

Comment on the following document	EAE 0422 A	
David Corn, <i>Showdown: The Inside Story of How Obama Battled the GOP to Set Up the 2012 Election</i> , HarperCollins, 2012, pp. 142-43.	Code Sujet	CCV B2
	Sujet Jury	
	Sujet Candidat	

On January 25th, 2011, Obama entered the House of Representatives. The Tucson shooting shaped the mood. The guests in the First Lady's box included Daniel Hernandez, an intern for Giffords who had helped save her life during the attack, and the parents of Christina Taylor Green.¹ Senators and representatives were wearing black-and-white ribbons to honor the victims of that tragedy. And this year, at the suggestion of Senator Mark Udall, a Colorado Democrat, Republicans and Democrats were sitting together – not separated into partisan blocs.

Obama began by noting the empty chair of Gabby Giffords. "What comes of this moment will be determined not by whether we can sit together tonight, but whether we can work together tomorrow," he said. He did not mention gun violence – an omission that disappointed gun control advocates who had hoped for some reference.

Obama noted that the economy was growing, but pointed out the American Dream remained under great pressure from domestic and global forces. He was echoing the speeches he made during the 2008 campaign, before he (and the rest of the nation) had been forced to cope with an economic collapse. To win the future, the president maintained, the nation must "out-innovate, out-educate, and out-build the rest of the world."

The country did have to erase its deficits, he said, but to be competitive in the global economy, the government must invest in information technology, biomedical research, clean energy technology, and other cutting-edge fields. There would have to be money spent on education reforms, math and science teachers, and tax credits for college tuition. Government spending – that is, investments – was needed to bolster the infrastructure, from high-speed rail to high-speed Internet, from crumbling roads to falling-down bridges.

It was a boldly moderate speech. Obama proposed nothing radical, as he expressed an apple-pie vision that in the not-too-distant past would have won much bipartisan support. He did not unfurl a laundry list of legislative measures for the coming year. (With the Republican House, what would be the point?) The president did not dwell on health care. There was no reference to Wall Street. His two paragraphs on the Afghanistan war were obligatory. He wasn't preaching austerity; he was selling American leadership.

The critical question, Obama insisted, was "whether new jobs and industries take root in this country or somewhere else."

He was talking about jobs in the future, not the present. And his message was stark: if we don't get our act together, our clock will be cleaned by the Chinese and others. China, he noted, was "home to the world's largest private solar research facility and the world's fastest computer."

The president was certainly correct about the necessity of prepping for the future. But would embracing the long view persuade voters that he was doing all that was necessary *right now* to kick the sluggish recovery into a higher gear and, thus, deserved their backing in the oncoming battles with the Republicans, as well as the 2012 election? He didn't address the immediate frustration or anger felt by Americans. He was presenting himself as an optimistic and responsible guardian of the economy in contrast to the gripe-and-slash Republicans.

¹ Gabrielle Giffords was a Democratic representative from Arizona's 8th Congressional District. On January 8th 2011 she was the victim of an assassination attempt at a mass shooting in Tucson. She survived but 6 people died, including 9 year-old Christina Taylor Greene.

Comment on the following document	EAE 0422 A	
Barack Obama, Remarks by the President at the United States Military Academy Commencement Ceremony, U.S. Military Academy-West Point, West Point, New York, May 28, 2014. (https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2014/05/28/remarks-president-united-states-military-academy-commencement-ceremony)	Code Sujet	CCV B5
	Sujet Jury	
	Sujet Candidat	

(...) This is a particularly useful time for America to reflect on those who have sacrificed so much for our freedom, a few days after Memorial Day. You are the first class to graduate since 9/11 who may not be sent into combat in Iraq or Afghanistan. When I first spoke at West Point in 2009, we still had more than 100,000 troops in Iraq. We were preparing to surge in Afghanistan. Our counterterrorism efforts were focused on al Qaeda's core leadership -- those who had carried out the 9/11 attacks. And our nation was just beginning a long climb out of the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression.

Four and a half years later, as you graduate, the landscape has changed. We have removed our troops from Iraq. We are winding down our war in Afghanistan. Al Qaeda's leadership on the border region between Pakistan and Afghanistan has been decimated, and Osama bin Laden is no more. And through it all, we've refocused our investments in what has always been a key source of American strength: a growing economy that can provide opportunity for everybody who's willing to work hard and take responsibility here at home.

In fact, by most measures, America has rarely been stronger relative to the rest of the world. Those who argue otherwise -- who suggest that America is in decline, or has seen its global leadership slip away -- are either misreading history or engaged in partisan politics. Think about it. Our military has no peer. The odds of a direct threat against us by any nation are low and do not come close to the dangers we faced during the Cold War.

Meanwhile, our economy remains the most dynamic on Earth; our businesses the most innovative. Each year, we grow more energy independent. From Europe to Asia, we are the hub of alliances unrivaled in the history of nations. America continues to attract striving immigrants. The values of our founding inspire leaders in parliaments and new movements in public squares around the globe. And when a typhoon hits the Philippines, or schoolgirls are kidnapped in Nigeria, or masked men occupy a building in Ukraine, it is America that the world looks to for help. So the United States is and remains the one indispensable nation. That has been true for the century passed and it will be true for the century to come.

But the world is changing with accelerating speed. This presents opportunity, but also new dangers. We know all too well, after 9/11, just how technology and globalization has put power once reserved for states in the hands of individuals, raising the capacity of terrorists to do harm. Russia's aggression toward former Soviet states unnerves capitals in Europe, while China's economic rise and military reach worries its neighbors. From Brazil to India, rising middle classes compete with us, and governments seek a greater say in global forums. And even as developing nations embrace democracy and market economies, 24-hour news and social media makes it impossible to ignore the continuation of sectarian conflicts and failing states and popular uprisings that might have received only passing notice a generation ago. (...)

Comment on the following document	EAE 0422 A	
Janet Murguía, "National Council of La Raza 2014 Capital Awards Speech: President's Message", March 4 th 2014, Washington, DC.	Code Sujet	CCV B6
	Sujet Jury	
	Sujet Candidat	

(...) Governing is possible. It's what the country wants. It's what our community wants. It is what our nation needs.

5 After the last two elections, leaders from both parties signaled that resolving the immigration debate was possible. And tonight we honored the sponsors of a true bipartisan agreement — the Gang of Eight — who raised hopes for comprehensive immigration reform by crafting and passing a landmark Senate bill. Yet our hopes, once again, have been dashed by political gridlock.

10 One week after saying he was ready to move forward with immigration reform, Speaker Boehner pulled the plug on legislation in the House. He said, and I quote, "There's widespread doubt about whether this Administration can be trusted to enforce our laws. And it's going to be difficult to move any immigration legislation until that changes." Seriously? Failing to enforce our laws? For us, this president has been the deporter-in-chief.

15 Any day now, this Administration will reach the two million mark for deportations. It is a staggering number that far outstrips any of his predecessors and leaves behind it a wake of devastation for families across America. Many groups, including NCLR, have long been calling on the president to mitigate the damage of these record deportations. But again we hear no. The president says his administration does not have the authority to act on its own. All we hear is
20 no. No from Congress. No from the Administration.

25 But here's the thing: we won't take no for an answer, because we can't — not while over 400,000 people a year are being deported by this administration. Not while millions continue to live in the shadows, struggling in fear, every single day of their lives, outside the scope and protection of the law. Nearly half of those being deported are simply hardworking people who have put down roots in their communities and have employers who count on them. Most have been here more than a decade. One out of every four deportees is the parent of a child who is a U.S. citizen. Hundreds of thousands of these children, our children, are being deprived of their mother or father — and very often the family's only breadwinner. It will take generations to heal the harm caused by inaction.
30

35 So, yes. We respectfully disagree with the president on his ability to stop unnecessary deportations. He can stop tearing families apart. He can stop throwing communities and businesses into chaos. He can stop turning a blind eye to the harm being done. He does have the power to stop this. Failure to act will be a shameful legacy for his presidency.

40 But we cannot rely on administrative relief alone. It's important and it's needed, but it is also limited and temporary. We do a grave disservice to our community and to ourselves if we focus on only one front in this battle. Only Congress can deliver a broad, inclusive, and lasting solution. So, to the House of Representatives, we say take up immigration reform now, or suffer the political consequences. (...)

Comment on the following document	EAE 0422 A	
Samantha Power, <i>Ambassador Samantha Power on Russia: Remarks at the Atlantic Council</i> , January 17 th 2017. https://time.com/4637117/samantha-power-united-nations-russia-speech-transcript/	Code Sujet	CCV B8
	Sujet Jury	
	Sujet Candidat	

(...) In 1796, our nation's first president, George Washington, used his Farewell Address to issue a stark warning to the American people about the danger of foreign governments trying to interfere in our democracy. He told his audience: "Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me, fellow-citizens), the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government."

More than 220 years later, Washington's warning feels strikingly relevant. For if anything, the vulnerabilities that Washington saw, in his words, "to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils," have only multiplied with modern technology. And unlike in 1796, it is no longer enough for us simply to protect our own democracy against foreign interference; we also have to protect the integrity of the entire rules-based international order, on whose foundations our security and prosperity rest.

Yet while so much has changed since Washington issued his warning, the essence of the threat has not. It goes to the creation of America itself – a nation born out of a simple, yet revolutionary idea: that it was the American people, ordinary citizens – and not a government, domestic or foreign – who should enjoy the right to shape our nation's path. That is a right that we have had to fight to defend throughout our history. And while in recent decades we may have felt confident that no power would dare try to take that right away from us, we have again been reminded that they will try.

Just as the threat is fundamentally unchanged since Washington's time, so is our most effective way to confront it. And that is by renewing the faith of the American people in our democracy. Our democracy's vitality has long depended on sustaining the belief among our citizens that a government by and for the people is the best way to keep themselves and their loved ones safe, to preserve the freedoms they value most, and to expand their opportunities. It is not that we have a perfect system, but a perfectible system – one that the American people always have the power to improve, to renew, to make their own. That faith is the engine that has powered our republic since its creation, and it is the reason other nations still look to America as a model.

And it is precisely that faith that the Russian Government's interference is intended to shake. The Kremlin's aim is to convince our people that the system is rigged; that all facts are relative; that ordinary people who try to improve their communities and their country are wasting their time. In the place of faith, they offer cynicism. In the place of engagement – indifference.

But the truth is that the Russian Government's efforts to cast doubt on the integrity of our democracy would not have been so effective if some of those doubts had not already been felt by many Americans. By citizens who are asking whether our system still offers a way to fix the everyday problems they face, and whether our society still gives them reason to hope that they can improve their lives for the better. In this way, the attack has cast a light on a growing sense of divisiveness, distrust, and disillusionment. (...)