down the arsenal will require direct, bilateral arms control talks between Russia and the United States. New START, the strategic nuclear weapons treaty now up for debate in the Senate, is the latest in a long line of bilateral arms control agreements between the countries dating back to the height of the Cold War. To this day, it remains the only mechanism granting U.S. inspectors access to secret Russian nuclear sites. The original START agreement was essential for reining in the runaway Cold War nuclear buildup, and New START promises to cut deployed strategic arsenals by a further 30 percent from a current limit of 2,200 to 1,550 on each side. Even more, President Obama and his Russian counterpart, Dmitry Medvedev, have agreed to a long-term goal of eliminating nuclear weapons entirely. But they can only do that by working together.

2. **Russia is a swing vote on the international stage.**

As one of the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council, Moscow holds veto power over any resolution that the body might seek to pass -- including recent efforts to levy tougher sanctions on Iran or, in 2009, against North Korea following that country's second nuclear test. Russian support for such resolutions can also help persuade China and others not to block them. The post-reset relationship between Moscow and Washington works like a force multiplier for U.S. diplomacy. Russia plays an equally crucial role in the G-8 and G-20 economic groups, helping to formulate a coordinated approach in response to economic threats. In 2008, for example, Russia supported a G-20 resolution promising to refrain from protectionism and avoid new barriers to investment or trade.

3. Russia is big.

The country's borders span across Europe, Central and East Asia, and the Arctic -- all regions where the United States has important interests and where it cannot afford destructive competition. With an ongoing counterinsurgency campaign in Afghanistan, the United States has a strong interest in Central Asian stability and relies on Russia not only for direct assistance with logistics and information sharing, but to help manage threats like the recent political upheaval and sectarian violence in Kyrgyzstan. In the former Soviet space, Moscow's historical ties to newly independent states are still fresh and powerful. Moscow is the linchpin to resolving "frozen conflicts" that prevent countries like Moldova, Georgia, and Azerbaijan from prospering economically and moving toward European Union membership. Recently, for example, Moscow signaled renewed interest in resolving frozen conflicts in Nagorno-Karabakh and Transnistria. And despite recent troop movements into Abkhazia, a negotiated settlement is still very possible, one that returns some territory to Georgia but preserves its autonomous status, along with that of its fellow breakaway republic, South Ossetia.

4. Russia's environment matters.

As the catastrophic fires across Western Russia have dramatically illustrated, Russia is both a victim of global climate change and a steward of natural resources -- including many of the forests now badly burned -- **needed to reverse the global warming trend.** With more than one-tenth of the world's total landmass, vast freshwater and ocean resources, plus deposits of nearly every element on the periodic table, Russia is an indispensable partner in the responsible stewardship of the global environment. On climate change, there is work to be done, but progress is evident. Russia today is the world's fourth-largest carbon emitter, but as a signatory to the Copenhagen Accord, it has pledged to reduce emissions to 20 to 25 percent below 1990 levels. Another black spot is Russia's use of "flaring" -- a technique that burns natural gas into the open atmosphere during oil extraction, but Medvedev agreed to capture 95 percent of the gas currently released through flaring. Last year he also signed Russia's first law on energy efficiency, which takes such steps as requiring goods to be marked according to their energy efficiency and banning incandescent light bulbs after 2014. True, most of Russia's other commitments are short on deadlines and concrete deliverables. But like China's cleanup for the Beijing Olympics, Moscow could transform resolve into reality with surprising speed, given the right amount of international engagement. And in the meantime, Russia's natural climate-cleaning properties are vast; the Siberian provinces alone contain more clean oxygen-producing forests and reserves of freshwater than continental Europe.

5. Russia is rich.

As the "R" in the famous BRIC grouping of emerging economies, Russia is the 12th-largest market in world, with the third-largest foreign currency reserves. And the country's role in world markets is only growing. Russia is a big player in commodity trading, the country boasts a volatile but increasingly attractive stock exchange, and it is open to foreign investment -- even in state-owned industries. Russian businesses are increasingly looking abroad to form strategic partnerships, acquire assets, and sell their products. And as a country that felt the global financial crisis viscerally -- economic growth fell by almost 8 percent in 2009 -- Russia has a strong interest in making sure there is no repeat. Despite occasional retrenchments, such as the ban on grain exports after the summer fires, Russia is committed to becoming a free-trading World Trade Organization member, and wants more access to U.S. and European technology and management know-how to drive its modernization. Excessive bureaucracy and widespread corruption are the biggest challenges to Russia's further economic growth, but these are already top talking points in Medvedev's modernization drive, and engagement with more transparent Western countries such as the United States can only help.

6. One word: energy.

The American way of life depends on stable and predictable commodity prices -- gasoline, natural gas, and coal in particular -- and Russia plays a large role in the global production and pricing of these fossil fuels. Russia alone possesses roughly one-quarter of the world's known gas reserves, and it is currently responsible for over a fifth of global exports. It is the second largest oil-producing state after Saudi Arabia and has the second-largest coal reserves after the United States. The even better news for Washington is that Russia is not a member of OPEC, the cartel of oil-producing countries. This gives the country far more freedom to focus on increasing exports rather than reducing them to keep prices down. When it comes to bringing supply to market, many will no doubt remember the so-called gas wars between Russia and Ukraine and Russia and Belarus that left Eastern Europe in the cold several times in recent years. Much of the trouble is attributable to the legacy of Soviet energy infrastructure in Russia's western neighbors, which put a choke-hold on Russia's gas pipelines. Moscow is currently working with the United States, China, and Western Europe to find a way around this problem, which will entail building new pipelines through the Baltic Sea, Black Sea and Siberia.

7. **Russia is a staunch ally in the war on terror** (and other scourges).

Even during the dark days after the 2008 Russia-Georgia war, Moscow and Washington cooperated effectively on counterterrorism, counternarcotics, infectious disease prevention and response, and other shared security priorities. Recently, the two have worked together under the auspices of the Bilateral Presidential Commission to coordinate relief strategies for catastrophes such as the Haiti earthquake and the violence in Kyrgyzstan. Both Washington and Moscow recognize that swift, well-organized responses to such crises are key to preventing weaknesses from being exploited -- for example by extremist groups who are happy to fill the vacuum of government authority. Russia is also a critical partner in U.S. law enforcement efforts to defeat organized crime and terrorism financing. The two countries are currently working to map smuggling routes in Central Asia. And Russia has shared information with the United States on the informal financial networks used to fund Taliban and Afghan warlords.

8. The roads to Tehran and Pyongyang go through Moscow.

Russia maintains unique relationships with Iran and North Korea -- both top concerns on Washington's nuclear nonproliferation radar. In the past, the Kremlin has used its leverage to keep the path open for negotiations, sending senior diplomats to Tehran and offering carrots such as civilian nuclear assistance and weapons sales (though it has deferred the sale of advanced S-300 ground-to-air missiles that could be used to blunt a U.S. or Israeli air strike). Now more than ever, Washington needs allies with that kind of leverage to help punish violators and **discourage cascading nuclear proliferation worldwide.** Leading by example on nonproliferation is also a must; as the world's biggest nuclear powers, the United States and Russia are looked to as the standard-setters. If they fail to ratify their latest modest step forward on bilateral nuclear arms control, it will be difficult to push other countries to take similar counter-proliferation measures.

9. **Russia can be a peacemaker.**

Moscow has the potential to play a role in the settlement of key regional conflicts -- or if it chooses, to obstruct progress. Russia is a member of the Middle East "Quartet," the six-party talks dealing with North Korean denuclearization, and each of the working groups addressing conflicts in the post-Soviet space, such as the OSCE Minsk group on Nagorno-Karabakh, and the 5+2 group on Transnistria. In such post-Soviet regions in particular, Russia has a unique capacity to contribute to peaceful resolution of territorial disputes by facilitating trade and economic engagement with and between former adversaries, and acting as a peacekeeper once a final settlement is reached. In the Middle East, Russia still controls a network of commercial and intelligence assets and has substantial influence with the Syrians, who should be pushed to play a more productive role in the Arab-Israeli peace process.

10. Russians buy U.S. goods.

As the U.S. economy stops and starts its way out of recession, most everyone agrees that boosting exports is a key component in the recovery. And Russia is a big market. U.S. companies such as Boeing, International Paper, and John Deere have invested billions in Russian subsidiaries and joint ventures. In all, there are more than 1,000 U.S. companies doing business there today. They are in Russia not only to take advantage of the country's vast natural resources and highly skilled workers but also to meet the demand for American-branded goods. The Russian middle class wants consumer goods and the country's firms increasingly seek advanced U.S. equipment and machinery. Between 2004 and 2008, before the financial crisis hit, U.S.-Russia trade grew by more than 100 percent to over $36 billion annually, and although that figure dropped by a third in 2009, there is potential for an even better, more balanced trade relationship in the coming decade.

In short, **Russia is indispensible**. As long as the United States participates in the global economy and has interests beyond its own borders, it will have no choice but to maintain relations with Russia. And good relations would be even better.

#### U.S.-Russian coop key --- prevents nuclear use and helps manage major hot spots including Middle East and North Korea

Speedie, 1/19 --- Senior Fellow at the Carnegie Council (David C. Speedie, Russia Bulletin, Issue 1, 1/19/2012, [http://www.carnegiecouncil.org/resources/russia\_bulletin/00001/:pf\_printable](http://www.carnegiecouncil.org/resources/russia_bulletin/00001/%3Apf_printable))

The dawn of a new year has brought a renewed focus on Russia and on U.S.-Russia relations—and on some sharply acerbic divisions.

The aftermath of the Russian parliamentary elections and the ensuing demonstrations in the streets of Moscow and other cities; the looming Presidential elections in Russia in March; the appointment of Michael McFaul, the architect of the vaunted "reset" policy as ambassador in Moscow; and sundry reflections on the 20 years since the fall of the Soviet Union—these and other issues have kept Russia in the forefront of the foreign policy debate.

At the same time, we are accustomed to seeing a pattern of ebb and flow when it comes to Russia and Russia policy. It has been our consistent position at the Carnegie Council that, for a host of reasons, the relationship with Russia endures as one of the most critical for the United States. Among these reasons are:

[1] The nuclear question: the United States and Russia, New START notwithstanding, still possess more than 90 percent of the world's strategic nuclear warheads, along with the lion's share of tactical nukes, which remain largely unconstrained by any treaty;

[2] The matter of trade and commerce: Despite Russia's recent accession to WTO, it is still subject to the anomalous and anachronistic Jackson-Vanik amendment (see Jackson-Vanik: Time for Reconsideration? and Jackson-Vanik: A Bridge to the 20th Century) which, if not removed from the books, could put the United States at a disadvantage in trading with a growing Russian market, and could indeed put us in violation of our WTO obligations; and

[3] The plain fact of Russia's strategic global position: from a greater Middle East to North Korea, Russia borders virtually every trouble spot on the planet, thus suggesting that a cooperative U.S.-Russia spirit is preferable to that of confrontation.

In a febrile Presidential campaign environment in the United States, Russia policy may be fueled more by heat than by light, more by electioneering rhetoric than informed analysis. We therefore launch today a regular, biweekly Russia Bulletin, the content and approach of which will be shaped by events, but which will contain some reflections on news items of note, some attempt at analysis, and some reference to ongoing and useful research being conducted elsewhere. We shall also, on occasion, take a look at the foundation community, and at what is being funded by way of research or NGO activity in or concerning Russia.

In each Russia Bulletin we shall take a look at one of the critical holdover issues that continue to strain the bilateral relationship. And in this first bulletin, we consider the aftermath of the parliamentary elections, the ensuing Moscow demonstrations, and the various charges and counter-charges as to what and who are behind them.

#### U.S.-Russian relations are necessary to solve proliferation, terrorism, diseases and prevent a number of conflicts

Hart, 7 – Wirth Chair professor at the University of Colorado (Gary, “Letter to Democrats on U.S.-Russia Relationship,” 4-5-2007, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/gary-hart/letter-to-democrats-on-u\_b\_45075.html) // JMP

This letter represents an appeal to Democrats, now constituting a Congressional majority, to challenge this antipathy and to propose a more positive, constructive relationship between the United States and Russia, less in Russia's interest than in the strategic interest of the United States. Resurgent neo-realist foreign policy principles require us to resist both evangelical division of the world between good and evil and, again for mysterious reasons, irrational condemnation of Russia to the evil category.

What interests, if any, do we have in common?, should be our first question. It turns out there are several. First, we have an ongoing interest in reducing nuclear arsenals. Thanks to the persistent efforts of Senators Sam Nunn and Richard Lugar, and despite resistance by the Bush administration, we continue to work with the Russians to carry out long-standing steps to dramatically reduce nuclear warheads and delivery systems on both sides. A serious argument as to how rejection of this project makes us safer has yet to be offered.

Second, we have a mutual interest in defeating terrorism. Those interests have caused the Russians to conduct prolonged military actions in Chechnya and the United States to conduct equally prolonged military occupations of Afghanistan and Iraq. Clearly, there are differences in methodology, with the Russians using much more brutal means, but the residents of Grosny and of Falluja may not see that much difference. Though opposing our invasion of Iraq, the Russians fully endorsed our invasion of Afghanistan (where they themselves had a rather unpleasant experience). If we are not fully exploiting Russian intelligence networks in pursuit of this common interest, it is to our detriment.

Third, there is the matter of oil. The Russians have it and we need it. During the first Clinton term, I urged our government to negotiate long-term oil purchase agreements with the Russians to help reduce our dependence on dangerously unstable Persian Gulf sources. It is not too late to pursue that idea. The Russians need massive Western investment in oil production facilities and the United States and its European allies need predictable oil supplies. High level diplomatic and commercial engagement with the Russians can prevent destructive Russian tendencies to nationalize their oil production facilities. There is no reason that arrangements such as we have had with the Saudis for decades cannot be replicated in Russia. But this will only occur in the context of stable, friendly relations between our two nations.

Fourth, we have high technology and the Russians need high technology, particularly in the fields of telecommunications, health care, and industrial modernization. A decade of experience in modernization of Russia's telecommunication system convinces me of two things: 21st century communications technology is key to Russia's emerging economy, and Russian science, though inadequately equipped, has much to offer the West and global markets. Russia represents a huge potential market for U.S. technology companies--its health care system is still abysmal for most Russians--and U.S. companies require encouragement to explore those markets.

Fifth, Russia is neighbor to several Islamic states, former Soviet republics, and whether one subscribes to a Huntingtonian thesis of civilization clashes or merely civilization frictions, Russia occupies an unrivaled strategic position on the margins of a cultural divide. Further, it occupies a strategic position in Northeast Asia, particularly with regard to North Korea and China. Russia allied with the West and sharing a common international agenda can only be in our interest.

As the noted Russian expert Dimitri Simes has repeatedly pointed out, its geo-strategic location places Russia in a unique position to exert influence on critical matters such as Iran's nuclear ambitions. According to Professor Simes, "exactly like the United States, Russians wonder what will be the immediate purpose of the Iranian nuclear enrichment program."

The list above is merely illustrative of the common interests the U.S. and Russia share. Several principles might be evoked to produce a constructive bi-lateral relationship. Our relationship should be based upon mutual self-interest, not altruism. We do not develop a working relationship as a favor to the Russians but as an advantage to ourselves. Russia is by history and culture a Western nation and should be integrated into the West. The U.S. and Russia share security interests and concerns. We are a market for Russia's natural resources and Russia is a market for our technology. An isolated, anti-democratic Russia increases our insecurity. Russia's development as a market democracy will best be achieved by engagement not rejection.

Except in recent years when American foreign policy assumed a theological aura, we have consistently sought self-interested relations with nations with whom we did not always agree. The late Jean Kirkpatrick is notable for having distinguished between authoritarian states, with whom we could collaborate regardless of their undemocratic natures, and totalitarian states with whom we could have nothing to do. Even today, in the era of a foreign policy based on good and evil, we maintain productive relations with highly authoritarian states (including former Soviet republic) that are guilty of no more undemocratic behavior than Russia.

We have seldom if ever demanded absolute conformity with strict standards of behavior as the price for bilateral relationships. Yet that seems to be exactly what the Bush administration and the Council on Foreign Relations report presume. Once again, why this is peculiarly the case with Russia remains a mystery never fully explained.

To expect Russian subservience to any foreign power, and particularly its chief Cold war rival the United States, is seriously to misunderstand Russian history, culture, and the Russian character. At few points in U.S. history, prior to the end of the Cold War, have we adopted the kind of imperious attitude toward other nations that has characterized our international relations in the 21st century. This arrogance of power has not coincidentally arrived at the same time as a form of neo-imperialistic project that has overtaken our foreign policy.

Few nations rival the Russians in the category of nationalist sentiment. Though younger Russians, or at least those with income, are internationalist and cosmopolitan, outside Moscow and among older generations "Mother Russia" is still a palpable phenomenon. Dictation of domestic behavior and performance, especially by the triumphant United States, is a sure prescription for popular resistance. In most cases, the issue is not what is preferable, best, and right but who is dictating it. U.S. policy makers, including incumbent Democratic Congressional majorities, must resist the temptation to reduce the Russians to school children whom we are called upon to instruct.

The new realities of the 21st century require us to seek all the help we can get. These realities include: proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; jihadi terrorism; failed and failing states; tribalism, ethnic nationalism, and religious fundamentalism; the decline of nation-state sovereignty; integrating markets; climate change; and the threat of pandemics. These realities share two characteristics: they cannot be addressed by military means alone, and they cannot be resolved by one nation alone, including the world's only superpower. We are going to need all the help we can get. We do not have the luxury of dismissing other nations who share these concerns and who have the potential to add value to our efforts to resolve these challenges.

It is not in America's national interest, and particularly its security interests, to go it alone or to rely on ad-hoc "coalitions of the willing" composed of minor powers at best and rallied only in extremis.

As co-chair of the United States Commission on National Security for the 21st Century, my fellow commissioners and I agreed unanimously that we focus particular attention on three regional powers as critical to future world stability. These were China, India, and Russia. We urged the new Bush administration in early 2001 as well as subsequent administrations to expand ties to these nations, to increase their positive contributions to regional stability, and to encourage them to undertake economic and political leadership in their own venues. No systematic effort has been made to implement these recommendations. Indeed, in the case of Russia exactly the opposite has occurred.

In a recent Wall Street Journal opinion piece, "A Nuclear-Free World," George Shultz (former Secretary of State), Brent Scowcroft (former National Security Advisor), Henry Kissinger (former Secretary of State), and Sam Nunn (former Senator) advocate an ambitious agenda to achieve the goal of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPF) to eliminate nuclear weapons from the earth. It is impossible to envision this agenda being achieved absent Russian cooperation. Russia will cooperate in this and similar ventures if they prove to be in Russia's own interest. But it is much easier for the United States to engage the Russians, or any other key player, if relations are positive and productive. Those in power must be required to acknowledge a fundamental human truth: it is much easier to achieve cooperation if a basis of understanding and collaboration already exists.

Congress does not make foreign policy. The Congressional party, particularly in opposition, is hamstrung if shut out by the Executive branch from offering advice and consent. But Congress can use its unique parliamentary platform to educate the American people on the importance of a constructive and engaged relationship with Russia. That is what I advocate here.

To the degree it is in our interest to do so, Administration officials should be encouraged to develop a positive U.S.-Russian relationship or, if they refuse to concur, to defend in the public arena their justification for not doing so. In recent years this has not happened. It is not too late for the 110th Congress to undertake this project.

The United States does not have the luxury of creating unnecessary conflicts. We have enough to deal with as it is. It is patently not in our interest to demonize and isolate Russia and it is patently in our interest to integrate it into the West.

### 2nc Europe Impact

#### Relations are critical prevent multiple Eurasian wars, proliferation, terrorism and China war

Legvold, 2 – professor of political science at Columbia University (Robert, National Interest, “All the way: crafting a U.S.-Russian alliance,” Winter 2002, http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_m2751/is\_2002\_Winter/ai\_95841626) // JMP

The Core of Cooperation

THE NEW agenda in U.S.-Russian relations, constructive as it is for now, still falls short of its historic possibilities. Viewed in proper perspective, the evolution under way in Russian foreign policy if fostered, opens the prospect of going beyond temporary cooperation all the way to a genuine alliance. The point is not a formal treaty, but a psychological leap by which each side comes to trust the other as an ally, to believe that on the most vital international issues they have a common purpose and that where there is disagreement, it is between friends, not opponents. It is a reach, but it is a wise reach.

If this idea seems far-fetched to some, it is, first, because the revolution occurring in Russian foreign policy is not yet clear to them, even as the suspicion of Russian double-dealing still looms large in the back of many peoples' minds; second, because so few have thought through what such an alliance would be about; and, third, because the new direction in Russian policy seems still fragile, appearing to be virtually one mortal man's work.

On the last score, were Putin gone tomorrow the thrust of the new Russian policy would doubtless lose some momentum, but it would not collapse. Putin, after all, is not so much inventing a policy that transcends events as he is adjusting to realities that no Russian leader can escape. In the end, whether an alternative leadership would pursue an accommodation leading to a U.S.-Russian alliance depends more on the course of U.S. policy than on the vagaries of Russian politics.

So what might animate a U.S.-Russian alliance? The core focus can and should be stability and mutual security in and around the Eurasian land mass. This focus operates through three geographical lenses: Russia itself and its near European periphery; Russia's south; and China's western periphery.

First, as Alexander Vershbow, the current U.S. ambassador in Moscow, puts it: "Russia is the most important key to the stability of Eurasia", without which neither Europe nor Asia--two regions in which the United States has vital interests--can "be stable and prosperous." (9) As long as Russia respects the sovereignty of the former Soviet republics, the United States has every reason to cooperate with Russia in stabilizing and aiding those states. In this regard, as well as others, alliance does not mean condominium; U.S.-Russian collaboration must not imply a readiness to decide matters over the heads of Russia's neighbors. On the contrary, an alliance's purpose would be to strengthen their sovereignty and vitality. A key example of the subtle way in which the revolution in Russian foreign policy makes this kind of alliance possible concerns Belarus. Putin's new agenda has led to a sharp cooling in Russia's relations with Alexander Lukashenka's regime. As a consequence, a leadership that flouts the values on which modern European security is based is increasingly isolated, the prospect of a Russian-Belarusian union has faded, and Ukraine's fears of encirclement have eased. Although not perfectly parallel, U.S. and Russian interests in Belarus, Ukraine and Moldova now converge sufficiently to make promoting stability and successful reform there a matter of common U.S. and Russian ground.

Second, to borrow the formulation of Alexei Bogaturov, in the 21st century no longer is peninsular Europe or Northeast Asia the critical "strategic rear" of the United States, but the vast turbulent region stretching from eastern Turkey to western China and along Russia's south. (10) As the United States girds to cope with the threats emanating from this area, no country brings more value as a potentialally than Russia. As things stand, the United States has backed into Central Asia with military power as part of the war against terrorism, and in the process it has offered quasi-security commitments to its new partners, almost certainly without careful consideration of their wider implication." Central Asia forms the unstable core of Inner Asia; it is an area--the only one in the world--surrounded by four nuclear powers, two of whom recently teetered on the brink of war. It contains multiple points of friction--from Kashmir to the Fergana Valley to northwest Kazakhstan to China's Xinjiang province. Each of these points is capable of bleeding into a larger conflict, and of strengthening WMD proliferation and terrorism. It is populated by regimes whose stability is universally suspect, and contains wealth--particularly in energy resources--that will make it increasingly important to both Asian and European consumers.

Not only are the United States and Russia directly but separately implicated in the stability of this region, but China is as well. This raises the third aspect of a U.S.-Russian alliance to enhance Eurasian stability. China will be a decisive actor in Inner Asia, not the least because it forms an integral part of the region. Unfortunately, China enters through its underdeveloped northwest territories, including Xinjiang--precisely where it feels most vulnerable. In part because of this sense of vulnerability, and in part because of the general state of Sino-American relations, China has not welcomed the arrival of American military power in Central Asia. On the contrary, while excusing a temporary deployment in the context of a war that it supports, China's leadership has opposed an extended U.S. presence there as an element of a hostile encirclement stratagem.

Russia and the United States have good reason to act jointly, not only to enhance their common stake in regional stability, but to draw China into a constructive dialogue over the role all three will play in Central Asia. Russia, with the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, is already engaged in such an effort. Talking to the Russians about U.S. military activities in Central Asia (and Georgia) builds mutual confidence by promoting transparency, but it is not so far-fetched to imagine a far more ambitious trilateral dialogue among Russia, China, and the United States. Much as the United States and its European allies share assessments of threats at the edges of Europe, plan for coordinated action, and struggle to create the necessary machinery to carry it out, so can and should Russia and the United States do the same in Eurasia with Chinese participation when appropriate.

#### European war escalates and goes nuclear

Glaser, 93 – Assistant Professor in the Graduate School of Public Policy Studies at the University of Chicago (Charles Glaser, International Security, Summer 1993)

However, although the lack of an imminent Soviet threat eliminates the most obvious danger, U.S. security has not been entirely separated from the future of Western Europe. The ending of the Cold War has brought many benefits, but has not eliminated the possibility of a major power war, especially since such a war could grow out of a smaller conflict in the East. And, although nuclear weapons have greatly reduced the threat that a European hegemon would pose to U.S. security, a sound case nevertheless remains that a major European war could threaten U.S. security. The United States could be drawn into such a war, even if strict security considerations suggest it should stay out. A major power war could **escalate to a nuclear war** that, especially if the United States joins, could include attacks against the American homeland. Thus, the United States should not be unconcerned about Europe’s future.

### --- XT: U.S.-Russian Relations Key to Hegemony / Terrorism / Prolif

#### U.S.-Russian relations are key to U.S. hegemony and solving terrorism and proliferation

Nixon Center, 3 (Advancing American Interests and the U.S.-Russian Relationship, September 2003, http://www.nixoncenter.org/publications/monographs/FR.htm) // JMP

At the same time, U.S. leaders increasingly recognized the emerging, inter-related threats of terrorism and proliferation. Though policy makers and experts had devoted some attention to these issues earlier, the tragic events of September 11 rapidly crystallized American thinking about these threats and transformed the struggle to contain them into the principal aim of American foreign policy. Notwithstanding its diminished status and curtailed ambition, Russia has considerable influence in its neighborhood and a significant voice elsewhere as well. Moscow can contribute importantly to U.S. interests if it chooses to do so. Accordingly Russia can markedly decrease, or increase, the costs of exercising American leadership both directly (by assisting the United States, or not) and indirectly (by abetting those determined to resist, or not).

For this Commission’s purposes it is American interests, not the U.S.-Russian relationship per se, that are paramount. The relationship should serve U.S. interests—not vice versa. This does not mean that Russian interests are unimportant. Russian cooperation on specific issues will reflect Russian judgment of how these actions affect its interests. Fortunately, Russia’s national interests converge with our own interests much more than they diverge. The real interests Russia and America share—including Russia’s successful integration into the West as a market-oriented democracy—greatly outweigh the interests that divide us. But since short term interests and narrower political advantage can cloud perceptions, U.S. policy must have a more ambitious objective than simply demonstrating to Moscow how its cooperation with the U.S. advances Russian interests. Wise policy will also seek to create significant equities in Russian society and among leading political forces in cooperative action, which provides the context for managing unavoidable differences on other issues.

#### Russian cooperation is key to prevent nuclear proliferation and terrorism and sustain U.S. leadership

Obama, 7 – Democratic Senator from Illinois and a candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination (Barack, Foreign Affairs, “Renewing American Leadership,” July/August 2007, http://www.foreignaffairs.org/20070701faessay86401/barack-obama/renewing-american-leadership.html) // JMP

HALTING THE SPREAD OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

To renew American leadership in the world, we must confront the most urgent threat to the security of America and the world -- the spread of nuclear weapons, material, and technology and the risk that a nuclear device will fall into the hands of terrorists. The explosion of one such device would bring catastrophe, dwarfing the devastation of 9/11 and shaking every corner of the globe.

As George Shultz, William Perry, Henry Kissinger, and Sam Nunn have warned, our current measures are not sufficient to meet the nuclear threat. The nonproliferation regime is being challenged, and new civilian nuclear programs could spread the means to make nuclear weapons. Al Qaeda has made it a goal to bring a "Hiroshima" to the United States. Terrorists need not build a nuclear weapon from scratch; they need only steal or buy a weapon or the material to assemble one. There is now highly enriched uranium -- some of it poorly secured -- sitting in civilian nuclear facilities in over 40 countries around the world. In the former Soviet Union, there are approximately 15,000-16,000 nuclear weapons and stockpiles of uranium and plutonium capable of making another 40,000 weapons -- all scattered across 11 time zones. People have already been caught trying to smuggle nuclear material to sell on the black market.

As president, I will work with other nations to secure, destroy, and stop the spread of these weapons in order to dramatically reduce the nuclear dangers for our nation and the world. America must lead a global effort to secure all nuclear weapons and material at vulnerable sites within four years -- the most effective way to prevent terrorists from acquiring a bomb.

This will require the active cooperation of Russia. Although we must not shy away from pushing for more democracy and accountability in Russia, we must work with the country in areas of common interest -- above all, in making sure that nuclear weapons and material are secure. We must also work with Russia to update and scale back our dangerously outdated Cold War nuclear postures and de-emphasize the role of nuclear weapons. America must not rush to produce a new generation of nuclear warheads. And we should take advantage of recent technological advances to build bipartisan consensus behind ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. All of this can be done while maintaining a strong nuclear deterrent. These steps will ultimately strengthen, not weaken, our security.

## Affirmative Responses

### 2ac Winners-Win

#### Winners-win --- confrontation yields political momentum

Klein, 2/16 (Ezra, 2/16/2012, “Wonkbook: For White House, compromise through confrontation,” <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/ezra-klein/post/wonkbook-for-white-house-compromise-through-confrontation/2012/02/16/gIQAYrySHR_blog.html>)

Most in the White House will admit it: Over the past few months, their strategy has swung from seeking compromise to welcoming confrontation. After the debt-ceiling debacle, they stopped believing that they could reach a deal with House Republicans. And so they stopped emphasizing policies they thought Republicans would like and began emphasizing policies -- like the Buffett rule -- that they thought the public would like. But then a funny thing began to happen. The president's numbers began to rise. And with it, the possibility that seeking confrontation might force the Republicans to welcome compromise.

Since August, President Obama's job approval has risen from 43 percent to 49 percent. Disapproval of his job performance has fallen from 53 percent to 46 percent. Much of that likely reflects renewed signs of economic recovery. Some, perhaps, is due to the the White House's new communications strategy, which has been to hang back from the congressional fray and campaign on what is popular rather than what is possible. And the Republican primary probably hasn't hurt, both in terms of attracting Democrats back into the president's corner and leaving independents wondering whether there weren't better off sticking with Obama.

As the president's numbers have improved, some in the White House have begun talking quietly, cautiously, about the possibility -- which they admit is slim -- of a "1996 moment."

From 2009 to 2011, Ronald Klain was chief of staff to Vice President Joe Biden. Before that, he was chief of staff to Vice President Al Gore. And in a January Bloomberg View column, he explained the way the White House understands what happened in 1996:

"Back in 1995, as in 2011, powerful Republican leaders (including Gingrich, then speaker of the House) faced a Democratic president who had been weakened by a stinging midterm defeat. They blocked the president’s initiatives, and tried to use their power in Congress to bring him down. By the end of 1995, gridlock had reached a new high with the government shutdown and the failure of budget talks between the White House and Congress. Sound familiar?"

"Most experts expected things to get even worse in 1996. Then, a few things happened to change that outcome. Bill Clinton, the Democratic president, regained his footing, sharpened his message for re-election and was buoyed by improving economic news. Congress grew less popular as voters became dissatisfied with the lack of progress and obstructioznism. There were mounting signs of another tidal wave election, this one to sweep out the new Republican members who had been seated in the previous election. As 1996 unfolded, the party lost enthusiasm for its lackluster emerging nominee, Bob Dole."

"The result: Gingrich and fellow Republican leaders in Congress decided to work with Clinton to pass a raft of important legislation. These included a balanced budget deal, an extension of health-care coverage (the Kennedy-Kassebaum Act) and sweeping welfare reform."

But there hasn't been much evidence of a 1996 moment in the offing. At least, not until this week. Over the last few days, however, something remarkable happened: The negotiations over the payroll tax cut, the unemployment-insurance benefits, and the Medicare doc fix moved from deadlock to deal. And it didn't happen at the last minute, or because the markets were about to tumble into the abyss. It happened because Republicans coolly assessed the politics and decided they were better off compromising with the Democrats than taking this one to the edge.

Would this deal have happened if the president's numbers were weaker, if the economy was in worse shape, and if the Republican primary was producing a more able set of champions? Perhaps. But perhaps not. Rather, it looks as if the president's strengthened position and his clear appetite for further conflict led Republicans to conclude that compromise might serve them better in this case.

The payroll tax cut deal is, to be sure, not a 1996 moment all on its own. It's very likely a one-off. It may even still fall apart. But it is, at the least, a template for how further deals might go. If Obama's numbers continue to rise, if the economy continues to recover, and if the GOP's presidential nominee falls behind in the polls, it's easy to see how Boehner and McConnell and Cantor and Kyl begin worrying more about their own majorities than about what happens at the top of the ticket. And if that happens, they may decide their members need a few accomplishments of their own. A big infrastructure bill, perhaps. Or, if gas prices rise, a serious compromise on energy.

But if that happens, it won't be because the White House offered Republicans a deal they couldn't refuse. It will be because they offered them a confrontation they couldn't win.

### 2ac Presidential Push Fails

#### Studies prove presidential involvement reduces chance of passage

Klein, 3/19 (Ezra, 3/19/2012, “The Unpersuaded; Who listens to a President?” <http://www.newyorker.com/reporting/2012/03/19/120319fa_fact_klein#ixzz1pxjQpFdO>)

In January, 2004, George W. Bush announced his intention to “take the next steps of space exploration: human missions to Mars and to worlds beyond.” It was an occasion that might have presented a moment of bipartisan unity: a Republican President was proposing to spend billions of dollars on a public project to further John F. Kennedy’s dream of venturing deep into the cosmos. As Frances Lee, now a professor at the University of Maryland, recalls, “That wasn’t a partisan issue at all. Democrats had no position on sending a mission to Mars.” But, she says, “they suddenly began to develop one. They began to believe it was a waste of money.” Congressional Democrats pushed the argument in press releases, public statements, and television appearances. In response, the White House, which had hinted that the Mars mission would feature prominently in the State of the Union address, dropped it from the speech.

The experience helped to crystallize something that Lee had been thinking about. “Most of the work on the relationship between the President and Congress was about the President as the agenda setter,” she says. “I was coming at it from the perspective of the increase in partisanship, and so I looked at Presidents not as legislative leaders but as party leaders.” That changes things dramatically. As Lee writes in her book “Beyond Ideology” (2009), there are “inherent zero-sum conflicts between the two parties’ political interests as they seek to win elections.” Put more simply, the President’s party can’t win unless the other party loses. And both parties know it. This, Lee decided, is the true nature of our political system.

To test her theory, she created a database of eighty-six hundred Senate votes between 1981 and 2004. She found that a President’s powers of persuasion were strong, but only within his own party. Nearly four thousand of the votes were of the mission-to-Mars variety—they should have found support among both Democrats and Republicans. Absent a President’s involvement, these votes fell along party lines just a third of the time, but when a President took a stand that number rose to more than half. The same thing happened with votes on more partisan issues, such as bills that raised taxes; they typically split along party lines, but when a President intervened the divide was even sharper.

One way of interpreting this is that party members let their opinion of the President influence their evaluation of the issues. That’s not entirely unreasonable. A Democrat might have supported an intervention in Iraq but questioned George W. Bush’s ability to manage it effectively. Another interpretation is that party members let their political incentives influence how they evaluate policy. “Whatever people think about raw policy issues, they’re aware that Presidential successes will help the President’s party and hurt the opposing party,” Lee says. “It’s not to say they’re entirely cynical, but the fact that success is useful to the President’s party is going to have an effect on how members respond.” Or, to paraphrase Upton Sinclair, it’s difficult to get a man to support something if his reëlection depends on his not supporting it.

Both parties are guilty of this practice. Karl Rove, President Bush’s deputy chief of staff, recalls discussing the Social Security privatization plan with a sympathetic Democrat on the House Ways and Means Committee. He says that the representative told him, “You wouldn’t get everything you want and I wouldn’t get everything I want, but we could solve the problem. But I can’t do it because my leadership won’t let me.” Rove says, “It was less about Social Security than it was about George W. Bush.” At various times during the nineteen-nineties, Clinton and other Democrats had been open to adding some form of private accounts to Social Security, and in 1997 there were, reportedly, quiet discussions between Democrats and Republicans about doing exactly that. In theory, this background might have led to a compromise in 2005, but Bush’s aggressive sales pitch had polarized the issue.

The Obama Administration was taken by surprise when congressional Republicans turned against the individual mandate in health-care reform; it was the Republicans, after all, who had championed the idea, in 1993, as an alternative to the Clinton initiative. During the next decade, dozens of Senate Republicans co-sponsored health-care plans that included a mandate. Mitt Romney, of course, passed one when he was governor of Massachusetts. In 2007, when Senator Jim DeMint, of South Carolina—now a favorite of the Tea Party—endorsed Romney for President, he cited his health-care plan as a reason for doing so.

Senator Orrin Hatch, of Utah, who supported the mandate before he opposed it, shrugs off his party’s change of heart. “We were fighting Hillarycare,” he has said, of the Republicans’ original position. In other words, Clinton polarized Republicans against one health-care proposal, and then Obama turned them against another.

Representative Jim Cooper, a Democrat from Tennessee, takes Lee’s thesis even further. “The more high-profile the communication effort, the less likely it is to succeed,” he says. “In education reform, I think Obama has done brilliantly, largely because it’s out of the press. But on higher-profile things, like deficit reduction, he’s had a much tougher time.”

Edwards’s work suggests that Presidential persuasion isn’t effective with the public. Lee’s work suggests that Presidential persuasion might actually have an anti-persuasive effect on the opposing party in Congress. And, because our system of government usually requires at least some members of the opposition to work with the President if anything is to get done, that suggests that the President’s attempts at persuasion might have the perverse effect of making it harder for him to govern.

### 1ar Presidential Push Fails

#### Backlash from Obama push is especially likely now

Dennis, 3/26 (Steven T., Roll Call, 3/26/2012, “White House Hasn't Found Sequel to Payroll Tax Fight,” Lexis)

Asked about the lack of a single top priority last week, senior administration officials at a background briefing pointed the finger at House Republicans. They said the administration and Obama want to get as much accomplished as possible but need to see signs of cooperation from the House in order to take action. They mentioned several bills, including the highway bill, as proposals they hope can get accomplished.

But even some of Obama's allies on the Hill think that with the election already under way, there's only so much appetite for taking on additional big-ticket items before November. And the more Obama pushes for something, the more pushback he's likely to encourage from the GOP.

Aside from the highway reauthorization, the next key deadline is the end of September, when Congress must approve at least a stopgap spending measure to avoid a government shutdown. But the bigger deadlines come at the end of the year, when assorted tax cuts expire and big spending cuts are triggered. Administration officials acknowledged those decisions are going to wait until the lame-duck session.

Rep. Barney Frank (D-Mass.) said he doesn't see a singular priority coming from the president, but that's not necessarily a bad thing with Republicans in control of the House. "It makes sense to have a bunch out there and see if one of them works," he said.

Rep. Chris Van Hollen (D-Md.) said the administration does have a top priority - the remainder of the jobs act - and predicted it would step up its push for the transportation bill in particular.

But other Democrats give puzzled looks when asked what the White House's top priority is beyond the generic topic of "jobs."

"My guess is, generally, it's the economy, but you'd have to ask them that," Sen. Mark Pryor (D-Ark.) said. "I don't know."

Rep. Luis Gutierrez (D-Ill.) said everything is about jobs, but at this point, there's not much chance Obama can get much else through, and if he pushes hard for something in particular, it could send Republicans running in the other direction.

"I don't think there's a legislative piece that stands a great opportunity of passage," he said. "They're not going to do it. It's like, 'Nope! It's Obama's idea? Nope!'"

Republicans say they want to work with Obama on jobs - pointing to the bipartisan support for House Majority Leader Eric Cantor's (R-Va.) JOBS Act reducing regulations on most startup companies, which the president embraced, as well as GOP efforts aimed at addressing gas prices. But they say the president already seems focused on his re-election campaign.

"We welcome any White House assistance, but we're not expecting much since they've already made clear in words and actions that the payroll bill was their last priority before shifting full-time to election mode," said Brendan Buck, spokesman for Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio). "They can campaign; we'll keep governing."

#### Backlash is empirically true

Bouie, 11 (1/18/2011, Jamelle, American Prospect, “Taxes and Presidential Leadership,” http://prospect.org/article/taxes-and-presidential-leadership)

I sympathize with Sullivan, but I'm not sure that he gets Yglesias' point. Simply put, on sensitive issues where bipartisan compromise is necessary for a satisfactory result, presidential leadership is usually counterproductive. When the president takes a position, that position tends to polarize. Not only will his rhetoric intensify already-held views, but the sheer act of taking a stance will push the other side into opposition, even when there's plenty of agreement. The DREAM Act was relatively uncontroversial up until a Democratic president decide to stump for it. At that point, Republicans -- even former supporters -- found reasons to vote against the bill. Yglesias doesn't want presidential involvement in tax reform because presidential involvement in tax reform would doom the project. As soon as Barack Obama came out in support of one element, conservatives would come out in opposition. Like Yglesias said, fundamental reform is only possible if the president stays out of the conversation.

#### Even backroom deal-making fails --- not in the GOP’s interest too cooperate

Klein, 3/19 (Ezra, 3/19/2012, “The Unpersuaded; Who listens to a President?” <http://www.newyorker.com/reporting/2012/03/19/120319fa_fact_klein#ixzz1pxjQpFdO>)

One option is to exert private leadership. The Obama Administration has had some success with this approach. Late in 2010, some observers wondered why the White House, which clearly believed that there was a need for further stimulus, wasn’t pushing Republicans on a payroll-tax cut, one of the few stimulus measures they had seemed somewhat open to. Then, suddenly, after the midterm election, it appeared in the tax deal. Axelrod says, “We didn’t put the payroll-tax cut into our speeches in the fall because we didn’t think we could pass it, and we worried that if we included it in our rhetoric it might pollute the issue and impair our chances of getting it done after the election.”

Back-room bargains and quiet negotiations do not, however, present an inspiring vision of the Presidency. And they fail, too. Boehner and Obama spent much of last summer sitting in a room together, but, ultimately, the Speaker didn’t make a private deal with the President for the same reason that Republican legislators don’t swoon over a public speech by him: he is the leader of the Democratic Party, and if he wins they lose. This suggests that, as the two parties become more sharply divided, it may become increasingly difficult for a President to govern—and there’s little that he can do about it.

### 2ac Nothing Will Pass

#### Nothing will pass --- Obama is in election mode

Dennis, 3/26 (Steven T., Rol Call, 3/26/2012, “White House Hasn't Found Sequel to Payroll Tax Fight,” Lexis)

Rep. Chris Van Hollen (D-Md.) said the administration does have a top priority - the remainder of the jobs act - and predicted it would step up its push for the transportation bill in particular.

But other Democrats give puzzled looks when asked what the White House's top priority is beyond the generic topic of "jobs."

"My guess is, generally, it's the economy, but you'd have to ask them that," Sen. Mark Pryor (D-Ark.) said. "I don't know."

Rep. Luis Gutierrez (D-Ill.) said everything is about jobs, but at this point, there's not much chance Obama can get much else through, and if he pushes hard for something in particular, it could send Republicans running in the other direction.

"I don't think there's a legislative piece that stands a great opportunity of passage," he said. "They're not going to do it. It's like, 'Nope! It's Obama's idea? Nope!'"

Republicans say they want to work with Obama on jobs - pointing to the bipartisan support for House Majority Leader Eric Cantor's (R-Va.) JOBS Act reducing regulations on most startup companies, which the president embraced, as well as GOP efforts aimed at addressing gas prices. But they say the president already seems focused on his re-election campaign.

"We welcome any White House assistance, but we're not expecting much since they've already made clear in words and actions that the payroll bill was their last priority before shifting full-time to election mode," said Brendan Buck, spokesman for Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio). "They can campaign; we'll keep governing."

### --- 1ar Nothing Will Pass

#### Obama’s agenda won’t pass --- he’s just campaigning

Hoover, 2/21 (Kent, 2/21/2012, “Obama Sells Election Year Agenda: Congress Unlikely to Buy,” <http://www.portfolio.com/views/blogs/capital/2012/02/21/obama-sells-election-year-agenda-congress-unlikely-to-buy>)

So what did the president ask Congress to do? Pass bills that he knows aren’t going anywhere because they involve tax increases. He wants Congress to pass his plan to help more homeowners refinance their mortgages, which would require a new tax on big banks. He called on Congress to make his so-called Buffett Rule a reality—meaning anyone who makes more than $1 million a year should pay an income tax rate of at least 30 percent. And he called on Congress to raise income tax rates for people making more than $250,000, while ensuring that folks who make less than that aren’t hit with a tax hike when January 1 rolls around.

“These are things we can do today,” Obama said.

It’s all part of his campaign theme of building an economy in which everybody has a fair shot and everyone shares responsibility.

And that’s what today’s speech was: a campaign address, not a president outlining a legislative agenda.

The big decisions—what to do with income tax rates and how to avoid across-the-board budget cuts that could decimate the Defense Department—won’t be made until after the election.

### 2ac Jackson-Vanik

#### Won’t pass without human rights laws that causes Russian backlash

Abrams, 6/12 (Jim, 6/12/2012, “Bill for normal trade with Russia meets opposition,” <http://www.usnews.com/news/politics/articles/2012/06/12/bill-for-normal-trade-with-russia-meets-opposition>, JMP)

WASHINGTON (AP) — A Senate plan to lift Cold War restrictions on trade with Russia drew immediate resistance from Senate Republicans who said Congress must first address Russia's poor human rights record and existing economic and political policies.

Senate Finance Committee Chairman Max Baucus, D-Mont., on Tuesday introduced bipartisan legislation to normalize trade relations with Russia by repealing the 1974 Jackson-Vanik act that tied trade with the then-Soviet Union to Moscow's allowing Jews and other minorities to leave the country.

The repeal of Jackson-Vanik is necessary if U.S. businesses are to enjoy the lower tariffs and increased access to Russian markets that will become available when Russia joins the World Trade Organization this summer. Supporters of normalized trade said it could lead to a doubling of U.S. exports to Russia.

"Jackson-Vanik served its purpose during the Cold War, but it's a relic of another era that now stands in the way of our farmers, ranchers and businesses pursuing opportunities to grow and create jobs," Baucus said in a statement.

Baucus was joined in sponsoring the bill by Senate Foreign Relations Committee chairman John Kerry, D-Mass., and Republicans John McCain of Arizona and John Thune of South Dakota.

But eight Finance Committee Republicans, led by ranking Republican Orrin Hatch of Utah, wrote a letter to Baucus saying that Congress cannot ignore ongoing issues with Russia in moving to normalize trade relations.

"Many aspects of the U.S.-Russia relationship are troubling," they said, naming the "flawed election and illegitimate regime of Vladimir Putin," the suppression of public protests, Russia's support for the Syrian government and its threats to attack U.S.-led NATO missile defense sites in Eastern Europe. The letter also raised Russia's theft of U.S. intellectual property and its pervasive problems with bribery and corruption and questioned whether Russia would comply if the WTO handed down adverse rulings on its economic policies.

House Foreign Affairs Committee chairman Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, R-Fla., on Tuesday, responding to reports that Russia was selling attack helicopters to Syria, said the administration's "string of concessions to Moscow must stop, including the latest effort to repeal the Jackson-Vanik amendment to give Russia preferential trade benefits."

The GOP senators also warned against any weakening of human rights legislation now moving through both the House and the Senate and likely to be linked to repeal of Jackson-Vanik.

The legislation, named after Russian lawyer Sergey Magnitsky, who died in a Russian jail in 2009 after allegedly being subject to torture, would impose sanctions such as visa bans and asset freezes on Russian officials involved in human rights violations including the Magnitsky case. The House Foreign Affairs Committee last week approved the bill by voice vote. In the Senate the main sponsor is a Democrat, Ben Cardin of Maryland.

The Russian government has voiced strong objections to the bill and suggested that there would be retaliatory measures if it becomes law.

#### Relations resilient and no war

Weitz, 11 --- senior fellow at the Hudson Institute and a World Politics Review senior editor (9/27/2011, Richard, “Global Insights: Putin not a Game-Changer for U.S.-Russia Ties,” http://www.scribd.com/doc/66579517/Global-Insights-Putin-not-a-Game-Changer-for-U-S-Russia-Ties)

Fifth, there will inevitably be areas of conflict between Russia and the United States regardless of who is in the Kremlin. Putin and his entourage can never be happy with having NATO be Europe's most powerful security institution, since Moscow is not a member and cannot become one. Similarly, the Russians will always object to NATO's missile defense efforts since they can neither match them nor join them in any meaningful way. In the case of Iran, Russian officials genuinely perceive less of a threat from Tehran than do most Americans, and Russia has more to lose from a cessation of economic ties with Iran -- as well as from an Iranian-Western reconciliation.

On the other hand, these conflicts can be managed, since they will likely remain limited and compartmentalized. Russia and the West do not have fundamentally conflicting vital interests of the kind countries would go to war over. And as the Cold War demonstrated, nuclear weapons are a great pacifier under such conditions.

Another novel development is that Russia is much more integrated into the international economy and global society than the Soviet Union was, and Putin's popularity depends heavily on his economic track record. Beyond that, there are objective criteria, such as the smaller size of the Russian population and economy as well as the difficulty of controlling modern means of social communication, that will constrain whoever is in charge of Russia.

#### Impact is inevitable --- missile defense and disagreements on Libya and Syria

TASS, 2/15 (ITAR-TASS World Service, 2/15/2012, “RF-US reset runs its course, expert says,” Factiva)

MOSCOW, February 15 (Itar-Tass) — The Russian-U.S. reset has run its course, said Sergei Rogov, director of the Institute of the USA and Canadian Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences.

“I don’t think that the reset reached a deadlock. This was an attempt to normalise Russian-U.S. relations that turned out to be on the verge of a new ‘Cold War’. In essence, the normal dialogue between Moscow and Washington has been suspended,” Rogov said on Wednesday.

“The signing and ratification of the New START Treaty, the agreement on nuclear cooperation and the completion of the WTO accession talks became a big achievement. Russian-U.S. trade reached a pre-crisis level,” the expert stressed.

In his view, the reset was successful. At the same time, Rogoz said, “It has run its course because new issues have arisen in all fields of Russian-U.S. relations.”

“Serious disagreements have emerged on missile defence and the Jackson-Vanik amendment. These issues are irritating symbol n relations between Russia and the United States. There are also divergences on regional problems, for example on Libya and Syria,” the expert said.

#### Won’t pass ---

#### A. Not until after election

Herspring, 3/23 --- University Distinguished Professor at K State (Dale, Frolov Vladimir, 3/23/2012, Russia Profile, “Russia Profile Weekly Experts Panel: Will Russia Graduate From the Jackson-Vanik Amendment?” Factiva)

Will Russia finally be graduated from the Jackson-Vanik Amendment imposed in 1974 on the now non-existent country? Will the Obama administration win this battle in Congress during the U.S. presidential campaign? Will the congressional opposition succeed in imposing new trade restrictions on Russia linked to the human rights situation? What will this mean for the U.S.-Russian “reset?”

Dale Herspring, University Distinguished Professor, Kansas State University, KS

Only if Putin goes privately to Obama and makes a very big deal of it. Even then, I think it will be delayed. Obama doesn't oppose ending it. However, we are now in a political “funny season.” Obama does not want to do anything to give voters another reason not to vote for him – and I think if he did, the McCains on the hill would beat him over the head with it.

If he wins in November, I think it would make sense to have the Russians raise it (privately, without publicity). But in the meantime, I think it is a non-starter until after the election.

#### B. Russia won’t make concessions

Korves, 3/22 --- economic policy analyst with Truth About Trade and Technology (Ross, 3/22/2012, “Russia and Permanent Normal Trade Relations,” http://www.truthabouttrade.org/2012/03/22/russia-and-permanent-normal-trade-relations/)

Based on the debate to date, Congress probably won’t approve PNTR before Russia joins the WTO this summer. Opponents may be able to extract some additional commitments from the Obama Administration to increase monitoring of conditions, but the Russian government is not likely to make concessions. Terminating the application of the Jackson-Vanik amendment and approving PNTR should be done sooner rather than later and allow freer trade to work to change how Russia relates to the rest of the world. Then the U.S., the EU, Japan and the other major trading countries should hold Russia accountable to its accession agreement.

#### **Obama push won’t solve**

Jatras, 3/23 --- Principal, Squire Sanders Public Advocacy, Washington, DC (3/23/2012, James George, Vladimir Frolov, 3/23/2012, Russia Profile, “Russia Profile Weekly Experts Panel: Will Russia Graduate From the Jackson-Vanik Amendment?” Factiva)

The Obama Administration, like the Bush and Clinton administrations before it, pays lip service to getting rid of Jackson-Vanik – but with one important procedural twist. Like its predecessors, the Obama White House insists that Congress must pass legislation “graduating” Russia, which in the misguided anti-Russia and anti-Putin climate that dominates Congress – not to mention demagogy in an election year – has virtually guaranteed that even a few anti-Russian senators or congressmen (and sadly, there are more than a few) can continue to block it.

### --- 1ar Will Only Pass If Linked to Anti Russia Legislation

#### Will be linked to anti-Russia legislation

Kaminski, 6/13 (Matthew, 6/13/2012, The Wall Street Journal Online, “A Russian Rights Deal,” Factiva, JMP)

Senate leaders unveiled an agreement on Tuesday to revoke Cold War-era restrictions on trade with Russia and adopt new human rights legislation despised by the Kremlin.

Democratic Sen. Max Baucus, who chairs the Finance Committee, introduced a bill to establish permanent normal trade relations (PNTR) with Russia and repeal the 1974 Jackson-Vanik amendment, which was originally meant to pressure the Kremlin to treat Soviet Jews better. Ahead of Russia's accession this summer to the World Trade Organization, U.S. companies will be disadvantaged on the Russian market without PNTR.

But the Obama administration will have to swallow new human rights legislation to replace Jackson-Vanik. In a letter, Sen. Baucus on Tuesday promised to include the so-called Magnitsky Act in the PNTR bill. Magnitsky sets out sanctions, including visa bans and asset freezes, for Russian officials implicated in human rights abuses. Sen. Ben Cardin, a Maryland Democrat, introduced the bill in 2010 after the death in police custody of Russian lawyer and whistle blower Sergei Magnitsky the previous year.

Senators John McCain (R) and Joe Lieberman (I) made their support for PNTR contingent on passage of Magnitsky. The White House had leaned on Democratic senators to stop or water down the legislation. President Obama has invested a lot of time and capital in the "reset" of relations with Russia, which has threatened to retaliate for Magnitsky. A new draft of the bill circulated by Sen. Cardin's staff last week weakened some provisions, angering its Republican supporters.

Addressed to Senators McCain, Cardin, Lieberman and Republican Roger Wicker, the Baucus letter promises that the final Magnitsky text will have GOP support. They intend to restore the original, stronger language of Magnitsky. In return, Sen. McCain agreed to co-sponsor the repeal of Jackson-Vanik. His support can help bring along Republicans skeptical of PNTR. "As we take steps to liberalize U.S. trade with Russia, as we should, we must also maintain our long-standing support for human rights and the fight against corruption in Russia," Sen. McCain said.

The deal avoids Democratic Sen. John Kerry's Foreign Relations Committee, which had refused to move on the Magnitsky bill. The administration on Tuesday signaled its grudging acceptance by welcoming the introduction of the PNTR legislation.

Sen. Baucus said he hopes to get his bill a Senate floor vote before the August recess. The House last week moved its version of Magnitsky out of the Foreign Affairs Committee without PNTR included. A final package will likely have to be hashed out in House-Senate conference.

#### Will be net worse than Jackson-Vanik

Jatras, 3/23 --- Principal, Squire Sanders Public Advocacy, Washington, DC (3/23/2012, James George, Vladimir Frolov, 3/23/2012, Russia Profile, “Russia Profile Weekly Experts Panel: Will Russia Graduate From the Jackson-Vanik Amendment?” Factiva)

Until very recently, I would have said the chances of getting a Jackson-Vanik “graduation” bill for Russia through Congress this year were next to zero. The deck still is stacked against it, but the possibility exists – if it is accompanied by anti-Russian measures even more insulting than continued Jackson-Vanik application.

#### Republicans will demand other anti-Russia measures that trigger retaliation

Barkley, 6/12 (Tom, Dow Jones International News, 6/12/2012, “3rd UPDATE: Senators Introduce Bill to Lift Russian Trade Limits,” Factiva, JMP)

Other, however, argue that adding human rights or other unrelated provisions to the trade bill could backfire, given Russian threats of retaliation against imposing any new human rights measures.

"We urge members to refrain from supporting any legislation that would needlessly complicate relations with Russia or jeopardize the significant benefits of Russia's WTO accession," said Bill Reinsch, president of the National Foreign Trade Council, which represents multinationals.

The House and Senate appear to be taking different paths, with Ways and Means Committee Chairman Dave Camp (R., Mich.) supporting a clean trade bill. A separate House committee has already passed the so-called "Magnitsky" bill, and Camp remains open to moving the two bills in parallel, said spokeswoman Sarah Swinehart.

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 Magnitsky bill.

Sen. John McCain (R, Ariz.), who unveiled the legislation along with Mr. Baucus, Foreign Relations Committee Chairman John Kerry (D, Mass.) and Sen. John Thune (R, S.D.), the trade bill must be accompanied by the human-rights legislation.

But a fight is brewing even in the Senate Finance Committee, where eight Republicans have demanded that the legislation go beyond human rights to address concerns over Russian support for Syria and other foreign-policy issues.

""We believe it will be necessary to satisfactorily address these and other issues if Congress is to successfully navigate a path toward granting [permanent, normal trade relations] to Russia," said the letter, signed by Orrin Hatch (R., Utah), the top Republican on the committee, and seven other committee members.

To establish permanent, normal trade relations with Russia, Congress has to repeal Jackson-Vanik, a 1974 measure that prevents the U.S. from granting most-favored-nation status to countries that restrict emigration.

Those restrictions have been waived on a yearly basis, but Russian officials have said they must be repealed for the U.S. to receive the same benefits as other countries once it joins the WTO.

Russian officials have also warned of retaliation if any legislation imposes new human-rights measures in place of Jackson-Vanik.

#### **Magnitsky will be critical for passage of Jackson-Vanik**

Inside U.S. Trade, 6/15 (“CONGRESS PUSHES TO ADVANCE RUSSIA MFN BILL, AIMING FOR AUGUST PASSAGE,” 6/15/2012, Factiva, JMP)

Sen. John Thune (R-SD), who is ranking member on the Senate Finance trade subcommittee, this week said that joining the MFN bill with the Magnitsky legislation would be essential for securing widespread support.

He was among the Republicans who demanded a second Russia hearing, but not among those that have been considering amendments other than the Magnitsky bill. He said with Baucus having scheduled the hearing, the legislation can move relatively quickly.

### --- 1ar Won’t Pass

#### **Won’t pass until after election**

Belaeff, 3/23 --- Global Society Institute, San Francisco (3/23/2012, Vladimir, Vladimir Frolov, 3/23/2012, Russia Profile, “Russia Profile Weekly Experts Panel: Will Russia Graduate From the Jackson-Vanik Amendment?” Factiva)

In the current election year, Obama’s opponents in Congress may not be interested to give him a political victory in this area, especially considering the strong anti-Russian convictions of some leading members of Congress. Some horse-trading is possible, but then the question arises: what is the White House prepared to concede to the opposition for the removal of legislation that can be waived by the president in any case?

Of course, the Kremlin may make concessions of its own in order to earn U.S. Congressional removal of the JVA, but it is not clear what level of Russian compliance will be sufficient to satisfy the Kremlin’s opponents on Capitol Hill.

Therefore, it is highly probable that Obama’s JVA initiative will languish until after the November 2012 elections and (depending on who becomes the president-elect) may be undertaken after the inauguration in January 2013 – but by then the domestic political need to eliminate the JVA will be weaker. And the JVA can be retained in its current state, as a mostly psychological weapon against the Kremlin, even though the substance of this law is now mostly obsolete.

The current economic impact of the JVA is not high, the domestic price to the White House for congressional approval may be too high, and possible reinstallation of legislation after it has been abrogated is more difficult than retaining it in suspended animation. These factors will influence the fate of the present initiative.

#### Won’t pass until after the election

RIA Novosti, 3/28 (“Anti-Russian Amendment Now Headache for U.S.,” 3/28/2012, Factiva)

MOSCOW, March 28 (RIA Novosti, Alexey Eremenko) - Economic sanctions against Russia imposed by the United States in 1974 could backfire on America this year, but are likely to stay in place because of persistent political and ideological grudges between the two Cold War rivals, analysts said.

The Jackson-Vanik amendment was defunct in practice over the last two decades, but things got tricky after Russia completed its 18-year-long path to the World Trade Organization (WTO) last year, with more than a little help from the White House.

WTO rules ban formal trade restrictions such as the Jackson-Vanik amendment, which means the United States could face economic sanctions from Moscow and pressure from WTO once Russia completes the treaty's ratification, expected this summer.

Elections First

"Russia has no practical interest in canceling the Jackson-Vanik amendment," said Konstantin Kosachyov, a State Duma lawmaker with United Russia who is deputy head of the international affairs committee at the lower chamber.

"Common sense predicts it will be canceled this summer. But it may become a hostage of the election campaign in the United States," Kosachyov said.

The administration of U.S. President Barack Obama is making a push to have Congress formally repeal the Jackson-Vanik amendment in regard to Russia, but this is unlikely to happen before the U.S. presidential elections in November, according to Russian and American pundits contacted by RIA Novosti.

Kosachyov's prediction was echoed by Angela Stent of Georgetown University and Valery Garbuzov of the Russian Institute of the United States and Canada, both of whom said the Jackson-Vanik is expected to stay in place until the U.S. presidential elections.

#### Won’t pass until after election and economic concerns will determine the vote

Gasyuk, 3/16 --- Washington, D.C. correspondent for Rossiyskaya Gazeta (3/16/2012, “Trade hearings renew debates on Russia,” http://rbth.ru/articles/2012/03/16/jackson-vanik\_trade\_hearings\_renew\_debates\_on\_russia\_15086.html)

On Capitol Hill yesterday, the Senate listened to animated testimony on whether to lift an outdated Jackson-Vanik amendment — and if so, how.

The United States Senate Finance Committee began hearings Thursday on abolishing controversial trade restrictions against Russia under the Soviet-era Jackson-Vanik amendment. American lawmakers will debate the end of trade practices, which have long prevented granting Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) status to Moscow.

It is still unclear clear whether the Obama administration will convince Congress to lift the decades-old law and if so on what terms.

The Jackson-Vanik amendment was adopted in 1974, when it linked restrictions on trade with the right of Jews to emigrate from the Soviet Union. That issue has been dead since the collapse of the U.S.S.R., if not before. Some lawmakers and analysts believe lifting the amendment could be a boon for U.S.-Russia trade.

Senate Finance Committee Chairman Max Baucus (D-Mont.), said that lifting the provision could double U.S. exports to Russia. And Anders Aslund, a senior fellow at the Peterson Institute, said that that exports could increase to $20 billion annually in five years.

Edward Verona, the president and CEO of the U.S.-Russia Business Council, which supports repeal, said about 50,000 U.S. jobs depend on trade with Russia and those numbers could be significantly boosted by more open trade.

However if the Jackson-Vanik amendment is still on the books by the time Russia officially joins the World Trade Organization this summer, U.S. companies will find themselves at a disadvantage in the Russian market. Unlike competitors from other countries, they will not be protected by WTO rules and Moscow could choose to retaliate against American companies with tariffs and other barriers.

The American business community with interests in Russia has been actively lobbying the U.S. Congress for months; the administration has also become animated in its support of lifting the restrictions. “It really needs to happen before Russia joins WTO otherwise American companies will be penalized,” Philip Gordon, an assistant secretary of state, told RBTH on the first day of senate hearings.

Last week, during a meeting with U.S. business leaders, President Barack Obama emphasized that granting PNTR to Russia is necessary for American companies to benefit from Russia's entry into the WTO.

A similar message was carried to Capitol Hill senior officials from Secretary of State Hillary Clinton to U.S. Trade Representative Ron Kirk.

In Congress, however, there is a sense that the United States shouldn’t repeat mistakes it made with China, according to Jeffrey Mankoff of the Washington, D.C.-based Council on Foreign Relations, a private think tank. “Beijing’s entry to the WTO in the early 2000s didn’t result in the resolution of several important trade issues such as intellectual property rights, piracy, tariff policy and human rights concerns,” he said. “After graduating China from Jackson-Vanik, some in Congress thought America had lost effective leverage over Beijing.”

Sharp differences between Moscow and Washington on the situation in Syria and U.S. concerns about human rights in Russia do not encourage U.S. lawmakers to “make concessions to Russia,” he added.

A recent report prepared by the Washington, D.C.-based Bipartisan Policy Center urges Congress “to enact legislation that graduates Russia from Jackson-Vanik,” but also argues for the promotion of human rights and civil society in the country.

Some Republican and Democratic lawmakers also want to link the trade issue issues of human rights and corruption in Russia to the passage of the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2011, named for the anti-corruption lawyer who died in a Russian prison more than two years ago.

The Magnitsky Bill is intended to put dozens of Russian officials along with their relatives on a U.S. visa ban list as well as to freeze their assets in American banks. If it is adopted it will inflame U.S.-Russia relations, and invite retaliation from Moscow. David Kramer, executive president of the democracy and human rights watchdog Freedom House, who will be testifying on Jackson-Vanik on Capitol Hill, told RBTH that the “only way to lift Jackson-Vanik is to link it to passage of Magnitsky.”

The Obama administration has stated that it doesn’t want the Magnitsky bill to pass; separately, it has already put several Russians on a non-public visa blacklist.

Presidential politics could also delay resolution of the issue. Mankoff said Republicans have no incentive to repeal Jackson-Vanik now. “But at the end of the day I think economic sense will prevail and perhaps sometime after the November elections PNTR [permanent normal trade relations] will be provided to Russia,” he said.

### --- 1ar Relations Now

#### Cooperation being institutionalized now

Needham, 3/27 (Vicki, 3/27/2012, “US, Russia leaders urge Congress to provide path to open trade,” <http://thehill.com/blogs/on-the-money/1005-trade/218549-us-russia-leaders-urge-congress-to-provide-path-to-open-trade>)

Russia will join the World Trade Organization this summer regardless of whether Congress decides to grant PNTR and repeal Jackson-Vanik, which was used to urge Communist nations to improve human rights and emigration policies.

"Russia's ascension into the WTO can open up trade and commerce between our two countries that can create jobs and economic growth for both Russians and Americans," Obama said.

"And as Dmitry mentioned, we think it's going to be very important for us to address Jackson-Vanik so that American businesses can fully take advantage of an open and liberalized Russian market," he said.

"On the international front, we agreed that, as two of the world’s leading powers, it’s absolutely critical that we communicate effectively and coordinate effectively in responding to a wide range of situations that threaten world peace and security," he said.

A bilateral presidential commission headed Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton will be working actively around a number of the trade and commercial issues, not only with respect to WTO but "how we can more vigorously expand the kind of investment and the kind of cooperation on the economic front that can benefit both Russia and the United States," Obama said.

As part of the accession process Russia is required to lower tariffs, increase market access for foreign businesses and improve protections for intellectual property, while the U.S. doesn't need to make any changes.

Senate Finance Chairman Max Baucus (D-Mont.) has said his panel will probably wait until the summer to move forward.

### --- 1ar Relations Decline Inevitable

#### Relations decline inevitable --- missile defense, Syria and Iran

Kramer, 3/21 --- President of Freedom House (3/21/2012, David, “House Foreign Affairs Committee Hearing - "Russia 2012: Increased Repression, Rampant Corruption, Assisting Rogue Regimes." Factiva)

The chemistry that developed between Obama and Medvedev will not be replicated with Putin, and with Obama focused on his own reelection, The U.S-Russian relationship is unlikely to deliver much this year. With disagreements over missile defense and Syria, and possibly Iran, it would be a mistake to downplay our differences over human rights out of a false sense of hope that doing so might win Russia over on Syria, for example. Instead, the United States should stand unequivocally for democratic processes, rule of law, and respect for human rights. A U.S. policy - publicly and privately - that is consistent with American values is one that simultaneously supports democratic accountability in Russia. When Russian officials behave in blatantly undemocratic ways, as they did on December 4 and March 4 and in the lead-ups to both elections, they should not get a pass from the White House because of fear that criticism of their actions might upset the reset.

#### And, Obama’s funding of Russian NGOs

Lozansky, 3/23 --- President, American University in Moscow and Professor of World Politics at Moscow State University (3/23/2012, Edward, Vladimir Frolov, 3/23/2012, Russia Profile, “Russia Profile Weekly Experts Panel: Will Russia Graduate From the Jackson-Vanik Amendment?” Factiva)

Realistically speaking, the amendment is sure to be lifted, and sooner rather than later. But when Congress eventually does what it is supposed to have done 20 years ago, after the collapse of communism and the Soviet Union, this will most likely be hyped as a great big gift to Russia, very much like Minuit’s offer of $24 to the Indians.

That’s not the end of the story, though. To show Congress that he was not too soft on Putin, Obama declared the establishment of a new $50 million fund to support “Russian non-governmental organizations that are committed to a more pluralistic and open society.”

In view of Russia’s concern over American meddling in its internal affairs, it is hard to imagine a more dubious move. In fact, even some potential Russian grant recipients have been soured by this idea. Surely, in these difficult economic times, U.S. taxpayers might certainly find better ways to spend these “democracy promotion funds” on the domestic front – just ask any resident of the towns and counties across America that are now close to bankruptcy.

#### Magnitsky legislation won’t kill coop on other issues and if it does then the relationship isn’t sustainable

Kramer, 3/21 --- President of Freedom House (3/21/2012, David, “House Foreign Affairs Committee Hearing - "Russia 2012: Increased Repression, Rampant Corruption, Assisting Rogue Regimes." Factiva)

The other concern raised by Russian officials and apparently shared by some in the U.S. is that passage of the Magnitsky legislation would sink the reset policy and end cooperation on issues like Iran, North Korea, and Afghanistan. If that's the case, then the reset is extremely shallow and on its last legs, its successes grossly oversold. Russia presumably is cooperating with us on these strategic challenges because it's in their interests to do so, not because they're being nice to us and doing us favors. If they stop this cooperation because of the Magnitsky bill, then we really need to reexamine the relationship and the sustainability of the bilateral relationship. Moreover, the U.S. and Europeans should firmly push back against such threats and remind Russian officials that if they ended human rights abuses and held accountable those who committed them, such legislation wouldn't be necessary at all. If Russia wants to be treated like a partner, then it needs to abide by the rules and norms required of a member of the Council of Europe and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

#### Relations decline inevitable --- missile defense

Speedie, 1/19 --- Senior Fellow at the Carnegie Council (David C. Speedie, Russia Bulletin, Issue 1, 1/19/2012, [http://www.carnegiecouncil.org/resources/russia\_bulletin/00001/:pf\_printable](http://www.carnegiecouncil.org/resources/russia_bulletin/00001/%3Apf_printable))

Divisions that Keep on Dividing: Missile Defense

"Reset" ambitions notwithstanding, 2011 was not a good year for U.S.-Russia relations. As recently as December 30, 2011, the influential Nezavisimaya Gazeta offered this bleak summary in an editorial piece:

"The whole year saw a deterioration of our relations with the West as a whole and with the United States in particular. The problem of missile defenses—a potentially ruinous one for the economy—so far has no 'road maps' to help the opponents to move toward one another."1

The prioritizing of missile defense (MD) as the cause that divides, and the choice of the term "opponent" are significant. The mutual intransigence on MD is clear, and compromise unlikely. At the NATO-Russia meeting in Brussels in early December the rhetoric was stark: Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov reiterated the Russian threat to deploy missiles in Kaliningrad in retaliation for a proposed, U.S.-urged NATO MD shield in Europe or Turkey that would threaten Russia; NATO Secretary-General Anders Fogh Rasmussen scoffed at the Russian threat as a "waste of valuable money against an artificial enemy."2

While the S-G's concern for Russia's economic wellbeing may be sincere, so to are Russia's fundamental concerns as to the value of the entire NATO-Russia dialogue: "We would like our intellectual abilities and our military expertise, which also exists, to be treated with respect when we are called for cooperation," said Lavrov in Brussels.3 The key word here is "cooperation:" for Russia, the NATO-Russia process is increasingly seen as a fig leaf for NATO's intent to move ahead with its MD agenda. In this regard, it is interesting to compare Lavrov's articulation of the Russian position with a statement by former Soviet president Mikhail Gorbachev—no friend of the current administration in Moscow that Lavrov represents:

"During the period following the breakup of the Soviet Union, the United States and the European Union kept relations with Russia in a state of uncertainty. On the one hand, there were numerous declarations of cooperation, even strategic partnership. On the other hand, post-Soviet Russia was not given a hand in resolving key problems, and obstacles were put in the way of its integration into the European and global economy. It seems that while being given occasional pats on the back, Russia is still being treated as an outsider, not as a serious and constructive force in world affairs."4 [My emphasis]

From Russia's standpoint, what is to be made of the avowal of the new ambassador to Moscow (and the aforementioned architect of "reset") Michael McFaul, in his swearing in ceremony on January 11?

"We do not intend to sign any legally binding agreements that could in any way limit our missile defense system."5

Pretty categorical—as was the announcement on January 4 by Russia's Strategic Rocket Forces (RSVN) that some dozen intercontinental ballistic missile test launches are planned for this year, the majority of which are "under experimental programs to test new missiles and improve existing ones with a view to piercing missile defense systems."6

Back to the Cold War future? The point is that if the United States and NATO are sincere in their stated intent to engage Russia in a serious discussion of missile defenses (which would include Putin's on-the-table offer of exploration of a joint system) the dialogue must go beyond just inviting Russia to meetings—as Rasmussen proposed for the upcoming NATO session in Chicago. From Russia's point of view (if one may be allowed a mixed metaphor) this would be kicking the can a little further down a dead-end street.

Pifer, 3/21 --- director of the Brookings Arms Control Initiative and former ambassador to Ukraine (3/21/2012, Steve, “The Future Course of the U.S.-Russia Relationship,” 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.

The democracy and human rights situation within Russia remains difficult and troubling. The problems are epitomized by the flaws in the recent parliamentary and presidential elections, the appalling treatment of Sergey Magnitsky and others, and the unresolved murders of journalists such as Anna Politkovskaya.