# Uniqueness

### 2NC AT: Gun Control Thumper

#### Gun control isn’t a thumper their evidence only says Obama will push legislation not that he will push it and spend PC

#### Not a priority for Obama --- immigration is

Meckler, 1/1 (Laura, 1/1/2013, Wall Street Journal, “Push for New Restrictions on Guns Lacks Clear Strategy,” Factiva)

In an interview on NBC's "Meet the Press," Mr. Obama said he planned to put his "full weight" behind the ideas generated by Mr. Biden and his team. But asked about his priorities for a second term, he didn't name guns while offering a list that included immigration, deficit reduction, rebuilding infrastructure and promoting clean energy.

#### No legislative strategy and Obama might not spend capital

Meckler, 1/1 (Laura, 1/1/2013, Wall Street Journal, “Push for New Restrictions on Guns Lacks Clear Strategy,” Factiva)

WASHINGTON—Democrats hoping to enact new gun restrictions after last month's school shooting have yet to coalesce around a legislative strategy, with views differing over what controls to propose and many lawmakers awaiting White House recommendations. President Barack Obama offered mixed signals about how much political capital he will spend on the matter. Gun-rights advocates say new restrictions are unnecessary and wouldn't work, and some are hoping that emotions will cool, making it harder to pass new laws as time goes on. Proponents at the White House, on Capitol Hill and in advocacy groups have put forth a wide range of ideas for curbing gun violence in the weeks since the Dec. 14 massacre at a school in Newtown, Conn., which was closely followed by the fatal shooting of two firefighters in upstate New York by a gunman who drew them to the scene with a call for help. "You have all these moving parts so you can't really have a strategy per se at this point," said Kristen Rand, legislative director of the Violence Policy Center, a Washington, D.C., group that favors gun control. She added that the effort needs to move quickly to benefit from the outcry generated by the Newtown killings. "Without that kind of momentum we've seldom been able to pass anything," she said. Buster Bachhuber, a National Rifle Association board member and retired lawyer in Wausau, Wis., predicted that the new Congress would reject new restrictions because he said they wouldn't help solve the problem. "In the short term, maybe when the emotion is still there," lawmakers may be more open to new restrictions, said Mr. Bachhuber. "In the long term, no, I really don't think it is going to make a difference." So far there is little consensus among gun-control proponents on how to proceed. Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D., Calif.) plans to introduce an updated version of the ban on assault weapons that expired in 2004 when the new Congress convenes Thursday. In the House, Rep. Diana DeGette (D., Colo.) and other Democrats plan to introduce a ban on the production of high-capacity magazines. That effort that is independent from a Democratic House task force formed to look at the issue. This week the task force is expected to announce plans for hearings over the next month with the goal of putting forth proposals by early February. Others are focusing on the lack of background checks when people buy weapons in private transactions such as some gun-shows sales. Dan Gross, president of the Brady Campaign to Prevent Gun Violence, described requiring background checks—which seek to prevent convicted felons and others from buying a gun—for all sales as a "middle ground" that enjoys considerable public support. One recent poll, by USA Today and Gallup, found 92% support for requiring background checks at gun shows. "It's not taking anybody's Second Amendment rights away," Mr. Gross said. Bans on assault weapons or high-capacity magazines have been challenged as a violation of gun-ownership rights. Shortly after the Newtown shootings, Mr. Obama tapped Vice President Joe Biden to review executive and legislative policy proposals on gun control, though his task doesn't include legislative strategy.

#### Will be more talk than action

Schmuhl, 1/1 --- Professor of American Studies at the University of Notre Dame (1/1/2013, Robert, Irish Independent, “Obama faces battle to keep word on breaking political deadlock,” Factiva)

Hurricane Sandy, which devastated sections of the east coast in October, and the recent school massacre in Connecticut open large doors to address climate change and gun control. Both subjects, however, tend to provoke more talk than action, with well-funded interest groups (such as the National Rifle Association) opposed, with feet-in-cement immobility, to changing the status quo. Shortly after the mass killing in Newtown, Obama created a task force, led by Vice President Joe Biden, to propose specific measures for reducing gun violence. How effectively Obama handles potential restrictions to the availability of assault-style weapons and ammunition will be a genuine test of his political strength and skill.

### 2NC AT: Reform Delayed/Piecemeal

#### Obama is gonna push right away for immigration reform

Foley and Stein, 1/3 (Elise and Sam, 1/2/2013, “Obama's Immigration Reform Push To Begin This Month,” <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/02/obama-immigration-reform_n_2398507.html>)

WASHINGTON -- Despite a bruising fiscal cliff battle that managed to set the stage for an even more heated showdown that will likely take place in a matter of months, President Barack Obama is planning to move full steam ahead with the rest of his domestic policy agenda. An Obama administration official said the president plans to push for immigration reform this January. The official, who spoke about legislative plans only on condition of anonymity, said that coming standoffs over deficit reduction are unlikely to drain momentum from other priorities. The White House plans to push forward quickly, not just on immigration reform but gun control laws as well. The timeframe is likely to be cheered by Democrats and immigration reform advocates alike, who have privately expressed fears that Obama's second term will be drowned out in seemingly unending showdowns between parties. The just-completed fiscal cliff deal is giving way to a two-month deadline to resolve delayed sequestration cuts, an expiring continuing resolution to fund the government and a debt ceiling that will soon be hit. With those bitter battles ahead, the possibility of passing other complicated legislation would seem diminished.

#### Even if no vote till June – their evidence concedes Obama will try to cobble it together now – that still requires PC – Obama is already trying to get involved – they haven’t read a PC spent in the end game card – its going to be spent through

#### Quick action is necessary for passage

Hesson, 1/2 (Ted, 1/2/2013, “Analysis: 6 Things Obama Needs To Do for Immigration Reform,” <http://abcnews.go.com/ABC_Univision/News/things-president-obama-immigration-reform/story?id=18103115#.UOR2lXfbhtE>)

On Sunday, President Barack Obama said that immigration reform is a "top priority" on his agenda and that he would introduce legislation in his first year. To find out what he needs to do to make reform a reality, we talked to Lynn Tramonte, the deputy director at America's Voice, a group that lobbies for immigration reform, and Muzaffar Chishti, the director of the New York office of Migration Policy Institute, a think tank. Here's what we came up with. 1. Be a Leader During Obama's first term, bipartisan legislation never got off the ground. The president needs to do a better job leading the charge this time around, according to Chishti. "He has to make it clear that it's a high priority of his," he said. "He has to make it clear that he'll use his bully pulpit and his political muscle to make it happen, and he has to be open to using his veto power." His announcement this weekend is a step in that direction, but he needs to follow through. 2. Clear Space on the Agenda Political priorities aren't always dictated by the folks in D.C., as the tragic Connecticut school shooting shows us. While immigration had inertia after the election, the fiscal cliff and gun violence have been the most talked about issues around the Capitol in recent weeks. The cliff could recede from view now that Congress has passed a bill, but how quickly the president can resolve the other issues on his agenda could determine whether immigration reform is possible this year. "There's only limited oxygen in the room," Chishti said. 3. Choose an Approach The president has said that he plans to introduce his own immigration legislation in 2013. That's a strategic choice -- he could also wait for Democrats or Republicans in Congress to come up with a bill. Some Republicans, like Speaker of the House John Boehner, seem ready to cede leadership on the issue to the president. But that doesn't preclude Republicans in Congress from coming up with their own piece of legislation, and Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.), a strong voice on immigration in his party, recently met with reform champion Rep. Luis Gutiérrez (D-Ill.). Obama's decision to introduce his own bill could also have repercussions in the 2014 congressional elections. A liberal immigration bill could put Republicans in the position of either embracing the president's approach or adopting more restrictionist positions, as noted by The Daily Caller. Congressional Republicans could find themselves facing the same questions as Mitt Romney in whether to embrace reform or something like "self-deportation." 4. Acknowledge the Power of the Latino Vote What sort of policies should be included in a 2013 reform bill? An article in the Los Angeles Times earlier this month mentioned that the White House could pick up more than 300 pages of draft legislation that was developed during the first term. But that might not be as relevant today. The role that Latino voters played in the election -- and will continue to play in future elections -- has changed the game, according to Lynn Tramonte. The president and Congress need to "realize that the negotiating dynamic has changed on this issue," she says. "Democrats bring the votes to immigration reform but Republicans have the most to gain with it politically." Groups like America's Voice are hoping that means a better chance at passing a large-scale legalization program without the same level of increased enforcement that has been proposed as a trade-off in the past. "We've done a lot of enforcement, but what we haven't done is deal with the 11 million people without papers." 5. Keep a Clear Message Remember death panels? The claim started on Sarah Palin's Facebook page but became a headache for the Obama administration during the fight for healthcare reform (It was eventually awarded PoliFact's "Lie of the Year" for 2009). The president will need to focus on selling the core points of the bill -- which could be quite complicated overall -- and not get distracted by minutia and misinformation. "Something that happened in healthcare was that it was very confusing to Americans," Tramonte said. "They didn't know what was in the bill...Immigration has the potential to be much simpler." 6. Move Quickly "Time is of the essence," according to Tramonte. Members of Congress are always looking ahead to the next election, and some advocates think a reform bill will need to be introduced early in 2013 to have a chance. "I don't think it helps any issue to stay out there in Congress for a long time," Tramonte said. "Just get it off the table and move on to the next thing."

### 2NC U/Q

#### Immigration reform will pass --- coming deficit battles won’t derail it

Foley & Stein, 1/3 (Elise and Sam, 1/2/2013, “Obama's Immigration Reform Push To Begin This Month,” <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/02/obama-immigration-reform_n_2398507.html>)

WASHINGTON -- Despite a bruising fiscal cliff battle that managed to set the stage for an even more heated showdown that will likely take place in a matter of months, President Barack Obama is planning to move full steam ahead with the rest of his domestic policy agenda. An Obama administration official said the president plans to push for immigration reform this January. The official, who spoke about legislative plans only on condition of anonymity, said that coming standoffs over deficit reduction are unlikely to drain momentum from other priorities. The White House plans to push forward quickly, not just on immigration reform but gun control laws as well. The timeframe is likely to be cheered by Democrats and immigration reform advocates alike, who have privately expressed fears that Obama's second term will be drowned out in seemingly unending showdowns between parties. The just-completed fiscal cliff deal is giving way to a two-month deadline to resolve delayed sequestration cuts, an expiring continuing resolution to fund the government and a debt ceiling that will soon be hit. With those bitter battles ahead, the possibility of passing other complicated legislation would seem diminished. "The negative effect of this fiscal cliff fiasco is that every time we become engaged in one of these fights, there's no oxygen for anything else," said a Senate Democratic aide, who asked for anonymity to speak candidly. "It's not like you can be multi-tasking -- with something like this, Congress just comes to a complete standstill." It remains unclear what type of immigration policies the White House plans to push in January, but turning them into law could be a long process. Aides expect it will take about two months to write a bipartisan bill, then another few months before it goes up for a vote, possibly in June. A bipartisan group of senators are already working on a deal, although they are still in the early stages. Rep. Zoe Lofgren (D-Calif.) will likely lead on the Democratic side in the House. While many Republicans have expressed interest in piecemeal reform, it's still unclear which of them plan to join the push. Lofgren expressed hope that immigration reform would be able to get past partisan gridlock, arguing that the election was seen as something of a mandate for fixing the immigration system and Republicans won't be able to forget their post-election promises to work on a bill. "In the end, immigration reform is going to depend very much on whether Speaker [John] Boehner wants to do it or not," Lofgren said. Advocates have vowed to keep pushing for reform. As part of their efforts, they plan to remind Republican members of Congress about their presidential nominee's defeat among Latino and Asian voters, a majority of whom support a fix to the immigration system. "They can procrastinate as long as they want, but they're going to have a serious day of reckoning next election cycle," said Angela Kelley, vice president for immigration policy and advocacy at the Center for American Progress. "We're going to have a lot of near-death experiences with this issue, but I'm pretty confident it's never going to go completely to a flatline." Good news for immigration advocates may have come Tuesday night, when Boehner broke the so-called "Hastert Rule" and allowed the fiscal cliff bill to come for a vote without support from a majority of his Republican conference. Given opposition to immigration reform by many Tea Party Republicans, the proof that Boehner is willing to bypass them on major legislation is a good sign, the Democratic aide said. "If something is of such importance that the GOP establishment [is] telling Boehner, 'You must do this. You need to get this off the table soon,'" the Democratic aide said, the speaker could break the Hastert Rule again. "He already did it with this fiscal issue, so I would not be surprised if when it came down to it he puts up a bill that he just allows to go through with a combination of Democratic and Republican votes, without worrying about a majority of the majority," the aide continued. Frank Sharry, executive director of the pro-immigration reform group America's Voice, also said he thinks the House could pass an immigration bill in the same way it did last night, relying on support from both parties. He's hopeful that the fiscal cliff fight could even make them happy to work out legislation in a more standard way."I never thought I'd say this, but after bruising battles over the future of the American and world economy, the chance to legislate through regular order on immigration reform might have leaders in both parties working together and singing 'Kumbaya,'" Sharry said.

#### A2 Tea Party – Our evidence says Boehner doesn’t care –fiscal cliff proves

#### Obama is using his political capital to pass immigration reform --- fiscal battles won’t prevent passage

Kludt, 1/3 (Tom, 1/3/2013, “Report: Obama To Make Push For Immigration Reform This Month,” <http://livewire.talkingpointsmemo.com/entry/report-obama-to-make-push-for-immigration-reform>)

President Barack Obama is prepared to use his political capital to pursue immigration reform this month, according to a report published Wednesday in the Huffington Post. The report cited an anonymous official in the Obama administration, who suggested that the president is unlikely to be deterred by the protracted fiscal cliff debate that will be revisited in the coming months. As such, the administration will reportedly move quickly on both immigration reform and gun control. The report also quoted an unnamed Senate Democratic aide, who gauged the likelihood of immigration reform to pass Congress. Citing the fiscal cliff deal that passed the House of Represenatives this week with a combination of Republican and Democratic votes, the aide expressed confidence that House Speaker John Boehner (R-OH) will be able to overcome expected opposition from the conservative wing of his caucus. "He already did it with this fiscal issue, so I would not be surprised if when it came down to it he puts up a bill that he just allows to go through with a combination of Democratic and Republican votes, without worrying about a majority of the majority," the aide said.

### 2NC AT: Fiscal Thumper

#### Immigration is the exception --- Obama push and congressional support will cause it to pass

Feldmann, 1/2 (Linda, 1/2/2013, Christian Science Monitor, “How Obama won and lost in 'fiscal cliff' deal,” Factiva)

But Obamas victory is narrow. And by getting only a partial deal now, he faces a bigger fiscal cliff just a few weeks into his second term. In fact, there will be three cliffs: the deep spending cuts known as the sequester that come due (again) in two months; the debt ceiling, which will prohibit new federal borrowing without congressional action, also in about two months; and the expiration on March 27 of the continuing budget resolution the short-term deal passed Oct. 27 that allows the federal government to keep spending money. Those three anvils hanging over Washingtons head are likely to consume attention as the deadlines approach, creating a distraction from other matters Obama might want to address after his second inauguration on Jan. 21 starting with gun violence and immigration reform. Typically, reelected presidents begin their second terms with a bit of fresh political capital in the bank and about an 18-month window in which to accomplish anything. Fiscal matters could easily deplete Obamas balance. And with each passing month, Congress becomes increasingly concerned about midterms particularly House members, who face reelection every two years, and the one-third of the Senate that is up for reelection. Immigration reform could be an exception: Republicans face a crisis in their declining Hispanic support, and the issue has shot to the top of their agenda. That, coupled with Obamas longstanding pledge to enact comprehensive reform, could mean action, almost regardless.

# Link

### 2NC AT: Winners-Win (Long)

#### Plan isn’t a win – immigration is the only thing relevant to their evidence – a major policies

#### Our link outweighs and subsumes it --- the plan spends capital the wrong way. It starts the administration off on the wrong foot and spoils any spirit of cooperation.

[That’s Lillis --- 2NC link block]

Lillis, 9/29 (Mike, 9/29/2012, “Democrats lay out second-term wish list for President Obama,” <http://thehill.com/homenews/campaign/259253-dems-lay-out-wish-list-for-a-second-obama-term>)

Obama, for his part, is optimistic that Republicans would be more willing to compromise in a second term than they were in his first. “My hope is that when the American people speak in this election – if I'm fortunate enough to be elected but we still have a Republican-controlled House – that some of the fever breaks and the particular goal of beating me no longer holds,” Obama told Ohio's Plain Dealer Thursday. Still, the window to act on significant legislative changes will likely be short, as the fiscal cliff debate could extend well into 2013, leaving little room to maneuver before the campaign season launches for the 2014 midterms. Asked how Obama should spend his political capital if he wins reelection, Rep. Emanuel Cleaver (D-Mo.) offered some advice. "Carefully," he warned. "Carefully. "Whatever we go after first has to be a bipartisan issue, whether it's cyber-security, whether it's payroll tax, whether it's the doc fix in Medicare, whether it's the jobs bill – whatever it is – we've got to do it together," Cleaver added. "Because even if we have the votes and try to run over them, the hostility will be so great here on the Hill that the midterm will very likely create problems."

#### Their turn actually just strengthens our link

Wallsten & Goldfarb, 12/8 (Peter Wallsten and Zachary A. Goldfarb, 12/8/2012, “Obama’s second-term agenda will be shadowed by budget woes,” <http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/obamas-second-term-agenda-will-be-shadowed-by-budget-woes/2012/12/08/ea97e956-4091-11e2-ae43-cf491b837f7b_story.html>)

One House GOP leadership aide said Obama would be unwise “if he comes in here and poisons the well by trying to break as many Republicans as he can. By nature of how politics works, you’re going to see a lot less cooperation going forward.” Rep. Peter Roskam (R-Ill.), a top Boehner lieutenant, hinted at that sentiment among House Republicans last week when he told reporters Obama had “an unbelievable opportunity to be a transformational president” by bringing the parties together for a debt deal. “Or he can dissolve into zero-sum game politics, where he wins and . . . other people lose.”

#### Missteps undermine capital more than victories replenish it

Anderson, 5 --- Phd candidate in Philosophy at Ohio State (William David, THE PRESIDENT’S AGENDA: POSITION-TAKING, LEGISLATIVE SUPPORT, AND THE PERSISTENCE OF TIME, DISSERTATION, Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate School of The Ohio State University, <http://etd.ohiolink.edu/view.cgi/Anderson%20William%20David.pdf?osu1123169358>)

Expansionism and Protectionism

Besides policy congruence and taking advantage of policy windows, presidents build their personal skills while solidifying in their own minds the risks they are willing to accept as they take positions on bills and lobby before Congress. Like members of the House (Fenno 1978), presidents move through expansionist and protectionist periods during their administrations, with expansionist periods more likely to immediately follow the election when political capital is high and legislative deference more common. The president’s coalition is larger, and he has more latitude to even further expand that coalition—a tactic that may serve him well during the next electoral cycle. Presidential capital, however, erodes over time: a president’s mistakes during the term erode political capital more than victories replenish it, and activist presidents expose themselves to greater “capital risk” than reticent executives. Thus, the president’s accumulated legislative record from earlier in the term may harm his legislative and electoral chances later in the term (Light 1999). The early months of the first Clinton term illustrate how difficult it is to seize on the momentum elections provide. Clinton’s struggles with health care reform and his missteps with peripheral issues—that eventually harmed agenda items more germane to his presidential platform—suggest how important early presidential momentum is in shaping subsequent relations between Congress and the president.

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

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

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

### 2NC PC Key (Immigration)

#### The link frames the uniqueness debate – comprehensive immigration reform will happen only if Obama invests substantial political muscle into the fight to bring both parties together – DMN

#### Default to specificity of our I/L – says that in immigration reform Obama is key because even some democrats don’t want reform – has to work with his party

#### PC key to switching votes

Kuttner 11 (Robert, Senior Fellow – Demos and Co-editor – American Prospect, “Barack Obama's Theory of Power,” The American Prospect, 5-16, http://prospect.org/cs/articles?article=barack\_obamas\_theory\_of\_power)

**As the political scientist** Richard **Neustadt observed** in his classic work, Presidential Power, a book that had great influence on President John F. Kennedy, **the essence of a president's power is "the power to persuade."** Because our divided constitutional system does not allow the president to lead by commanding, **presidents amass power by** making strategic choices **about when to use the latent authority of the presidency to move public and elite opinion and then use that added prestige as clout to move Congress.** In one of Neustadt's classic case studies, Harry Truman, a president widely considered a lame duck, nonetheless persuaded the broad public and a Republican Congress in 1947-1948 that the Marshall Plan was a worthy idea. As Neustadt and Burns both observed, **though an American chief executive is weak by constitutional design, a president possesses several points of leverage. He can play an effective outside game, motivating and shaping public sentiment, making clear the differences between his values and those of his opposition, and using popular support to box in his opponents and move them in his direction. He can complement the outside bully pulpit with a nimble inside game, uniting his legislative party, bestowing or withholding benefits on opposition legislators, forcing them to take awkward votes, and using the veto. He can also enlist the support of interest groups to pressure Congress, and use media to validate his framing of choices. Done well, all of this signals leadership that often moves the public agenda.**

#### Dickinson concludes neg – prefer this evidence because it’s from a peer reviewed journal and isn’t just a random blog post

Dickinson, poli sci prof middlebury, ‘9 (Matthew Dickinson, professor of political science at Middlebury College. He taught previously at Harvard University, where he also received his Ph.D., working under the supervision of presidential scholar Richard Neustadt, We All Want a Revolution: Neustadt, New Institutionalism, and the Future of Presidency Research, Presidential Studies Quarterly 39 no4 736-70)

Small wonder, then, that initial efforts to find evidence of presidential power centered on explaining legislative outcomes in Congress. Because scholars found it difficult to directly and systematically measure presidential influence or "skill," however, they often tried to estimate it indirectly, after first establishing a baseline model that explained these outcomes on other factors, including party strength in Congress, members of Congress's ideology, the president's electoral support and/or popular approval, and various control variables related to time in office and political and economic context. With the baseline established, one could then presumably see how much of the unexplained variance might be attributed to presidents, and whether individual presidents did better or worse than the model predicted. Despite differences in modeling assumptions and measurements, however, these studies came to remarkably similar conclusions: individual presidents did not seem to matter very much in explaining legislators' voting behavior or lawmaking outcomes (but see Lockerbie and Borrelli 1989, 97-106). As Richard Fleisher, Jon Bond, and B. Dan Wood summarized, "[S]tudies that compare presidential success to some baseline fail to find evidence that perceptions of skill have systematic effects" (2008, 197; see also Bond, Fleisher, and Krutz 1996, 127; Edwards 1989, 212).     To some scholars, these results indicate that Neustadt's "president-centered" perspective is incorrect (Bond and Fleisher 1990, 221-23). In fact, the aggregate results reinforce Neustadt's recurring refrain that presidents are weak and that, when dealing with Congress, a president's power is "comparably limited" (Neustadt 1990, 184). The misinterpretationof the findings as they relate to PP stems in part from scholars' difficulty in defining and operationalizing presidential influence (Cameron 2000b; Dietz 2002, 105-6; Edwards 2000, 12; Shull and Shaw 1999). But it is also that case that scholars often misconstrue Neustadt's analytic perspective; his description of what presidents must do to influence policy making does not mean that he believes presidents are the dominant influence on that process. Neustadt writes from the president's perspective, but without adopting a president-centered explanation of power.     Nonetheless, if Neustadt clearly recognizes that a president's influence in Congress is exercised mostly, as George Edwards (1989) puts it, "at the margins," his case studies in PP also suggest that, within this limited bound, presidents do strive to influence legislative outcomes. But how? Scholars often argue that a president's most direct means of influence is to directly lobby certain members of Congress, often through quid pro quo exchanges, at critical junctures during the lawmaking sequence. Spatial models of legislative voting suggest that these lobbying efforts are most effective when presidents target the median, veto, and filibuster "pivots" within Congress. This logic finds empirical support in vote-switching studies that indicate that presidents do direct lobbying efforts at these pivotal voters, and with positive legislative results. Keith Krehbiel analyzes successive votes by legislators in the context of a presidential veto and finds "modest support for the sometimes doubted stylized fact of presidential power as persuasion" (1998,153-54). Similarly, David Brady and Craig Volden look at vote switching by members of Congress in successive Congresses on nearly identical legislation and also conclude that presidents do influence the votes of at least some legislators (1998, 125-36). In his study of presidential lobbying on key votes on important domestic legislation during the 83rd (1953-54) through 108th (2003-04) Congresses, Matthew Beckman shows that in addition to these pivotal voters, presidents also lobby leaders in both congressional parties in order to control what legislative alternatives make it onto the congressional agenda (more on this later). These lobbying efforts are correlated with a greater likelihood that a president's legislative preferences will come to a vote (Beckmann 2008, n.d.). In one of the most concerted efforts to model how bargaining takes place at the individual level, Terry Sullivan examines presidential archives containing administrative headcounts to identify instances in which members of Congress switched positions during legislative debate, from initially opposing the president to supporting him in the final roll call (Sullivan 1988, 1990, 1991). Sullivan shows that in a bargaining game with incomplete information regarding the preferences of the president and members of Congress, there are a number of possible bargaining outcomes for a given distribution of legislative and presidential policy preferences. These outcomes depend in part on legislators' success in bartering their potential support for the president's policy for additional concessions from the president. In threatening to withhold support, however, members of Congress run the risk that the president will call their bluff and turn elsewhere for the necessary votes. By capitalizing on members' uncertainty regarding whether their support is necessary to form a winning coalition, Sullivan theorizes that presidents can reduce members of Congress's penchant for strategic bluffing and increase the likelihood of a legislative outcome closer to the president's preference. “Hence, the skill to bargain successfully becomes a foundation for presidential power even within the context of electorally determined opportunities,” Sullivan concludes (1991, 1188).

### 2NC Solar Link

#### Any increase in energy incentives is completely off the table post-election – neither side wants the financial and political risks since any new energy spending is associated with Solyndra – Krauss

#### Prefer it – Their evidence says that researchers from brookings and the Hoover institute want to past the plan – doesn’t speak to congressional feelings about new energy spending and doesn’t assume current political climate

#### Solar energy is highly politicized --- GOP will fight the plan because they see renewables as tied to Obama

Martin, 11/15 --- transactional lawyer whose principal areas of practice are tax and project finance (Keith, 11/15/2012, “US policy outlook for renewable energy,” <http://www.lexology.com/library/detail.aspx?g=1f0b8cd6-3d25-4fca-855a-3dd31306a547>)

When President Obama took office in 2009, he did so with an ambitious agenda to promote renewable energy. The real goal was to address global warming. Shifting electricity generation to wind, sunlight and other forms of renewable energy and away from fossil fuels was a way to help. A year and a half later by the summer of 2010, the agenda had stalled. The “cap-and-trade” program to control carbon emissions failed in the House. A national clean energy standard, a federal green bank and help making it easier to build new transmission lines were further casualties. Meanwhile, the market hit turbulence of its own making. It is hard for renewable energy developers to get utilities to sign long-term contracts to buy electricity. On top of that, low natural gas prices are making it hard for renewable energy to compete. Renewable energy became highly politicized. Republicans in the House have been pursuing a noisy investigation into Solyndra and other asserted failures in the DOE loan guarantee program. Joe Kelliher, a thoughtful former Republican chairman of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, said part of the problem was a new class of Republican freshmen in the House took office believing that US support for renewable energy started with the Obama administration and, as a consequence, they were opposed to it.

#### Passage will be a battle even if there is bipartisan support

McEntee, 12 --- Executive Director and CEO, American Geophysical Union (8/15/2012, Christine, “Science, Politics and Public Opinion,”http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/08/finding-the-sweet-spot-biparti.php?comments=expandall#comments)

As convenient as it would be to say that a single change could alleviate the gridlock we are experiencing, the reality is that there are a number of critical obstacles keeping us from passing energy and environmental legislation. We know that objective scientific knowledge is needed to inform good policy decisions – and that objective knowledge exists – but all too often we are allowing politics and ideology to take precedence over, or be pitted against, science. This not only risks the legitimacy of the science, but also the strength of the policy and its ability to protect the security, health and welfare of the American people, and support a healthy and thriving economy. The current rhetoric on climate change is a perfect example. We also know that the biggest obstacles to passage of energy and environmental legislation are disagreements about the extent to which the federal government can and should regulate business, and reluctance to launch new initiatives that will add to the deficit. The science tells us that small initiatives that require only nominal investments can't begin to address the environmental and energy challenges we face; and legislation big enough to achieve significant results will cost more than Congress is willing to spend. Environmental legislation is also held prisoner to partisan gridlock, with far less bipartisan support than many energy proposals. Even environmental legislation that saves many times its cost in medical and health care savings cannot advance in the current Congress. One recent example is the defeat of legislation to limit the release of airborne particulates proven to adversely affect the respiratory health of children and seniors. Dissonance about the role of federal regulation, its cost-effectiveness, and potential to impose costs on private sector that might adversely impact economic recovery further complicate energy/environmental legislative calculus. For these reasons, it is difficult for Congress to pass new energy and/or environmental initiatives, even where there is wide bipartisan support for a given bill. Lastly, we know that Congress is not likely to make much real progress on either energy or environmental issues until voters demand such action. Research shows that most voters, including Independents in swing states, do not list energy and environmental issues as a major determinant of how they vote, despite their significant impact on local, state and national economies, public health and national security. This needs to change. Historically, a major energy or environmental disaster has sometimes generated a major change in voter sentiment, e.g., the Cuyahoga River fire that helped launch the Clean Water Act. Unfortunately, it may take a major environmental or energy disaster to get sufficient voter support for significant legislation on these issues. In summary, the only way that we can hope to reach bipartisan action on energy and environmental policy will require an effective policy strategy that has been built on a foundation of scientific knowledge, strategic budget decisions, and a mandate from the voters themselves.

### A2 Piecemeal

#### This card is terrible – just says that a comprehensive reform isn’t a good idea – there’s no warrant – look at their underlining – just a representative complaining about it

#### Reform process must begin right away and can’t be piecemeal

Deseret News, 12/17 (“Immigration reform,” 12/17/2012, Factiva)

President Barack Obama has pledged to tackle the issue of immigration reform as a priority for his second term, and the sooner that effort begins in earnest, the better. The issue is complicated and subject to sharp partisan differences, and has consequently fallen victim to the expediency of procrastination. It is high time for that to end, and the beginning point cannot be a piecemeal approach that focuses on a single component of the problem. What is needed and desired by the American public is a comprehensive effort that results in clear and sustainable policies to deal with extant issues, as well as those which will inevitably spring up in the future. Chief among them is the status of those who enter the country without the proper documentation. There are currently an estimated 12 million undocumented immigrants living in the United States, and a process for them to become properly documented is the only realistic course of action.

# Impact

### Impact XT

#### Immigration reform key to boost the technological and scientific leadership that is the foundation of hegemony and our economic leadership – we control a better internal link to long term economic growth – all of the biggest increases in the economy have been because of innovation boosts

#### Their impact defense to Heg says that the US doesn’t have the capability to solve things like civil wars – written in 97 in response to things like Rwanda – doesn’t speak to the fact collapse of hegemony leads to great power wars – 2AC didn’t answer this no new 1AR answer

#### Heg decline internal links all of their impacts

Brzezinski, IR Prof @ JHU, ’12

[Zbigniew Brzezinski, Professor @ JHU School of Advanced International Studies, National Security Adviser for Jimmy Carter, Member of CSIS, “Eight nations are on the endangered list,” January 7th 2012, http://www.therecord.com/opinion/columns/article/650388--eight-nations-are-on-the-endangered-list]

With the decline of American global pre-eminence, weaker countries will be more susceptible to the assertive influence of major regional powers. India and China are rising, Russia is increasingly imperially minded, and the Middle East is growing ever more unstable. The potential for regional conflict in the absence of an internationally active United States of America is real. Get ready for a global reality characterized by the survival of the strongest. 1. Georgia American decline would leave this tiny Caucasian state vulnerable to Russian political intimidation and military aggression. The United States has provided Georgia with $3 billion in aid since 1991 — $1 billion of that since its 2008 war with Russia. American decline would put new limitations on U.S. capabilities, and could by itself stir Russian desires to reclaim its old sphere of influence. What's more, once-and-future Russian President Vladimir Putin harbors an intense personal hatred toward Georgian President Mikheil Saakashvili. At stake: Russian domination of the southern energy corridor to Europe, possibly leading to more pressure on Europe to accommodate Moscow's political agenda; a domino effect on Azerbaijan. 2. Taiwan Since 1972, the United States has formally accepted the mainland's “one China” formula while maintaining that neither side shall alter the status quo by force. Beijing, however, reserves the right to use force, which allows Washington to justify its continued arms sales to Taiwan. In recent years, Taiwan and China have been improving their relationship. America's decline, however, would increase Taiwan's vulnerability, leaving decision-makers in Taipei more susceptible to direct Chinese pressure and the sheer attraction of an economically successful China. That, at the least, could speed up the timetable for cross-strait reunification, but on unequal terms favouring the mainland. At stake: Risk of a serious collision with China. 3. South Korea The United States has been the guarantor of South Korea's security since it was attacked in 1950 by North Korea, with Soviet and Chinese collusion. Seoul's remarkable economic takeoff and democratic political system testify to the success of U.S. engagement. Over the years, however, North Korea has staged a number of provocations against South Korea, ranging from assassinations of its cabinet members to the 2010 sinking of the South Korean warship Cheonan. So American decline would confront South Korea with painful choices: either accept Chinese regional dominance and further reliance on China to rein in the nuclear-armed North, or seek a much stronger, though historically unpopular, relationship with Japan out of shared democratic values and fear of aggression from Pyongyang and Beijing. At stake: Military and economic security on the Korean Peninsula; a general crisis of confidence in Japan and South Korea regarding the reliability of existing American commitments. 4. Belarus Twenty years after the fall of the Soviet Union, Europe's last dictatorship remains politically and economically dependent on Russia. One-third of its exports go to Russia, on which it is almost entirely reliant for its energy needs. At the same time, President Aleksandr Lukashenko's 17-year dictatorship has stood in the way of any meaningful relations with the West. Consequently, a marked American decline would give Russia a virtually risk-free opportunity to reabsorb Belarus. At stake: The security of neighbouring Baltic states, especially Latvia. 5. Ukraine Kiev's relationship with Moscow has been as prone to tension as its relationship with the West has been prone to indecision. In 2005, 2007, and 2009, Russia either threatened to or did stop oil and natural gas from flowing to Ukraine. More recently, President Viktor Yanukovych was pressured to extend Russia's lease of a naval base at the Ukrainian Black Sea port of Sevastopol for another 25 years in exchange for preferential pricing of Russian energy deliveries to Ukraine. The Kremlin continues to press Ukraine to join a “common economic space” with Russia, while gradually stripping Ukraine of direct control over its major industrial assets through mergers and takeovers by Russian firms. With the U.S. in decline, Europe would be less willing and able to reach out and incorporate Ukraine into an expanding Western community, leaving Ukraine more vulnerable to Russian designs. At stake: The renewal of Russian imperial ambitions. 6. Afghanistan Devastated by nine years of brutal warfare waged by the Soviet Union, ignored by the West for a decade after the Soviet withdrawal, mismanaged by the medieval Taliban, and let down by 10 years of half-hearted U.S. and allied military operations and sporadic economic assistance, Afghanistan is in shambles. With 40 per cent unemployment and ranking 215th globally in per capita GDP, it has little economic output beyond its illegal narcotics trade. A rapid U.S. troop disengagement brought on by war fatigue or the early effects of American decline would most likely result in internal disintegration and an external power play among nearby states for influence in Afghanistan. In the absence of an effective, stable government in Kabul, the country would be dominated by rival warlords. Pakistan and India would more assertively compete for influence in Afghanistan — with Iran also probably involved. At stake: The re-emergence of the Taliban; a proxy war between India and Pakistan; a haven for international terrorism. 7. Pakistan Although Islamabad is armed with 21st-century nuclear weapons and held together by a professional late 20th-century army, the majority of Pakistan is still pre-modern, rural, and largely defined by regional and tribal identities. Conflict with India defines Pakistan's sense of national identity, while the forcible division of Kashmir sustains a shared and profound antipathy. Pakistan's political instability is its greatest vulnerability, and a decline in U.S. power would reduce American ability to aid Pakistan's consolidation and development. Pakistan could then transform into a state run by the military, a radical Islamic state, a state that combined both military and Islamic rule, or a “state” with no centralized government at all. At stake: Nuclear warlordism; a militant Islamic, anti-Western, nuclear-armed government similar to Iran's; regional instability in Central Asia, with violence potentially spreading to China, India, and Russia. 8. Israel (and the greater Middle East) American decline would set in motion tectonic shifts undermining the political stability of the entire Middle East. All states in the region remain vulnerable to varying degrees of internal populist pressures, social unrest, and religious fundamentalism, as seen by the events of early 2011. If American decline were to occur with the Israeli-Palestinian conflict still unresolved, the failure to implement a mutually acceptable two-state solution would further inflame the region's political atmosphere. Regional hostility to Israel would then intensify. Perceived American weakness would at some point tempt the more powerful states in the region, notably Iran or Israel, to pre-empt anticipated dangers. And jockeying for tactical advantage could precipitate eruptions by Hamas or Hezbollah, which could then escalate into wider and bloodier military encounters. Weak entities such as Lebanon and Palestine would pay an especially high price in civilian deaths. Even worse, such conflicts could rise to truly horrific levels through strikes and counterstrikes between Iran and Israel. At stake: Direct Israeli or U.S. confrontation with Iran; a rising tide of Islamic radicalism and extremism; a worldwide energy crisis; vulnerability of America's Persian Gulf allies.

#### Hegemony controls the terminal impact to resource wars – even if countries havea greater incentive to go to war with one another when prices spike – unipolarity ensures they won’t

#### Comprehensive reform will boost every sector of the economy fast

Hinojosa-Ojeda, 12 --- Founding Director of the North American Integration and Development Center at UCLA (Winter 2012, Raul, Cato Journal, “The Economic Benefits of Comprehensive Immigration Reform,” <http://www.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/serials/files/cato-journal/2012/1/cj32n1-12.pdf>)

The Economic Benefits of Comprehensive Immigration Reform

The results of our modeling suggest that comprehensive immigration reform would increase U.S. GDP by at least 0.84 percent per year. Using 10-year GDP projections prepared by the Congressional Budget Office, this translates into a steadily increasing amount of added annual GDP over the coming decade. The 10-year total is at least $1.5 trillion in added GDP, which includes roughly $1.2 trillion in additional consumption and $256 billion in additional investment. Comprehensive immigration reform brings substantial economic gains even in the short run—during the first three years following legalization. The real wages of newly legalized workers increase by roughly $4,400 per year among those in less-skilled jobs during the first three years of implementation, and $6,185 per year for those in higher-skilled jobs. The higher earning power of newly legalized workers translates into an increase in net personal income of $30 billion to $36 billion, which would generate $4.5 to $5.4 billion in additional net tax revenue nationally, enough to support 750,000 to 900,000 new jobs. Ultimately, only the federal government can resolve the status of the undocumented. But for the purposes of our analysis, we examine what would happen on a state and county level if local workforces were fully legalized through comprehensive immigration reform. In California, which faces a $25.4 billion budget shortfall in 2011–12, this scenario would lead to a $27 billion increase in labor income (pre-tax salary and wage earnings) that would generate a $5.3 billion boost in tax revenue for the state and add 633,000 desperately needed jobs to the economy. In Los Angeles County, labor income would increase $10 billion through legalization, leading to $1.9 billion in additional net tax revenue and 211,000 new jobs. In Arizona, the same legalization scheme would generate $5.6 billion more in labor income, leading to $1.68 billion in tax revenue and an additional 261,000 jobs. The wages of native-born workers also increase under the comprehensive immigration reform scenario because the “wage floor” rises for all workers—particularly in industries where large numbers of easily exploited, low-wage, unauthorized immigrants currently work. Wages for native-born U.S. workers increase by roughly $162 per year for the less-skilled and $74 per year for the higher-skilled. Under the temporary worker program scenario, wages fall for both less-skilled and higher-skilled native-born U.S. workers. And under the mass deportation scenario, wages for less-skilled native-born workers actually rise, but only at the cost of significantly fewer jobs as the economy contracts and investment declines. The cost of this scheme to local economies, however, is staggering. If California’s workforce were depleted by mass deportation, the resulting contraction of the economy would mean a loss of $176 billion in labor income and a reduction in gross product of $300 billion, or 17 percent of the state economy. As a result, 3.6 million jobs would be lost. Los Angeles County would be even harder hit, with the $60.1 billion loss in labor income causing a 22 percent reduction in the local economy and the loss of 1.2 million jobs. Arizona’s case is almost as severe, with the $29.5 billion the state would lose in labor income as a result of mass deportation and the $48.8 billion reduction in gross product representing a 20 percent depletion of the economy and the loss of 581,000 jobs. The benefits of additional U.S. GDP growth under the comprehensive immigration reform scenario are spread very broadly throughout the U.S. economy, with virtually every sector expanding. Particularly large increases occur in immigrant-heavy industries such as textiles, ferrous metals, transportation equipment, electronic equipment, motor vehicles and parts, nonelectric machinery and equipment, capital goods, mineral products, and construction. In comparison, every sector experiences significantly smaller gains under the temporary worker scenario, while every sector contracts under the mass deportation scenario.

#### That happens faster then the aff’s i/l – this would boost the economy by the end of the year and would check any economic decline that would result from blackouts