### Impact

#### Prefer our more qualified evidence - high risk of cyberattacks-in the SHORT TERM-means fastest path to extinction

**Habiger**, 2/1/**10** (Eugue – Retired Air Force General, Cyberwarfare and Cyberterrorism, The Cyber Security Institute, p. 11-19)

However, there are reasons to believe that what is going on now amounts to a fundamental shift as opposed to business as usual. Today’s network exploitation or information operation trespasses possess a number of characteristics that suggest that the line between espionage and conflict has been, or is close to being, crossed. (What that suggests for the proper response is a different matter.) First, the number of cyberattacks we are facing is **growing significantly**. Andrew Palowitch, a former CIA official now consulting with the US Strategic Command (STRATCOM), which oversees the Defense Department’s Joint Task Force‐Global Network Operations, recently told a meeting of experts that the Defense Department has experienced **almost 80,000 computer attacks**, and some number of these assaults have actually “reduced” the military’s “**operational capabilities**.”20 Second, the nature of these attacks is starting to shift from penetration attempts aimed at gathering intelligence (cyber spying) **to offensive efforts** aimed at taking down systems (cyberattacks). Palowitch put this in stark terms last November, “We are currently in a cyberwar and war is going on today.”21 Third, these recent attacks need to be taken in a broader strategic context. Both Russia and China have stepped up their offensive efforts and taken a **much more aggressive cyberwarfare posture**. The Chinese have developed an openly discussed cyberwar strategy aimed at achieving electronic dominance over the U.S. and its allies by 2050. In 2007 the Department of Defense reported that for the first time China has developed **first strike viruses**, marking a **major shift** from prior investments in defensive measures.22 And in the intervening period China has launched a series of offensive cyber operations against U.S. government and private sector networks and infrastructure. In 2007, Gen. James Cartwright, the former head of STRATCOM and now the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, told the US‐China Economic and Security Review Commission that China’s ability to launch “denial of service” attacks to overwhelm an IT system is of particular concern. 23 Russia also has already begun to wage offensive cyberwar. At the outset of the recent hostilities with Georgia, Russian assets launched a series of cyberattacks against the Georgian government and its critical infrastructure systems, including media, banking and transportation sites.24 In 2007, cyberattacks that many experts attribute, directly or indirectly, to Russia shut down the Estonia government’s IT systems. Fourth, the current geopolitical context must also be factored into any effort to gauge the degree of threat of cyberwar. The start of the new Obama Administration has begun to help reduce tensions between the United States and other nations. And, the new administration has taken initial steps to improve bilateral relations specifically with both China and Russia. However, it must be said that over the last few years the posture of both the Chinese and Russian governments toward America has clearly become **more assertive, and** at times even **aggressive**. Some commentators have talked about the prospects of a cyber Pearl Harbor, and the pattern of Chinese and Russian behavior to date **gives reason for concern** along these lines: both nations have offensive cyberwarfare strategies in place; both nations have taken the cyber equivalent of building up their forces; both nations now regularly probe our cyber defenses looking for gaps to be exploited; both nations have begun taking actions that cross the line from cyberespionage to cyberaggression; and, our bilateral relations with both nations are increasingly **fractious and complicated by** areas of marked, direct **competition**. Clearly, there a sharp differences between current U.S. relations with these two nations and relations between the US and Japan just prior to World War II. However, from a strategic defense perspective, there are enough warning signs to warrant preparation. In addition to the threat of cyberwar, the limited resources required to carry out even a large scale cyberattack also makes **likely the potential for a significant cyberterror attack** against the United States. However, the lack of a long list of specific incidences of cyberterrorism should provide no comfort. There is **strong evidence** to suggest that al Qaeda has the ability to conduct cyberterror attacks against the United States and its allies. Al Qaeda and other terrorist organizations are extremely active in cyberspace, using these technologies to communicate among themselves and others, carry out logistics, recruit members, and wage information warfare. For example, al Qaeda leaders used email to communicate with the 9‐11 terrorists and the 9‐11 terrorists used the Internet to make travel plans and book flights. Osama bin Laden and other al Qaeda members routinely post videos and other messages to online sites to communicate. Moreover, there is evidence of efforts that al Qaeda and other terrorist organizations are **actively developing cyberterrorism capabilities** and seeking to carry out cyberterrorist attacks. For example, the Washington Post has reported that “U.S. investigators have found evidence in the logs that mark a browser's path through the Internet that al Qaeda operators spent time on sites that offer software and programming instructions for the digital switches that run power, water, transport and communications grids. In some interrogations . . . al Qaeda prisoners have described intentions, in general terms, to use those tools.”25 Similarly, a 2002 CIA report on the cyberterror threat to a member of the Senate stated that al Qaeda and Hezbollah have become "more adept at using the internet and computer technologies.”26 The FBI has issued bulletins stating that, “U. S. law enforcement and intelligence agencies have received indications that Al Qaeda members have sought information on Supervisory Control And Data Acquisition (SCADA) systems available on multiple SCADA‐related web sites.”27 In addition a number of jihadist websites, such as 7hj.7hj.com, teach computer attack and hacking skills in the service of Islam.28 While al Qaeda may lack the cyber‐attack capability of nations like Russia and China, there is every reason to believe its operatives, and those of its ilk, are as capable as the cyber criminals and hackers who routinely effect great harm on the world’s digital infrastructure generally and American assets specifically. In fact, perhaps, the most troubling indication of the level of the cyberterrorist threat is the countless, serious non‐terrorist cyberattacks routinely carried out by criminals, hackers, disgruntled insiders, crime syndicates and the like. If run‐of‐the‐mill criminals and hackers can threaten powergrids, hack vital military networks, steal vast sums of money, take down a city’s of traffic lights, compromise the Federal Aviation Administration’s air traffic control systems, among other attacks, it is overwhelmingly likely that terrorists can carry out similar, if not more malicious attacks. Moreover, even if the world’s terrorists are unable to breed these skills, they can certainly buy them. There are untold numbers of cybermercenaries around the world—sophisticated hackers with advanced training who would be willing to offer their services for the right price. Finally, given the nature of our understanding of cyber threats, there is always the possibility that we have already been the victim or a cyberterrorist attack, or such an attack has already been set but not yet effectuated, and we don’t know it yet. Instead, a well‐designed cyberattack has the capacity **cause widespread chaos**, sow societal unrest, undermine national governments, spread paralyzing fear and anxiety, and create a state of utter turmoil, all without taking a single life. A sophisticated cyberattack could throw a nation’s banking and finance system into chaos **causing markets to crash**, prompting runs on banks, **degrading confidence in markets**, perhaps even putting the nation’s currency in play and making the government look helpless and hapless. In today’s difficult economy, imagine how Americans would react if vast sums of money were taken from their accounts and their supporting financial records were destroyed. A truly nefarious cyberattacker could carry out an attack in such a way (akin to Robin Hood) as to engender populist support and deepen rifts within our society, thereby making efforts to restore the system all the more difficult. A modestly advanced enemy could use a cyberattack to shut down (if not physically damage) one or more regional power grids. An entire region could be cast into total darkness, power‐dependent systems could be shutdown. An attack on one or more regional power grids could also cause **cascading effects that could jeopardize our entire national grid**. When word leaks that the blackout was caused by a cyberattack, the specter of a foreign enemy capable of sending the entire nation into darkness would only **increase the fear, turmoil and unrest**. While the finance and energy sectors are considered prime targets for a cyberattack, an attack on any of the 17 delineated critical infrastructure sectors could have a major impact on the United States. For example, our healthcare system is already technologically driven and the Obama Administration’s e‐health efforts will only increase that dependency. A cyberattack on the U.S. e‐health infrastructure could send our healthcare system into chaos and put countless of lives at risk. Imagine if emergency room physicians and surgeons were suddenly no longer able to access vital patient information. A cyberattack on our nation’s water systems could likewise cause widespread disruption. An attack on the control systems for one or more dams could put entire communities at risk of being inundated, and could **create ripple effects across the water, agriculture, and energy sectors**. Similar water control system attacks could be used to at least temporarily **deny water to** otherwise **arid regions**, impacting everything from the quality of life in these areas to agriculture. In 2007, the U.S. Cyber Consequences Unit determined that the destruction from a single wave of cyberattacks on critical infrastructures could exceed $700 billion, which would be the rough equivalent of 50 Katrina‐esque hurricanes hitting the United States all at the same time.29 Similarly, one IT security source has estimated that the impact of a single day cyberwar attack that focused on and disrupted U.S. credit and debit card transactions would be approximately $35 billion.30 Another way to gauge the potential for harm is in comparison to other similar noncyberattack infrastructure failures. For example, the August 2003 regional power grid blackout is estimated to have cost the U.S. economy up to $10 billion, or roughly .1 percent of the nation’s GDP. 31 That said, a cyberattack of the exact same magnitude would most certainly have a much larger impact. The origin of the 2003 blackout was almost immediately disclosed as an atypical system failure having nothing to do with terrorism. This made the event both less threatening and likely a single time occurrence. Had it been disclosed that the event was the result of an attack that could readily be repeated the impacts would likely have grown substantially, if not exponentially. Additionally, a cyberattack could also be used to **disrupt our nation’s defenses or distract our** national **leaders** in advance of a more traditional conventional or strategic attack. Many military leaders actually believe that such a disruptive cyber pre‐offensive is the most effective use of offensive cyber capabilities. This is, in fact, the way Russia utilized cyberattackers—whether government assets, governmentdirected/ coordinated assets, or allied cyber irregulars—in advance of the invasion of Georgia. Widespread distributed denial of service (DDOS) attacks were launched on the Georgian governments IT systems. Roughly a day later Russian armor rolled into Georgian territory. The cyberattacks were used to prepare the battlefield; they denied the Georgian government a critical communications tool isolating it from its citizens and degrading its command and control capabilities precisely at the time of attack. In this way, these attacks were the functional equivalent of conventional air and/or missile strikes on a nation’s communications infrastructure.32 One interesting element of the Georgian cyberattacks has been generally overlooked: On July 20th, weeks before the August cyberattack, the website of Georgian President Mikheil Saakashvili was overwhelmed by a more narrowly focused, but technologically similar DDOS attack.33 This should be particularly chilling to American national security experts as our systems undergo the same sorts of focused, probing attacks on a constant basis. The ability of an enemy to use a cyberattack to counter our offensive capabilities or **soften our defenses for a wider offensive** against the United States is **much more than mere speculation**. In fact, in Iraq it is already happening. Iraq insurgents are now using off‐the‐shelf software (costing just $26) to hack U.S. drones (costing $4.5 million each), allowing them to intercept the video feed from these drones.34 By hacking these drones the insurgents have succeeded in greatly reducing **one of our most valuable sources of real‐time intelligence** and situational awareness. If our enemies in Iraq are capable of such an effective cyberattack against one of our more sophisticated systems, consider what a more technologically advanced enemy could do. At the strategic level, in 2008, as the United States Central Command was leading wars in both Iraq and Afghanistan, a cyber intruder compromised the security of the Command and sat within its IT systems, monitoring everything the Command was doing. 35 This time the attacker simply gathered vast amounts of intelligence. However, it is clear that the attacker could have used this access to wage cyberwar—**altering information, disrupting the flow of information, destroying information, taking down systems**—against the United States forces already at war. Similarly, during 2003 as the United States prepared for and began the War in Iraq, the IT networks of the Department of Defense were hacked 294 times.36 By August of 2004, with America at war, these ongoing attacks compelled then‐Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz to write in a memo that, "Recent exploits have **reduced operational capabilities on our networks**."37 This wasn’t the first time that our national security IT infrastructure was penetrated immediately in advance of a U.S. military option.38 In February of 1998 the Solar Sunrise attacks systematically compromised a series of Department of Defense networks. What is often overlooked is that these attacks occurred during the ramp up period ahead of potential military action against Iraq. The attackers were able to obtain vast amounts of sensitive information—information that would have certainly been of value to an enemy’s military leaders. There is no way to prove that these actions were purposefully launched with the specific intent to distract American military assets or degrade our capabilities. However, such ambiguities—the inability to specifically attribute actions and motives to actors—are the very nature of cyberspace. Perhaps, these repeated patterns of behavior were mere coincidence, or perhaps they weren’t. The potential that an enemy might use a cyberattack to soften physical defenses, increase the gravity of harms from kinetic attacks, or both, significantly increases the potential harms from a cyberattack. Consider the gravity of the threat and risk if an enemy, rightly or wrongly, believed that it could use a cyberattack to degrade our strategic weapons capabilities. Such an enemy might be convinced that **it could win a war**—conventional or **even nuclear**—against the United States. The effect of this would be to **undermine our deterrence**‐based defenses, making us **significantly more at risk of a major war**.

#### CIR is solves economy

Hinojosa-Ojeda 12 Founding Director of the North American Integration and Development Center at UCLA Raúl Hinojosa-Ojeda, The Economic Benefits of Comprehensive Immigration Reform Cato Journal, Vol. 32, No. 1 Winter 2012

The historical experience of legalization under the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act indicates that comprehensive immigration reform **would raise wages, increase consumption, create jobs, and generate additional tax revenue.** Even though IRCA was implemented during a period that included a recession and high unemployment (1990–91), it still helped raise wages and spurred increases in educational, home, and small business investments by newly legalized immigrants. Taking the experience of IRCA as a starting point, we estimate that comprehensive immigration reform would yield at least $1.5 trillion in added U.S. gross domestic product (GDP) over 10 years. 1 This is a compelling economic reason to move away from the current “vicious cycle” where enforcement-only policies perpetuate unauthorized migration and exert downward pressure on already low wages, and toward a “virtuous cycle” of worker empowerment in which legal status and labor rights exert upward pressure on wages.

#### And Heg

Nye 12 Joseph S. Nye, a former US assistant secretary of defense and chairman of the US National Intelligence Council, is University Professor at Harvard University. “Immigration and American Power,” December 10, Project Syndicate, http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/obama-needs-immigration-reform-to-maintain-america-s-strength-by-joseph-s--nye

CAMBRIDGE – The United States is a nation of immigrants. Except for a small number of Native Americans, everyone is originally from somewhere else, and even recent immigrants can rise to top economic and political roles. President Franklin Roosevelt once famously addressed the Daughters of the American Revolution – a group that prided itself on the early arrival of its ancestors – as “fellow immigrants.”¶ In recent years, however, US politics has had a strong anti-immigration slant, and the issue played an important role in the Republican Party’s presidential nomination battle in 2012. But Barack Obama’s re-election demonstrated the electoral power of Latino voters, who rejected Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney by a 3-1 majority, as did Asian-Americans.¶ As a result, several prominent Republican politicians are now urging their party to reconsider its anti-immigration policies, and plans for immigration reform will be on the agenda at the beginning of Obama’s second term. **Successful reform will be an important step in preventing the** decline of American power**.**¶ Fears about the impact of immigration on national values and on a coherent sense of American identity are not new. The nineteenth-century “Know Nothing” movement was built on opposition to immigrants, particularly the Irish. Chinese were singled out for exclusion from 1882 onward, and, with the more restrictive Immigration Act of 1924, immigration in general slowed for the next four decades.¶ During the twentieth century, the US recorded its highest percentage of foreign-born residents, 14.7%, in 1910. A century later, according to the 2010 census, 13% of the American population is foreign born. But, despite being a nation of immigrants, more Americans are skeptical about immigration than are sympathetic to it. Various opinion polls show either a plurality or a majority favoring less immigration. The recession exacerbated such views: in 2009, one-half of the US public favored allowing fewer immigrants, up from 39% in 2008.¶ Both the number of immigrants and their origin have caused concerns about immigration’s effects on American culture. Demographers portray a country in 2050 in which non-Hispanic whites will be only a slim majority. Hispanics will comprise 25% of the population, with African- and Asian-Americans making up 14% and 8%, respectively.¶ But mass communications and market forces produce powerful incentives to master the English language and accept a degree of assimilation. Modern media help new immigrants to learn more about their new country beforehand than immigrants did a century ago. Indeed, most of the evidence suggests that the latest immigrants are assimilating at least as quickly as their predecessors.¶ While too rapid a rate of immigration can cause social problems, over the long term, immigration strengthens US power. It is estimated that at least 83 countries and territories currently have fertility rates that are below the level needed to keep their population constant. Whereas most developed countries will experience a shortage of people as the century progresses, America is one of the few that may avoid demographic decline and maintain its share of world population.¶ For example, to maintain its current population size, Japan would have to accept 350,000 newcomers annually for the next 50 years, which is difficult for a culture that has historically been hostile to immigration. In contrast, the Census Bureau projects that the US population will grow by 49% over the next four decades.¶ Today, the US is the world’s third most populous country; 50 years from now it is still likely to be third (after only China and India). This is highly relevant to economic power: whereas nearly all other developed countries will face a growing burden of providing for the older generation**, immigration could help to attenuate the policy problem for the US.**¶ In addition, though studies suggest that the short-term economic benefits of immigration are relatively small, and that unskilled workers may suffer from competition**, skilled immigrants can be important to** particular sectors – and to long-term growth. There is a strong correlation between the number of visas for skilled applicants and patents filed in the US. At the beginning of this century, Chinese- and Indian-born engineers were running one-quarter of Silicon Valley’s technology businesses, which accounted for $17.8 billion in sales; and, in 2005, immigrants had helped to start one-quarter of all US technology start-ups during the previous decade. Immigrants or children of immigrants founded roughly 40% of the 2010 Fortune 500 companies.¶ Equally important are immigration’s benefits for America’s soft power. The fact that people want to come to the US enhances its appeal, and immigrants’ upward mobility is attractive to people in other countries. The US is a magnet, and many people can envisage themselves as Americans, in part because so many successful Americans look like them. Moreover, connections between immigrants and their families and friends back home help to convey accurate and positive information about the US.¶ Likewise, because the presence of many cultures creates avenues of connection with other countries, it helps to broaden Americans’ attitudes and views of the world in an era of globalization. Rather than diluting hard and soft power, immigration enhances both.¶ Singapore’s former leader, Lee Kwan Yew, an astute observer of both the US and China, argues that China will not surpass the US as the leading power of the twenty-first century, precisely **because the US attracts the best and brightest** from the rest of the world and melds them into a diverse culture of creativity. China has a larger population to recruit from domestically, but, in Lee’s view, its Sino-centric culture will make it less creative than the US.¶ That is a view that Americans should take to heart. If Obama succeeds in enacting **immigration reform** in his second term, he **will** have gone a long way toward fulfilling his promise to maintain the strength of the US.

### Will Pass

#### Will pass but there are sticking points

Graham 2/7 David is an associate editor of The Atlantic. “Why Immigration-Reform Advocates Feel Good About Their Chances,” 2013, http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2013/02/why-immigration-reform-advocates-feel-good-about-their-chances/272977/

The way John McCain and Michael Bennet talk about it, you'd be surprised immigration reform hasn't passed already.¶ "We have the opportunity to pass a broad-based bill that deals not just with one problem or two problem but takes on the entire of array in ways this touches our economy," said Bennet, a Democratic U.S. senator from Colorado, at an Atlantic conference in Washington Thursday. (Bennet is the brother of Atlantic Editor in Chief James Bennet.) "I do think you've got two parties that've got reasons to get this done."¶ And McCain, as usual, was colorful and blunt. A veteran of several failed attempts at reform, he offered one big explanation for why this time would be different.¶ "**The climate has changed,** American opinion has changed, elections have changed ... and I'm working with people who are effective," he said. "Chuck Schumer is effective. I hate him! But he's effective."¶ Of course, there's more to it, especially for Republicans like McCain, who along with Bennet is a member of the "Gang of Eight" senators working on a bipartisan proposal. The Arizonan pinpointed three reasons this is the time to get reform done. One is simple political math: As many Republicans seem to be realizing, the GOP will find it harder and harder to win elections if it continues to alienate Latino voters. A second is technological, he said, repeatedly citing drones and other technological advances developed to fight the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan as useful tools for policing the border with Mexico more effectively.¶ But much of it comes down to fairness, he concluded.¶ "Can we leave 11 million people in the shadows forever?" McCain asked, referring to the estimated number of illegal immigrants in the country. "The people that wash our dishes, cut our lawns, take care of our children -- is it right to leave them in the shadows forever? I don't think so."¶ Intriguingly, the two Democratic senators who bookended McCain's appearance -- Bennet and Minnesota's Amy Klobuchar -- offered economic rationales for reform, while the Republican made the compassionate case. But what's interesting is how views often associated with one party or the other seem to have been pushed aside, if not totally dispensed with. Bennet said it was reasonable to expect immigrants to learn English, and he said it was fine to make legislation contingent upon border security as long as employee verification, the standard Democratic priority, was part of a comprehensive bill. Bennet would offer only oblique criticism of GOP hardliners like David Vitter and Ted Cruz, saying, "There are some people that are better at putting themselves in other people's shoes that others."¶ Meanwhile, the occasionally cranky McCain was all smiles and jokes, with praise for both Klobuchar and Bennet; he saved his fire for budgetary matters. Asked about the sequester -- which he voted for -- he said, "It's insane, and it's unacceptable." And he criticized his 2008 rival Barack Obama's campaign-style strategy of barnstorming the country to drum up grassroots backing for his side. The real solution, McCain said, was to invite legislators to the White House to hash out a compromise. "There's no point in going out and giving another speech."¶ There should be no illusion that the road forward on immigration reform will be smooth. Panelists identified two big ones. First is the already-cliched "path to citizenship" for illegal immigrants, which McCain pointed out was likely to disappoint some advocates -- it **won't be a walk in the park**. The second sticking point is likely to be a guest-worker program. While lawmakers in both parties seem to agree that the country should lift caps on visas for highly skilled workers, the fate of agricultural and other low-skill workers seems certain to provoke acrimonious debate.¶ For the time being, however, it's the not-inconsiderable common ground between the parties that's on display.

#### Will pass including path to citizenship---momentum

Karst 2/7 Tom is a writer @ The Packer. “House committee considers immigration reform,” 2013, http://www.thepacker.com/fruit-vegetable-news/House-Judiciary-Committee-considers-path-to-immigration-reform-190283571.html

Though some House Republicans still seem hesitant to support a pathway to citizenship for 11 million illegal immigrants in the U.S., Congress opened the door on immigration reform with a hearing by the House Judiciary Committee.¶ With rumors of comprehensive immigration legislation being worked on by **bipartisan groups in the House and Senate,** Washington sources said there appears to be momentum for reform.

#### Immigration reform’s TOD and will pass---Obama push is critical---UQ doesn’t o/w

Foley 2/7 Elise is a writer at the Huffington Post. “Obama On Immigration Reform: Politics Not Easy, But 'Now Is The Time',” 2013, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/02/07/obama-immigration-reform\_n\_2638843.html

LANSDOWNE, Va. -- President Barack Obama reiterated to House Democrats on Thursday that he is relying on their support for comprehensive immigration reform, even if they fear the political ramifications. "I recognize that politics aren't always easy, there are regional variations," he said at a conference here for the House Democratic caucus. "I understand that in some places this may end up being a tough issue. But what I also know is that part of our strength is our youth and our dynamism, and our history of attracting talent from all around the world." **Obama's immigration push hit full speed** last week with a speech in Las Vegas, where he called for a pathway to citizenship for undocumented immigrants, more border security and better interior enforcement. A bipartisan group in the Senate dubbed the "gang of eight" released a similar framework for reform, but tied green cards to yet-to-be-determined border metrics to disallow immigrants granted provisional status from becoming legal permanent residents until those triggers were met. Obama applauded the work being done in Congress on immigration. "I am heartened to see Republicans and Democrats starting to be **in a serious conversation** about getting this done," he said. "Now is the time." The biggest fight on immigration reform will be over a pathway to citizenship. Many House Republicans have said they might support a middle ground that would allow undocumented immigrants to stay in the U.S., but not to become citizens. Only 10 percent of American voters support such a plan, while 56 percent believe the undocumented should be allowed to eventually become citizens, according to a Quinnipiac University poll released Thursday. **Obama** has reiterated repeatedly, both in public and in private meetings with advocates and members of Congress, that he **will not accept a bill without a pathway to citizenship,** although he did not get into the issue on Thursday. He acknowledged that the politics of the issue were difficult, as he did later when discussing the need for gun control. But, like Vice President Joe Biden the day before him, he encouraged Democrats to think of what's right first and their own political aspirations second. "As long as we keep in mind why we came here in the first place, as long as we think back to whatever inspired each of us to say, 'Maybe I can give something back, maybe I can make a difference, maybe my purpose here on earth is not just to think about what's in it for me,'" he said. "Thinking about what's in it for the broader community, my neighborhood, or my state, or my country. If we keep that in mind every single day, I have no doubt that **we will continue to make progress."**

#### The tide is turning---path to citizenship is key

Weakland 2/7 Bryan is a writer for MSNBC. “Phoenix Mayor: Tide is turning on immigration reform,” 2013, http://tv.msnbc.com/2013/02/07/phoenix-mayor-tide-is-turning-on-immigration-reform/

A mayor on the front lines of immigration reform says **the tide is turning on finally getting legislation passed.**¶“We’re at a unique time in our nation’s history where good public policy, passage of the DREAM Act, and comprehensive immigration reform and good politics seem to be coming together at the right time,” Phoenix Mayor Greg Stanton said on Jansing & Co. Thursday.¶ Mayor Stanton says immigration reform must include a path to citizenship, but “not an easy path. You’ve got to go to the back of the line and of course pay a fine…We know that border security has to be an element of it as well. And the DREAM Act has to be a part of it,” Stanton said.¶ A new Quinnipiac University poll shows a majority of Americans say illegal immigrants should be allowed to stay in the United States and apply for citizenship, another 30% say illegal immigrants should be required to leave the country.¶ “I’m optimistic that the right thing is going to occur. And certainly if it does occur, it’s going to help us here in Arizona, in my city of Phoenix, a great deal,” Mayor Stanton told MSNBC’s Chris Jansing.¶ At the same time, President Obama’s political PAC, Organizing for Action, has sent out a new email asking undocumented workers to share their personal stories with the public. It’s the latest strategic move in its campaign to build public support for immigration reform.

### AT: Intrinsicness

#### The disad is intrinsic---announcement of the plan necessarily would cause backlash.

#### Intrinsicness is a voting issue---makes the aff a moving target and kills all neg link ground because the USFG could take action to solve almost any disad.

**Politics disads are good:**

* **Key to current events education that’s useful immediately and promotes political engagement**
* **They’re a vital neg generic on this topic because there’s no limiting word in the resolution**
* **Most real world---politicians must always assess political consequences of advocating any bill---the real inherent barrier to the plan is political opposition**

#### Counter-interpretation---they get topical intrinsicness---otherwise they’ve proven the resolution insufficient which means you still vote negative.

### AT: Thumpers

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

Drum 10 Kevin Drum is a political blogger for MOTHER JONES magazine. Prior to that he was a contributing writer for the WASHINGTON MONTHLY, “Immigration Coming Off the Back Burner?,” 3/10 http://motherjones.com/kevin-drum/2010/03/immigration-coming-back-burner

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

#### Obama pushing immigration over guns

Pace and Werner 1-25. [Julie, Erica, AP writers, "White House, senators to start immigration push" Twin Cities Pioneer Press [www.twincities.com/national/ci\_22454002/white-house-senators-start-immigration-push](http://www.twincities.com/national/ci_22454002/white-house-senators-start-immigration-push)]

WASHINGTON -- Reviving an issue that has languished for years, President Barack Obama will launch a campaign next week aimed at overhauling the nation's flawed immigration system and creating legal status for millions, as a bipartisan Senate group nears agreement on achieving the same goals.¶ The proposals from Obama and lawmakers will mark the start of what is expected to be a contentious and emotional process with deep political implications. Latino voters overwhelmingly backed Obama in the 2012 election, leaving Republicans grappling for a way to regain their standing with an increasingly powerful pool of voters.¶ The president will press his case for immigration changes during a trip to Las Vegas on Tuesday, Jan. 29. The Senate working group is also aiming to outline its proposals next week, a Senate aide said.¶ Administration officials say Obama's second-term immigration push will be a continuation of the principles he outlined during his first four years in office but failed to act on. He is expected to revive his little-noticed 2011 immigration "blueprint," which calls for a pathway to citizenship for illegal immigrants that includes paying fines and back taxes; increased border security; mandatory penalties for businesses that employ unauthorized immigrants; and improvements to the legal immigration system, including giving green cards to highly skilled workers and lifting caps on legal immigration for the immediate family members of U.S. citizens.¶ "What has been absent in the time since he put those principles forward has been a willingness by Republicans, generally speaking, to move forward with comprehensive immigration reform," White House press secretary Jay Carney said. "What he hopes is that that dynamic has changed."¶ The political dynamic does appear to have shifted since the November election. Despite making little progress on immigration in his first term, Obama won more than 70 percent of the Latino vote, in part because of the conservative positions on immigration that Republican nominee Mitt Romney staked out during the GOP primary. Latino voters accounted for 10 percent of the electorate in November.¶ The president met privately Friday with the Congressional Hispanic Caucus to discuss his next steps on immigration. Among those in the meeting was Rep. Linda Sanchez, D-Calif., who said Obama told lawmakers "immigration reform is his number one legislative priority."¶ That could bump back the president's efforts to seek legislation enacting stricter gun laws, another issue he has vowed to make a top second-term priority.¶ The Senate immigration group is also pressing for **quick action,** aiming to draft a bill by March and pass legislation in that chamber by August, said the aide, who requested anonymity in order to discuss private deliberations. The GOP-controlled House would also need to pass the legislation before it went to the White House for the president's signature.

#### Obama will prioritize immigration

Wernick 1/25 Allan is a writer for the New York Daily News. “A look at where key Congressional players stand on immigration indicates reform could come soon,” 2013, http://www.nydailynews.com/new-york/citizenship-now/immigration-chances-good-sweeping-immigration-reform-article-1.1245988

As expected, President Obama confirmed his support for immigration reform in his inaugural address. It was one of the few specific issues mentioned by the President in setting the program for his coming four years in office. In the last few weeks, some pundits have argued that the debate over debt and budget issues or gun control will sidetrack the President from his commitment to immigrants. That analysis ignores the expectations of Latino voters and their allies. Obama and both parties have no choice but to make immigration reform a priority in the coming year. The doubters are wrong. I am more optimistic than ever that we will see reform this year. To understand why, lets take a look at what some key players on the immigration reform debate have been saying and doing this year:

### PC K2 Path to Citizenship

#### PC key to path to citizenship

CNN 1/29 “Obama lays out his plan to overhaul immigration,” 2013, http://news.blogs.cnn.com/2013/01/29/president-obama-to-lay-out-plan-for-immigration-overhaul/

Emory University law professor Polly Price told CNN there has been one flaw in American enforcement policy.¶ "What it has not done in the past is track people who are leaving, so usually they don’t know if someone here on a temporary visa has overstayed that visa," she said.¶ "It’s terribly important that there be an emphasis on enforcement," she added, but it's not been lacking under this administration.¶ Obama has deployed more enforcement than any previous president, but **she suspects he'll expend some political capital to make sure immigrants have a pathway to citizenship**, she said.

#### Obama’s demanding it now

Grant 2/5 David is a writer for the Christian Science Monitor. “Immigration reform: Amid GOP reservations, signs of flexibility,” 2013, http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Politics/2013/0205/Immigration-reform-Amid-GOP-reservations-signs-of-flexibility

But **significant issues need to be resolved**. Mr. Gowdy and Rep. Raúl Labrador (R) of Idaho in particular dug into the delicate issue of whether the nation’s undocumented millions should be granted a path to US citizenship at all. ¶ A path to US citizenship – what some conservatives deride as “amnesty” for lawbreakers and what liberals call “earned citizenship” for the fines, English-language requirements, and time needed to obtain a US passport – is a key demand of President Obama and Democratic lawmakers, including Gutierrez. They say relegating millions of people to sub-citizen status would create a “permanent underclass,” as Gutierrez often explains it, on par with the socially restive groups of unassimilated immigrants in many European cities.

### Link

#### Obama can only lose political capital by advocating offshore drilling

Hobson 4/18 Margaret is a writer for E&E Publishing. “OFFSHORE DRILLING: Obama's development plans gain little political traction in years since Gulf spill,” 2012, http://www.eenews.net/public/energywire/2012/04/18/1

President Obama is embracing the offshore oil and gas development policies he proposed in early 2010 but were sidelined in the shadow of the Deepwater Horizon oil spill.¶ Two years after the BP PLC oil rig exploded, killing 11 people and causing the worst oil spill in U.S. history, Obama's "all of the above" energy policy includes offshore drilling provisions that are nearly identical to his aggressive March 2010 drilling plan.¶ Since the moratorium on offshore oil drilling ended in late 2010, the administration expanded oil and gas development in the western and central Gulf of Mexico and announced plans for lease sales in the eastern Gulf. The White House appears poised to allow Royal Dutch Shell PLC to begin exploring for oil this summer in Alaska's Beaufort and Chukchi seas and to open oil industry access to the Cook Inlet, south of Anchorage. The administration is also paving the way for oil and gas seismic studies along the mid- and south Atlantic coasts, the first such survey in 30 years.¶ While opening more offshore lands to oil and gas development, the Obama administration has also taken steps to make offshore oil drilling safer, according to a report card issued yesterday by Oil Spill Commission Action, an oversight panel formed by seven members of President Obama's oil spill commission.¶ That report criticized Congress for failing to adopt new oil spill safety laws but praised the Interior Department and industry for making progress in improving offshore oil development safety, environmental protection and oil spill preparation.¶ An environmental group was less complimentary. A report yesterday by Oceana charged that the measures adopted by government and industry are "woefully inadequate."¶ As the 2012 presidential campaign heats up and gasoline prices remain stuck near $4 per gallon, Obama's offshore oil development policies aren't winning him any political capital**.** The environmental community hates the drilling proposals. The Republicans and oil industry officials complain that the White House hasn't gone far enough. And independent voters are confused by the president's rhetoric.

#### Bipartisan opposition to the plan---causes big fights

Greenwire 6 (“Rough going seen for efforts to lift congressional moratoria,” 5-26-6,

http://www.noia.org/website/download.asp?id=295)

With a growing number of Republican lawmakers facing stiff midterm races, efforts to open more offshore areas to oil and gas drilling will find tough going on Capitol Hill, environmentalists and others tracking the issue say. For now, industry groups say momentum is on their side. Though the House voted 217-203 on Thursday to reject removing congressional moratoria on most offshore natural gas drilling, industry lobbyists point out that Rep. John Peterson's (R-Pa.) plan got 46 more votes than it did last year. If there is an offshore drilling component to an upcoming House energy package, it is expected to be shaped largely by House Resources Committee Chairman Richard Pombo (R-Calif.). Pombo's plan would allow states to "opt-out" of offshore oil and gas drilling bans. States that opt-out would receive a share of offshore production revenues. Environmentalists are hopeful the **bipartisan coastal coalition** that opposes wider leasing will not be swayed in sufficient numbers to endorse an opt-out plan or other efforts that are less aggressive than Peterson's but still relax current bans. Heather Taylor, deputy legislative director for the Natural Resources Defense Council, called the argument that Thursday's vote puts industry within striking distance of winning changes to current restrictions a "stretch." "We still won. Period," Taylor said in an interview Friday. "The bottom line is that [the] vote proves that people care about our coasts, and any proposal that comes through that hurts our coasts will be rejected." Also, a House floor vote last week that would also have lifted congressional coastal oil drilling bans lost by a large margin. That prompted an environmentalist to note that an opt-out covering both oil and gas would face hurdles that could be greater than Peterson's gas-only proposal. One lobbyist who works on environmental and energy issues does not believe the House is ready to adopt the opt-out idea, which was most recently floated through legislation offered by Rep. Bobby Jindal (R-La.) that largely mirrors an opt-out and state revenue-sharing plan Pombo floated last year. "I don't see how an opt-out passes," the lobbyist said. "We have never lost a vote on this on the floor," added an aide to a Democratic lawmaker. "To succeed, Pombo has to play the middle ground. I am not sure if he is there yet." Still, an industry lobbyist seeking wider drilling said Friday the vote on Peterson's plan "proves a nuanced approach to things ... has a lot of credibility on the Hill right now." Yet the fight could get tougher if it does not happen this year. Republicans are bracing for a tough midterm election, and while votes on offshore drilling are not quite partisan showdowns, more Democrats oppose wider offshore leasing.

#### Relaxing drilling restrictions empirically causes backlash---no risk of offense

Broder 10 John is a writer for the New York Times. “Obama to Open Offshore Areas to Oil Drilling for First Time,” March 31, http://www.nytimes.com/2010/03/31/science/earth/31energy.html?\_r=0

But while Mr. Obama has staked out middle ground on other environmental matters — supporting nuclear power, for example — the sheer breadth of the offshore drilling decision will take some of his supporters aback. **And it is no sure thing that it will win support** for a climate bill **from undecided senators close to the oil industry**, like Lisa Murkowski, Republican of Alaska, or Mary L. Landrieu, Democrat of Louisiana.¶ The Senate is expected to take up a climate bill in the next few weeks — the last chance to enact such legislation before midterm election concerns take over. Mr. Obama and his allies in the Senate have already made significant concessions on coal and nuclear power to try to win votes from Republicans and moderate Democrats. The new plan now grants one of the biggest items on the oil industry’s wish list — access to vast areas of the Outer Continental Shelf for drilling.¶ But even as Mr. Obama curries favors with pro-drilling interests, he risks a backlash from some coastal governors, senators and environmental advocates, who say that the relatively small amounts of oil to be gained in the offshore areas are not worth the environmental risks.

### Oil Lobby Weak

#### Oil lobby is weak---Obama victory proves they’ve lost all influence

Rowell and Kretzmann 11/7 Andy and Steve are writers at priceofoil.org. “Big Oil bet big…and lost.” 2012, http://priceofoil.org/2012/11/07/big-oil-bet-big-and-lost/

Remember how scared everyone was of Big Oil in this election? **Who’s scared now?** The top candidate backed by the fossil fuel industry – big oil, gas and coal – just lost the election. The latest data (October 15) from the Center for Responsive Politics, further refined and analyzed by Oil Change International, indicates that President Barack Obama received $769,435 from the fossil fuel industry and it’s employees in this election. Mitt Romney received more than six times as much dirty energy money – $4,854,051 – and he lost. The oil boys from Houston must be feeling sick as dogs this morning as they backed the wrong man. They must be feeling sick that their corrosive funding of politicians has failed. We should celebrate that today, in this historic moment, when America re-elected our first ever African-American President, the country stands with the many, not the money.

#### Congressional defiance proves

Learsy 9/10 (Raymond J., "No Oil Producing and Exporting Cartels Act': A Presidential Issue And A Test Of Political Integrity", Politics Daily, lexis)

Yet some years ago, in 2007, there was a genuine effort to change the equation in a fundamental way when Congress voted overwhelmingly, in defiance of the oil lobby and their allied interests for the NOPEC bill, so named because it would allow the international oil cartel, OPEC, and its national oil companies operating outside the law, hiding behind our sovereign immunity shield, to be sued and held accountable for what are clearly anti-competetive attempts to limit the world's supply of petroleum and the consequent impact on oil prices. In defiance of oil interests Congress voted overwhelmingly for the Bill (70 votes to 23 in the Senate and 345 to 72 in the House). This was an act of refreshing and courageous leadership by our Congress only to be abandoned after President George W. Bush, that great stalwart of oil interests and friend of Saudi Arabia, made it clear that he would veto the bill should it land on his desk.

#### Recency matters---oil has lost clout

NFN 7/6 (News From Nowhere, “The Politics of Energy”, July 6, http://newsfromnowhere.info/archive/issue-15-april-20-2012/the-politics-of-energy)

The oil industry is one of America's biggest recipients of corporate welfare, sucking up $4 billion in taxpayer subsidies every year. It's a worthy cause, of course: Big guns like Exxon-Mobil rake in a paltry $9 billion each quarter in profits (free and clear – not gross income), so they need the charity of the working-class taxpayer to stay afloat. But the oil industry came pretty close to losing their subsidies last week, when the Close Big Oil Tax Loopholes Act, backed by President Obama, came to a vote in the U.S. Senate. The bill failed on a 51-48 vote. Even though **a majority supported the bill,** proponents didn’t get the 60 votes they needed for ‘cloture,’ which moves the bill to a vote. Some 88% of oil and gas industry campaign contributions went to Republicans last year, and the investment paid off. In the Senate that was able to buy the votes of all but two – Olympia Snowe and Susan Collins, the two famously moderate Republicans from Maine. The 48 Senators who voted against removing the oil industries subsidies received almost $18 million in campaign contributions from the employees and political action committees of oil and gas companies during their Congressional careers, while the 51 Senators who voted to get rid of the taxpayer subsidies received $3.7 million. Want to know what’s driving America’s politics? Follow the money. Certainly today's political climate is not nearly as favorable to the oil industry as the halcyon days of the Bush administration. With the former CEO of Arbusto Petroleum at as Chief Executive and his trusty sidekick Dick Cheney of Halliburton fame occupying the White House, they stacked federal agencies with oil executives and lobbyists, appointing the industry's most vacal supporters to oversee regulation. Gale Norton, protege of James Watt at the Mountain States Legal Foundation, spent her career as a lawyer defending the biggest polluters in the oil industry, was appointed as Secretary of the Interior, in charge of the Bureau of Land Management, the agency that regulates most federal oil and gas operations. (Now she works for Shell). Steven Griles, a notorious coalbed methane industry lobbyist who did a lot of his dirty work in Wyoming's Powder River Basin, was appointed Assistant Secretary in charge of Lands and Minerals.