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#### Immigration Reform will pass in the House and Senate now – there will be heated debates. Obama is actively lobbying to get it done.

Werner 6 – 11 – 13 AP Staff [Erica Werner, House Speaker John Boehner: Congress can do immigration this year, <http://www.news-sentinel.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20130611/NEWS/130619933/1006>]

With the Senate ready to cast the first floor votes on a landmark immigration bill, House Speaker John Boehner said Tuesday he thinks there's a good chance the legislation can be signed into law "by the end of the year."

Ahead of Tuesday afternoon's procedural votes to officially allow debate to move forward, senators were readying amendments on contentious issues including border security, back taxes and health care coverage. Some Republicans said they were seeking to strengthen enforcement provisions so that they could be comfortable voting for the bill.

Other GOP measures were already being dismissed by Democrats as attempts to kill the bill by striking at the fragile compromises at its core.

Boehner said in a nationally broadcast interview he still has concerns about aspects of the bill pertaining to border security. But the Ohio Republican also said he has sought to create an environment in the House where both parties can work together on the measure, which could eventually lead to full citizenship for millions of people currently living in the United States illegally.

"I think, no question, by the end of the year we could have a bill. No question," the speaker said in an interview on ABC's "Good Morning America."

In the Senate, the bill's supporters were working to determine which measures they could accept to lock down more "yes" votes from the GOP side without losing Democratic backing. They are aiming for a resounding show of support from the Democratic-led Senate that could pressure the Republican-led House to act.

President Barack Obama, who's made overhauling immigration laws a top second-term priority, was to speak at a midmorning event with advocates at the White House to praise the Senate's efforts and renew his calls for reform.

The two votes scheduled for Tuesday afternoon were on procedural measures to officially allow debate to move forward on the far-reaching bill. Both votes were expected to succeed by comfortable margins, because even some senators with deep misgivings about the immigration bill said the issue deserved a Senate debate.

The real fights will come in the following days and weeks as Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev., aims to push the bill to final Senate passage before July 4.

Even if that happens, the outlook in the House remains unsettled. Boehner indicated earlier that he'd like to see a bill through his chamber before August.

The Senate bill would stiffen border security and require all employers to check their workers' legal status, as well as initiate new or expanded visa programs for high-skilled and lower-skilled workers and the agriculture sector. At its core is its most contentious element, a 13-year path to citizenship for some 11 million immigrants now here illegally.

"Given the impact the broken system has on our economy and our families, we cannot afford delay," Senate Judiciary Chairman Patrick Leahy, D-Vt., said Monday on the Senate floor. "This is a measure the Senate should come together to consider and pass."

"Unfortunately the bill before us repeats our past mistakes," said the Judiciary Committee's top Republican, Sen. Chuck Grassley of Iowa. "Nobody disputes this is a bill that legalizes first and enforces later."

Heated debate is anticipated on the border security elements of the bill. The bill sets up a system wherein immigrants may only begin taking steps toward citizenship once certain border security requirements are met. But opponents say those "triggers" aren't strong enough, and one of the bill's authors, Sen. Marco Rubio, R-Fla., has argued that the border security elements of the bill must be strengthened if it's to make it through Congress.

#### Obama’s political capital and avoiding controversial actions will be vital to insuring final passage of the bill.

Bloomberg 5 – 23 – 13 [Obama Probes Create Immigration Magic as Bill Advances, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-05-23/obama-probes-create-immigration-magic-as-bill-advances.html]

The measure’s critics are still pressing to prevent that from happening, and seeking to use the negative attention focused on Obama’s administration as a means of doing so.

Tea Party Opposition

A coalition of Republican-aligned commentators and small-government Tea Party groups released a letter on May 21 urging opposition to the bill, writing that it suffers from “fundamental design flaws that make it unsalvageable,” including that it “cedes excessive control over immigration law to an administration that has repeatedly proven itself to be untrustworthy, even duplicitous.”

Should the measure pass the Democratic-controlled Senate, its initial reception will be chilly in the House, where Republicans hold the majority.

The bill won’t accomplish the goal of ending “illegal immigration for once and for all,” said House Judiciary Committee Chairman Bob Goodlatte, a Virginia Republican who will be a key player in determining its fate.

“The Senate bill is unlikely to secure the border,” Goodlatte said at a hearing he convened yesterday in Washington to examine the legislation.

In other criticisms, he said the measure takes too long -- as much as seven years -- to implement an electronic employment verification system, known as e-verify.

Credibility Issue

His comments underscore the congressional hurdles that loom for revising immigration laws -- obstacles that Republican strategist Ron Bonjean said will be harder for Obama to surmount if the scandals continue to undercut his credibility.

“It may help them now that people aren’t paying as much attention” to the debate on the immigration bill because of the investigations, “but long-term it’s a big problem,” Bonjean said. “The president’s political capital diminishes as these crises continue, and eventually he’s going to have to cash in that capital to get people to cast tough votes and push this thing through.”

#### Lifting the embargo will be a massive fight – strong groups will rally against it.

Spadoni & Sagebien 13 a. assistant professor in the Department of Political Science at Augusta State b. associate professor at the School of Business Administration and an adjunct professor in the International Development Studies program in the College of Sustainability at Dalhousie University, Canada [Paolo Spadoni & Julia Sagebien, Will They Still Love Us Tomorrow? Canada-Cuba Business Relations and the End of the US Embargo, Thunderbird International Business Review, Volume 55, Issue 1, pages 77–93, January/February 2013, http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/tie.21524/full]

Although Fidel Castro's definitive exit from the scene, and a Cuban government led by someone other than Raúl Castro, would speed up a relaxation of the embargo, such process will mostly depend on US domestic dynamics. The embargo has survived the end of the Cold War primarily as a domestic electoral issue linked to the role the US-based Cuban exile community has played in helping determine the electoral outcome of important swing states such as Florida and New Jersey. Cuban-American lobbying and hefty campaign contributions were additional key factors (Eckstein, 2009, pp. 127–132; Haney & Vanderbush, 2005, p. 72; Rich Kaplowitz, 1998, p. 134). What Cuban-Americans think and feel matters. They were relatively receptive or at least not outright hostile to Obama's early remarks on Cuba and welcomed the lifting of restrictions on their travel and money transfers to the island. The Cuban American National Foundation (CANF) fully supported the president's decision to increase this kind of people-to-people exchange (CANF, 2009). Moreover, US opinion polls show considerable backing for a further easing of sanctions that are considered anachronistic and ineffective, even by many Cuban-Americans.4 Washington's Cuba policy has recently been going through a strident debate in Congress, where a series of bipartisan legislative proposals aimed to chip away at various aspects of the embargo are under consideration. Yet, pro-embargo forces, among them Cuban-American legislators and other members of the congressional group Cuba Democracy Caucus, will not go down without a fight, as demonstrated by their strenuous opposition to the aforementioned bills and their attempts to set rules for travel and remittances to Cuba back to what they were under former President George W. Bush.5

#### Immigration is key to maintaining economic growth

Center for American Progress 10 [How Immigration Reform Would Help the Economy, p. <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/immigration/news/2010/01/14/7130/how-immigration-reform-would-help-the-economy/>]

A new report, “Raising the Floor for American Workers: The Economic Benefits of Comprehensive Immigration Reform,” by Dr. Raúl Hinojosa-Ojeda, finds that comprehensive immigration reform that includes a legalization program for unauthorized immigrants and enables a future flow of legal workers would result in a large economic benefit—a cumulative $1.5 trillion in added U.S. gross domestic product over 10 years. In stark contrast, a deportation- only policy would result in a loss of $2.6 trillion in GDP over 10 years. Hinojosa uses a computable general equilibrium model based on the historical experience of the 1986 legalization program, and finds that: Comprehensive immigration reform that includes a legalization program for unauthorized immigrants would stimulate the U.S. economy. Immigration reform would increase U.S. GDP by at least 0.84 percent. This would translate into at least a $1.5 trillion cumulative increase in GDP over 10 years, which includes approximately $1.2 trillion in consumption and $256 billion in investment. The benefits of additional GDP growth would be spread broadly throughout the U.S. economy, but immigrant-heavy sectors such as textiles, electronic equipment, and construction would see particularly large increases. The higher earning power of newly legalized workers would mean increased tax revenues of $4.5 billion to $5.4 billion in the first three years. Higher personal income would also generate increased consumer spending—enough to support 750,000 to 900,000 jobs in the United States. Experience shows that legalized workers open bank accounts, buy homes, and start businesses, further stimulating the U.S. economy. Comprehensive immigration reform increases all workers’ wages. The real wages of less-skilled newly legalized workers would increase by roughly $4,405 per year, while higher-skilled workers would see their income increase $6,185 per year. The wages of native-born high-skill and low-skill U.S. workers also increase modestly under comprehensive immigration reform because the “wage floor” rises for all workers. Legalized workers invest more in their human capital, including education, job training, and English-language skills, making them even more productive workers and higher earners. Mass deportation is costly, lowers wages, and harms the U.S. economy. Mass deportation would reduce U.S. GDP by 1.46 percent, amounting to a cumulative $2.6 trillion loss in GDP over 10 years, not including the actual costs of deportation. The Center for American Progress has estimated that mass deportation would cost $206 billion to $230 billion over five years. Wages would rise for less-skilled native-born workers under a mass deportation scenario, but higher-skilled natives’ wages would decrease, and there would be widespread job loss. Studies from various researchers with divergent political perspectives confirm these findings. A report by the libertarian CATO Institute using a similar CGE model came to startlingly similar conclusions. CATO found that legalization would yield significant income gains for American workers and households. Legalization would boost the incomes of U.S. households by $180 billion in 2019. CATO also concluded that tighter restrictions and a reduction in less-skilled immigration would impose large costs on native-born Americans by shrinking the overall economy and lowering worker productivity.

#### Economic decline risks multiple global nuclear wars

O’Hanlon 12 Kenneth G. Lieberthal, Director of the John L. Thornton China Center and Senior Fellow in Foreign Policy and Global Economy and Development at the Brookings Institution, former Professor at the University of Michigan [“The Real National Security Threat: America's Debt,” Los Angeles Times, July 10th, <http://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2012/07/10-economy-foreign-policy-lieberthal-ohanlon>]

Alas, globalization and automation trends of the last generation have increasingly called the American dream into question for the working classes. Another decade of underinvestment in what is required to remedy this situation will make an isolationist or populist president far more likely because much of the country will question whether an internationalist role makes sense for America — especially if it costs us well over half a trillion dollars in defense spending annually yet seems correlated with more job losses. Lastly, American economic weakness undercuts U.S. leadership abroad. Other countries sense our weakness and wonder about our purport 7ed decline. If this perception becomes more widespread, and the case that we are in decline becomes more persuasive, countries will begin to take actions that reflect their skepticism about America's future. Allies and friendswill doubt our commitment and may pursue nuclear weapons for their own security, for example; adversaries will sense opportunity and be less restrainedin throwing around their weight in their own neighborhoods. The crucial Persian Gulf and Western Pacific regions will likely become less stable. Major war will become more likely. When running for president last time, Obama eloquently articulated big foreign policy visions: healing America's breach with the Muslim world, controlling global climate change, dramatically curbing globalpoverty through development aid, **moving toward a world free of** nuclear weapons. These were, and remain, worthy if elusive goals. However, for Obama or his successor, there is now amuchmore urgent big-pictureissue:restoring U.S. economic strength.Nothing else isreallypossibleif thatfundamentalprerequisite toeffectiveforeign policyis not reestablished.
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### Will Pass

#### Immigration will pass – Rubio will get on board

Washington Post 6 – 6 – 13 [Why Marco Rubio is against his own immigration bill — and what it means, http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2013/06/06/why-marco-rubio-is-against-his-own-immigration-bill-and-what-it-means/]

After months of defending immigration reform to conservatives, Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.) said earlier this week that, as the bill stands, he won’t vote for it. So, is Rubio’s pronouncement a death knell for the legislation’s chances?

Nope. Rubio’s been saying for weeks that he can’t support the bill in its current form. But that doesn’t mean he’s giving up (as one conservative radio host urged him just yesterday to do). What is worrisome for reformers is that Rubio might embrace a bill that’s too conservative for them.

During the bill markup in the Senate Judiciary Committee, Rubio pushed for an amendment that would require the implementation of a biometric tracking system, among other border-security measures. After the bill passed out of committee without those measures, he put out a statement saying that “work still remains to be done” to “earn the confidence of the American people that we are solving our immigration problems once and for all.”

It was also a few weeks ago that he circulated a memo around the Senate that listed 21 concerns with the bill.

When asked if he would support the legislation as is, Rubio told conservative talk radio host Hugh Hewitt: “If those amendments don’t pass, then I think we’ve got a bill that isn’t going to become law and I think we’re wasting our time. So the answer is no.” But, he added: “If they don’t pass, then we have to keep working to ensure that we get to a bill that can become a law.” (Rubio’s office declined to comment on the Hewitt interview. )

“Gang of Eight” members on both sides of the aisle who are pushing the legislation aren’t panicking — Sens. Chuck Schumer (D-N.Y.) and Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.) told the Tampa Bay Times that they welcomed Rubio’s efforts to bridge the gap between reformers and conservatives.

That doesn’t mean reform advocates aren’t worried. Rubio’s comments to Hewitt are his most public push yet to move the bill to the ideological right, and some reform advocates whisper that soon the legislation will be so compromised it won’t be worth passing.

They are concerned that Rubio has been supportive of Sen. John Cornyn (R-Tex.), who has introduced an amendment that would trigger a path to citizenship only after 90 percent of illegal-border crossers are caught.

“His public forays drive me a little batty, but I’m less interested in what he says and more interested in what he does,” said Frank Sharry, the executive director of the pro-reform America’s Voice. “It’s really kind of a moment of truth for Rubio: is he gonna let John Cornyn push him into a corner in a way that destabilizes the ‘Gang of Eight?’”

Others are annoyed but still confident.

“Rubio is trying to have it both ways — be seen as a leader on behalf of both immigrants and people who are uncomfortable with immigration,” said AFL-CIO spokesman Jeff Hauser. “At some point, he’ll have to choose, and ultimately we are convinced he will recognize that choosing citizenship for the 11 million is the right political move.”

If the legislation succeeds, Rubio’s efforts will make him look doubly good. With Hispanic voters, he can say he was a key player in the reform’s passage. With conservatives he can say he ensured the bill was heavily girded with enforcement measures.

But Rubio has already expended huge amounts of political capital on immigration reform. To walk away from it now – after risking his standing with conservatives by going on record, repeatedly, in support of a path to citizenship — would make no sense. Nope. Rubio’s been saying for weeks that he can’t support the bill in its current form. But that doesn’t mean he’s giving up (as one conservative radio host urged him just yesterday to do). What is worrisome for reformers is that Rubio might embrace a bill that’s too conservative for them.

#### Will pass – smaller house bills good

Klein 6 – 5 – 13 Washington Post political insider [Ezra Klein, The House won’t have a bipartisan immigration bill. That’s (maybe) okay., http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2013/06/05/the-house-wont-have-a-bipartisan-immigration-bill-thats-maybe-okay/]

The bipartisan House group that’s been working for years on an immigration bill is about to break up without anything to show for it. ABC News reports that the negotiations crashed on the shoals of whether immigrants would have access to government-subsidized health care during their 15-year path to citizenship. So what comes next? “The House is likely to pass several smaller bills that address immigration reform, but would not include a pathway to citizenship.”

Disaster? Maybe not. There’s a theory going around that that’s actually better for the final bill. The premise is that the purpose of the House process is to get a bill through the House. It could be a good bill. It could be a bad bill. It just has to be a bill. Because once something makes it through the House it will go to conference with the Senate. Once it goes to conference with the Senate, the Senate can force a product that’s more like its bill than the House bill. And once the process is that near to completion, House Republicans will be afraid to kill it. Speaker John Boehner will waive the Hastert rule, it’ll be passed with a bunch of Democratic votes, and President Obama will have something to sign.

Under this theory, anything that keeps the process moving in the House is a good thing. That means the break-up of the bipartisan House group might be a good thing. Whatever came out of the bipartisan group was likely to fail in the broader House. Either it would be too liberal for the Republicans or too conservative for the Democrats. And once it failed, there’d be no replacement. Everyone’s political capital would already be used up.

Letting Republicans break the bill into pieces makes it likelier that some of those pieces will pass. It also makes it easier for Republicans to vent their anger against certain parts of immigration reform — like the path to citizenship — without imperiling the whole bill. It makes it likelier that something, anything, passes the House.

#### Will pass - momentum

Bloomberg 5 – 23 – 13 [Obama Probes Create Immigration Magic as Bill Advances, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-05-23/obama-probes-create-immigration-magic-as-bill-advances.html]

Interesting Timing

“The timing of all of this is kind of interesting in that it probably took a bit of heat off the markup in the committee - - that doesn’t mean the bill’s not going to face intense scrutiny on the Senate floor,” Democratic strategist Jim Manley said.

“Regardless of all the so-called scandals whirling around, the fact is the immigration bill is about the only thing that’s going to get done this year,” he said.

Republican Senator Jeff Flake of Arizona, a member of the group of eight that wrote the compromise bill as well as the Judiciary Committee that signed off on it, said the scandal fever that has broken out in Washington has “been good” for the legislation, lowering the emotional temperature that has surrounded past failed efforts to make immigration changes.

‘Open Process’

“To be able to go through this markup where nobody can claim that we’ve short-circuited the process -- it’s been an open process, we’ve adopted some substantive amendments -- to be able to do that without people calling press conferences outside and without groups calling members, it’s been a good process,” Flake said in an interview, referring to the Judiciary panel’s actions. “I’d have to say it probably helped.”

The final day of Judiciary’s markup of the bill was a case in point. While former IRS officials testified before the Senate Finance Committee, the panel convened in the building next door for its fifth day of deliberations. Senator Orrin Hatch, a Utah Republican, quietly reached agreement with Democrats on changes to a high-skilled visa program, clearing an impediment to his party’s support for the bill.

“While the discussion on TV continues, the immigration bill marches on, and that’s because of that independent, strong support for the bill -- labor, business, farm groups, it’s incredible,” said Senator Amy Klobuchar of Minnesota, a Democratic member of the committee. “It’s been actually a nice oasis to actually do some legislating during all of the somewhat radioactive news.”

#### Will pass the senate

AP 6 – 11 – 13 [Immigration debate clears procedural Senate hurdle, <http://www.myfoxphoenix.com/story/22555748/immigration-bill-nears-critical-test>]

In Spanish and English, the Senate pushed contentious immigration legislation over early procedural hurdles with deceptive ease on Tuesday as President Barack Obama insisted the "moment is now" to give 11 million immigrants in the United States illegally a chance at citizenship.

Despite the lopsided votes, Republicans served notice they will seek to toughen the bill's border security provisions and impose tougher terms on those seeking to gain legal status. "This bill has serious flaws," said their party leader, Sen. Mitch McConnell of Kentucky, one of several who noted pointedly that the 60-vote majority they will demand for passage is hardly assured.

Even before the first proposed changes were considered, Florida Sen. Marco Rubio, a potential 2016 Republican presidential contender, outlined the complicated state of play for a measure that he helped draft as a member of the bipartisan "Gang of Eight" and now seeks to alter. With changes to tighten control of the U.S.-Mexican border, he said, about half of the Senate's 46 Republicans are prepared to vote to create the pathway to citizenship that is backed by most or all of the 54 lawmakers aligned with the Democratic majority.

At the White House, Obama said repeatedly the current immigration system is broken, for the foreign-born who live in the United State legally and illegally alike.

#### Will pass – momentum & Boehner’s support in the House

Politico 6 – 17 – 13 [Immigration momentum grows in House, <http://www.politico.com/story/2013/06/house-immigration-bill-92941.html>]

The Republican-led House will take its deepest dive yet into immigration reform this week, rushing to play catchup with the Senate on the chief domestic policy battle this year.

The House bipartisan group, which has labored for four years without releasing anything, is finally on the verge of producing a bill. The House Judiciary Committee is holding its first immigration markup on Tuesday on an enforcement-centered bill that Democrats abhor.

And the all-Democratic Congressional Hispanic Caucus will huddle with Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) on Wednesday, and immigration will undoubtedly be a hot topic.

“He’s the speaker of the House, the leader of the House and of the Republican Conference,” Rep. Luis Gutierrez (D-Ill.), head of the CHC immigration task force, said in an interview Monday. “He wants to get comprehensive immigration reform; we want to get comprehensive immigration reform passed. We should form a pact. Let’s cement it this Wednesday.”

The dual-track approach could signal actual momentum on House immigration reform, which so far has lagged considerably behind efforts on the other side of the Capitol. The Senate is considering the bipartisan Gang of Eight bill on the floor and may vote on it before the July 4th recess.

After several setbacks and one member withdrawing his support in an intractable disagreement over health care, the House group — now composed of three Republicans and four Democrats — appears poised to unveil its bill. That could come as early as Wednesday, although later in the week or early next week is more likely.

Negotiators have to meet again for the finishing touches and to review the language that has come back from the House legislative counsel. And the four Democratic negotiators — Reps. Xavier Becerra and Zoe Lofgren of California, John Yarmuth of Kentucky and Gutierrez — will update all House Democrats at a caucus meeting on Tuesday.

The group’s Democratic members also are having smaller briefings with different members throughout the week — meetings with the Congressional Black Caucus and the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus are on tap for Tuesday, while New Democrats — a center-left coalition — and the Congressional Progressive Caucus are scheduled for Wednesday.

“Democratic members are seeking input from their caucus on the bipartisan agreement the working group is drafting into legislative language,” a Democratic aide said. “It’s their hope that once all the i’s are dotted and the t’s are crossed, they will be able to introduce the measure with support from both sides of the aisle.”

But the focus will be on the meeting between Boehner and the Congressional Hispanic Caucus. It is believed this will be the first time that a Republican House speaker has met with the group, which is composed of all Democrats.

Boehner has privately put out word that he wants the House to act on immigration reform before the August recess and has been publicly bullish on the chances of a bill for President Barack Obama to sign into law by the end of the year.

Still, what Rep. Bob Goodlatte (R-Va.) will do is key.

#### Will pass the senate – has the votes

CBS NEWS 6 – 10 – 13 [Immigration: House, Senate looking for common ground, http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-250\_162-57588418/immigration-house-senate-looking-for-common-ground/?utm\_source=feedburner&utm\_medium=feed&utm\_campaign=Feed%3A+CBSNewsTravelGuru+(Travel+Guru%3A+CBSNews.com]

A comprehensive immigration reform bill that can only pass through one congressional chamber "doesn't do anybody any good," Sen. Ron Johnson, R-Wis., warned Sunday, two days before the Senate is slated to launch procedural votes on a weeks-long debate about legislation that would include a pathway to citizenship.

"We have to fix this system because it's not good for anybody," Johnson said on "Fox News Sunday." "Hopefully we can pass a bill."

Chances of that happening spiked significantly Sunday, when Sen. Kelly Ayotte, R-N.H., announced on "Face the Nation" she will back the comprehensive bill, pushing the legislation past the 60-vote threshold that shields it from a GOP filibuster. Ayotte called the bill's most controversial tenet - a route to citizenship for the 11 million undocumented immigrants currently living in the United States - a "tough but fair way for them to earn citizenship: Go to the back of the line, pay taxes, pass a criminal background check, learn English."

"I've looked at this very carefully," Ayotte said. "Our immigration system is completely broken; we've got 11 million people living in this country illegally and in the shadows. We have a legal immigration system that isn't meeting our needs to grow the economy. And so I looked at this carefully, this is a thoughtful bipartisan solution to a tough problem and so that's why I'm going to support it."

With Democrats and independents adding up to 54 likely "yea" votes, six is the magic number of Republicans needed to get the bill through the Senate. Expected to join Ayotte on the right are the four GOP members of the "gang of eight" senators who crafted the legislation - Sens. John McCain, R-Ariz., Jeff Flake, R-Ariz., Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., and Marco Rubio, R-Fla. - and Sen. Orrin Hatch, R-Utah, who voted the bill out of the Judiciary Committee last week.

The "gang" has said it hopes to collect as many as 70 votes in the Senate before moving the bill over to the House. And President Obama - who on Saturday said in his weekly address that there's "no reason" lawmakers can't get an immigration bill on his desk by "the end of the summer" - is on tap to deliver a speech Tuesday on the issue, which he had hoped would be a hallmark of his second-term agenda.

#### Will pass – bipartisan support in the Senate

Reuters 5 – 22 – 13 [<http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/05/22/us-usa-immigration-idUSBRE94K00L20130522>]

Supporters of U.S. immigration reform are hoping that the smooth and drama-free passage of their legislation through a Senate committee - a departure from almost everything that has happened in Congress over the past four years - will boost the likelihood of the bill winning full Senate approval.

Even Senator Charles Grassley of Iowa, the senior Republican on the Judiciary Committee who voted against the immigration bill on Tuesday, told Reuters TV that the "very fair" debate by the panel "does improve its chances."

#### House GOP leadership is on board – want a bill

Frates 6 – 18 – 13 National Journal Staff [Chris Frates, Boehner Aims to Move Immigration by Capitalizing on a Conservative Rift, <http://www.nationaljournal.com/congress/boehner-aims-to-move-immigration-by-capitalizing-on-a-conservative-rift-20130618>]

John Boehner wants immigration reform to pass. To get it done, the House speaker will have to capitalize on the widening gap among conservatives, and he’s preparing the groundwork to do it.

The rare split inside the conservative wing of Boehner’s Republican conference offers him an uncommon opportunity to bring a bill to the floor without facing an insurrection among his members. It also means convincing enough conservatives that passing some immigration measure won’t be preamble to the Senate using compromise negotiations to jam a more liberal version down the House’s throat.

As a senior GOP leadership aide put it, “Our conference is all over the place. Our goal here is to try and find that little slice of land where we can walk through and we’re not crucified on either side.”

Republicans on and off the Hill say Boehner, House Majority Leader Eric Cantor, and House Majority Whip Kevin McCarthy all want to do something on immigration. Boehner “really wants to get that done but he has to be real quiet about it because if he puts his name on it and his brand on it, like he did with the big (fiscal-cliff) deal, then it’s probably going to die under its own weight,” a former GOP leadership aide said.

So House leaders have been meeting privately with members, making the case that inaction on immigration will be more costly than doing something. Weeks into the debate, it remains a hard sell among reform opponents, particularly members who do not want to offer citizenship to people here illegally. They worry that any House legislation—such as a tough border-security bill most of them are after—will ultimately be watered down in negotiations with the Senate.

“What will have to happen, and is happening in private discussions, is that we have to convince these guys if we’re going to go to conference, we’re not going to cave on our principles,” a senior House GOP aide said. “That is the sales job you have to make to those guys.”

But it’s a hard argument to win—and not only because Republicans don’t think Democrats have much incentive to accept anything other than the Senate bill.

Plaguing House leadership is a fear among conservatives that immigration reform could be one of those few pieces of legislation that Boehner might value enough to bring to the floor knowing it would pass even though it fails to get the majority of House Republicans to back it.

“This is one of those issues where they may only get 80 to 100 Republicans to vote for it on the House floor, but there won’t be the huge internal backlash,” the former aide said. “And that gives (leadership) some room to maneuver and they have some conservative cover. They have (Sen. Marco) Rubio and (Rep. Raul) Labrador,” who are two key conservative Republicans pushing reform.

Some in leadership scoff at the notion of bringing anything to the floor without majority Republican support. “I just can’t see that happening,” a House GOP leadership aide said.

Boehner spokesman Michael Steel said, “Our goal is always to pass legislation with strong Republican support consistent with our principles.”

A number of influential congressional Republicans believe that giving the 11 million people living in the country illegally a path to citizenship opens up a new pool of voters who share the GOP’s entrepreneurial, family, and religious values.

“There’s no reason why these people can’t be our voters except for the fact that you have (GOP Rep.) Steve King out there talking about electrifying our border fence,” the senior GOP aide said.

But before that happens, Republican leaders need to convert more skeptical lawmakers into believers.

### A2 No PC

#### Obama’s loss of influence hasn’t effected immigration yet

Guardian 5 – 17 – 13 [Beleaguered Obama looks to fight back as critics ask: is he a lame duck already?, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2013/may/17/barack-obama-beleagured-lame-duck>]

However, there are some who warn that the tides of Obama's political fortunes could turn again. He still wields a lot of power in the White House, including the ability to push an agenda using presidential executive orders.

He is also likely to still be able to pursue his ambitious aim of securing immigration reform as a landmark achievement of his second term to match his healthcare law during his first period in office.

Mindful of demographic changes and the fast-growing power of Hispanic voters, many Republicans are aware that signing up with immigration reform is good politics for their party. They are unlikely to let a desire to win political points over a weakened Obama get in the way of the broader aim of improving their image with Hispanic communities.

"The politics of immigration changed dramatically after the presidential election. That continues to be the case. Both parties want to do it," said Haas.

### A2 Gitmo Thumper

#### Obama isn’t using capital on closing Gitmo

Daily Beast 6 – 12 – 13 [Wait, What about Gitmo?, <http://www.thedailybeast.com/newsweek/2013/06/12/obama-is-quietly-moving-ahead-on-guantanamo.html>]

Another potentially positive indicator for supporters of closing Guantánamo: the government of Yemen announced this week that it had begun to work with Saudi Arabia to develop a rehabilitation program for jihadis. That is a key development because among the remaining 166 detainees at Gitmo are 56 Yemenis. In early 2010, Obama had imposed a ban on their return to Yemen because of the iffy security situation there. He recently lifted the ban contingent on assurances that they could be repatriated safely. A rehab program could smooth the way for their return.

But proponents of closing Guantánamo say the most important signal has yet to arrive: evidence that Obama is willing to spend significant political capital on the effort. That could come in the form of directing Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel to issue national-security waivers to bypass onerous restrictions Congress has imposed on transferring detainees from the prison. “If Obama’s serious,” says Carlos Warner, a federal public defender who has 11 clients at Guantánamo, “he’ll start transferring men immediately using the authority he already has.”

#### Obama not spending capital on gitmo

Rogin 5 – 23 – 13 Daily Beast Staff [Josh Rogin, How Obama Bungled the Guantánamo Closing, <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2013/05/23/how-obama-bungled-the-guantanamo-closing.html>]

By announcing these steps, Obama is calling on the public to support his contention that the prison can be closed safely, in order to put pressure on Congress to change its tune, experts said.

“It looks like he’s learned some lessons from the last go-round,” said Ken Gude, chief of staff at the Center for American Progress, the think tank founded by former Clinton chief of staff John Podesta. “Starting by designating a site on a military base to hold commissions is a great first step. What is Congress going to say to the Defense Department? That it doesn’t think it can secure a U.S. military base inside the United States from potential attack by terrorists?”

The president’s new plan is only as viable as his willingness to fight for it, according to all those who witnessed its failure the first time around. It remains to be seen if Obama will use his political capital to make sure the job gets done, or if he will leave it to underlings who might not carry it out once more.

Congress is not going to move unless the White House is engaged and the president uses his own personal power to force lawmakers to implement a policy they may not like, said Moran.

“I believe the president genuinely wants to do this, but he needs to prove it and he needs to be prepared to use his leverage to make it happen,” he said. “If he doesn’t achieve it, it’s going to be one of those things that will bother him for the rest of his days.”

## Link Debate

### Political Capital is key

#### Obama’s capital is critical to overcome those differences to negotiate a deal

Washington Post 5-2 [“Why is immigration going so much better for Obama than the budget”, May 2nd, 2013, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2013/05/02/why-is-immigration-going-so-much-better-for-obama-than-the-budget/>]

In his news conference on Tuesday, Obama expressed confidence that Congress would overhaul immigration laws – what he said would be an “historic achievement” – while he was less optimistic about whether he could achieve a grand bargain on the debt. Somehow, the election and public opinion more generally have produced two different outcomes. On immigration, Senate Republicans – led by 2016 presidential contender Sen. Marco Rubio (Fla.) – are eager to strike and sell a deal. But they seem content to stand their ground on the budget. Why? The question has prompted much discussion about the structural forces shaping Congress – and Obama’s limited power to overcome them. The conventional thinking is that on immigration, Republicans are in survival mode: They recognize they need Hispanics to win national elections. On the other hand, Republicans do not see much to lose in a budget fight with Obama, and they see much more to lose if they make themselves vulnerable to primary challenges from the right. This argument is elegant in that it looks at the incentives facing Republicans, and to a large degree it is fair. But it’s also an oversimplification. Obama’s role has been more important than it may seem in shaping the political forces in Washington, but the underlying dynamics favoring an immigration deal and auguring against a budget agreement are even stronger than many recognize. In asking why Republicans seem responsive to public opinion on immigration but impervious on the budget, consider the following chart: It’s extremely unlikely that Republicans would be considering an immigration deal in the absence of Obama’s aggressive pursuit of an overhaul. In words and action, Obama forced Republicans to take a position on the issue. He also created space for more voters to support a pathway to citizenship by being quite tough on illegal immigrants facing deportation – often to the displeasure of the Hispanic community. Republicans, including presidential candidate Mitt Romney, staked out a far different position, opposing any pathway to citizenship. Republicans were savaged on Election Day: exit polling showed Obama winning Hispanics by 44 percentage points.

### Obama pushing

#### Obama spending capital on immigration – fighting to secure votes

Hindustan Times 6 – 11 – 13 [Obama back in fray on immigration reform, <http://www.hindustantimes.com/world-news/Americas/Obama-back-in-fray-on-immigration-reform/Article1-1074774.aspx>]

US President Barack Obama made an outspoken pitch for a Senate bill on comprehensive immigration reform on Tuesday, branding those opposed to it insincere about fixing a badly broken system.

Obama has gently pushed the bill from behind the scenes for months, fearing his open support would swell the ranks of conservatives who see the bill as offering amnesty to illegal immigrants and who are determined to kill it.

But as the legislation faced a crucial test vote in the Senate, Obama waded into the fray, leveraging the political capital on the issue he won during last year's election campaign, particularly among Hispanic voters.

"This week, the Senate will consider a common-sense, bipartisan bill that is the best chance we've had in years to fix our broken immigration system," Obama said at an event at the White House.

The president also sought to disarm conservative Republicans -- even some who support immigration reform -- who argue that the bill should not be passed without tough new border security measures.

"I know there's a lot of talk right now about border security so let me repeat: today illegal crossings are near their lowest level in decades.

"If passed, the Senate bill, as currently written and as hitting the floor, would put in place the toughest border enforcement plan that America has ever seen. So nobody's taking border enforcement lightly."

Obama also took direct aim at the motives of lawmakers who are opposed to the bill, which was drawn up in the Senate by a bipartisan group of lawmakers known as the "Gang of Eight."

"There's no reason Congress can't get this done by the end of the summer," Obama said, but cast doubt on the motives of those wanting to block the bill.

#### Obama pushing immigration – keeping supporters happy

The Hill 6 – 17 – 13 [Who is he? Obama keeps allies, enemies guessing in second term, <http://thehill.com/homenews/administration/305851-who-is-he-obama-keeps-allies-enemies-guessing-in-second-term>]

In a Washington Post interview last week, senior adviser Dan Pfeiffer acknowledged that the White House needed to keep supporters happy. “The greatest danger zone a president can be in is when he is being attacked on the left and the right,” Pfeiffer said. “When they are reading off the same talking points, that’s when presidencies fall apart.”

Allies say that the president has stuck his neck out for big liberal items such as gun control and immigration reform.

“He’s pushing hard on a pathway to citizenship, he wants to fight on the budget deal having a lot of balance, and on the background [checks] issue, he went around the country and spent serious political capital on that,” said Democratic strategist Doug Thornell.

They also say the Democratic grassroots see Obama’s White House as politically shrewd. They cite the way the administration fought during the election year against making Plan B birth control available to all women, but then quietly dropped that opposition last week.

#### Obama pushing immigration – publicly committing

MSNBC 6 – 11 – 13 [Obama: Congress, get your act together on immigration, <http://tv.msnbc.com/2013/06/11/president-obama-tells-congress-to-get-its-act-together-on-immigration/>]

President Obama threw his weight behind the Senate’s immigration bill in a White House speech Tuesday, declaring it the best “vehicle” for reform on political and policy grounds alike.

“To truly deal with this issue, Congress needs to act,” Obama said. “And that moment is now.”

The president’s remarks come at a tense moment for immigration reform in Congress. The Senate is opening debate on the bipartisan “Gang of Eight’s” bill with broad support from labor unions, business groups, religious leaders, and Latino groups. Supporters are confident it will reach the 60 votes needed to pass. But Republican Sen. Marco Rubio of Florida, the bill’s most conservative co-sponsor, is concerned it will be dead on arrival in the GOP-controlled House of Representatives and is demanding changes to its border security provisions. Democrats are warning that some of the ideas floating around the Senate—especially a proposed amendment by Republican Sen. John Cornyn of Texas that adds new obstacles to eventual citizenship for undocumented immigrants—would derail the bill.

Keenly aware of the debate, Obama called the existing Senate bill the “biggest commitment to border security in our nation’s history.” He listed a number of its provisions on that front, including billions of dollars for border surveillance and enforcement, higher criminal penalties for smugglers, and a new requirement that employers check their workers’ legal status before hiring.

He also had some stern words for House Republicans, who supporters of reform fear are returning to their old hardline ways. Last week, Republicans overwhelmingly voted for an amendment opposing Obama’s decision to stay deportations on young undocumented immigrants, and two key House committee chairs on immigration introduced a hardline enforcement-only bill.

Obama, who was introduced by an aspiring engineer who arrived in America illegally from Nigeria as a child, decried “extreme steps like stripping protection to DREAMers my office has already provided” which he said would relegate them to the same enforcement priority as “violent criminals.”

The good news for Obama is that House Speaker John Boehner of Ohio publicly supports passing immigration reform this year. The bad news is nobody is sure what kind of immigration reform he means—he’s extremely cagey about issues like a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants, a centerpiece of the Senate proposal, for example. It’s still not clear he’d be willing to override his conservative members to pass a final bill that relies mostly on Democratic votes. The most promising way forward may be a bipartisan group of House members working on a comprehensive bill, but they’ve been mired by internal divisions over how newly legalized immigrants would obtain health care, prompting one member, Republican Rep. Raul Labrador of Idaho, to quit.

### Delay Link

#### Delay threatens immigration passage

Kelley 6 – 12 – 13 Swamp Land Staff [Caroline Kelley, Can Congress Vote On Immigration Reform Before Its Vacation?, <http://swampland.time.com/2013/06/12/can-congress-pass-immigration-reform-before-its-vacation/>]

The clock is ticking for immigration reform. On Tuesday, President Obama urged Congress to move quickly on the sweeping reform bill the Senate began debating this week. “There’s no reason Congress can’t get this done by the end of the summer,” he said. The president’s urgency was reminiscent of the way President George W. Bush pushed for his own immigration reform package in 2007. Six years ago this Wednesday, Bush visited Capitol Hill to “make a personal appeal” to Republican senators on behalf of his plan, which included a goal that they vote before Congress’s July 4 recess—the same target recently set for this year’s Senate reform effort by New York Democrat Chuck Schumer.

The Senate couldn’t deliver a vote by July 4 in 2007, however, and Bush’s bill eventually died in the doldrums of summer. Proponents of this year’s version hope for more success. But, they too face a calendar challenge. Norman J. Ornstein, a resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, says that he “wouldn’t bet a great deal of money on meeting the July 4th deadline” this year.

A significant delay in the Senate could make it harder for the House to vote on immigration reform before Congress goes on vacation. The House is scheduled to be in session for just 16 days following the July 4 holiday before lawmakers begin their month-long vacation on August 5th. House Speaker John Boehner has said he hopes the House can vote before then.

Reform advocates worry that if a bill isn’t passed before August, opponents might marshal intense opposition to it in the media and at lawmakers’ town hall meetings, just as they did with Obama’s health care plan in the summer of 2009, which threatened to derail that bill. Ornstein thinks immigration reform could survive Congress’s recess, but that the delay would make passage more difficult.

## Answers To Aff Generics

### Hirsh 1nr Block

#### 1. Hirsh is an indict of the meme of capital – we have warrants specific to the immigration bill.

#### 2. Obama’s working behind the scenes – that’s the 1nc link – here’s academic support

BECKMANN & KUMAR 11 Professor of Political Science, UC, Irvine [Matthew N. Beckmann and Vimal Kumar, How presidents push, when presidents win: A model of positive presidential power in US lawmaking, Journal of Theoretical Politics 2011 23: 3

Fortunately for those inside the West Wing, some researchers paint a more optimistic picture regarding presidents’ potential for passing important planks of their legislative agenda. Covington et al. (1995), Barrett and Eshbaugh-Soha (2007), Edwards III and Barrett (2000), Kellerman (1984), Light (1982), Peterson (1990), and Rudalevige (2002) all observe that presidents secure greater support for their ‘priority’ items, and when they exert ‘effort’ pushing them. In addition, Covington (1987) concludes that White House officials can occasionally win greater support among legislators by working behind the scenes, while Canes-Wrone (2001, 2005) shows that presidents can induce support from a recalcitrant Congress by strategically ‘going public’ when advocating popular proposals (see also Kernell (1993)). Sullivan (1987, 1988) finds that presidents can amass winning congressional coalitions by changing members’ positions as a bill moves through the legislative process.

However, even among these relative optimists, the prescription for presidents appears to be an ephemeral combination of luck and effort, not a systematic strategy. In discussing the challenge for a president looking to push legislation on Capitol Hill, Samuel Kernell offers a comparable assessment. He writes, The number and variety of choices place great demands upon [presidents’] strategic calculation, so much so that pluralist leadership must be understood as an art…an ability to sense ‘right choices’. (Kernell, 1993: 36) Furthermore, the seemingly paradoxical findings noted above, that is, a general (if modest) pattern of president-supported legislative success on passage and policy content, but not on ‘key’ roll-call votes, remain unexplained.

This paper aims to demystify the White House’s legislative strategies, both their logic and their effects. Developing a non-cooperative game in which the president allocates scarce ‘political capital’ to induce changes in legislators’ behavior, we deduce two lobbying strategies White House officials may execute and, in turn, investigate their impact on the laws that result. Interestingly, we theorize that presidents’ foremost influence comes from bargaining with congressional leaders over policy alternatives before bills reach the floor, not bargaining with pivotal voters for their support once they do. Precisely because so much of the presidents’ influence comes in the legislative earlygame (rather than the endgame), we theorize that typical roll-call-based tests of presidents’ legislative influence have missed most of it.

#### 3. Prefer our theory cards – from professors – not a Daily Beast Blogger

#### A. Insiders believe it’s true – so it de-facto is

SCHIER 11 Dorothy H. and Edward C. Congdon Professor of Political Science at Carleton College [Steven E. Schier, The Contemporary Presidency: The Presidential Authority Problem and the Political Power Trap, Presidential Studies Quarterly, Volume 41, Issue 4, pages 793–808, December 2011]

The concept of political capital captures many of the aspects of a president's political authority. Paul Light defines several components of political capital: party support of the president in Congress, public approval of the president's conduct of his job, the president's electoral margin, and patronage appointments (Light 1999, 15). Light derived this list from the observations of 126 White House staff members he interviewed (1999, 14). His indicators have two central uses. First, Light's research reveals that they are central to the “players' perspective” in Washington. That is, those “in the game” view these items as crucial for presidential effectiveness. Second, they relate to many central aspects of political authority as defined by Skowronek. So on both theoretical and practical levels, the components of political capital are central to the fate of presidencies. The data here will reveal that presidents over the last 70 years have suffered from a trend of declining levels of political capital, a trend that is at the heart of their political authority problem.

Many scholars have examined particular aspects of presidential political capital, from congressional support (for example, Bond and Fleisher 1992, 2000; Mayhew 2005; Peterson 1993) to job approval (Brace and Hinckley 1991; Kernell 1978; Nicholson Segura and Woods 2002). From these, we know that presidential job approval is influenced by economic performance, tends to drop over time, and that divided government can boost job approval. Also, job approval and control of Congress by fellow partisans boosts presidential success in floor votes but does not produce more important legislation than does periods of divided government. These “micro” findings, however, comport with a “macro trend” of declining presidential political capital over time. This analysis explores that macro trend and relates it to previous micro findings.

#### B. Losing capital hurts

BECKMANN & KUMAR 11 Professor of Political Science, UC, Irvine [Matthew N. Beckmann and Vimal Kumar, How presidents push, when presidents win: A model of positive presidential power in US lawmaking, Journal of Theoretical Politics 2011 23: 3

Before developing presidents’ lobbying options for building winning coalitions on Capitol Hill, it is instructive to consider cases where the president has no political capital and no viable lobbying options. In such circumstances of imposed passivity (beyond offering a proposal), a president’s fate is clear: his proposals are subject to pivotal voters’ preferences. So if a president lacking political capital proposes to change some far-off status quo, that is, one on the opposite side of the median or otherwise pivotal voter, a (Condorcet) winner always exists, and it coincides with the pivot’s predisposition (Brady and Volden, 1998; Krehbiel, 1998) (see also Black (1948) and Downs (1957)). Considering that there tends to be substantial ideological distance between presidents and pivotal voters, positive presidential influence without lobbying, then, is not much influence at all.11

#### 4. Hirsh admits the agenda sometimes works that way

HIRSH 12 – 14 – 12 [Michael Hirsh, Obama Gets a Solution to His Susan Rice Problem, <http://www.nationaljournal.com/whitehouse/obama-gets-a-solution-to-his-susan-rice-problem-20121213>]

It was a classic Washington exit: stealthy and swift, with few fingerprints. President Obama didn’t want to be seen as backing down. So Susan Rice — one of his most devoted aides since 2007 — gave him the way out, seemingly all on her own.

“If nominated, I am now convinced that the confirmation process would be lengthy, disruptive, and costly — to you and to our most pressing national and international priorities,” Rice wrote on Thursday in a letter withdrawing her name from consideration as secretary of State.

In a statement in response, Obama said that “while I deeply regret the unfair and misleading attacks on Susan Rice in recent weeks,” he “accepted her decision.” He added that Rice will continue as his U.N. ambassador for the time being.

This was all the part intended for public consumption. The underlying reality is this: The president is almost certainly furious about this turn of events — which represents the first major defeat he’s suffered since his reelection — but he’s a savvy enough politician to know how to back off without seeming to back down. While floating Rice’s name for secretary of State in the media was always something of a trial balloon — she was never formally nominated or even publicly declared by the administration to be the leading candidate to replace Hillary Rodham Clinton — Obama appeared to really want to appoint her, calling her “extraordinary” and excoriating GOP attacks on her with unusual (for him) personal pique.

But as the weeks passed, it became clearer that Rice’s biggest political problem was no longer just the klatch of Republican senators, led by John McCain, who were fiercely criticizing her for allegedly misleading statements on the attack at the U.S. consulate that killed U.S. Ambassador Christopher Stevens and three other Americans in Benghazi, Libya on Sept. 11.

After a series of strikingly unsuccessful meetings on Capitol Hill in which she failed to impress even moderate Republicans such as Susan Collins of Maine, Rice also found herself facing resistance from foreign-policy elites who questioned her temperament and her record. In addition, human-rights critics were up in arms over her behavior toward African dictators, particularly her role in allegedly holding up publication of a U.N. report that concluded the government of Rwandan President Paul Kagame, with whom she has a long and close relationship, was supplying and financing a brutal Congolese rebel force known as the M23 Movement.

That may have been the tipping point, though an official on Rice's team declined to say so. As she put it herself in her letter to Obama, the president had some other “pressing national international priorities.… It is far more important that we devote precious legislative hours and energy to enacting your core goals, including comprehensive immigration reform, balanced deficit reduction, job creation, and maintaining a robust national defense and effective U.S. global leadership.”

In other words, the Obama team was quickly coming to realize that, even though it appeared he had considerable leverage over the Republicans following a more-robust-than-thought reelection victory, a Rice nomination was simply going to cost him too much political capital, especially when it came to a long-term budget deal.

### Winners Win Answers

#### Winners don’t win – Needs to build trust not alienate

DICKERSON 3 – 21 – 13 CBS Political Director [John Dickerson, How Not to Woo Republicans, <http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/politics/2013/03/if_barack_obama_wants_a_grand_bargain_with_republicans_he_needs_to_build.single.html>]

To woo your enemy, do not drop an ox in his soup. That isn’t an ancient maxim, but the idea behind it is so self-evident, I don't need to find Sun Tzu’s version to know it’s true. When you are trying to build trust with someone who does not trust you, don't give them new reasons not to trust you.

President Obama needs to be reminded of this basic truth. When Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu asked him if he was planning to relax after he landed in Israel on Wednesday, Obama replied, "It's good to get away from Congress." House Speaker John Boehner told Jake Tapper in an interview, "So much for the charm offensive."

Oh come on, you're saying. (And if you're not, you should be.) How sensitive a spring flower is John Boehner if he bruises this easily? Is this how inconsequential our politics have become that this overheard line requires comment? Yes, this is exactly what we've been reduced to and we can all meet for a symposium on how small things have become later this summer. (I'll bring the microscope!) But if the president wants to get that big deal he's been talking about, he's going to have to hold his tongue.

The premise of the president's recent outreach to Republicans is that he might be able to build connections that would lead to a grand budget bargain. This relationship relies on trust. Republicans must trust that if they take a political risk to support changes in the tax code that would bring in revenue for deficit reduction—which will hurt them with their supporters—the president won't undermine them further with their voters by making them look like chumps.

This relationship needs to do more than just win their agreement. It needs to be flexible and durable enough to help Republicans build support on their own side. The president’s Republican partners have to make the case for this bargain (still a near-fantasy long shot) to their voters and colleagues who don't trust the president and who only form their opinions about him by watching television.

#### Obama needs allies – influence lower than it was

WSJ 3 - 6 - 13 President Woos GOP to Seek Broad Dealhttp://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887323628804578344083964807590.html

Even some Democrats are doubtful that Mr. Obama's latest efforts will bear fruit. Senate Democrats believe the White House had far more leverage at the end of 2012, when Republicans were eager to avoid across-the-board tax increases under what was called the fiscal cliff.

Mr. Obama hosted several gatherings with chief executives to seek input as he tried to reach a budget deal at the end of the year. After he gave a speech last week to CEOs at a Washington hotel, he lingered for nearly an hour for private discussions with the corporate leaders, moving table to table, said someone who was at the gathering.

Senior Obama aides also have held conference calls with the chiefs of several dozen top companies, including Xerox Corp., XRX +0.71% Caterpillar Inc. CAT +0.01% and Boeing Co., BA +2.49% according to participants on the calls.

"The president and his aides realize they need as many allies as they can get for the four years ahead," said one executive who has been in the thick of the recent White House outreach campaign.

### Capital is finite

#### Capital is finite – Obama has enough to get his agenda done now

U DAILY 3 – 12 – 13 University of Delaware Paper [Talking politics, Mycoff discusses Obama, Congress during UDARF luncheon talk, <http://www.udel.edu/udaily/2013/mar/udarf-mycoff-031213.html>]

\*Cites Jason Mycoff – Associate Professor of Political Science and IR at UD

The guest speaker was Jason Mycoff, associate professor of political science and international relations at UD, who was a moderator during the Delaware Debates on campus last fall.

Mycoff has research interests that include Congress, the presidency and the judiciary, with special interests in committees, political leadership and the interaction between the legislative and executive branches.

In his presentation, “President Obama and the 113th Congress: Setting the Agenda,” Mycoff looked at the possible opportunities that Obama and Republicans might have to work together on the president’s second term priorities.

“President Obama succeeded in getting one of his major initiatives, the Affordable Care Act (ACA), passed by Congress during his first term,” Mycoff said. “The major agenda items that I see for his second term include implementing the ACA, tax increases, immigration reform and climate change.”

Mycoff noted that a fifth agenda item, gun safety, was not on the president’s original list, but was forced on by events at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newton, Conn., last December.

“I think President Obama is in a pretty strong position,” Mycoff said. “He has a 50 percent-plus approval rating, and this gives him a comfortable cover and the notion that the voters are on his side.”

While slightly more than half of those polled approve the president’s performance, only 15 percent have a favorable opinion about the job Congress is doing, Mycoff said.

“The president’s approval rating is not great, but it’s much better than that of Congress,” Mycoff said. “What the president is saying to the public as a result is, ‘I’m the one you like. I’m the one who has the good ideas.’”

Further strengthening Obama’s position in pursing his second term agenda is his success at the polls last November.

“Of all the swing states that people were looking at as capable of deciding the election, the president won 10 and Mitt Romney took only one state, North Carolina,” Mycoff said. “The president not only got 50 percent of the vote, but he remained standing in 10 of the 11 states where Romney tried to knock him down.”

While the Democrats increased their majority in the U.S. Senate, the Republicans kept control of the House of Representatives, where they hold a 234 to 201-seat majority.

“Even with this, the president is in a relatively strong position,” Mycoff said. “The question is, how can he transform this momentum into action on his second term agenda.”

Historically, for a variety of reasons, presidents have tended to be less successful in pursing agenda goals, Mycoff said.

“The first theory is that people feel presidents have already had four years in office and have used up all their great ideas,” Mycoff said. “Another theory is that scandals usually happen during the second term because people have more time to get into trouble.”

Examples of the “second term curse” include court-packing via the Judicial Procedures Reform Bill of 1937, by Franklin D. Roosevelt, the resignation of Richard Nixon, the Iran Contra scandal during Ronald Reagan’s second term, Bill Clinton’s impeachment and the failure of George W. Bush’s initiative to reform Social Security, Mycoff said.

“One of the reasons that presidential approval ratings fall during the second term is that people get tired of seeing the same faces after eight years,” Mycoff said. “They also may tend to reach too far in pushing their agenda and use up their political capital in doing so.”

For his part, Obama has to do battle with the Republicans in Congress while contending with the myths about presidential second terms, Mycoff said.

Despite a fairly divided electorate and Republican intransigence in Congress, Mycoff said there are signs that some compromise may be possible as the president pursues his priority programs.

“Speaker of the House John Boehner said that there is a widow of opportunity for President Obama during the next 18 months when things will have to get done,” Mycoff said. “The speaker said that ‘this will take time, but if we’re all striving for a solution, I’m confident that we can get it done.’”

#### Agenda finite – adding things kills other items

WEIGANT 1 – 23 – 13 Political writer and blogger at ChrisWeigant.com & Huffington [Chris Weigant, Handicapping Obama's Second Term Agenda, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/chris-weigant/obama-second-term_b_2537802.html>]

The ceremonies are all over and Congress has slunk back into Washington, meaning President Obama's second term can now truly begin. Obama laid out an impressive and optimistic agenda in his speech on Monday, which leads to the question of how much of this agenda will actually be passed into law. Obama faces a Senate with a Democratic edge, but not a filibuster-proof edge. Obama also faces a House with fewer Republicans in it, but still enough for a solid majority. From the viewpoint of the past two years, this seems to indicate that not much of what Obama wants will get done. But perhaps -- just perhaps, mind you -- things will be a little different for the next two years.

Obama, like all second-term presidents, will only have a short window of time to push his issues. There is one way this conventional wisdom could turn out to be wrong, but it is a long shot, at best. If Democrats can manage to hold their edge in the Senate and take control of the House in the 2014 midterm elections, then Obama could defy second-term expectations and actually get a lot done in his final two years in office. But, as I said, this should be seen as a remote possibility at this point. Remember 2010, in other words.

Realistically, Obama's only going to have anywhere from a few months to (at most) a year and a half to get anything accomplished. Which is why he is right to push his agenda immediately, as evidenced by his inaugural speech. But even he must realize that he's not going to get everything he wants, so it will be interesting to see what makes it through Congress and what dies an ignoble legislative death.

There is reason for hope. Obama begins from a position of strength, politically. His job approval ratings have been consistently over 50 percent since he was re-elected -- a range Obama hasn't seen since 2009. As mentioned, the Republican presence in both houses of Congress has shrunk. More importantly, though, the House Republicans are visibly chastened (or even "shaken") by the election's outcome.

### Dickerson Answers

#### Even Dickerson has switched positions – Obama doesn’t have the positioning to gets wins going

NEWS BUSTERS 3 – 22 – 13 [CBS Political Director Now: Obama Shouldn't Agitate GOP; Back in January: 'Go For The Throat,' Mr. President, <http://www.newsbusters.org/blogs/matt-vespa/2013/03/22/180-turn-cbs-political-director-says-obama-shouldnt-agitate-gop-said-go->]

Has Slate’s John Dickerson been replaced with a pod person? If not, the CBS Political Director is exuding signs of schizophrenia – or sheer forgetfulness. While in January Dickerson counseled the president to "go for the throat" of the Republican Party, in today's piece at the online opinion journal he's calling for Obama to court Republicans on a "grand bargain" to avert the looming debt crisis.

Today, Mr. Dickinson used anecdotes and Sun Tzu axioms to convey the point that Obama should not be such an agitator if he wants a deal to solve our fiscal woes.

The premise of the president's recent outreach to Republicans is that he might be able to build connections that would lead to a grand budget bargain. This relationship relies on trust. Republicans must trust that if they take a political risk to support changes in the tax code that would bring in revenue for deficit reduction—which will hurt them with their supporters—the president won't undermine them further with their voters by making them look like chumps.

This relationship needs to do more than just win their agreement. It needs to be flexible and durable enough to help Republicans build support on their own side. The president’s Republican partners have to make the case for this bargain (still a near-fantasy long shot) to their voters and colleagues who don't trust the president and who only form their opinions about him by watching television.

[…]

Resisting the urge to strike back is the hard part of schmoozing with the opposition, and that is where LBJ's talents—which are so often misapplied to the current context—might be instructive. Johnson was a brute and a bully, and he fought like hell for what he wanted. He was also incredibly arrogant. (Why check the Bible, his press secretary Bill Moyers once joked on the LBJ campaign plane, "when we have Himself here with us.") But when LBJ wanted something as much as Obama wants us to believe he wants a deal, Johnson flattered, sublimated, and diminished himself before whomever he hoped to woo. Sometimes he even gave those senators pointers on how they should boast in public about how they'd bested him.

Perhaps President Obama has done all of this in those private phone calls. He's definitely endured a lot of lectures from men he would like to tell to get stuffed. But what he does in private only creates some of the room he needs for a deal.

What’s odd is that Dickerson wrote a piece on January 18, which said that Obama should “declare war” on Republicans in order to become the transformative political figure everyone on the left wants him to be. This could be seen as the beginning of the end of the vicious gloating liberals dished out to conservatives after Obama was re-elected, but it was nasty all the same.

Heck, even some Slate writers were telling their colleagues to cool it. Is this a tale of two Dickersons?

On Jan. 18, Dickerson wrote (emphasis mine):

The challenge for President Obama’s speech is the challenge of his second term: how to be great when the environment stinks. Enhancing the president’s legacy requires something more than simply the clever application of predictable stratagems. Washington’s partisan rancor, the size of the problems facing government, and the limited amount of time before Obama is a lame duck all point to a single conclusion: The president who came into office speaking in lofty terms about bipartisanship and cooperation can only cement his legacy if he destroys the GOP. If he wants to transform American politics, he must go for the throat.

[…]

Obama’s only remaining option is to pulverize. Whether he succeeds in passing legislation or not, given his ambitions, his goal should be to delegitimize his opponents. Through a series of clarifying fights over controversial issues, he can force Republicans to either side with their coalition's most extreme elements or cause a rift in the party that will leave it, at least temporarily, in disarray.

What happened in the interim? First, the president and the Democrats lost the sequester battle. Second, polling shows Americans tend to support the substance of Republican economic policies, even as the party label itself is, at present, not popular.

This, coupled with the hyperbolic scenarios related to the sequestration cuts, have allowed Republicans to highlight the real pork, such as the studying of duck genitalia, to slam the president lamenting over the closure of White House tours. Indeed, even self-described lefties are starting to lose confidence in Obama. In a recent Washington Post/ABC poll, the president saw liberals lose confidence in him over handling the economy over Republicans by fourteen points! Women’s support of his economic agenda slipped an equally bad twelve points since December.

Perhaps Dickerson was part of the liberal crowd that felt the president, fresh off his reelection, has a mandate, but was wholly illusory.

## Aff Specific Link Cards

### Cuba Link – Obama flip-flop

#### Obama won’t initiate change to the embargo – he’s said he’s against it

Knoller 09 CBS News White House Correspondent [Mark Knoller, Obama: I'll Stick With Embargo For Now, http://www.cbsnews.com/2100-503764\_162-4955009.html]

President Obama freely admits that the U.S. trade embargo of Cuba "hasn't worked the way we wanted it to" although it's been in effect for nearly 50 years.

Even so, he made it clear today it will stay in place until Cuban leaders take more overt action to free political prisoners, and permit freedom of the press and democratic elections.

"The Cuban people aren't free and that's our lodestone, our north star when it comes to our policy in Cuba," said Mr. Obama.

During a trip-ending news conference at the site of the Summit of the Americas (where Cuba's exclusion and the U.S. embargo were highly-contentious issues), the president said his concerns about Cuba are "not simply something to be brushed aside."

That puts his policy in line with all of his predecessors, who resisted calls at home and abroad, even from members of Congress, that the embargo be lifted.

Defending the exclusion of Cuba from the Summit, President Obama pointed out that all 34 leaders there were democratically-elected, which "conferred legitimacy" on them. He said that is not the case with Cuba's leaders.

He said his administration won't change its policy toward Havana "overnight," but he feels he has sent a signal to Cuba that he wants to see a "transformation."

### Engagement Link

#### Plan requires capital and domestic political backlash dooms engagement – sends signal of failure & can undo efforts. Means the link turns the aff.

HAASS & O’SULLIVAN 00 a. VP & Director of Foreign Policy Studies at Brookings, b. Fellow in the Foreign Policy Studies Program at Brookings [Richard N. Haass and Meghan L. O’Sullivan, Terms of Engagement: Alternatives to Punitive Policies 113, Survival, vol. 42, no. 2, Summer 2000, pp. 113–35]

Building support at home

Engagement strategies often fail not simply because of disagreements between the US and the country it is engaging, but because American domestic political considerations warp the strategy or make it untenable. Détente between the US and the Soviet Union is the best case in point. Kissinger and Nixon carefully crafted their ‘linkage’ strategy, where the Soviet Union would be offered political and economic incentives in return for restrained behaviour in the strategic arena. This trade-off did encourage Brezhnev to negotiate and sign significant arms-control agreements, and certainly, some of the agreements and the summits at which they were signed accorded the Soviet Union a muchdesired increase in political status. However, Kissinger’s capacity to pursue détente was damaged by the inability of the Nixon administration to deliver pledged trade concessions. While Kissinger and Nixon had promised the Soviet Union MFN trading status in return for its cooperation in other global arenas, they failed to convince Congress of the importance of this deal. As a result, Congress passed the Jackson-Vanik amendment, which linked MFN status to the internal behaviour of the Soviet regime. This move tied the hands of Kissinger and helped undermine the strategy of détente.

Although the strong backing of domestic public opinion will always be valuable to those implementing an engagement strategy, the support of Congress and representatives of key constituencies and businesses is critical to success. Securing support for engagement among these key actors in democratic societies requires intense coordination between various branches of government. As the case of North Korea aptly illustrates, engagement strategies are too often hindered by executive efforts to evade congressional involvement and congressional attempts to thwart executive endeavours. From the perspective of the executive branch, a strength of the Agreed Framework was that it was not a treaty with North Korea. While this technicality spared the agreement from the necessity of Senate ratification, Congress later asserted itself through its reluctance to finance commitments made under the accord. For several reasons, the executive branch should take the lead in implementing engagement strategies. Not only is the articulation of the rationale behind the chosen foreign-policy strategy best handled by the President and his principals, but also the executive branch is uniquely positioned to negotiate with foreign countries and their leaders. However, rather than regarding Congress as an impediment to the smooth implementation of engagement, the president and his advisers need to consider Congress as another partner in a multi-faceted consultation. Ideally, these efforts would go beyond simply briefing Congress about the state of relations with candidates for engagement, to include the appointment of joint executive/congressional delegations and fact-finding missions. In return for such efforts, Congress should recognise that the executive branch needs discretion in order to negotiate with target countries, in the reasonable expectation that it can deliver the incentives it extends.

## Impact Debate

### Key to the Economy

#### Immigration reforms key to the economy

Beadle 12 [Amanda Peterson Beadle, Think Progress, Dec 10, 2012, “Top 10 Reasons Why The U.S. Needs Comprehensive Immigration Reform” <http://thinkprogress.org/justice/2012/12/10/1307561/top-10-reasons-why-the-us-needs-comprehensive-immigration-reform-that-includes-a-path-to-citizenship/>]

1. Legalizing the 11 million undocumented immigrants in the United States would boost the nation’s economy. It would add a cumulative $1.5 trillion to the U.S. gross domestic product—the largest measure of economic growth—over 10 years. That’s because immigration reform that puts all workers on a level playing field would create a virtuous cycle in which legal status and labor rights exert upward pressure on the wages of both American and immigrant workers. Higher wages and even better jobs would translate into increased consumer purchasing power, which would benefit the U.S. economy as a whole. 2. Tax revenues would increase. The federal government would accrue $4.5 billion to $5.4 billion in additional net tax revenue over just three years if the 11 million undocumented immigrants were legalized. And states would benefit. Texas, for example, would see a $4.1 billion gain in tax revenue and the creation of 193,000 new jobs if its approximately 1.6 million undocumented immigrants were legalized. 3. Harmful state immigration laws are damaging state economies. States that have passed stringent immigration measures in an effort to curb the number of undocumented immigrants living in the state have hurt some of their key industries, which are held back due to inadequate access to qualified workers. A farmer in Alabama, where the state legislature passed the anti-immigration law HB 56 in 2011, for example, estimated that he lost up to $300,000 in produce in 2011 because the undocumented farmworkers who had skillfully picked tomatoes from his vines in years prior had been forced to flee the state. 4. A path to citizenship would help families access health care. About a quarter of families where at least one parent is an undocumented immigrant are uninsured, but undocumented immigrants do not qualify for coverage under the Affordable Care Act, leaving them dependent on so-called safety net hospitals that will see their funding reduced as health care reforms are implemented. Without being able to apply for legal status and gain health care coverage, the health care options for undocumented immigrants and their families will shrink. 5. U.S. employers need a legalized workforce. Nearly half of agricultural workers, 17 percent of construction workers, and 12 percent of food preparation workers nationwide lacking legal immigration status. But business owners—from farmers to hotel chain owners—benefit from reliable and skilled laborers, and a legalization program would ensure that they have them. 6. In 2011, immigrant entrepreneurs were responsible for more than one in four new U.S. businesses. Additionally, immigrant businesses employ one in every 10 people working for private companies. Immigrants and their children founded 40 percent of Fortune 500 companies, which collectively generated $4.2 trillion in revenue in 2010—more than the GDP of every country in the world except the United States, China, and Japan. Reforms that enhance legal immigration channels for high-skilled immigrants and entrepreneurs while protecting American workers and placing all high-skilled workers on a level playing field will promote economic growth, innovation, and workforce stability in the United States. 7. Letting undocumented immigrants gain legal status would keep families together. More than 5,100 children whose parents are undocumented immigrants are in the U.S. foster care system, according to a 2011 report, because their parents have either been detained by immigration officials or deported and unable to reunite with their children. If undocumented immigrants continue to be deported without a path to citizenship enabling them to remain in the U.S. with their families, up to 15,000 children could be in the foster care system by 2016 because their parents were deported, and most child welfare departments do not have the resources to handle this increase. 8. Young undocumented immigrants would add billions to the economy if they gained legal status. Passing the DREAM Act—legislation that proposes to create a roadmap to citizenship for immigrants who came to the United States as children—would put 2.1 million young people on a pathway to legal status, adding $329 billion to the American economy over the next two decades. 9. And DREAMers would boost employment and wages. Legal status and the pursuit of higher education would create an aggregate 19 percent increase in earnings for young undocumented immigrants who would benefit from the DREAM Act by 2030. The ripple effects of these increased wages would create $181 billion in induced economic impact, 1.4 million new jobs, and $10 billion in increased federal revenue. 10. Significant reform of the high-skilled immigration system would benefit certain industries that require high-skilled workers. Immigrants make up 23 percent of the labor force in high-tech manufacturing and information technology industries, and immigrants more highly educated, on average, than the native-born Americans working in these industries. For every immigrant who earns an advanced degree in one of these fields at a U.S. university, 2.62 American jobs are created.

### Economic Decline causes war

#### Decline cause miscalculation and conflict – prefer statistically significant evidence

Royal 10 (Jedediah, Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction – U.S. Department of Defense, “Economic Integration, Economic Signaling and the Problem of Economic Crises”, Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal and Political Perspectives, Ed. Goldsmith and Brauer, p. 213–215)

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defence behaviour of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances Modelski and Thompson's (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre–eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre–eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous shocks such as economic crises could usher in a redistribution of relative power (see also Gilpin. 1981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation (Feaver, 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflict as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power (Werner. 1999). Separately, Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remain unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland's (1996, 2000) theory of trade expectations suggests that 'future expectation of trade' is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behaviour of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, if the expectations of future trade decline, particularly for difficult to replace items such as energy resources, the likelihood for conflict increases**,** as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states.4 Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularlyduring periods of economic downturn. They write: The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favour. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self–reinforce each other. (Blomberg & Hess, 2002. p. 89) Economic decline has also been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism (Blomberg, Hess, & Weerapana, 2004), which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. "Diversionary theory" suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have increased incentives to fabricate externalmilitary conflicts to create a 'rally around the flag' effect. Wang (1996), DeRouen (1995). and Blomberg, Hess, and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997), Miller (1999), and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states, due to the fact that democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States, and thus weak Presidential popularity, are statistically linked to an increase in theuse of force. In summary, recent economic scholarship positively correlates economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflictat systemic, dyadic and national levels.5 This implied connection between integration, crises and armed conflict has not featured prominently in the economic–security debate and deserves more attention.

### Reform key to Latin Relations

#### Immigration reform is critical to US-Latin American relations

Barshefsky and Hill April 12 (Charlene and James T., Chairs Council on Foreign Relations, US-Latin America Relations: A New Direction For a New Reality”)

Some enduring problems stand squarely in the way of partnership and effective cooperation . The inability of Washington to reform its broken immigration system is a constant source of friction between the United States and nearly every other country in the Americas . Yet US officials rarely refer to immigration as a foreign policy issue . Domestic policy debates on this issue disregard the United States’ hemispheric agenda as well as the interests of other nations.

# Aff

## Uniquenesss

### Won’t Pass

#### Won’t pass – Obama’s scandal & GOP opposition

Bloomberg 5 – 23 – 13 [Obama Probes Create Immigration Magic as Bill Advances, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-05-23/obama-probes-create-immigration-magic-as-bill-advances.html]

2007 Defeat

The immigration bill stands at the same juncture a similar measure reached in June 2007, before heading for the Senate floor and collapsing after an at-times bitter floor fight, with a handful of Democrats joining Republicans to defeat it.

That could still be the current legislation’s fate. The potential damage from the scandal to Obama’s influence and the partisan fissures they could create may diminish momentum.

Also, some Democrats regard the bill’s provisions to bolster border security and enforcement as too punitive and object that it creates an arduous and costly process for undocumented immigrants to eventually gain citizenship.

And while most Republican leaders have embraced an immigration revision as a political imperative after the 2012 elections demonstrated their weakness with Hispanic voters, some parts of the party’s base remain opposed to what they regard as “amnesty.”

Some of the immigration bill’s top Republican supporters, who are risking their support from those party activists, have been the loudest voices criticizing Obama over the scandals.

#### Wont’ pass the house – despite Senate

CBS NEWS 6 – 10 – 13 [Immigration: House, Senate looking for common ground, http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-250\_162-57588418/immigration-house-senate-looking-for-common-ground/?utm\_source=feedburner&utm\_medium=feed&utm\_campaign=Feed%3A+CBSNewsTravelGuru+(Travel+Guru%3A+CBSNews.com]

Still, even with Ayotte in the mix, the legislation's journey going forward will be uphill: Rubio has stipulated that floor debate must churn out increased border security provisions if the bill hopes to pass muster among conservatives in both the Senate and the House. And though Hatch made a deal to pass the bill through committee, he hasn't committed to voting it into law.

Sen. Rand Paul, R-Ky., suggested he could be the one to bring Republicans together on this issue: "I am the conduit between conservatives in the House who don't want a lot of these things and more moderate people in the Senate who do want these things," Paul said on "Fox News Sunday." "They're going to have to come to me and they're going to have to work with me to make the bill stronger if they want me to vote for it.

"What they have in the Senate has zero chance of passing in the House," he continued. "I'm really trying to make immigration work."

Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev., has said he expects to hold a vote on final passage by July 4. On the House side, members of the chamber's "group of 8" working on their own version of immigration reform emerged from a closed-door meeting with select senators Wednesday saying they have "found a way forward" on a comprehensive bill.

#### Won’t pass the house

Reuters 5 – 22 – 13 [<http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/05/22/us-usa-immigration-idUSBRE94K00L20130522>]

Several House Republicans have warned that the Senate's bill will not pass the House.

If House negotiations do break down it is unclear what would happen next. At least one Republican in the group has threatened to abandon the talks and introduce his own bill. Meanwhile, House Judiciary Committee Chairman has said he might advance narrow, individual bills that Democrats say are an inadequate substitute for comprehensive changes to U.S. law.

IMPORTANCE OF BIPARTISANSHIP

Senate passage is by no means assured.

Senator Landrieu, who chairs the Senate Small Business Committee, said she is looking for better visa provisions to help small businesses hire foreigners. In a hallway interview with Reuters she also said she is inclined to support comprehensive immigration reform, but that it depends on what further changes are made to the bill.

"At some point, you've got to close the deal but we're not anywhere near closing that deal. We've got to go through a process on the floor," Landrieu said.

Another Democrat who is uncertain about the bill, Senator Jon Tester of Montana, told reporters that he will weigh several factors, including the bill's provisions for "securing the border; English (language requirements) are part of the equation; whether the path to citizenship is realistic and not a gift of amnesty."

Even with a strong, bipartisan vote for passage in the Senate next month, Republicans who control House say they will still want to chart their own course on immigration.

"When did they (senators) get elected to the House? Are they here? I missed when they were sworn into the House of Representatives," said the Puerto Rican-born Labrador sarcastically.

#### Won’t pass – academic model

ABC NEWS 5 – 27 – 13 [If Vote Was Today, Immigration Reform Would Fail House, <http://abcnews.go.com/ABC_Univision/vote-today-immigration-reform-fail-house/story?id=19252777#.UcB1-EC0dsk>]

In 2012, statistician Nate Silver made headlines when he accurately predicted the outcomes for the presidential election in all 50 states.

While political scientists have been forecasting election results for decades, very few forecast legislation. But in San Diego, one assistant professor is doing just that. He’s forecasting the outcome for immigration reform.

Most days, you can find Tom Wong inside a boutique coffee shop in San Diego’s North Park neighborhood, hunched over a Macbook Pro.

The assistant professor of political science at UC San Diego is crunching thousands of numbers.

“I’m predicting opposition and support for immigration reform among all 535 current members of congress," Wong said.

How Does It Work?

His forecast is created in three steps. The first is a model that determines what factors create a 'yes' or 'no' vote on immigration.

It begins in 2006. That was the year millions of immigration advocates protested in the streets across the United States, rallying against H.R. 4437, an enforcement-heavy immigration bill.

Many cite these demonstrations as the starting point for the modern immigration movement.

In step one, Wong counts every vote cast by every member of Congress on immigration since 2006. Then he pulls a ton of data — unemployment rates, education levels, ethnic makeup — from states and districts.

Wong explains his model is taking into account "the factors that previous research has identified as being important for immigration policy."

He uses that information to create a model that predicts how a member of Congress will vote based on what their state or district looks like.

Step two is seeing if his model is accurate.

Wong looks at each member of Congress since 2006 to see whether his model accurately predicted how they actually voted on immigration bills.

"In the House we’re talking about a 94 percent match rate. And the Senate we get about 90 percent," said Wong.

Step three is using the model as a predictor. For example, how will freshmen members of Congress vote, someone like Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Texas)?

"His state has certain demographic characteristics, certain economic characteristics and he’s a Republican," explains Wong.

It shouldn’t be a surprise that the model predicts Cruz will be voting against the bill. But what about the rest of the Senate and members of the House?

"Right now the data points to 67 to 71 'yes' votes in the Senate. For the House we’re only seeing about 203 'yes' votes," Wong said.

So if voted on today, according to Wong's model, the Senate’s comprehensive immigration reform bill would fail by 15 votes in the House.

### A2 House GOP leadership is on board

#### Pro House GOP moves are just to avoid blame

NEWSMAX 6 – 11 – 13[Boehner: House Republicans to Focus on Immigration as Senate Moves Ahead, <http://www.newsmax.com/Newsfront/boehner-immigration-house/2013/06/11/id/509151>]

House Republican leaders are seeking to speed up efforts to craft U.S. immigration-law proposals as the Senate nears the first test votes on its own plan.

House Speaker John Boehner and other leaders have decided to focus on immigration before the August recess, three Republican aides said yesterday. The aides asked not to be quoted by name because official deadlines haven’t been set.

The Senate plans to take its first procedural votes today on a bipartisan plan that includes a path to citizenship for the estimated 11 million undocumented immigrants with a goal of passing the measure by July 4 and sending it to the House. Unlike in the Senate, House leaders haven’t committed to advancing a comprehensive immigration rewrite.

“It’s very wise that House Republicans are trying to position themselves to try and not look like they are slowing down or stopping immigration reform,” Ron Bonjean, a Republican strategist and former congressional aide, said in an interview.

## Link Uniqueness

### No PC now

#### Obama is a lame-duck – scandals have cost him influence already

Guardian 5 – 17 – 13 [Beleaguered Obama looks to fight back as critics ask: is he a lame duck already?, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2013/may/17/barack-obama-beleagured-lame-duck>]

It is not a comparison that many people thought would ever get much traction.

But, assailed this week by multiple scandals and at the mercy of a furious press, President Obama has endured a legion of pundits wondering if he is the 21st-century Richard Nixon – and whether his second term is already a lame-duck disaster.

Certainly conservative writers have leapt at the idea that the now beleaguered Obama can be mentioned in the same breath as the shamed 37th president who left office early after the Watergate scandal.

They have looked at revelations that the Internal Revenue Service singled out conservative groups and that the Justice Department targeted AP journalists in a secret sweep of their phones as signs that Obama's administration is paranoid and over-reaching its power. Then they have added a healthy dose of outrage over whether or not the White House manipulated reaction to the death of four Americans in an attack on the US diplomatic mission in Libya.

"Benghazi, IRS – son of Watergate?" wrote conservative writer Cal Thomas amid a plethora of similar headlines. But it was not just the right wing. Liberal Democrat congressman Michael Capuano reacted to the IRS reports by saying: "There's no way in the world, I'm going to defend that. Hell, I spent my youth vilifying the Nixon administration for doing the same thing."

Indeed, even Buzzfeed used an animation of Obama's face morphing into Nixon's.

Long-time Washington observers have been shocked at how rapidly it seems that Obama's second term appears to have come off the rails. It has been barely six months since he was celebrating a comfortable win over Republican challenger Mitt Romney in the 2012 election and delighting his liberal base with a promise of four years of progress and reform.

"It has been downhill since the state of the union address in February, and it is going to be a tough road from here on in for him. It is a very bleak period for the White House," said Professor David Cohen, a political scientist at the University of Akron.

The three scandals that have dominated the headlines this week – the IRS, the spying on AP and the latest Benghazi revelations – have also only added to series of other problems that the Obama White House has encountered as it seeks to map out a meaningful second term.

Obama has been hit by intense criticism from his liberal base and rightwing Republicans over his enthusiastic use of unmanned drones to kill suspected Islamist militants abroad. A hunger strike at Guantánamo Bay has also highlighted his failure to fulfil a long-standing promise to close the controversial base. Finally, in the wake of the tragic Newtown school shooting, Obama staked a huge amount of political capital on tightening gun controls. Yet, despite huge public backing, he was defeated by intense lobbying from the gun industry.

It has added up to a sense, for some, that Obama's second term has been cut adrift and is watching its influence drain away. "His lame-duck status has come a couple years early. The defeat on the gun control issue was a real embarrassment," said Cohen.

Experts say that Obama's problems lie not so much with a newly galvanised Republican party that scents political blood in the water, but with his own Democratic party. As the White House becomes increasingly distracted and focused on damage control – for example, suddenly releasing a 100 emails linked to Benghazi on Wednesday and sacking the IRS chief – its ability to keep its own members of Congress disciplined diminishes.

With half an eye on the mid-term elections of 2014, many Democrats will now be wary of being too closely linked to a scandal-tainted Obama. Getting them to vote to pass the White House's desired legislation will be difficult. "It is going to be harder for him to rally his own party to get behind him. A president's power always diminishes with each day of a second term but a scandal speeds up that process," said Larry Haas, a political commentator and former aide in the Clinton White House.

The situation is also likely to get worse. The Republican party controls the House of Representatives and so has the power to hold committee hearings and issue subpoenas as part of investigations it chooses to pursue on any of the scandals. It has already this week publicly grilled attorney general Eric Holder on the IRS and AP situations – setting a tone that is likely to be repeated in the months to come and ensure the scandals get regular boosts of life.

"The House will continue to have investigation after investigation. This will be going on for years," said Steve Mitchell, a Republican political pollster and founder of Mitchell Research.

#### Obama losing capital on scandals

Morrissey 6 – 12 – 13 [Ed Morrissey, editor at Politico, [Politico: “Trust me” not really working for Obama, huh?, politico.com]

A couple of months ago, political analysts discussed Barack Obama’s increased political capital after winning re-election and increasing Democratic seats on Capitol Hill. These days, pundits like Glenn Thrush and Jennifer Epstein at Politico are openly wondering whether Obama and the avalanche of scandals have turned him into a liability. The scandals have eroded Obama’s greatest political asset — trust:

“Trust me” is President Barack Obama’s preferred mode of action in times of crisis — and his go-to comment to nervous staffers has always been some version of “Relax, I got this.”

But that message is an increasingly hard sell for Obama in his second term, following revelations that the man who once railed against the Bush administration over civil liberties abuses has himself surreptitiously quarterbacked the greatest expansion of electronic surveillance in U.S. history.

Obama’s call for trust, patience and near blanket secrecy is increasingly falling on deaf ears in his own party, spurring a backlash among Democrats who say it’s time for the “most transparent president in history” to provide the American people with a comprehensive explanation of a secret program that dragnets most phone records and much of the Internet.

It’s not just the scandals, either, but the administration’s response to them. When did Obama find out about the IRS targeting conservatives? When he picked up the newspaper — even though his chief of staff and White House counsel had briefed the West Wing on the scandal weeks earlier. He didn’t know that his close friend Eric Holder had named a Fox News reporter as a co-conspirator in espionage until that hit the newsstands, too. What did Obama do during the terrorist attack on Benghazi? He was “fully briefed,” but the White House refuses to say where he was and what specifically he did after the initial briefing. The administration managed to offer pictures of the Commander in Chief on the job during the Osama bin Laden raid, but all we get is a shrug when things went wrong in Benghazi.

#### Scandals costing Obama capital

Washington Times 6 – 17 – 13 [In Obama they trust much less these days; Snowden is among the disillusioned, <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2013/jun/17/in-obama-they-trust-much-less-these-days/>]

A string of scandals and fresh concerns about government overreach from the Internal Revenue Service to the National Security Agency have soured voters on President Obama and left many questioning his honesty and trustworthiness.

On a day when NSA leaker Edward Snowden stepped up his assault on government surveillance programs in a lengthy Internet chat, Mr. Obama was confronted with some of the worst poll numbers of his presidency. A CNN/ORC survey released Monday found Mr. Obama's job approval rating has fallen to 45 percent, a drop of 8 percentage points in one month, as the administration is besieged by negative news reports about its secretive and broad surveillance programs.

The poll confirms a steady erosion of the president's popularity that other surveys have documented since his re-election.

When the numbers in the CNN survey are broken down, there are even more troubling signs for the fate of Mr. Obama's second-term agenda. The president has lost 17 percentage points in the past month among voters younger than 30, who are his most ardent supporters and among those most likely to back his efforts on issues such as climate change and gun control.

### Gitmo costs PC

#### Closing gitmo will cost massive capital

Frankt & Hamoudi 6 – 9 – 13 Interview with Frankt – Visiting Prof of Law at Pitt and Hamoudi – Prof of Pitt by the Pittsburgh Post Gazette. [David J.R. Frakt & Haider Hamoudi, <http://www.post-gazette.com/stories/business/legal/guantanamo-bay-legal-issues-stubbornly-persist-691083/&utm_source=feedly/>]

PG: Why has Mr. Obama failed to deliver on his promise of closing the prison at Guantanamo?

DF: The failure to close Guantanamo is due to a combination of two things: the president's failure to make closure of Guantanamo a priority and devote effort and political capital to it, and the obstructionist actions of Congress to make things as difficult as possible to carry out this goal.

HH: There has been strong congressional resistance to closing Gitmo. So far the president hasn't fought back very hard. ... There are about 50 high-value detainees who haven't been charged and can't be charged, but they can't be let go. The evidence is inadmissible in a respectable court system.

### Obama Pushing to close Gitmo

#### Obama pushing to close Gitmo now

Daily Beast 6 – 12 – 13 [Wait, What about Gitmo?, <http://www.thedailybeast.com/newsweek/2013/06/12/obama-is-quietly-moving-ahead-on-guantanamo.html>]

THREE WEEKS ago, President Obama tried to seize the initiative in balancing the war on terror with civil liberties. In a major address at the National Defense University in Washington, D.C., he announced his intention to reform the drone wars and revive his long-dormant effort to close the detention facility at Guantánamo Bay. What a long three weeks it’s been: since then, the national-security conversation has been dominated by the Justice Department’s aggressive crackdown on leaks and blockbuster revelations about the National Security Agency’s surveillance activities.

One might expect those controversies to have overwhelmed Obama’s efforts on drones and Guantánamo. But, at least on Gitmo, there seem to be some small signs that Obama is quietly pressing on. Late last week came word of a fact-finding trip to the prison by Sens. Dianne Feinstein and John McCain. What was especially notable was who accompanied them: White House Chief of Staff Denis McDonough. According to a congressional source, McDonough heard about the trip and asked if he could tag along. The excursion was seen as a positive signal by those who want Obama to close Gitmo because it suggests that he is putting muscle behind his promise and that he understands he can succeed only by engaging Congress.

Meanwhile, State Department sources say there are signs of life again in the office formerly occupied by onetime Guantánamo czar Daniel Fried, the veteran diplomat who was reassigned at the beginning of this year. Since announcing plans to name new Gitmo envoys at both State and the Pentagon three weeks ago, the White House has given no indication when those appointments will come. But Obama may have already settled on a candidate, at least at State. One administration official says this person is an “outsider” rather than a foreign-service professional. The source adds that the likely pick has political chops and a strong familiarity with Congress. That would be welcome news on Capitol Hill. “They don’t need a policy person who understands the nuts and bolts of the process,” says one congressional aide who has been following the Gitmo saga closely. “They need someone who can advocate domestically and internationally to get people moved.”

Another potentially positive indicator for supporters of closing Guantánamo: the government of Yemen announced this week that it had begun to work with Saudi Arabia to develop a rehabilitation program for jihadis. That is a key development because among the remaining 166 detainees at Gitmo are 56 Yemenis. In early 2010, Obama had imposed a ban on their return to Yemen because of the iffy security situation there. He recently lifted the ban contingent on assurances that they could be repatriated safely. A rehab program could smooth the way for their return.

## Link Answer

### PC theory is wrong

#### Political Capital makes no sense – useless concept – unforeseen events are just as likely. The consequences of losing capital are just as likely to be positive.

HIRSH 2 – 7 – 13 chief correspondent for National Journal, previously served as the senior editor and national economics correspondent for Newsweek. Overseas Press Club award for best magazine reporting from abroad in 2001 and for Newsweek’s coverage of the war on terror, which also won a National Magazine Award [Michael Hirsh, There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital, http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207]

On Tuesday, in his State of the Union address, President Obama will do what every president does this time of year. For about 60 minutes, he will lay out a sprawling and ambitious wish list highlighted by gun control and immigration reform, climate change and debt reduction. In response, the pundits will do what they always do this time of year: They will talk about how unrealistic most of the proposals are, discussions often informed by sagacious reckonings of how much “political capital” Obama possesses to push his program through.

Most of this talk will have no bearing on what actually happens over the next four years.

Consider this: Three months ago, just before the November election, if someone had talked seriously about Obama having enough political capital to oversee passage of both immigration reform and gun-control legislation at the beginning of his second term—even after winning the election by 4 percentage points and 5 million votes (the actual final tally)—this person would have been called crazy and stripped of his pundit’s license. (It doesn’t exist, but it ought to.) In his first term, in a starkly polarized country, the president had been so frustrated by GOP resistance that he finally issued a limited executive order last August permitting immigrants who entered the country illegally as children to work without fear of deportation for at least two years. Obama didn’t dare to even bring up gun control, a Democratic “third rail” that has cost the party elections and that actually might have been even less popular on the right than the president’s health care law. And yet, for reasons that have very little to do with Obama’s personal prestige or popularity—variously put in terms of a “mandate” or “political capital”—chances are fair that both will now happen.

What changed? In the case of gun control, of course, it wasn’t the election. It was the horror of the 20 first-graders who were slaughtered in Newtown, Conn., in mid-December. The sickening reality of little girls and boys riddled with bullets from a high-capacity assault weapon seemed to precipitate a sudden tipping point in the national conscience. One thing changed after another. Wayne LaPierre of the National Rifle Association marginalized himself with poorly chosen comments soon after the massacre. The pro-gun lobby, once a phalanx of opposition, began to fissure into reasonables and crazies. Former Rep. Gabrielle Giffords, D-Ariz., who was shot in the head two years ago and is still struggling to speak and walk, started a PAC with her husband to appeal to the moderate middle of gun owners. Then she gave riveting and poignant testimony to the Senate, challenging lawmakers: “Be bold.”

As a result, momentum has appeared to build around some kind of a plan to curtail sales of the most dangerous weapons and ammunition and the way people are permitted to buy them. It’s impossible to say now whether such a bill will pass and, if it does, whether it will make anything more than cosmetic changes to gun laws. But one thing is clear: The political tectonics have shifted dramatically in very little time. Whole new possibilities exist now that didn’t a few weeks ago.

Meanwhile, the Republican members of the Senate’s so-called Gang of Eight are pushing hard for a new spirit of compromise on immigration reform, a sharp change after an election year in which the GOP standard-bearer declared he would make life so miserable for the 11 million illegal immigrants in the U.S. that they would “self-deport.” But this turnaround has very little to do with Obama’s personal influence—his political mandate, as it were. It has almost entirely to do with just two numbers: 71 and 27. That’s 71 percent for Obama, 27 percent for Mitt Romney, the breakdown of the Hispanic vote in the 2012 presidential election. Obama drove home his advantage by giving a speech on immigration reform on Jan. 29 at a Hispanic-dominated high school in Nevada, a swing state he won by a surprising 8 percentage points in November. But the movement on immigration has mainly come out of the Republican Party’s recent introspection, and the realization by its more thoughtful members, such as Sen. Marco Rubio of Florida and Gov. Bobby Jindal of Louisiana, that without such a shift the party may be facing demographic death in a country where the 2010 census showed, for the first time, that white births have fallen into the minority. It’s got nothing to do with Obama’s political capital or, indeed, Obama at all.

The point is not that “political capital” is a meaningless term. Often it is a synonym for “mandate” or “momentum” in the aftermath of a decisive election—and just about every politician ever elected has tried to claim more of a mandate than he actually has. Certainly, Obama can say that because he was elected and Romney wasn’t, he has a better claim on the country’s mood and direction. Many pundits still defend political capital as a useful metaphor at least. “It’s an unquantifiable but meaningful concept,” says Norman Ornstein of the American Enterprise Institute. “You can’t really look at a president and say he’s got 37 ounces of political capital. But the fact is, it’s a concept that matters, if you have popularity and some momentum on your side.”

The real problem is that the idea of political capital—or mandates, or momentum—is so poorly defined that presidents and pundits often get it wrong. “Presidents usually over-estimate it,” says George Edwards, a presidential scholar at Texas A&M University. “The best kind of political capital—some sense of an electoral mandate to do something—is very rare. It almost never happens. In 1964, maybe. And to some degree in 1980.” For that reason, political capital is a concept that misleads far more than it enlightens. It is distortionary. It conveys the idea that we know more than we really do about the ever-elusive concept of political power, and it discounts the way unforeseen events can suddenly change everything. Instead, it suggests, erroneously, that a political figure has a concrete amount of political capital to invest, just as someone might have real investment capital—that a particular leader can bank his gains, and the size of his account determines what he can do at any given moment in history.

Naturally, any president has practical and electoral limits. Does he have a majority in both chambers of Congress and a cohesive coalition behind him? Obama has neither at present. And unless a surge in the economy—at the moment, still stuck—or some other great victory gives him more momentum, it is inevitable that the closer Obama gets to the 2014 election, the less he will be able to get done. Going into the midterms, Republicans will increasingly avoid any concessions that make him (and the Democrats) stronger.

### PC isn’t key

#### House breaking up the bill proves – its all about House desire

Klein 6 – 5 – 13 Washington Post political insider [Ezra Klein, The House won’t have a bipartisan immigration bill. That’s (maybe) okay., http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2013/06/05/the-house-wont-have-a-bipartisan-immigration-bill-thats-maybe-okay/]

Under this theory, anything that keeps the process moving in the House is a good thing. That means the break-up of the bipartisan House group might be a good thing. Whatever came out of the bipartisan group was likely to fail in the broader House. Either it would be too liberal for the Republicans or too conservative for the Democrats. And once it failed, there’d be no replacement. Everyone’s political capital would already be used up.

Letting Republicans break the bill into pieces makes it likelier that some of those pieces will pass. It also makes it easier for Republicans to vent their anger against certain parts of immigration reform — like the path to citizenship — without imperiling the whole bill. It makes it likelier that something, anything, passes the House.

This theory has some clear problems. It assumes success in the Senate. It assumes that House Republicans will fold before the Senate. It assumes Boehner will waive the Hastert rule and permit a vote on a bill many in his caucus don’t support. Any and all of these assumptions could be wrong. But they’re necessary assumptions for any and all paths to success on the bill, including those that run through a bipartisan House proposal. That law, too, would be closer to what the Senate wants than to what House Republicans want, and that law, too, would require Democratic votes.

In the end, this really does come down to the House Republican leadership. If they want to pass this thing, there are ways to pass it. If they’re willing to accept failure, then that’s what they’ll get.

#### Focus on Obama helps immigration pass

Bloomberg 5 – 23 – 13 [Obama Probes Create Immigration Magic as Bill Advances, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-05-23/obama-probes-create-immigration-magic-as-bill-advances.html]

The trio of investigations causing headaches for President Barack Obama’s administration has also provided a honeymoon period for the marquee element of his domestic agenda: revising immigration laws.

The congressional probes into various government agencies diverted attention at a critical time, allowing the Senate Judiciary Committee a respite from the spotlight as it reached critical compromises on the measure and approved it on a bipartisan 13-5 vote on May 21. The bill would allow the estimated 11 million immigrants living in the U.S. without authorization a chance at citizenship.

“It’s like magic -- you distract the audience while the real trick is being done -- and I think right now, while Americans focus on President Obama’s unending difficulties, it’s good news for the Gang of Eight working on immigration,” said Republican strategist Alex Castellanos, referring to the four Republicans and four Democrats who crafted the bill.

The dynamic is probably fleeting; the immigration measure’s path is likely to become more treacherous as the scandal investigations persist in grabbing headlines, the legislation moves toward a high-profile Senate vote next month, and skeptical House Republicans have their say.

That debate will take place while Congress is still raising questions about allegations that the Internal Revenue Service targeted anti-tax groups for scrutiny, the Justice Department seized Associated Press telephone records in a leak investigation, and the State Department initially glossed over the seriousness of last September’s attack on consulate in Benghazi, Libya, that left four Americans dead.

#### Criticism of Obama won’t derail immigration – recent events prove

Bloomberg 5 – 23 – 13 [Obama Probes Create Immigration Magic as Bill Advances, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-05-23/obama-probes-create-immigration-magic-as-bill-advances.html]

Republican Criticism

Senator Marco Rubio of Florida, another of the eight senators who teamed to write the bill, has used several television interviews, speeches on the Senate floor and his Twitter social media account to express outrage at the Obama administration over the Benghazi and IRS cases.

Senator Lindsey Graham, a South Carolina Republican and Gang of Eight participant, also has been among the most outspoken critics of the administration’s handling of the Benghazi attack.

“Walking and chewing gum at the same time is something that is a lost art in politics,” Graham said in an interview. “Investigating the administration about IRS and Benghazi is very important. Passing immigration reform is very important. We can do both.”

### Winners Win

#### winners-win. He needs one

THE HILL 3 – 20 – 13 [Amie Parnes and Justin Sink, Obama honeymoon may be over, <http://thehill.com/homenews/administration/289179-obama-honeymoon-may-be-over>]

The second-term honeymoon for President Obama is beginning to look like it is over.

Obama, who was riding high after his reelection win in November, has seen his poll numbers take a precipitous fall in recent weeks.

A CNN poll released Tuesday showed Obama’s favorability rating underwater, with 47 percent approving and 50 percent disapproving of Obama’s handling of his job.

Much of the president’s agenda is stuck, with climate change regulations delayed, immigration reform mired in committee negotiations and prospects for a grand bargain budget deal in limbo at best.

On Tuesday, in a decision that underscored Obama’s depleting political capital, the White House watched as Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) announced only a watered-down version of Obama’s gun control proposals would be considered on the Senate floor.

Republicans, sensing the sea change, are licking their chops. They point to the lack of movement on Obama’s signature issues, noting the contrast to the ambitious plans outlined in the early weeks of his second term.

“The president set very high goals for himself during his State of the Union, but the reality is very little of his agenda is actually moving,” Republican strategist Ron Bonjean said. “He allowed himself to get caught up in the legislative quicksand, [and] the cement is beginning to harden. “

History isn’t on Obama’s side.

The last four presidents who won a second term all saw their poll numbers slide by mid-March with the exception of Bill Clinton, whose numbers improved in the four months following his reelection.

Clinton may have only been delaying the inevitable. His numbers dropped 5 points in April 1994. Even Ronald Reagan, buoyed by a dominant performance over Walter Mondale in the 1984 election, saw a double-digit erosion by this point in his second term.

Obama has yet to complete the first 100 days of his second term. But without a signature achievement since his reelection, he faces a crossroads that could define the remainder of his presidency.

White House aides maintain that the 24-hour news cycle makes comparisons to previous presidents difficult.

“I think the nature of our politics now is different than Ronald Reagan’s honeymoon,” one senior administration official said. “The ebb and flow of politics doesn’t follow that model anymore.”

But observers say a drop in popularity is typical for second-termers.

“There may be some typical second-term honeymoon fade happening,” said Martin Sweet, an assistant visiting professor of political science at Northwestern University. “Honeymoon periods for incumbents are a bit more ephemeral.”

But like most other presidents, Sweet added, “Obama’s fate is tied to the economy.”

“Continuing economic progress would ultimately strengthen the president but if we are hit with a double-dip recession, then Obama’s numbers will crater,” he said.

The White House disputes any notion that Obama has lost any political capital in recent weeks.

“The president set out an ambitious agenda and he’s doing big things that are not easy, from immigration to gun control,” the senior administration official said. “Those are policies you can’t rack up easily, and no one here is naive about that.”

The White House is aware that the clock is ticking to push its hefty agenda, but the official added, “The clock is not ticking because of president’s political capital. The clock is ticking because there’s a timetable in achieving all of this. [Lawmakers] are not going to sign on because the president’s popular.”

And administration officials believe they still have the leverage.

“There’s a decent amount of momentum behind all of this,” the official said. “It looks like immigration is closer [to passage] than ever before.”

Republican strategist Ken Lundberg argued that current budget fights “have cut short the president’s second-term honeymoon.”

He said this could also hurt the president’s party, warning “the lower the president’s approval rating, the bigger the consequence for vulnerable Democrats.”

“Voters want solutions, and if they see the president headed down the wrong path, lockstep lawmakers will be punished in 2014,” he said.

Democratic strategist Chris Kofinis maintained that as long as he’s president, Obama still has the leverage.

“Immigration reform doesn’t get impacted by whether Obama’s poll numbers are 55 or 45,” Kofinis said. “Does it make certain things a little more difficult? Possibly. But while his numbers may have fallen, he’s still more likeable than the Republicans are on their best day.”

Kofinis said the real question for Obama is what kind of emphasis he’s going to place on his second term because the public will have less patience than they did during his first.

“The challenge in a second term is the American people look at certain things and have a higher tolerance in a second term,” he said. “When they know you’re not running for reelection again, they hold you to a higher standard.”

Bonjean and other Republicans are aware that Obama could potentially bounce back from his latest slip in the polls and regain his footing.

“He has the opportunity to take minor legislative victories and blow them up into major accomplishments – meaning if he got something on gun control, he can tout that that was part of his agenda and the work isn’t over. If he were able to strike a grand bargain with Republicans, that’d be a legacy issue.”

Still, Bonjean added, “It’s not looking so good right now.”

#### Obama’s capital is declining because he doesn’t have a win

THE HILL 3 – 20 – 13 [Amie Parnes and Justin Sink, Obama honeymoon may be over, <http://thehill.com/homenews/administration/289179-obama-honeymoon-may-be-over>]

Obama has yet to complete the first 100 days of his second term. But without a signature achievement since his reelection, he faces a crossroads that could define the remainder of his presidency.

White House aides maintain that the 24-hour news cycle makes comparisons to previous presidents difficult.

“I think the nature of our politics now is different than Ronald Reagan’s honeymoon,” one senior administration official said. “The ebb and flow of politics doesn’t follow that model anymore.”

But observers say a drop in popularity is typical for second-termers.

“There may be some typical second-term honeymoon fade happening,” said Martin Sweet, an assistant visiting professor of political science at Northwestern University. “Honeymoon periods for incumbents are a bit more ephemeral.”

But like most other presidents, Sweet added, “Obama’s fate is tied to the economy.”

#### Needs Wins – breeds party optimism

THE HILL 3 – 26 – 13 <http://thehill.com/homenews/administration/290249-after-taking-hit-in-the-polls-obama-pivots-back-to-immigration>

\*Devine - a former strategist to Secretary of State John Kerry and former Vice President Gore

Democrats are worried that Obama hasn't had a lot of signing ceremonies in 2013 as unresolved budget battles have hit the president's approval ratings. Obama's healthy post-election advantage on the economy has dwindled into a virtual tie with congressional Republicans. Voters equally blame Obama and the GOP for the sequester, which is expected to hit in full force in the coming weeks.

“It goes back to a sense in Washington that things aren't getting done,” Devine said. “No matter whose fault that is, when you're president, the buck stops here.”

#### Winners-win – gets moderates on board

RCP 3 – 11 – 13 [Caitlin Huey-Burns, Is the GOP Finally Winning?, http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2013/03/11/is\_the\_gop\_finally\_winning\_117363.html]

The president is going around House Republicans and courting their colleagues in the Senate. Over the past week, Obama has phoned and dined with several GOP senators, hoping to strike a deal.

“The White House is trying anything they can to win right now,” said South Dakota Sen. John Thune, a member of the GOP leadership. “I think the president sort of got on the wrong side of this whole issue with the sequester by going out and using the scare tactics, and I think that’s kind of bit him.”

The president’s shift in tone rests better with the public, which is holding him accountable, a top Democratic aide said. “It is better when he looks like he’s getting stuff done,” the aide explained. “He’s reaching out and working with Republicans and trying to get something done rather than just trying to talk about the bad things that are going to happen.”

Many rank and file Republicans in the Senate welcome the president’s outreach and are open to a grand bargain on deficit reduction. But they are also working to impel the president on entitlements.

## Impact Answers

### Economy IL Answers

#### Impossible to predict the economic benefits

**Khimm, 13** (Suzy, “How much will immigration reform cost?,” February 1st, 2013, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2013/02/01/how-much-will-immigration-reform-cost/>)

There’s a lot of evidence pointing to the economic benefits of adding more legal immigrants to the economy. What’s less clear is how much a comprehensive immigration overhaul would affect the federal budget.¶ While more legal immigrants could cost taxpayers more in health care, education, and other social services, they would also contribute more tax revenues. Ultimately, there will be a lot of political pressure to produce a reform that costs as little as possible, possibly even reducing the deficit in the long term.¶ In 2007, the Congressional Budget Office concluded that the Senate’s proposed bipartisan immigration reform would increase the deficit by about $18 billion over 10 years, but would have “a relatively small net effect” on the deficit over 20 years.¶ Here’s how that number breaks down: Direct federal spending on immigrants would cost $23 billion over 10 years, mostly because of Medicaid and refundable tax credits. At the same time, the overhaul would generate $48 billion in new revenue, mostly through increased Social Security taxes.¶ So under the 2007 overhaul, newly legal immigrants would have generated far more revenue than they take in from the government. It’s partly because most undocumented immigrants are working age and wouldn’t immediately incur major Social Security and Medicare costs. It’s also because the 2007 bill required immigrants to pay back taxes and forced them to wait for years before receiving federal benefits.¶ However, the process of implementing reform itself — setting up a legalization process, new enforcement measures, and so forth — carries its own price tag, of $43 billion over 10 years. So ultimately, CBO estimated that the total cost of the 2007 immigration overhaul was $18 billion.¶ How would the math work out now? Since neither Congress nor the White House has actually put out a bill, it’s not clear. But there are a few things that we do know: Obamacare expanded federal health insurance, and an estimated 7 million undocumented immigrants might theoretically qualify for coverage under its provisions, as my colleague Sarah Kliff explains.¶ That could add to the cost of immigration reform, depending on how many ultimately became legal citizens and how long they would have to wait to receive benefits. (Both the White House and the Senate gang agree that undocumented immigrants with provisional legal status wouldn’t qualify for benefits.) At the same time, it could also introduce a large number of younger, healthier people into insurance pools, which could potentially reduce overall insurance costs, says Michael Fix, senior vice-president of the Migration Policy Institute. ”The jury is still really out.”¶ It’s also unclear what the cost of implementation will be: As I’ve reported earlier, we’ve already hit most of the 2007 targets for border security, at the cost of hundreds of millions of dollars. And the Senate Gang of Eight’s plan is vague about what “securing our border” will really mean this time around. Most of the security reforms involve more use of technology, rather than personnel, but the government already has a track record of investing into tech-driven boondoggles in the name of border security.¶ So the price tag of immigration reform will really depend on legislative debate that Congress has begun to wade into. There will be a lot of pressure on Congress to produce a bill that’s either revenue-neutral or will actually reduce the deficit, both by restricting any federal spending on immigrants and limiting the upfront appropriations on implementation.

#### CIR doesn’t solve the economy – trades of with native jobs and will use welfare programs more than they provide in job creation

Ruark and Graham 11 [Eric Ruark and Matthew Graham – Directors of Research at the Federation for American Immigration Reform, “Immigration, Poverty and Low-Wage Earners the Harmful effect of Unskilled immigrants on American Workers”, May 2011, <http://www.fairus.org/docs/poverty_rev.pdf>]

Current calls for “comprehensive immigration reform” are nothing short of a push for a massive amnesty that would give permanent status to millions of illegal aliens who are not needed in the workforce, and it would reward unscrupulous employers who profited from hiring illegal workers, providing them with a legal low-wage workforce that would continue to have a negative impact on native workers. The border is not secured and there is much opposition to the mandatory use of E-Verify and interior enforcement. Those who argue against enforcement are not going to decide overnight to support these measures, and politicians have long ago proven that their promise to enforce immigration laws after granting amnesty are not to be believed. This report contains the following findings: • In 2009, less than 6 percent of legal immigrants were admitted because they possessed skills deemed essential to the U.S. economy. • Studies that find minimal or no negative eﬀects on native workers from low-skill immigration are based upon lawed assumptions and skewed economic models, not upon observations of actual labor market conditions. • There is no such thing as an “immigrant job.” The reality is that immigrants and natives compete for the same jobs and native workers are increasingly at a disadvantage because employers have access to a steady supply of low-wage foreign workers. • Low-skilled immigrants are more likely than their native-born counterparts to live in poverty, lack health insurance, and to utilize welfare programs. Immigrants and their children made up 32 percent of those in the United States without health insurance in 2009. • Research done by the Center for American Progress has found that reducing the illegal alien population in the United States by one-third would raise the income of unskilled workers by $400 a year. • Defenders of illegal immigration often tout the findings of the so-called Perryman Report to argue that illegal aliens are responsible for job creation in the United States; yet, if one accepts the Perryman findings as true, that would mean that only one job is created in the United States for every three illegal workers in the workforce. • It is true that if the illegal alien population decreased the overall number of jobs in the U.S. would be reduced, but there would be many more jobs available to native workers –jobs that paid higher wages and oﬀered better working conditions

#### Immigration will burden state governments—bill doesn’t address those problems

**Davidson, 13** (Adam, February 12th, 2013, “Do Illegal Immigrants Actually Hurt the U.S. Economy?,” <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/02/17/magazine/do-illegal-immigrants-actually-hurt-the-us-economy.html?pagewanted=2&_r=0>)

The problem, though, is that undocumented workers are not evenly distributed. In areas like southern Texas and Arizona and even parts of Brooklyn, undocumented immigrants impose a substantial net cost to local and state governments, Shierholz says. Immigrants use public assistance, medical care and schools. Some immigrant neighborhoods have particularly high crime rates. Jared Bernstein, a fellow at the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities, told me that these are also areas in which low-educated workers are most likely to face stiff competition from immigrants. It’s no wonder why so much political furor comes from these regions. ¶ Undocumented workers represent a classic economic challenge with a fairly straightforward solution. Immigrants bring diffuse and hard-to-see benefits to average Americans while imposing more tangible costs on a few, Shierholz says. The dollar value of the benefits far outweigh the costs, so the government could just transfer extra funds to those local populations that need more help. One common proposal would grant amnesty to undocumented workers, which would create a sudden increase in tax payments. Simultaneously, the federal government could apply a percentage of those increased revenues to local governments. ¶ But that, of course, seems politically improbable. Immigration is one of many problems — like another economic no-brainer: eliminating farm subsidies — in which broad economic benefits battle against a smaller, concentrated cost in one area. As immigration reform seems more likely than at any time in recent memory, it’s important to remember that it is not the economic realities that have changed. It’s the political ones.

#### Deficits have no impact on the US or global economy

STIGLITZ 12 University Professor at Columbia University, and a Nobel laureate in Economics [Joseph E. Stiglitz, Stimulating the Economy in an Era of Debt and Deficit, The Economists’ Voice http://www.degruyter.com/view/j/ev March, 2012]

concluding comments

The first priority of the country should be a return to full employment. The underemployment of labor is a massive waste and, more than anything else, jeopardizes our country’s future, as the skills of our young get wasted and alienation grows. As the work of Jayadev5 as well as the IMF6 convincingly shows, austerity in America will almost surely weaken growth. Moreover, as the work of Ferguson and Johnson7 shows, we should view with suspicion the claim (e.g. by Rogoff and Reinhardt) that exceeding a certain a debt-to-GDP ratio will trigger a crash. Even if this notion were true on average, the U.S. is not an average country. It is a reserve currency country, with markets responding to global instability—even when caused by the U.S.—by lowering interest rates. The U.S. has managed even bigger deficits. Unlike the countries of Europe, there is no risk that we will not pay what we owe. To put it bluntly, we promise to repay dollars, and we control the printing presses.

But a focus on the ratio of debt-to-GDP is simply economic nonsense. No one would judge a firm by looking at its debt alone. Anyone claiming economic expertise would want to look at the balance sheet—assets as well as liabilities. Borrowing to invest is different from borrowing for consumption. The failure of the deficit hawks to realize this is consistent with my earlier conclusion that this debate is not about the size of the deficit, but about the size of the government and the progressivity of the tax system.

### Economy Impact Answer

#### Economic decline doesn’t cause war
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Empirical support for the economic growth rate is much weaker. The finding that poor economic performance is associated with a higher likelihood of territorial conflict initiation is significant only in Models 3–4.14 The weak results are not altogether surprising given the findings from prior literature. In accordance with the insignificant relationships of Models 1–2 and 5–6, Ostrom and Job (1986), for example, note that the likelihood that a U.S. President will use force is uncertain, as the bad economy might create incentives both to divert the public’s attention with a foreign adventure and to focus on solving the economic problem, thus reducing the inclination to act abroad. Similarly, Fordham (1998a, 1998b), DeRouen (1995), and Gowa (1998) find no relation between a poor economy and U.S. use of force. Furthermore, Leeds and Davis (1997) conclude that the conflict-initiating behavior of 18 industrialized democracies is unrelated to economic conditions as do Pickering and Kisangani (2005) and Russett and Oneal (2001) in global studies. In contrast and more in line with my findings of a significant relationship (in Models 3–4), Hess and Orphanides (1995), for example, argue that economic recessions are linked with forceful action by an incumbent U.S. president. Furthermore, Fordham’s (2002) revision of Gowa’s (1998) analysis shows some effect of a bad economy and DeRouen and Peake (2002) report that U.S. use of force diverts the public’s attention from a poor economy. Among cross-national studies, Oneal and Russett (1997) report that slow growth increases the incidence of militarized disputes, as does Russett (1990)—but only for the United States; slow growth does not affect the behavior of other countries. Kisangani and Pickering (2007) report some significant associations, but they are sensitive to model specification, while Tir and Jasinski (2008) find a clearer link between economic underperformance and increased attacks on domestic ethnic minorities. While none of these works has focused on territorial diversions, my own inconsistent findings for economic growth fit well with the mixed results reported in the literature.15 Hypothesis 1 thus receives strong support via the unpopularity variable but only weak support via the economic growth variable. These results suggest that embattled leaders are much more likely to respond with territorial diversions to direct signs of their unpopularity (e.g., strikes, protests, riots) than to general background conditions such as economic malaise. Presumably, protesters can be distracted via territorial diversions while fixing the economy would take a more concerted and prolonged policy effort. Bad economic conditions seem to motivate only the most serious, fatal territorial confrontations. This implies that leaders may be reserving the most high-profile and risky diversions for the times when they are the most desperate, that is when their power is threatened both by signs of discontent with their rule and by more systemic problems plaguing the country (i.e., an underperforming economy).