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## 1NC Shell

**A – Uniqueness – Obama is jumping ahead in the 2012 race gaining more support than anyone in political history**

Reuters 7/13/11 (“Barack Obama re-election campaign raises $86m in three months” <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/jul/13/barack-obama-reelection-campaign-fundraising>)

Barack Obama re-election campaign raises $86m in three monthsUS president's 2012 bid sails past $60m target for last quarter, easily eclipsing the efforts of Republican contenders Share111 reddit this Reuters in Washington guardian.co.uk, Wednesday 13 July 2011 15.41 BST Article history Barack Obama speaks during a fundraiser in Chicago. His 2012 re-election campaign is following the same 2008 winning strategy of targeting small donations. Photograph: Scott Olson/Getty Images Barack Obama's re-election campaign has exceeded its $60m fundraising target for the past three months, bringing in $86m from April to June and eclipsing his Republican contenders. Officials for Obama's 2012 presidential campaign said it had received funds from more than 552,000 people, representing "more grassroots support at this point in the process than any campaign in political history". In keeping with the president's 2008 winning strategy of targeting small donations, 98% of contributions in the second quarter of this year were $250 (£157) or less, with an average donation of around $69, campaign manager Jim Messina said in a video to supporters. The figures confirm that Obama, who raised a record $745m during his 2008 bid, has started the 2012 race as the cash leader despite criticism from some Democrats that he has tilted to the right in US debt talks and worries about the economy. The Republican frontrunner Mitt Romney raised $18.25m from April to June, and most of his party's hopefuls for the White House raised between $4m and $4.5m during the same period. Romney's rival Michele Bachmann is due to announce her fundraising total for last quarter this week. Of the total raised for Obama during that period, more than $47m went to the Obama for America fund and more than $38m to the Democratic National Committee.

**B – Link – Public has no interest in increasing NASA’s funding – no clear rationale for space travel**

Hsu 11 ("The Myth of America's Love Affair with the Moon" Jeremy is a SPACE.com Senior Writer http://www.space.com/10601-apollo-moon-program-public-support-myth.html)

The only time when more than half of the public believed Apollo was worth the expense came at the time of the Apollo 11 lunar landing in 1969, when Neil Armstrong took humanity's first steps on alien soil. Even then, only a lukewarm 53 percent of the public believed such a momentous historical occasion had been worth the cost. Such findings suggest that the United States went to the moon not because the public demanded it, but because U.S. presidents and Congress believed it served a greater political purpose during the Cold War, Launius said. He added that any future U.S. effort to send astronauts to the moon would also require a similar political, economic or national defense reason to compel funding for the effort. The absence of such a reason may have made it easier for President Barack Obama's administration to move to end NASA's Constellation program last year. That program had aimed to return U.S. astronauts to the moon. Instead, however, Obama has proposed an equally ambitious quest to send astronauts to an asteroid and then Mars. Crunching the numbers The good news for space exploration in general is that public opinion favors it – but only when not taking economic costs and budgetary spending into consideration. "When you divorce it from the numbers and you ask people if they like NASA and spaceflight, people say yes," Launius told SPACE.com. "75 to 80 percent are in favor." The space historian examined nationally representative polls done by industry people and Gallup that asked the same consistent questions year after year. He also looked at polls conducted by the New York Times and others. Public support for overall space funding has hovered around 80 percent in favor of the status quo since 1965, except for a major dip in support during the early 1970s. That may bode well for NASA's continued existence, but it also suggests that few people are clamoring to throw even more money at the space agency. Budget myths Still, polls also show a huge misconception regarding the cost of the U.S. space program. Public opinion has wrongly put NASA's budget at about 22 percent of the government's spending over the years, when in fact NASA's budget only reached 4.3 percent of the federal budget at its peak in 1965. Since the 1970s, the U.S. space agency's budget has hovered below 1 percent of government spending. "My suggestion is that NASA is so visible and the space shuttle is such a powerful icon that people believe this stuff must cost an enormous amount of money," Launius said. As for 2010, NASA's budget came in at just six-tenths of 1 percent of all government spending. Neither side of the political aisle seems to have any real interest in boosting NASA's budget, according to Launius. NASA also seems unlikely to get a dramatic budget boost in the near future. While an October 2010 NASA authorization bill signed by the president called for a slight increase in the space agency's funding, that money has yet to be appropriated. Instead, NASA and all other non-military government agencies have been frozen at their 2010 funding levels by a Congressional continuing resolution (a stopgap until a full budget can be agreed upon) that holds until March 4. Finding a prime directive U.S. space agency funding in recent years has depended upon certain congressional interests in protecting NASA-related jobs, as well as a fuzzier "feel-good" sentiment toward keeping the space agency afloat. If NASA ever wants to get a bigger budget to send astronauts back to the moon or beyond, it will need to find compelling reasons – whether they're related to the search for life or a precious "unobtanium" resource worth going after and exploiting, some experts say. Launius also suggested that the lack of political support for returning astronauts to the moon is related to the bigger question hanging over the purpose of human spaceflight – or rather, the lack of clearly defined purpose. "There's an inability of the aerospace community – and I include myself here – to articulate a clear, irrevocable, unassailable rationale for doing this," Launius said.

**C – Internal Link – Obama’s key to CTBT passage**

Kimball, 11. (Daryl is the Executive Director of the Arms Control Association. May 18, 2011, “Obama Administration to Begin Effort to Engage Senate on CTBT,” <http://www.projectforthectbt.org/TauscherCaseforCTBT>, )

In the most detailed and substantive address by a senior Barack Obama administration official to date, Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security Ellen O. Tauscher (to the left) spoke at the Arms Control Association's May 10 annual meeting on "The Case for the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty." She made it clear that the administration would soon engage with Republican and Democratic Senators on the CTBT and provide updated information on the key technical issues that gave some Senators reason for pause during the 1999 debate on the treaty. Tauscher explained in detail why prompt U.S. approval is in the United States national security interests. She said: "... we are in a stronger position to make the case for the CTBT on its merits. To maintain and enhance that momentum, the Obama Administration is preparing to engage the Senate and the public on an education campaign that we expect will lead to ratification of the CTBT." "In our engagement with the Senate, we want to leave aside the politics and explain why the CTBT will enhance our national security. Our case for Treaty ratification consists of three primary arguments: "One, the United States no longer needs to conduct nuclear explosive tests, plain and simple. Two, a CTBT that has entered into force will obligate other states not to test and provide a disincentive for states to conduct such tests. And three, we now have a greater ability to catch those who cheat." Under Secretary Tauscher's prepared remarks are available online. A video and full transcript of the event is available online. Tauscher's address speech builds upon National Security Advisor Tom Donilon's March 29 reiteration of the administration's commitment to ratification and entry into force of the CTBT. He said: "We are committed to working with members of both parties in the Senate to ratify the CTBT, just as we did for New START. We have no illusions that this will be easy. But we intend to ... make our case to the Senate and the American people." "So, When's the Vote?" Reporters at the event asked Tauscher and other speakers, including Sen. Robert Casey, Jr. (D-Pa.): - "In what timeframe do you think the Senate should act on the CTBT?" - "Do you think it should take this vote before the 2012 elections?" - "And what your assessment of how the votes are lining up?" But given that the Senate hasn't engaged on the topic in over a decade and given that the hard work of making the case for the CTBT has really just begun, its just too early for clear answers to such questions. Senator Casey said it well when he said: "In my judgment, we should act before the 2012 elections. I don’t have a high degree of confidence that we will. I think that would obviously be preferable, but I don’t have great confidence that will happen. In terms of the vote count, I’m not paid to do that. There are others who do that as part of their job. So, even if I were – even if I wanted to hazard a guess, it would be – the margin of error would have to be substantial. So it’s hard to – it’s hard to predict. Obviously I don’t think you can – that any of us can overlay the votes on New START on this vote. It’s going to be a different debate in some ways, and frankly a more difficult debate, from my side of the debate. It’s going to be, I think, a longer and more difficult challenge to get the treaty passed. But what’s why I think it’s important to start now, as best we can, to keep the treaty in the news, so to speak, to begin the outreach and engagement and education process." Under Secretary Tauscher said: "We recognize that a Senate debate over ratification will be spirited, vigorous and likely contentious. The debate in 1999 unfortunately was too short and too politicized. "The treaty was brought to the floor without the benefit of extensive committee hearings or significant input from administration officials and outside experts. We will not repeat those mistakes. But we will make a more forceful case when we are certain the facts have been carefully examined and reviewed in a thoughtful process. We are committed to taking a bipartisan and fact-based approach with the Senate." "For my Republican friends who voted against the treaty in 1999 and might feel bound by that vote, I have one message: Don’t be. The times have changed. Stockpile stewardship works. We have made significant advances in our ability to detect nuclear testing. As my good friend and fellow Californian, George Shultz, likes to say – those who opposed the treaty in 1999 can say they were right. But they would be more right to vote for the treaty today." "So we have a lot of work to do to build the political will be need to ratify the CTBT," Tauscher said. The Bottom line: making the case on the CTBT will take time but the process has finally begun. The White House and treaty proponents must now follow through with a serious, sustained effort to highlight the case for the CTBT. For their part, all Senators have a responsibility to take another look at the treaty in light of the new evidence that has accumulated in the decade since the Senate's brief review of the subject in 1999 and not rush to a judgement based on old information or misconceptions.

**D – Impact – Ratification of CTBT is key to revitalize the NPT and stop global proliferation and nuclear terrorism**

Joseph 9 (Jofi, senior Democratic foreign policy staffer in the United States Senate, “Renew the Drive for CTBT Ratification,” The Washington Quarterly, April 2009, <http://www.twq.com/09april/index.cfm?id=338>)

As the historic first 100 days of President Barack Obama’s administration fly by, he faces a tsunami of advice on the key priorities he should pursue over the next four years. Ranging from energy independence and national health care reform to improving America’s image with the Islamic world and revamping our foreign assistance structure, the president must decide where to focus his scarce time, resources, and political capital. One initiative he should strongly consider this year is calling upon the U.S. Senate to once again take up the ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) to outlaw nuclear testing around the world, even though the initiative failed in October 1999 by a 51—48 vote. Obama has assumed office at a time when the nuclear nonproliferation regime is seriously tattered. Iran is making significant progress on an ostensibly civilian uranium enrichment program that can be quickly converted into a weapons program. North Korea has quadrupled the size of its fissile material stockpile since 2002 and joined the nuclear club in 2006 with a nuclear weapons test. The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), the lynchpin of global efforts to halt the spread of nuclear weapons, is under heavy strain. Revitalizing the nonproliferation regime, and reducing the odds that a terrorist group can seize a nuclear weapon for use in a terrorist attack, must be at the top of any president’s to-do list.

Prolif makes global diplomatic relations unstable – even small triggers set off nuclear wars and make U.S. intervention impossible, destroying U.S. influence

Henry Sokolski, executive director of the Nonproliferation Policy Education Center, serves on the U.S. Congressional Commission on the Prevention of Weapons of Mass Destruction Proliferation and Terrorism, June-July 2009, “Avoiding a Nuclear Crowd,” Hoover Policy Review, online: http://www.hoover.org/publications/policyreview/46390537.html

So far, the U.S. has tried to cope with independent nuclear powers by making them “strategic partners” (e.g., India and Russia), NATO nuclear allies (France and the UK), “non-NATO allies” (e.g., Israel and Pakistan), and strategic stakeholders (China); or by fudging if a nation actually has attained full nuclear status (e.g., Iran or North Korea, which, we insist, will either not get nuclear weapons or will give them up). In this world, every nuclear power center (our European nuclear NATO allies), the U.S., Russia, China, Israel, India, and Pakistan could have significant diplomatic security relations or ties with one another but none of these ties is viewed by Washington (and, one hopes, by no one else) as being as important as the ties between Washington and each of these nuclear-armed entities (see Figure 3).

There are limits, however, to what this approach can accomplish. Such a weak alliance system, with its expanding set of loose affiliations, risks becoming analogous to the international system that failed to contain offensive actions prior to World War I. Unlike 1914, there is no power today that can rival the projection of U.S. conventional forces anywhere on the globe. But in a world with an increasing number of nuclear-armed or nuclear-ready states, this may not matter as much as we think. In such a world, the actions of just one or two states or groups that might threaten to disrupt or overthrow a nuclear weapons state could check U.S. influence or ignite a war Washington could have difficulty containing. No amount of military science or tactics could assure that the U.S. could disarm or neutralize such threatening or unstable nuclear states.22 Nor could diplomats or our intelligence services be relied upon to keep up to date on what each of these governments would be likely to do in such a crisis (see graphic below):

Combine these proliferation trends with the others noted above and one could easily create the perfect nuclear storm: Small differences between nuclear competitors that would put all actors on edge; an overhang of nuclear materials that could be called upon to break out or significantly ramp up existing nuclear deployments; and a variety of potential new nuclear actors developing weapons options in the wings.

In such a setting, the military and nuclear rivalries between states could easily be much more intense than before. Certainly each nuclear state’s military would place an even higher premium than before on being able to weaponize its military and civilian surpluses quickly, to deploy forces that are survivable, and to have forces that can get to their targets and destroy them with high levels of probability. The advanced military states will also be even more inclined to develop and deploy enhanced air and missile defenses and long-range, precision guidance munitions, and to develop a variety of preventative and preemptive war options.

Certainly, in such a world, relations between states could become far less stable. Relatively small developments — e.g., Russian support for sympathetic near-abroad provinces; Pakistani-inspired terrorist strikes in India, such as those experienced recently in Mumbai; new Indian flanking activities in Iran near Pakistan; Chinese weapons developments or moves regarding Taiwan; state-sponsored assassination attempts of key figures in the Middle East or South West Asia, etc. — could easily prompt nuclear weapons deployments with “strategic” consequences (arms races, strategic miscues, and even nuclear war). As Herman Kahn once noted, in such a world “every quarrel or difference of opinion may lead to violence of a kind quite different from what is possible today.”23 In short, we may soon see a future that neither the proponents of nuclear abolition, nor their critics, would ever want.

# Uniqueness

## 2NC Uniqueness Wall

**Obama is going to win now – he’s raising more money than anyone else in the race and he’s got more grassroots support than anyone else in history – that’s 1NC Reuters. There are no other Republican candidates and Obama is too far ahead for anyone to challenge him in the status quo –**

Edaburn, 11. (Patrick is an assistant editor in At TMV, Media, Politics. May 23, 2011. “Why Obama Will Win in 2012.” http://themoderatevoice.com/108362/why-obama-will-win-in-2012/)

As more Republican Presidential candidates either enter or drop out of the 2012 race people are beginning to speculate over who will win the nomination. Although it is almost 18 months until the election I am increasingly thinking that the nomination is irrelevant as President Obama is almost certain to win re-election. The most basic reason for this conclusion is the simple fact that most Presidents win re-election. If you look over the last 100 years or so, there are only a few examples of Presidents losing. In 1912 President Taft lost, but only because the GOP vote was split between Taft and TR. In 1928 President Hoover lost, but only because of a massive depression that was seen as his fault. In 1976 President Ford lost, largely due to the party split with Reagan and the aftermath of Watergate. In 1980 President Carter lost, thanks to party divisions with Kennedy, the 3rd party candidacy of John Anderson, the bad economy AND the Iran hostage crisis. In 1992 President Bush lost thanks to party divisions with the right, the Perot candidacy and the bad economy. Looking to 2012 it does not seem likely any of these things will apply. There is some discontent with Obama on the left but nobody major seems to be emerging for a primary challenge and the base generally seems satisfied. Nor does a 3rd party campaign seem likely. The economy is bad, but most people seem to see that as being beyond party, and to the degree they blame a party it is at most evenly split between the two sides, if not tilted to the GOP. Similarly there does not seem to be any major foreign policy issue, especially after the killing of Bin Laden. Obama will also have a massive treasury to spend. One of the advantages that Richard Nixon had was that he as a long time anti Communist could go to China without being condemned. Similarly President Obama seems to have the ability to raise billions in campaign funds while avoiding the ‘buying the election’ allegations. This of course does not even go in to the fact that the GOP is currently without a major candidate who seems to have the ability to match up with Obama on a debate and communications level. Further many of the contenders have problems with the GOP base, and in particular the more insane portion of it. Romney is a decent enough man but he has issues with his (gasp) moderate views on things like gay rights (also known as human decency), health care, etc.

**And –**

**Obama’s fundraising for 2012 puts him far ahead**

Williams 7/19/11(“Obama Leaps Ahead in 2012 Presidential Race” Juan is political analyst for Fox News Channel. He also writes for several newspapers including *The Washington Post*, *The New York Times*, and *The Wall Street Journal* http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2011/07/19/obama-leaps-ahead-in-2012-presidential-race/)

The silence of the big-dollar donors on the Republican side of the race for the White House is deafening these days. The first round of fundraising reports for the 2012 presidential candidates, released last week, shows the GOP field lagging far behind the 2008 Republican field. Four years ago, former Massachusetts Gov. Mitt Romney, Arizona Sen. John McCain and former New York grey_loader

City Mayor Rudy Giuliani and the other candidates had raked in $112 million. The GOP class of 2012 has raised a meager $35 million. On the Democratic side, meanwhile, the president has shattered the first-quarter fundraising records for an incumbent. He raised an unprecedented $86 million. That is more than the $60 million goal his campaign had set and easily surpasses the $50.1 million that then-President Bush had raised at the same point in the 2004 cycle. Republicans had hoped that, with unemployment topping 9 percent and Guantanamo Bay still open, left-wingers might no longer be so enthusiastic about President Obama. The answer from early fundraising is that the president has very enthusiastic supporters. And the money raised directly by the president’s reelection campaign does not include dollars being pulled in by independent groups supporting him, principally the Democrats’ own super-political action committee, Priorities USA. Bill Burton, the president’s former deputy press secretary, and Sean Sweeney, who was an aide to former White House Chief of Staff Rahm Emmanuel, created Priorities USA with the goal of raising another $100 million to re-elect Obama. They want to equal any outside funds coming to the GOP side from Karl Rove’s group, American Crossroads, which has a goal of $120 million. After the Supreme Court opened the door to anonymous contributions with the Citizens United ruling, Democrats feared big, anonymous dollars pouring into GOP coffers. But the big story in American politics so far this year is the exact opposite of a flood of Republican money. The absence of major money in the Republican primary cannot be blamed on a lack of trying on the part of the candidates. Romney has been aggressively raising money, even traveling to London for fundraisers. And he has raised the most money of the Republican contenders. Still, the Mitt Romney of 2012, with his $18.3 million take, could not beat the Mitt Romney of 2008, who reported $23 million when he submitted his first disclosure form.

**The head start in funding will allow Obama to get ahead in every state**

Martin and Burns 7/7/11 ("Mitt Romney fundraising sparks Republican fears" Jonathan is a senior political reporter at politico Alexander is a political analyst on television and radio shows including Fox News and “The Early Show” http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0711/58456.html

The Republican presidential fundraising reports are still coming in, but a clear winner has already emerged: President Barack Obama Whoever claims the GOP nomination is going to find it close to impossible to keep pace with the [president’s fundraising juggernaut](http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0611/58178.html). That was the lesson of the first real quarter of the money chase, when [it was revealed](http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0711/58412.html) Wednesday that Republican front-runner Mitt Romney — the GOP’s pale version of a cash-collecting machine — raised just over $18 million. (See: [Mitt Romney's warning signs](http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0711/58412.html)) Romney’s haul was less than what he took in as a first-time candidate out of the gates four years ago. Behind the former Massachusetts governor, the numbers tailed off dramatically. Neither [Tim Pawlenty](http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0711/58221.html) nor Jon Huntsman even hit $5 million. Meanwhile, the Republican National Committee is mired in $18.5 million of debt. (See: [Tim Pawlenty reportedly raised $4.2 million in second quarter](#ixzz1RQvctASz)) As for Obama, his reelection campaign and a joint fund set up with the Democratic National Committee have ostensibly set a $60 million goal for the quarter — a sum Democratic sources say they’re sure to exceed when forms are filed with the Federal Election Commission on July 15. (See: Obama fundraising quarter to be big, Dem fundraisers predict) Obama officials have already disclosed that 493,697 individual donors gave to the campaign this quarter. That’s almost twice the number of donors they accumulated through the first two quarters of 2007, by which point they had raised $55.7 million for their Democratic primary battle. And it’s nearly five times the 105,000 donors Bush-Cheney’s reelection began with in 2003. Republicans have long anticipated being outgunned by Obama on the fundraising front, but the breadth of the disparity is now coming into plainer sight — and it has some party veterans worried about what they see as a lack of urgency over the cash gap. “There’s not any doubt that Obama is going to raise more money than anybody has ever raised running for president,” said Henry Barbour, RNC committeeman for Mississippi and nephew of Gov. Haley Barbour. “Is that sobering? Sure it is. It’s a wake-up call.” Barbour, who is not yet supporting any candidate, predicted that Republican fundraising would pick up once the party settles on a nominee and the stakes become more clear. “But it takes a lot of preparation to get ready to beat an incumbent president, and we’ve got to pick up the pace,” he said. “From this early on, it appears that that’ll be enough resources for the Democrats to play in almost every state, and it sounds like the Republican nominee, whomever that will be, will be restrained by the resources to compete in the most obvious purple states,” added Al Cardenas, the head of the American Conservative Union and a former Florida GOP chairman. “So while the other side can wage a campaign in most states, I think the Republican nominee will most likely confine most of their resource allocation to 13 or 15 states. That’s a very significant disadvantage.” A former RNC head acknowledged that the takeaway was that the party’s nominee would not be in the same fundraising ballpark as Obama.

## Obama Yes Extensions

**7% would pick Obama over Romney – no other GOP candidate comes close**

Falcone and Walter 7/21/11 ("The Note: Benefit of the Bully Pulpit: Obama Up, Romney Down" Michael is political editor at The Huffington Post and **Amy is the ABC news political director** http://blogs.abcnews.com/thenote/2011/07/the-note-benefit-of-the-bully-pulpit-obama-up-romney-down.html)

President Obama is holding onto a 7 point lead over his chief Republican rival, Mitt Romney, in the latest ABC News-Washington Post poll. If the 2012 election were held today, 51 percent of adults said they would pick Obama compared to 44 percent who would support the former Massachusetts governor. (They were tied in early June.) Important to note, however, is that among registered voters, Obama's lead over Romney narrows to 49 percent to 47 percent. No other Republican challenger fares as well as Romney in head-to-head matchups against the president. http://abcn.ws/nUXx7F But there’s a bigger take away from the new numbers than just the 2012 horserace. “Obama looks to have turned the budget debate to his advantage,” writes ABC pollster Gary Langer. “His position on the deficit is more broadly popular, he’s taking less heat than the GOP for unwillingness to compromise and he’s got a sizable lead in the view that he cares more about protecting the middle class.”

**Obama is more popular than he should be – lack of a strong GOP candidate puts him ahead**

Bouie 7/21 ("Why Obama Will Win in 2012" Jamelle is a writing fellow at the Prospect http://prospect.org/cs/articles?article=why\_obama\_will\_win\_in\_2012\_)

Obama isn’t the only incumbent to start a re-election campaign with low approval ratings, but others enjoyed the advantage of a growing economy. Ronald Reagan might not have earned the reputation for political genius he’s been credited with had the economy stalled in 1984 instead of growing at a rapid clip. Likewise, Bill Clinton might not have regained his title as the “comeback kid” if the economy hadn’t begun to supercharge in 1995 and 1996. For Obama, even if the economy grows quickly in 2012, unemployment will still top 8 percent, and per-capita income growth (a major predictor of presidential elections) is projected to stagnate. Taken together, this is bad news for the White House. Nonetheless, there are reasons for optimism. For starters, Obama is far more popular than he should be under the current conditions. The relationship between presidential approval and unemployment is well established, and with the jobless rate at 9.2 percent, Obama should have approval numbers in the high 30s, on par with George H.W. Bush’s performance in the last year of his term. According to Gallup, however, his job approval for the current quarter (from April to July 19) averages to 47 percent, as does his year-to-date approval rating. Obama maintains high approval ratings among core Democratic constituencies—liberals, African Americans, and the poor—and a plurality of Americans still trust him to do right by the country. On the current budget negotiations, for example, 47 percent say that Obama is “putting the country’s interests first,” compared with 24 percent for Republicans in Congress. Likewise, a plurality of Americans hold negative views about the Republican Party as a whole, by a margin of 47 percent to 42 percent. This extends to the state level; Republican governors in swing states are deeply unpopular with their constituents. Governor Rick Scott of Florida leads the loser pack with an approval rating of 29 percent—the worst of any governor in the country. Governor John Kasich of Ohio and Governor Tom Corbett of Pennsylvania follow with approval ratings of 33 percent and 39 percent, respectively. This doesn’t guarantee votes for President Obama, but it could drive Democratic turnout in those states if activists use those unpopular governors to mobilize voters and increase turnout. Obama’s chief Republican competitors aren’t popular with the public, either. As the moderate former governor of Massachusetts, Mitt Romney is best positioned to challenge Obama in a general election, but in a head-to-head matchup, even he trails Obama. What’s more, if early fundraising is a sign of voter interest and intensity, Obama is far ahead of his Republican competitors. As of last week, the president had raised $85.6 million for his re-election bid—twice as much as the entire Republican field has brought in.

**Democrats are gaining support on taxes – Obama is winning the election now**

Colburn 7/24 ("Is the Republican tsunami spend?" David is the director of the Askew Institute at the University of Florida http://www.gainesville.com/article/20110724/OPINION03/110729789/-1/news?p=3&tc=pg)

Although there is a significant partisan divide on that question, Democrats support increase taxes for the wealthy and corporate profits by a lopsided margin of 87 to 7 percent and, more significantly, Independents do so by a 66 to 26 percent margin. In addition, only a narrow plurality of Republican voters, 48 percent to 43 percent, supports the party's position on taxes. These recent developments have caused some Republicans to think the unthinkable — that Obama may well win re-election of 2012. The current state of political affairs in Florida has fueled apprehension in Republican circles. Scott has the lowest approval ratings of any Florida governor since Charley Johns, in the 1950s, and Claude Kirk, in the 1960s. Neither Johns nor Kirk won another statewide office after their term as governor.

## AT: Economy means he can’t win

**The public does not blame Obama for the economy – he is favored to win the election due to Republican weaknesses**

Tapped 7/21 (Jamelle Bouie, 7/21/11, " Why Obama Will Win in 2012 ", http://prospect.org/cs/articles?article=why\_obama\_will\_win\_in\_2012)

For starters, Obama is far more popular than he should be under the current conditions. The relationship between presidential approval and unemployment is well established, and with the jobless rate at 9.2 percent, Obama should have approval numbers in the high 30s, on par with George H.W. Bush’s performance in the last year of his term. According to Gallup, however, his job approval for the current quarter (from April to July 19) averages to 47 percent, as does his year-to-date approval rating. Obama maintains high approval ratings among core Democratic constituencies—liberals, African Americans, and the poor—and a plurality of Americans still trust him to do right by the country. On the current budget negotiations, for example, 47 percent say that Obama is “putting the country’s interests first,” compared with 24 percent for Republicans in Congress. Likewise, a plurality of Americans hold negative views about the Republican Party as a whole, by a margin of 47 percent to 42 percent. This extends to the state level; Republican governors in swing states are deeply unpopular with their constituents. Governor Rick Scott of Florida leads the loser pack with an approval rating of 29 percent—the worst of any governor in the country. Governor John Kasich of Ohio and Governor Tom Corbett of Pennsylvania follow with approval ratings of 33 percent and 39 percent, respectively. This doesn’t guarantee votes for President Obama, but it could drive Democratic turnout in those states if activists use those unpopular governors to mobilize voters and increase turnout. Obama’s chief Republican competitors aren’t popular with the public, either. As the moderate former governor of Massachusetts, Mitt Romney is best positioned to challenge Obama in a general election, but in a head-to-head matchup, even he trails Obama. What’s more, if early fundraising is a sign of voter interest and intensity, Obama is far ahead of his Republican competitors. As of last week, the president had raised $85.6 million for his re-election bid—twice as much as the entire Republican field has brought in. Yes, voters hate the sluggish economy, and they are dissatisfied with the country’s direction. So far, though, that hasn’t translated into personal disdain for the president. Voters are still reluctant to saddle him with responsibility for existing economic conditions. By a 2-to-1 margin, according to a survey released last week by Quinnipiac University, voters still say that President George W. Bush is culpable for the current situation. This also holds true among independent voters—49 percent blame Bush; just 24 percent blame Obama. It’s easy to say that none of this will matter come October 2012, when the economy is still sluggish and unemployment is still high. If history and political science offer any insight, presidents lose when economic conditions are poor. But today’s political circumstances are unusual. Incumbents have never raised this much money, the electorate has never been this diverse, and—with the exception of the 1930s—the economy has never been this terrible. Political-science models are useful but limited, and we don’t have enough data to make conclusive judgments about the upcoming election. At this point in the game, even with poor conditions, I’d call the 2012 election for Obama. I’d do so not because of his personal popularity or his massive campaign operation but because of the Republican Party. The GOP has been captured by its most extreme members, and even the most moderate Republican candidate will be forced to kowtow to the party’s far-right wing to win the nomination. As Obama struggles with slow economic growth, the GOP’s fanaticism could be the thing that saves him. High unemployment aside, if the history of presidential politics shows anything, it’s that when you give voters a choice between the incumbent they know and the radicals they don’t, the former will win

# Links

## 2NC Link Wall

**The plan is highly unpopular with the public – they don’t want any additional spending on programs that they perceive are pointless and unnecessary. If Obama does the plan, he won’t be reelected – the public will see him as insensitive to the economy and wasteful on programs that they see as unnecessary.**

**Public has no interest in increasing NASA’s funding – no clear rationale for space travel**

Hsu 11 ("The Myth of America's Love Affair with the Moon" Jeremy is a SPACE.com Senior Writer http://www.space.com/10601-apollo-moon-program-public-support-myth.html)

The only time when more than half of the public believed Apollo was worth the expense came at the time of the Apollo 11 lunar landing in 1969, when Neil Armstrong took humanity's first steps on alien soil. Even then, only a lukewarm 53 percent of the public believed such a momentous historical occasion had been worth the cost. Such findings suggest that the United States went to the moon not because the public demanded it, but because U.S. presidents and Congress believed it served a greater political purpose during the Cold War, Launius said. He added that any future U.S. effort to send astronauts to the moon would also require a similar political, economic or national defense reason to compel funding for the effort. The absence of such a reason may have made it easier for President Barack Obama's administration to move to end NASA's Constellation program last year. That program had aimed to return U.S. astronauts to the moon. Instead, however, Obama has proposed an equally ambitious quest to send astronauts to an asteroid and then Mars. Crunching the numbers The good news for space exploration in general is that public opinion favors it – but only when not taking economic costs and budgetary spending into consideration. "When you divorce it from the numbers and you ask people if they like NASA and spaceflight, people say yes," Launius told SPACE.com. "75 to 80 percent are in favor." The space historian examined nationally representative polls done by industry people and Gallup that asked the same consistent questions year after year. He also looked at polls conducted by the New York Times and others. Public support for overall space funding has hovered around 80 percent in favor of the status quo since 1965, except for a major dip in support during the early 1970s. That may bode well for NASA's continued existence, but it also suggests that few people are clamoring to throw even more money at the space agency. Budget myths Still, polls also show a huge misconception regarding the cost of the U.S. space program. Public opinion has wrongly put NASA's budget at about 22 percent of the government's spending over the years, when in fact NASA's budget only reached 4.3 percent of the federal budget at its peak in 1965. Since the 1970s, the U.S. space agency's budget has hovered below 1 percent of government spending. "My suggestion is that NASA is so visible and the space shuttle is such a powerful icon that people believe this stuff must cost an enormous amount of money," Launius said. As for 2010, NASA's budget came in at just six-tenths of 1 percent of all government spending. Neither side of the political aisle seems to have any real interest in boosting NASA's budget, according to Launius. NASA also seems unlikely to get a dramatic budget boost in the near future. While an October 2010 NASA authorization bill signed by the president called for a slight increase in the space agency's funding, that money has yet to be appropriated. Instead, NASA and all other non-military government agencies have been frozen at their 2010 funding levels by a Congressional continuing resolution (a stopgap until a full budget can be agreed upon) that holds until March 4. Finding a prime directive U.S. space agency funding in recent years has depended upon certain congressional interests in protecting NASA-related jobs, as well as a fuzzier "feel-good" sentiment toward keeping the space agency afloat. If NASA ever wants to get a bigger budget to send astronauts back to the moon or beyond, it will need to find compelling reasons – whether they're related to the search for life or a precious "unobtanium" resource worth going after and exploiting, some experts say. Launius also suggested that the lack of political support for returning astronauts to the moon is related to the bigger question hanging over the purpose of human spaceflight – or rather, the lack of clearly defined purpose. "There's an inability of the aerospace community – and I include myself here – to articulate a clear, irrevocable, unassailable rationale for doing this," Launius said.

## Generic

**High spending programs upset the public – deficit is the primary worry**

Jones 11 (Jeffrey M., Managing Editor of the Gallup Poll and has written numerous public opinion analyses for Gallup, “On Deficit, Americans Prefer Spending Cuts; Open to Tax Hikes,” Gallup Polls, 7/13/11, <http://www.gallup.com/poll/148472/deficit-americans-prefer-spending-cuts-open-tax-hikes.aspx>)

Americans' preferences for deficit reduction clearly favor spending cuts to tax increases, but most Americans favor a mix of the two approaches. Twenty percent favor an approach that relies only on spending cuts and 4% favor an approach that uses tax increases alone. These results are based on a July 7-10 Gallup poll, conducted as government leaders from both parties continued negotiating an agreement to raise the federal debt limit. Both Republicans and Democrats appear willing to raise the debt limit, provided the government outlines plans to significantly reduce federal deficits in the future. The parties generally agree on making deep spending cuts, but do not agree on whether tax increases should be included to help reach their target goals for deficit reduction. Many Republicans in Congress oppose any such tax increases; thus, the legislation may not pass if tax hikes are included. Americans do not necessarily share this view, with 20% saying deficit reduction should come only through spending cuts. That percentage is a little higher, 26%, among those who identify as Republicans. Republicans do, however, tilt heavily in favor of reducing the deficit primarily if not exclusively with spending cuts (67%) as opposed to tax increases (3%). Fifty-one percent of independents share that preference. Democrats are most inclined to want equal amounts of spending cuts and tax increases (42%), though more favor a tilt toward spending cuts (33%) than tax increases (20%). Gallup finds about 6 in 10 Americans paying close attention to the debate about raising the debt limit. When the same poll asked for their general position on raising the limit, without providing reasons for doing so or not doing so, Americans were more likely to oppose an increase than favor one. The 42% who are opposed to doing so generally find fault with the government's spending patterns when asked in an open-ended format to explain their views. The most common reasons given for opposing an increased debt limit are that the U.S. already has too much debt and cannot afford more, that the government needs to control its spending, and that it needs to do a better job of budgeting and living within its means. Another common response is that raising the debt limit does not implicitly address the government's debt problem, and that government would likely just keep raising the limit in the future. The smaller proportion of Americans who favor an increase to the debt limit, 22%, are most likely to believe the United States has little choice in the matter -- in other words, the action may be undesirable but is necessary. Most commonly, proponents say they favor increasing the limit to avoid an economic catastrophe, which some experts including Treasury Secretary Tim Geithner predict will occur if the government is no longer able to borrow money. The other most common reasons for favoring a higher debt limit are that the U.S. cannot default on its debt, that the country simply has "no choice" in the matter, and to avoid a disruption of government services and benefits. Government spending seems to be the primary worry for Americans when their opinions are probed about raising the debt limit. Government leaders appear to be listening, as party leaders are proposing major cuts in future government spending as a way to persuade members of Congress to vote for an increase in the nation's debt limit. In terms of deficit reduction, Americans seem to generally back an approach that relies more on spending cuts than tax increases. A key question to be answered in the days ahead is whether an agreement to raise the debt ceiling will include any tax increases. This is something many Republican members of Congress oppose, but most Americans do not seem to share this view.

**The weak economy creates public rejection of any additional spending**

Jones, 10. (Jeffrey M., Gallup Polls, "Amercians Prioritize Deficit Reduction as an Economic Strategy," 11/20/10, <http://www.gallup.com/poll/144956/americans-prioritize-deficit-reduction-economic-strategy.aspx>)

Americans are most likely to choose deficit and debt reduction as the best approach for dealing with the economy over three widely discussed alternatives: raising taxes on the wealthy, cutting taxes, and increasing stimulus spending. These results are based on a USA Today/Gallup poll conducted Nov. 19-21 as the U.S. economy continues to suffer from sluggish growth and high unemployment. Americans do not show a strong consensus for any of the approaches, but clearly reject additional economic stimulus spending. The increased government spending in late 2008/early 2009 to bail out major U.S. corporations and attempt to jump-start the economy concerned many Americans and helped fuel the Tea Party movement, leading to significant Democratic losses in Congress in the midterm elections. That concern is also reflected in Americans' endorsing deficit reduction as an economic strategy over generally popular approaches like tax cuts or tax hikes on the wealthy. Both independents and Republicans choose deficit reduction as the preferred economic approach. Republicans even choose it over tax cuts, a core Republican Party goal, by a 14-point margin. Democrats are less inclined to back deficit reduction, with a majority instead choosing to increase taxes on the wealthy. President Obama, who has received low scores from the public for his handling of the federal budget deficit since last summer, made deficit reduction a priority earlier this year by establishing a bipartisan commission on reducing the deficit and national debt. The commission's report is due in December, but a draft of the report has already outlined some of the commission's proposed solutions, including changes to the major entitlement programs such as Social Security and Medicare that make up a large part of the budget each year. Gallup finds 75% of Americans saying that failing to address the costs of those programs would create major economic problems for the U.S. in the next 25 years. Among this group, more favor tax increases as the better solution than benefit cuts -- 30% vs. 19%; however, the largest segment, 46%, favors a combination of both.

**The public has an inflated perception of NASA’s budget creating a lack of interest in increased funding**

Plait 7("NASA's budget . . . as far as American's think" Phil is former professor in physics and astronomy at Sonoma State University http://blogs.discovermagazine.com/badastronomy/2007/11/21/nasas-budget-as-far-as-americans-think/)

So it doesn’t surprise me that the U.S. budget is difficult to comprehend, totaling $2.7 trillion. Still, I can’t quite wrap my head around the fact that the average American thinks that NASA gets 1/4 of the U.S. total budget: Americans in general have no idea what NASA’s "cost" is. In fact, most members of the public have no idea how much any government agency’s budget is. What we do know — and have recently documented — is that the public perception of NASA’s budget is grossly inflated relative to actual dollars. In a just-completed study, we asked respondents what percentage of the national budget is allocated to NA SA … NASA’s allocation, on average, was estimated to be approximately 24% of the national budget (the NASA allocation in 2007 was approximately 0.58% of the budget.) A lot of people think NASA is a waste of time and money, and maybe this is why; they have a grossly overinflated idea of how much NASA spends. When NASA loses a $150 million probe, that’s a lot of real money, but hardly a drop in the bucket compared to what we spend as a nation (and remember, we spend $11 million per hour in Iraq).

## Asteroid Detection

**No public support for asteroid detection – advocates perceived as paranoid and crazy**

New Yorker, 11. (Tad Friend has been a staff writer at the New Yorker since 1998 and has been an editor at several other publications, including *Esquire*, “Vermin of the Sky; Who will keep the planet safe from asteroids?” lexis, )

The administrator of NASA, Charlie Bolden, recently declared that deflecting a NEO will be "what keeps the dinosaurs-we are the dinosaurs, by the way-from becoming extinct a second time." Then he admitted that the agency couldn't afford to do that. The annual federal allocation for "planetary defense" is $5.8 million-.03 per cent of NASA's budget-which supports a shoestring program to find NEOs and track their orbits. In truth, NASA doesn't really want the job of global savior, and no one else does, either. "With planetary defense, there's a complex interaction of science, psychology, politics, and money-and everything falls into a gap between disciplines," Robert Arentz, who heads the NEOs team at Ball Aerospace and Technologies Corp., said. "The science guys say, 'NEOs are not scientifically interesting, and saving the planet is not our job,' and the military guys say, 'We'll blow them up, but we don't have anything to do with telescopes or space missions.' The issue's an orphan." Russell Schweickart has spent a decade trying to change all that. Schweickart, a rangy and congenial former astronaut known as Rusty, was the first man to fly a lunar module in space and the first to take an untethered space walk. He was also the Apollo program's resident hippie and gadfly, possessed of a New Age contrarianism which he maintains at the age of seventy-five. When he and other scientists launched a planetary-defense foundation, in 2001, they named it B612, after the home asteroid in Saint-Exupéry's "The Little Prince." In the belief that it won't be long before a big rock smashes into us at twenty-five thousand miles an hour, he has insistently prodded the government to find the undiscovered NEOs much faster, and to test a method of deflecting an asteroid in space by 2015. This past June, Schweickart sat in his kitchen, in Sonoma, California, drawing complex orbital diagrams on a napkin to illustrate how a deflection could occur. He scoffed at such proposals as attaching a giant magnifying glass to a satellite to focus the sun's rays on an asteroid; wrapping a NEO in plastic, Christo style, to create a solar sail that would waft the danger aside; or placing a huge bazooka on the moon to pummel the intruder with boulders. Instead, he sketched out the three generally accepted options. Small asteroids discovered with plenty of warning could be nudged aside with a "gravity tractor"-a plasma-powered craft that would hover near the NEO and use its own gravity to divert the target. (If you slow or accelerate an asteroid by just one centimetre per second, and you start ten years before the projected impact, the cumulative divergence will be sufficient.) For larger or closer NEOs, or those requiring a greater degree of deflection, you'd use "kinetic impactors," spacecraft loaded with lead or copper, to ram the target-speeding nails aimed at a speeding hammer. For NEOs larger than half a kilometre across, or those only a few years out, you'd need nuclear weapons. Such is the confused state of affairs that the Air Force would have to borrow a warhead from the Department of Energy-but couldn't, by law, let NASA stow it on a rocket. Nonetheless, Schweickart said, "after years of drought, this is the opportunity." He was about to co-chair a task force that would advise NASA on the topic, and the White House-which has taken an interest in asteroids since President Obama declared last year that he wanted to send humans to an asteroid by 2025, as a precursor to an eventual voyage to Mars-had just proposed increasing the agency's planetary-defense budget to $20.3 million. That wouldn't get a deflection mission farther than Topeka, yet Schweickart believed that it indicated a growing awareness of our place in the cosmos. "If there is a cosmic community out there," he said, "they will already have passed this test, of protecting themselves from asteroid impacts that could have wiped them out. If we want to join them, we have to do it, too." He cheerfully acknowledged that such talk had left him vulnerable to the inference that, like David Bowie's Major Tom, he's floating in a most peculiar way. "When Rusty started getting cranked up about this, I can't tell you the slanderous things I heard-'He was up in space too long, and the radiation cooked his brain,' " Robert Arentz said. "For the longest time, studying NEOs was like wearing an aluminum hat."

**The threat of asteroids has no credibility – public does not take NEOs seriously**

Weissman 2 ( "The Comet and Asteroid Impact Hazard in Persepctive " Paul is part of the Earth and Space Sciences Division Jet Propulsion Laboratory citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.38.3259&rep=rep1&type=pdf.)

The issue of credibility is a very important one for the impact hazard. As often noted, this topic has a high “giggle factor” and it is often not taken very seriously by the public or press. If an effective defense is to be developed against asteroid and comet impacts, then there must be widespread public understanding and support of the problem. As noted in the introduction, public experience is that asteroids and comets do not strike the Earth; there is no known incident of a major cratering event in human history, As reporting of random meteorite falls like the 1992 Peekskill, NY event becomes more widespread, public opinion may begin to accept the idea of larger impacts being possible

## SPS

**Renewable energy unpopular – cost and health issues**

PNB, 09. (Polish News Bulletin, Sep. 30, 2009, “The Future of Energy – Alternative Energy Sources,” lexis, )

The basic obstacles to wide application of renewable energy sources like the wind, solar energy and tides are the changing availability and difficult storage. Scientists are, obviously, constantly working on new technologies to improve the existing batteries and accumulators, however, their effects still seem to be far from satisfactory. That is why some specialists advocate Earth's internal energy as a more promising possibility of obtaining electric power. It is reliable and certainly has great potential. In 2005 alone, geothermal sources allowed for the production of 55TWh of electricity while another 76TWh was applied for heat production. The main proponent of this technology is Iceland, where 90 percent of households rely on geothermal energy for heating. According to MIT forecasts, by 2050, geothermal energy should provide for about 10 percent of demand for energy in the US. Renewable energy is still relatively unpopular due to the high costs of new technologies. According to the estimates made by British Carbon Trust Agency, it is still three times more expensive to obtain energy from tides than from traditional coal fueled power plants. Peter Fraenkel from Carbon Trust explains that the high costs are the result of relatively low level of advancement of technologies applied to tide flow energy production. He assures that with time technologies will be more complex, the scale of their application will increase and costs will fall. Similar arguments are used by wind energy producers. But wind energy is not only more expensive, it is also potentially harmful for human organism. According to Dr. Nina Pierpont from Princeton University, people living in the vicinity of windmill farms suffer from sleep disorders, recurrent headaches and panic attacks. The expert explains that all the conditions are caused by low frequency sounds produced by the windmill mechanisms. Several families have moved away from the windmill farms and their health has improved immediately.

**No widespread support for SSP**

Dinerman, 07. (Taylor is a well-respected space writer and journalist based in New York City. June 4, 2007, “Space solar power: opposition and obstacles.” http://www.thespacereview.com/article/881/1, )

Large-scale use of energy from space in the form of solar power beamed down to Earth is going to be an important alternative way for the US and its allies to generate the electricity needed to meet the needed of an expanding world economy. As long as it’s a pie-in-the-sky proposition, proponents of space solar power will be confined to a small club of space enthusiasts. Once it becomes an economically viable method of supplying, say, five or ten percent of the country’s electricity consumption, we can expect that the same anathemas that have been called down on nuclear power to be aimed at space solar power. In reality, the main obstacles to space solar power are technological and economic. There seem to be few real scientific problems, but of course there will be a constant need for studies to show how safe, or comparatively safe, these systems are. Low-cost access to space is the first and hardest hurdle to overcome. While the US government’s investment in RLVs has been radically reduced over the last few years, outsiders such as Burt Rutan’s Spaceship Company, Jeff Bezos and his Blue Origin team, and Elon Musk’s SpaceX are building rockets that could eventually reduce the cost of getting into low Earth orbit to something like the few hundred dollars a kilogram that is generally considered the “tipping point” for large-scale space commercialization. One important point is that if NASA’s heavy-lift Ares 5 launcher is built, it would be an ideal tool with which to place the heavy elements of a solar power satellite into orbit. The space agency should welcome the opportunity to turn what would otherwise be a highly specialized and rarely used heavy lifter into a multi-purpose space transportation vehicle that could actually serve a commercial purpose. The other really big problem is that no one has ever even tried to build anything the size of a solar power satellite in space. Russia’s Mir space station and the ISS are the only examples we have of anything that even approaches the size and complexity of an SPS. The difficulties that both these projects have encountered bodes nothing but ill for a project that tried to use modern-day technology. Lighter structures made from new materials might help, as would new methods of power and thermal management. In reality, the main obstacles to space solar power are technological and economic. One technology that might radically reduce the weight requirements for these systems is the technique pioneered at the University of Notre Dame where single-walled carbon nanotubes are added to a film made of titanium-dioxide nanoparticles, doubling the efficiency of converting ultraviolet light into electrons. Any solar cell technology that could reach conversion factors of over 50% or even higher would reduce the size and weight of an SPS and thus make it easier and cheaper to build and launch. We all know that things never stand still, and within the next ten or twenty years there may be breakthroughs that will change the situation. RLVs using structures made with nanotubes could radically reduce the cost of getting payloads into space. The same technology could also be used to build the SPSs themselves. Other, even more exotic space access solutions may exist, such as laser-powered launch vehicles or electromagnetic launchers. The demand for new sources of electricity is growing fast. Space solar power is one realistic alternative that does not require the use of coal or uranium. The private sector is not now ready to invest the very large sums needed to build a viable infrastructure, but that will change if the technology can be demonstrated.

## Moon/Mars

**Moon and Mars colonization is unpopular – spending.**

Day ‘4 (Dwayne A, DC based space policy analyst “Whispers in the echo,” The Space Review, 5/22/04, <http://www.thespacereview.com/article/119/3>)

After nearly two weeks of wildly inflated figures circulating in the media, the damage had already been done. For instance, on January 20 the Washington Post reported the results of a poll that indicated dissatisfaction with Bush’s handling of domestic issues. “And his call to establish a manned base on the Moon and eventually send American astronauts to Mars is broadly unpopular,” the article stated. Perhaps one of the reasons for its unpopularity was that for two weeks the media had been claiming that the plan would cost $1 trillion and nobody had bothered to claim otherwise.

**Given the economy space exploration is unpopular with the public, especially Mars and the Moon – polls prove**

Rasmussen Reports 10 (Electronic media company specializing in the collection, publication and distribution of public opinion polling information, “50% Favor Cutting Back on Space Exploration,” 1/15/10, <http://www.rasmussenreports.com/public_content/lifestyle/general_lifestyle/january_2010/50_favor_cutting_back_on_space_exploration>)

Fifty percent (50%) of Americans now say the United States should cut back on space exploration given the current state of the economy, according to a new Rasmussen Reports national telephone survey. Just 31% disagree with cutting the space program, and 19% more are not sure. The new findings mark a six-point increase in support - from 44% last July - for cutting back on space exploration. Still, Americans are almost evenly divided when asked if the space program should be funded by the government or by the private sector. Thirty-five percent (35%) believe the government should pay for space research, while 38% think private interests should pick up the tab. Twenty-six percent (26%) aren’t sure which is best. Sixty-four percent (64%) of adults have at least a somewhat favorable view of NASA, including 18% with a very favorable opinion of the government’s chief space agency. Just 20% have a somewhat or very unfavorable opinion of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, which celebrated its 50th anniversary in 2008. But that marks a sizable drop in support for NASA from a survey last May. At that time, 81% had a favorable view of NASA, including 24% with a very favorable opinion. The May findings, however, were a 23-point rebound for the space agency from July 2007 when just 58% had a favorable opinion. But, at that time, NASA was suffering some bad publicity, including reports about drunken astronauts. In the budget President Obama proposes in early February, NASA is hoping for $22 billion for the coming fiscal year, up $3 billion over the current year. This funding, according to news reports, will keep the agency on track for projects including landing on one of Mars’ moons in the next 15 years and further exploring the Earth’s moon. Women and Americans ages 18 to 29 are more strongly in support of cutting back on space exploration than are men and older adults. Democrats are more likely to agree than are Republicans and adults not affiliated with either party. Women also feel more strongly that the space program should be funded by the private sector. But unaffiliated adults and those in both political parties are narrowly divided over whether the space program is a government or private business responsibility. Investors are evenly divided on the question, while non-investors lean slightly more toward private sector financing. Only 27% of Americans believe the current goals of the space program should include sending someone to Mars. Fifty percent (50%) oppose such a mission, with 24% undecided. The findings on this question are unchanged from last July. The feelings are virtually identical about sending someone to the moon. Twenty-six percent (26%) like the idea, but twice as money (52%) are opposed to sending someone to the moon as one of the current goals of the space program.

**A manned mission to Mars is unpopular – public doesn’t want to spend the money**

Rasmussen Reports 9 ((Electronic media company specializing in the collection, publication and distribution of public opinion polling information, “51% Oppose U.S. Manned Mission to Mars,” 7/21/09, <http://www.rasmussenreports.com/public_content/lifestyle/general_lifestyle/july_2009/51_oppose_u_s_manned_mission_to_mars>)

Buzz Aldrin, one of the three U.S. astronauts who first walked on the moon in 1969, says America’s next goal should be sending a manned mission to Mars, but just 29% of Americans agree. Fifty-one percent (51%) of adults are opposed to sending someone to Mars as one of the current goals of the U.S. space program, according to a new Rasmussen Reports national telephone survey. Twenty-one percent (21%) are not sure. Women strongly oppose sending a manned mission to Mars while men are almost evenly divided. As the nation celebrates the 40th anniversary of landing men on the moon, 44% of all Americans also believe the United States should cut back on space exploration because of the state of the economy. Thirty-four percent (34%) oppose cuts in space exploration, and 22% are undecided. it’s likely intelligent life exists on other planets, but 35% said it was not very or not at all likely.

**A manned Mars mission costs tens of billions and support is dwindling**

Christianson 9 (J. Scott, "We can’t afford sky-high manned mission to Mars," The Columbia Daily Tribune (MO), 11/3/09, <http://m.columbiatribune.com/news/2009/nov/03/we-cant-afford-sky-high-manned-mission-to-mars/>)

A manned mission to Mars will cost tens of billions of dollars. According to a recent report, NASA immediately needs an extra $3 billion per year to keep its plans on track. It is almost guaranteed the costs for this project will expand greatly. Costs cannot be correctly estimated for large projects so unique and untried. And a major risk associated with a manned Mars mission is that, after sinking billions into this project, Congress or a future administration will pull the plug because of cost overruns and delays. This is exactly what happened to the superconducting super collider project in Texas, which Congress canceled after its estimated costs at completion ballooned from $4 billion to $12 billion. Political and public support of such large science projects wanes quickly as time and costs increase. By pouring the majority of their efforts into this one mission, NASA is betting on the success — and continued funding — of a manned mission to Mars. The known risks for human space flight on this scale are huge and have to be mitigated with a variety of not-yet-invented technologies. And in any such complex project, all the risks can’t be known. The space shuttles have surely proved that — two of them were destroyed by an “O” ring and a piece of foam. Mars is not days away like the moon; it is months away, with lots of time for things to go horribly wrong. A manned mission to Mars will tie up most of NASA’s intellectual resources for a decade or more as they toil on an incredibly expensive project whose success and scientific value is uncertain. The American public should have a better chance of receiving a decent return on its investment in NASA.

## Space Weaponization

**Space weaponization widely unpopular**

Ternes, 08. (Carl D. is a Major in the USAF. 3/28/2008, “Combat Satellites: What They Could Look Like, How They Might Operate, and Why We Need Them,” pdf, pg 21, )

Perhaps the most unsettling reason driving the U.S. to develop immediate and effective combat satellite-based OCS capabilities is the possibility that technically capable military peers may attempt to weaponize space regardless of world opinion. If an enemy were the first to employ space weapons, they could potentially resort to strategies of attrition, blackmail, or coercion to take control of and/or deny other nations access to space. This situation could be further exasperated by perpetrators whose space architectures emphasize constellations of cheap, single-purpose combat satellites supported by quick, dynamic acquisition and reconstitution processes.123 Yet, it is in the OCS arena where combat satellites could have their greatest impact and potential. Designed to directly and/or indirectly attack enemy space systems, American 20 combat satellites supporting OCS operations could employ a variety of technologies to target, engage, and negate enemy space systems and their supporting infrastructures. However, despite the historical likelihood that space warfare is a “virtual certainty,” the concept of a combat satellite enabled offensive U.S. space capability concerns many. This camp believes the U.S. has the most to lose economically, militarily, and politically should fighting shift to space. They also believe that if the U.S. fields offensively capable combat satellites it would encourage space competitors to do the same and therefore increase the likelihood of space conflicts. Unfortunately, neither DCS nor OCS operations, even those including combat satellites, can negate all possible threats to U.S. space assets. For example, no existing approach can currently defend against a space-based nuclear detonation designed to pollute the Earth’s radiation belts with high-energy particles that indefinitely deny space-faring nations access to near-earth orbits.124 While using such weapons would be extremely unpopular in the court of world opinion, this type of indefensible space weapon offers adversaries with little to lose options for reducing American space dominance.

**Space weapons satellites have no public support**

Ternes, 08. (Carl D. is a Major in the USAF. 3/28/2008, “Combat Satellites: What They Could Look Like, How They Might Operate, and Why We Need Them,” pdf, pg 26, )

Perhaps the greatest detractor of fielding U.S. combat satellites is the controversy it would raise. Regardless of the process used, fielding U.S. combat satellites would likely evoke a storm of negative public response both within the U.S. and across the international community. Sadly, there is no easy fix to this dilemma. America must decide if risking military subordination to adversaries who are the first to weaponize space is greater than the ridicule of a media frenzied public response. Unfortunately, the time to decide may be closer than first believed due to the rapid emergence of a new generation of dual-use space technologies currently being explored.

**Space militarization is massively unpopular and has bipartisan opposition**

World Public Opinion 8 (Study contributors Steven Kull, John Steinbruner, Nancy Gallagher, Clay Ramsay, Evan Lewis, “Large Majorities of Americans and Russians Oppose All Space Weapons,” 1/23/08, <http://www.worldpublicopinion.org/pipa/articles/international_security_bt/444.php>)

Most Americans and Russians agree that their governments should work together to prevent an arms race in space. Large majorities in both countries favor unilateral restraint and a treaty that would keep space free of weapons. A United States Air Force Defense Support System satellite used for infrared detection (Photo: USAF) Americans and Russians also support treaties that would prohibit countries from attacking or interfering with each others’ satellites and from testing or deploying weapons designed to attack satellites. These are among the key findings of a WorldPublicOpinion.org poll of 1,247 Americans and 1,601 Russians developed in conjunction with the Center for International and Security Studies at the University of Maryland (CISSM). Knowledge Networks in the United States and the Levada Center in Russia conducted the interviews. Majorities in both the United States (78%) and Russia (67%) say that as long as no other country puts weapons into space, their own governments should also refrain from doing so. Most Russians (72%) and Americans (80%) also favor a new treaty banning all weapons in space. Support for such a ban was strong among Americans even when they were presented counter arguments about the potential military advantages of deploying such systems. The US poll revealed strong bipartisan consensus on the issue. Majorities in both the Republican and Democratic parties believe the US government should refrain unilaterally from deploying space weapons. There is also bipartisan backing for a treaty to ban these weapons, though support is higher among Democrats. Steven Kull, director of WorldPublicOpinion.org, noted that there was remarkable agreement within and between the two countries on the issue of space weapons. "What is striking is the robust consensus among Russians as well as Americans, and among Republicans as well as Democrats that space should not be an arena for the major powers to compete for military advantage," Kull said. John Steinbruner, director of CISSM, added that the observed consensus also reflects a robust conception of security interest. "The use of space for common protection is, in fact, far more important for all countries under the circumstances of globalization than the pursuit of national advantage in performing traditional military missions," Steinbruner said. Asked how high a priority their governments should place on bilateral cooperation to prevent an arms race in space, large majorities of Americans (86%) and Russians (also 86%) agree that it should be an important priority. A majority of Russians (53%) consider this a top priority. American respondents were asked how they would like presidential candidates to deal with US national security and space weapons. Sixty-seven percent overall said they would have more confidence in a presidential candidate who favors a treaty banning weapons in space, including 57 percent of Republicans and 73 percent of Democrats. Seventy-three percent would also have more confidence in a candidate who took the position that as long as no other country puts weapons in space, the United States should not do so (Republicans 63%, Democrats, 83%).

**The public strongly dislikes the idea of weapons in space**

Lutes et al 2 (“Preserving Freedom of Action in Space: Realizing the Potential and Limits of US Spacepower” pg. 44 Colonel Charles is, USAF Senior Military Fellow and Peter L. Hays, eds., with Vincent A. Manzo, Lisa M. Yambrick, and M. Elaine Bunn [www.stimson.org/images/.../Preserving\_Freedom\_of\_Action\_in\_Space.pdf-](http://www.stimson.org/images/.../Preserving_Freedom_of_Action_in_Space.pdf-) )

These dilemmas are widely, but not universally, recognized. Together with the widespread public antipathy to elevating humankind’s worst instincts into space, they help explain why the flight-testing and deployment of dedicated space weapons have not become commonplace. These capabilities are certainly not difficult to acquire, as they are decades old. Indeed, tests of dedicated ASAT weapons have periodically occurred, and such systems were deployed for short periods during the Cold War. Surely, if the weaponization of space were inevitable, this would have occurred when the United States and the Soviet Union went to extraordinary lengths to compete in so many other realms. The weaponization of space has not occurred to date and is not inevitable in the future for two compelling reasons: **public citizens strongly dislike the idea of weapons in space**, and most national leaders have long recognized that this would open a Pandora’s Box that would be difficult to control. Much has changed since the end of the Cold War, but the fundamental dilemmas of space control, including the linkage of satellites to nuclear deterrence among major powers, have not changed. The increased post-Cold War US dependence on satellites makes the introduction of dedicated space weapons even more hazardous for national and economic security. Advocates of muscular space control must therefore take refuge in the fallacy of the last move, since war-fighting plans in space make sense only in the absence of return fire. Offensive counterforce operations in space do not come to grips with the dilemmas of spacepower, since proposed remedies are far more likely to accentuate, rather than reduce, satellite vulnerability.

## SETI

**The search for aliens is uniquely divisive and controversial**

Salla, 08. (Michael has a PhD in government from the University of Queensland and is the Founder of the Exopolitics Institute. Exopolitics Journal in 2008, “Exopolitics: Discipline of Choice for Public Policy Issues Concerning Extraterrestrial Life,” <http://exopoliticsjournal.com/vol-2/vol-2-4-Salla.htm>, )

The existence of extraterrestrial life has long been a subject of intense speculation and fierce public debate. Speculation has focused on the more than 200 billion solar systems known to exist in the Milky Way, and similar figures for other galaxies, that might harbor advanced extraterrestrial life. This is exemplified in estimates of extraterrestrial life in the galaxy provided by Project OZMA participants (forerunner to Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence - SETI), who in a 1961 meeting agreed on the Drake equation. They came up with the initial figure of 10,000 technological civilizations scattered throughout the galaxy.[[2]](http://exopoliticsjournal.com/vol-2/vol-2-4-Salla.htm" \l "_edn2" \o ")Such estimates have allowed futurists and science fiction authors to speculate on what such life would be like, and how it may impact on human society at some future date. Scientific speculation has taken the form of estimating the possibilities of advanced extraterrestrial life evolving in our galaxy, and the levels of scientific advancement that these would have reached. The Russian Astronomer Nikolai Kardashev, for example, speculated that advanced extraterrestrial civilizations could be distinguished by the quantity of energy they used. This could occur at a planetary level (Type I), stellar level (Type II) or galactic level (Type III).[[3]](http://exopoliticsjournal.com/vol-2/vol-2-4-Salla.htm" \l "_edn3" \o ")  Public debate concerning extraterrestrial life has focused upon extensive visual sightings, radar trackings and photographs of Unidentified Flying Objects (UFOs) that appear to be under intelligent control. Many UFO sightings have been acknowledged by government officials as not explainable in terms of known aircraft or natural phenomena, and have even been reported to outperform the most advanced aircraft possessed by industrialized nations. For example, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the U.S., General Nathan Twining, made the following declaration about the “flying disks” phenomenon in September 1947: “The phenomenon reported is something real and not visionary or fictitious.”[[4]](http://exopoliticsjournal.com/vol-2/vol-2-4-Salla.htm" \l "_edn4" \o ")Such comments by similar senior military or government officials have led to the extraterrestrial hypothesis that UFOs are extraterrestrial in origin, as a possible explanation.[[5]](http://exopoliticsjournal.com/vol-2/vol-2-4-Salla.htm" \l "_edn5" \o ")More recently, a growing number of former government, military and corporate officials have come forward to disclose direct experience of UFOs and extraterrestrial life, and of government suppression of corroborating data.[[6]](http://exopoliticsjournal.com/vol-2/vol-2-4-Salla.htm" \l "_edn6" \o ")  While speculation and debate continues around the subject of extraterrestrial life and its relation to UFO sightings, there has been growing controversy about how to approach the growing pool of data available in the public domain, primarily through the internet. The data comprises many thousands of accounts by both private individuals; and former corporate, military and government officials; who have made available personal testimonies, photos, videos and documentation concerning extraterrestrial life. National governments have also significantly contributed to the growing pool of open source data available. The U.S. government, for example, has made available many documents through Freedom of Information Act requests that are now available on the internet. Similarly, governments such as France and Britain in 2007 and 2008 placed thousands of UFO case files on the internet.[[7]](http://exopoliticsjournal.com/vol-2/vol-2-4-Salla.htm" \l "_edn7" \o ")

**SETI is unpopular --- recently shut down and the public doesn’t want to pay taxes to support it**

Cokinos 11 (Christopher, University of Arizona English professor working on a popular narrative history of SETI, "Disconnected," Los Angeles Times, 6/18/11, <http://articles.latimes.com/2011/jun/18/opinion/la-oe-cokinos-seti-20110618>)

In a country where some corporations do not pay taxes, millionaires get farm subsidies and a presidential candidate can run up a half-million-dollar tab at Tiffany's, we're deferring an attempt to answer one of our most enduring (and least inexpensive to answer) questions: Are we alone in the universe? Certainly we don't cotton to the idea of being alone. We yearn for the big signal from the stars, the cosmic hail. When Stephen Hawking warns us against contacting E.T. because we might end up invaded by Klingons, we argue about it around the water cooler. We thrill to "Contact" and "District 9" and play video games featuring tentacled aliens. We tune in when Carl Sagan and Timothy Ferris explain outer space on TV. Yet we're surprisingly unwilling to put our money where our imaginations want to roam. News that the Allen Telescope Array is "hibernating" -- a curiously biological term for shutting down 42 radio telescopes designed to listen for signs of life from other worlds -- raises questions about our true commitment to the search for extraterrestrial intelligence. The National Science Foundation recently slashed the University of California's budgets for the Allen array by 90%. This, along with state cuts, has left UC Berkeley, which operates the Hat Creek, Calif., array in the Cascade Mountains, and the private SETI Institute, which conducts searches, in the lurch. For now, the phone is off the hook -- as it was in 1994 when Sen. Richard Bryan (D-Nev.) derided NASA's "Martian chase" and successfully shut down its SETI -- "Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence" -- program. It would cost each U.S. taxpayer just 3 cents a year to fund the Allen array, according to SETI Institute Senior Astronomer Seth Shostak. But in this political environment, direct taxpayer support is unlikely, so the SETI Institute is trying to raise $5 million to reboot the array.

# Internal Links

## 2NC Internal Links – Spending = an Election Issue

**In this economy, spending is an election issue.**

Clift, 10. (Eleanor is a contributing editor for Newsweek. October 15, 2010, “How the Deficit Became a Major Election Issue,” <http://www.newsweek.com/2010/10/15/how-the-deficit-became-a-major-election-issue.html>, )

President Reagan used to joke about the deficit, saying it was “big enough to take care of itself,” and Republicans lauded him for finally ending the GOP’s decades-long obsession with curbing deficit spending and balancing the federal budget. What happened to change that Reagan-era calculus? Back then, nobody could get their mind around $3 trillion, which is what the debt was in 1989. Today the number is an unfathomable $13 trillion, yet the issue of government borrowing has taken on a power it hasn’t enjoyed since Ross Perot, the billionaire Texas populist, made it the center of the presidential campaign in 1992. Meanwhile, the U.S. debt clock, installed more than two decades ago on West 42nd Street in New York City by a civic-minded businessman disgusted with politics as usual, ticks away in a new location nearby. Maybe, finally, its time has come again. Why is the deficit the top issue in voters’ minds? Does the average person really grasp how the deficit could affect their lives? The reality is that they don’t really have to. What’s given the issue such potency as a political issue is government spending. The deficit is really a symbol for the anger that people feel about the amount of money that has been poured into the economy, without any tangible returns that they can see in their own pocketbooks. “The American people are not Keynesians,” says Brookings scholar Tom Mann. “In tough economic times, they spend less, and they think government should do the same.” Democratic pollster Geoff Garin agrees: “The deficit is more of an intellectual concern. The emotional concern is spending. And the president’s decision to spend a trillion dollars on health care was a pretty substantial fork in the road.”

## Obama Key/GOP Against

## Generic

**GOP against Obama’s policy on principle – all policies will be opposed**

Klein, 11. (Ezra is a columnist at the Washington Post, as well as a contributor to MSNBC. His work focuses on domestic and economic policymaking. 3/10/2011, “Republicans oppose Democrats, not health-care reform,” http://voices.washingtonpost.com/ezra-klein/2011/03/republicans\_oppose\_democrats\_n.html, )

I disagree. I think health-care policy is not a priority for most Republicans, so when they’re in office, it’s not the thing they naturally choose to spend political capital on. But that doesn’t mean that, all else being equal, they wouldn’t be glad to pass one of their policies on the subject and say they were the folks who solved the country’s health-care problem. You saw that impulse in Mitt Romney, in George W. Bush’s campaign to pass the Medicare prescription drug benefit (though that had a lot to do with winning Florida in 2004), in Bob Bennett’s decision to co-sponsor a comprehensive reform bill alongside Ron Wyden. The problem is, the thing that really is a priority for most Republicans is defeating Democratic presidents. And Democratic presidents often attempt health-care reform, because they care about it a lot, and they often appropriate Republican ideas, because they overestimate how much Republicans are interested in health-care policy and underestimate how much Republicans really want to make them fail. And then the policy they’re pushing becomes their policy, not a policy the Republicans originally offered up, and the process of polarization begins. I believe as strongly now as I did a year ago that President Mitt Romney or President John McCain could’ve offered a bill quite similar to the Affordable Care Act and gotten a lot more than zero Senate Republicans to vote for it, though I think it’s an open question whether they would’ve bothered to do anything about health-care reform at all. But I don’t think Republicans have strong and consistent views against health-care reform. I think they have strong and consistent views against Democratic presidents.

## Health Care

**Obama key to keep health care reform – Republicans will cut funding**

Stein, 10. (Sam Stein is a senior Political Reporter for the Huffington Post. Previously, he has worked for Newsweek and the New York Daily News. Nov 11, 2010, “Health Care Repeal Unpopular With The Public, Would Be Vetoed By Obama.” <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/11/11/health-care-repeal-unpopu_n_782111.html>, )

WASHINGTON -- White House senior adviser David Axelrod was adamant on Wednesday night that the president will go to the mat in defense of his cherished health care reform law, even as Republicans threaten to repeal it or strip it of funding. Obama, he told the Huffington Post, would veto any legislative effort to overturn the measure. As for the forthcoming budget battles over health care, the administration is prepared to make its case in Congress and to the public. And while he's not in the business of providing political advice to the GOP, Axelrod did just that. "The notion of spending the next two years fighting over this, I think, is a complete misreading of what the American people want," he said. "They want us to focus on the economy. They don't want us to fight the battles of the last two years. But we are not going to stand by and go back to allowing people with preexisting conditions to be discriminated against, go back to the situation where people can be thrown off their insurance simply because they become seriously ill or you can't get on your parents' insurance after the age of 20. There are so many things that are just central."

**Republicans committed to repealing health care**

Drake, 11. (Bruce Drake is a contributing editor to HuffPost Politics. Feb 2011, “Key Republicans Vow to Battle White House on Health Care, New EPA Rules,” <http://www.politicsdaily.com/2011/01/02/key-republicans-vow-to-battle-white-house-on-health-care-new-ep/>, )

As the 112th Congress convenes this week in Washington, Republicans are vowing to attack head-on key Obama administration initiatives, including health care reform and increased regulation of greenhouse gas emissions. Rep. Fred Upton of Michigan, who is set to be chairman of the powerful House Energy and Commerce Committee, promised on Sunday an early vote to make good on the GOP promise to try to repeal the health care legislation. Appearing on "Fox News Sunday," Upton said he will also take on the administration's plan to issue new rules through the Environmental Protection Agency limiting greenhouse gas emissions, which were announced after the end of a congressional session in which efforts to agree on a bipartisan plan to reduce carbon emissions collapsed. "We are not going to let this administration regulate what they've been unable to legislate," said Upton, referring to the "cap and trade" bill that passed the House but didn't make it through the Senate. In late December, the EPA announced a timetable for the new rules that would include stricter emission standards for power plants and oil refineries. Upton said: "We're going to have early, early hearings on this. We're going to see exactly what their [the EPA's] analysis is on its impact on jobs. There's also something called the Congressional Review Act, that within 60 days of rules being published, Congress can take this up and with an up-or-down vote, it is filibuster-proof in the Senate. It's been used before." Upton wrote in a Dec. 28 Wall Street Journal column that the EPA's "move represents an unconstitutional power grab that will kill millions of jobs -- unless Congress steps in." On health care, Upton said: "As part of our pledge, we said that we would bring up a vote to repeal health care early. That will happen before the president's State of the Union address." Upton noted the small margin by which the final health care measure passed the House and said: "We have 242 Republicans. There will be a significant number of Democrats, I think, that will join us." When asked if repeal could pass the Senate, Upton again pointed to last year's vote when Democrats, with their bigger majority, just managed to notch the 60 votes necessary to avert a filibuster and get a vote on the legislation. The Democratic majority is now 53 to 47.

**Health care is predicted to reduce deficit by 100 billion – Republicans threaten to repeal it**

Picard 11 ( "Is Obamacare good for the budget or not?" Joseph is editor for the International Business Times http://www.ibtimes.com/articles/98780/20110107/healthcare-reform-repeal.htm)

In the very likely event of defeat in the Senate of the repeal, House Republicans have promised to repeal the ACA provision by provision, sending each of these repeals to the Senate, where Democratic Senators are almost certain to kill each bill. This sort of thing could go on for quite some time, until the rest of the nation thinks that it, or at least Washington, D.C., has slipped down a rabbit hole. Perhaps neither side is right about their figures. But which side, the repealing Republicans or the defending Democrats, is closer to the truth? The government agency tasked with estimating the consequent costs of acts of Congress is the Congressional Budget Office. As the Obama administration and Congressional Democrats have repeatedly pointed out in the healthcare debate, both while trying to pass the law last year and now, trying to defend it, the CBO has estimated that the healthcare reform act will reduce the deficit by $100 billion over 10 years, and by more than $1 trillion over 20 years.

## Immigration Reform

**Obama is committed to passing immigration reform**

AP, 11. (Suzanne Gamboa is an AP writer based in Texas. April 19, 2011, “Obama, Eye on 2012, to Hold Meeting on Immigration Reform,” <http://www.cnsnews.com/news/article/obama-eye-2012-hold-meeting-immigration>, )

Washington (AP) - President Barack Obama has marshaled the likes of former California Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger, the mayors of New York and San Antonio and Philadelphia's police commissioner in an attempt to show wide and varied support for an overhaul of the nation's immigration laws. The invitees are among a bipartisan group expected to meet with Obama at the White House on Tuesday afternoon to discuss revamping the immigration system. Besides Schwarzenegger, New York Mayor Michael Bloomberg, San Antonio Mayor Julian Castro and Philadelphia Police Commissioner Charles Ramsey, who also served as Washington, D.C., police chief, are among those invited. In a statement issued late Monday, the White House said the president is holding the meeting to discuss the importance of fixing the nation's "broken immigration system" to meet the country's 21st century economic and national security needs. The White House said business and religious leaders, as well as current and former public officials from across the political spectrum were to be invited. The statement was attributed to a White House senior official who was not further identified. In a Monday afternoon interview with Dallas television station WFAA, Obama underscored the need for bilateral support to set new immigration policy. "The question is going to be, are we going to be able to find some Republicans who can partner with me and others to get this done once and for all instead of using it as a political football," he said. Obama has been under fire from Latino and immigration activists and Spanish-language media for failing to take up immigration in his first term. He has been consistently reminded of his campaign promise to address immigration early in his administration. Although Obama has repeatedly said he is committed to immigration overhaul, the deportation of a record 393,000 immigrants last year and other enforcement tactics during his administration have drawn criticism in the immigrant and Hispanic communities.

**Democrats pushing immigration reform but there is a lack of Republican support**

Brown, 11. (Carrie reports for Poltico. July 18, 2011, “Sen. Chuck Schumer tries reviving immigration bill.” http://cis.org/MorningNews/071911)

Sen. Chuck Schumer is attempting to revive moribund efforts to pass a comprehensive immigration bill, telling POLITICO Monday that he will hold a hearing next week focused on the economic argument for an immigration overhaul. It’s a subtle shift in emphasis for immigration reform advocates, who met recently with Schumer (D-N.Y.) to plot a strategy. “We decided we ought to start highlighting the fact that immigration creates jobs rather than takes them away,” Schumer, the No. 3 Senate leader, said in an interview. “Everyone agreed that is how we are going to start talking about immigration, as a job creator.” The change in emphasis capitalizes on an all-consuming focus in Washington on the economy. President Barack Obama spent several weeks in the spring pushing for immigration reform, including a speech that highlighted the economic benefits, but the issue has been overshadowed by budget negotiations and stalled by a Republican-controlled House. The dismal job reports have also soured efforts to pass a bill that would allow the country’s estimated 11 million illegal immigrants to earn citizenship. The Center for Immigration Studies, which favors stricter immigration rules, released a report last month pointing to the rising unemployment rate as an argument for a further crackdown on illegal immigration. But Schumer, chairman of the Judiciary Committee’s immigration subcommittee, said the July 26 hearing will argue the economic upside to immigration. Schumer is calling in business leaders to talk about the need for more highly skilled workers and mayors whose local economies have benefited from an influx of lower-skilled immigrants. The witnesses includes NASDAQ chief Robert Greifield, Cornell University President David Skorton, Microsoft General Counsel Brad Smith, Amgen medical director Puneet Arora, and the mayors of Utica, N.Y., Lewiston, Maine, and Uvalda, Ga. “Our immigration talks are moving along, and surprisingly well and regularly,” said Schumer, the Senate Democratic point person on the issue. “Immigration is a rough road and I’m making no predictions, but (the talks) are clearly not dead.”

**Obama pushing immigration reform**

Hing ’11 (Julianne, “Obama, in Re-election Mode, Promises Immigration Reform Again,” 4/21/11, http://colorlines.com/archives/2011/04/obama\_in\_re-election\_mode\_promises\_immigration\_reform\_again.html)

As President Obama winds into re-election mode, it’s time for him to remind immigrant communities that got him into office that he hasn’t forgotten about immigration reform. Before President Obama hit the road for his quick sweep through the West Coast this week, he gathered dozens of folks from a broad swath from the faith, labor, business and political worlds to talk immigration on Tuesday. At the meeting, according to the White House, Obama repeated his commitment to working for immigration reform, but only through congressional legislative action. He also reiterated his deep disappointment in the federal DREAM Act’s failure to pass the Senate in December, and urged the people in the room to keep pushing their constituencies to demand immigration reform. Such are the political promises that immigrant communities are by now well familiar with from President Obama while they wait for the unlikely event that Congress might take up comprehensive immigration reform. Immigrant rights groups expressed concerned, too, that Obama’s done more than enough on immigration since he’s been in office, and very little of it has been to the benefit of immigrant communities and the rest of the country. “While we appreciate the President’s effort to keep immigration reform on the national agenda, his actions belie his intent,” said Pablo Alvarado, executive director of the National Day Laborer Organizing Network. “If the President genuinely wanted to fix the broken immigration system, he would respond to the growing chorus of voices calling for the suspension of the Secure Communities program and move to legalize instead of further criminalize our immigrant communities.” Others were more encouraged. “The President made it clear he is willing to use whatever political capital he has to make the case for immigration reform that can fix our nation’s dysfunctional immigration system in a way that ends illegal immigration,” said Frank Sharry, executive director of the D.C. immigration reform advocacy group America’s Voice. “It was gratifying to hear the President reaffirm his commitment to immigration reform. It shows that he is raising the stakes on the issue and underscores the fact that doing nothing is not an option

**Republicans oppose immigration reform even through Democratic concessions**

Robinson, 11. (Dan Robinson is the chief White House correspondent at Voice of America. May 10, 2011, “Obama Challenges Republicans on Immigration Reform.” <http://www.voanews.com/english/news/usa/Obama-in-Texas-Challenges-Republicans-on-Immigration-Reform-121602099.html>, )

President Barack Obama used the backdrop of the U.S-Mexico border on Tuesday for a major speech amplifying his calls for bipartisan reform of U.S. immigration laws. Facing continuing opposition from congressional Republicans on how best to achieve comprehensive reform, Mr. Obama is trying to elevate the debate about finding a solution to what most agree is a broken immigration system. On Tuesday, he traveled to El Paso, Texas, a major crossing point on the more than 3,100 -kilometer border with Mexico. As in other southwest states, illegal immigration is a hot topic in Texas where the percentage of the population that is Hispanic increased by 43 percent over the past decade. In remarks after touring a cargo facility at the Bridge of the Americas, Mr. Obama listed steps he has taken to strengthen border security and cut down on illegal crossings, and said his administration has answered concerns voiced by opposition Republicans. "We have gone above and beyond what was requested by the very Republicans who said they supported broader reform as long as we got serious about enforcement," said President Obama. "All the stuff they asked for, we have done." Watch a related report by Kent Klein: Briefing reporters this week, senior administration officials detailed those steps, which include more than doubling the number of border patrol agents to 20,700, and a plan to extend deployment of National Guard troops. The administration has increased cooperation with Mexico in fighting drug cartel violence, intensified screening of rail and vehicle traffic, and nearly completed construction of a 1200 kilometer border fence. Officials also point to increased illegal drug and weapons seizures, and a 36 percent drop in illegal immigration attempts. In El Paso, Mr. Obama repeated his call for Republicans to join him in finding common ground to enable a bipartisan solution to immigration reform. "So, the question is whether those in Congress who previously walked away in the name of enforcement are now ready to come back to the table and finish the work that we have started," said Obama. "We have got to put the politics aside, and if we do, I am confident we can find common ground."

## EPA

**GOP is attempting to cut EPA – claims it hurts the economy**

**The Columbus Dispatch, 11.** (Renee Schoof, 7-17-11, “GOP Attacking Environmental Regulations,” <http://www.dispatch.com/live/content/national_world/stories/2011/07/17/gop-attacking-environmental-regulations.html?sid=101>)

Republicans in the House of Representatives are waging an all-out war to block federal regulations that protect the environment. They loaded up a pending 2012 spending bill with terms that would eliminate a broad array of environmental protections, everything from stopping new plants and animals from being placed on the endangered species list to ending federal limits on water pollution in Florida. The terms also include a rollback of pollution regulations for mountaintop mining. Another GOP bill would weaken the nation's 1972 Clean Water Act, taking away the Environmental Protection Agency's authority to step in when it finds state water-pollution rules too loose. The backers of the anti-environmental-regulation agenda say it's necessary for the sake of jobs and economic growth. "Earlier this year, I said that the scariest agency in the federal government is the EPA. I still believe that," Rep. Mike Simpson, R-Idaho, said at a hearing last week on the spending bill. He said that the bill "attempts to rein in the excesses of the EPA." Jim DiPeso, a spokesman for the independent group Republicans for Environmental Protection, said that "some of the more zealous tea partyers in Congress" wouldn't go so far in environmental protection as even Ronald Reagan, who signed wilderness bills even though he, too, tried to roll back environmental regulation. The spending bill's assault on environmental rules has "very little to do with getting fiscal imbalance under control," DiPeso said.. "It's ideological." Michael Livermore, the executive director of the Institute for Policy Integrity at the New York University School of Law, said that lifting environmental restrictions wouldn't help the economy as proponents claimed. "It's just really not that big a deal that it would make sense for Congress to spend so much of its energy and so much of its time focusing on this if what they care about is the economy," he said. "If what they care is making things easier for special industrial actors who are politically connected, then it makes a lot of sense."

**GOP against the EPA and climate change**

Madison, 11. (Lucy Madison is a political reporter for CBS News who previously was an assistant editor at Interview Magazine and graduated from Northwestern University :). March 16, 2011, “House Republicans reject climate change science,” <http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-503544_162-20043909-503544.html>, )

All 31 Republicans on the House Energy and Commerce Committee declined on Tuesday to vote in favor of a series of amendments acknowledging the scientific consensus around climate change. The three amendments were attached to a bill aiming to curb the Environmental Protection Agency's power to regulate greenhouse gasses. They posited that "Congress accepts the scientific finding ... that 'warming of the climate system is unequivocal'"; that the scientific evidence regarding climate change "is compelling"; and that "human-caused climate change is a threat to public health and welfare." The committee passed the measure, but voted down the amendments, with 30 of the 31 Republicans voting against them and one - Marsha Blackburn, of Tennessee - declining to vote either way. Democrats unanimously voted in favor of the amendments. Republicans, who have strongly opposed Obama administration efforts to regulate greenhouse gasses, have been pushing to strip the EPA of its regulatory power. The party blocked Democratic efforts last year to pass climate change legislation. Rep. Henry Waxman (Calif.), the committee's ranking Democrat who offered one of the three amendments, said they should not even be necessary because the "finding is so obviously correct." Rep. Joe Barton (R-Tex.), however, contended that the science of the issue was "not settled." "My good friend from California tries to make it clear that the science is settled. I would say it's not settled," Barton said of Waxman's amendment, according to the Hill. The global scientific community is largely unified in the belief that the climate is warming as a result of human actions, among them the release of greenhouse gasses into the atmosphere.

**Republican push to undercut EPA are held back by the democrats – Republican president would pass the bill**

Restuccia 11 ("GOP sees looming 2012 elections a key to blocking climate rules" Andrew is a staff writer for the Hill http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/677-e2-wire/141125-gop-sees-looming-2012-elections-as-key-to-blocking-climate-rules)

Republicans are banking on the looming 2012 election to provide a political boost for their efforts to undercut the Environmental Protection Agency's pending climate change rules this year. While a bill blocking EPA’s climate authority is likely to pass the House, the legislation faces an uphill battle in the Democrat-controlled Senate, as well as a potential veto from President Obama. Still, Republicans are planning to push forward with the legislation, hoping the threat of the 2012 elections will yield support from vulnerable Democrats in states that will be most affected by EPA rules. Even if the bill ultimately fails to become law, Republicans will attempt to force a vote on the issue in order to get Democrats on the record in anticipation of next year’s election. “This is going to be a year to shape legislation in terms of the presidential race in 2012,” a Senate Republican aide involved with efforts to block EPA climate rules said, arguing that fears of repercussions back home might convince fence-sitting lawmakers to support the bill.

**Republicans want to regulate the EPA**

Espe and Capiello 11 (David and Dina are writers for the Associate press House Republicans Want Restrictions On EPA” http://www.manufacturing.net/News/2011/02/Environmental-AP--House-Republicans-Want-Restrictions-On-EPA/, Feb 2, 2011)

In a sharp challenge to the Obama administration, House Republican leaders intend to unveil legislation to prohibit the Environmental Protection Agency from regulating greenhouse gases, officials said. They expect to advance the bill quickly. EPA chief Lisa Jackson was due on Capitol Hill on Wednesday for the first time since Republicans took over the House and gained seats in the Senate. She probably will have to defend steps by the EPA to control air pollution and water pollution to Senate Republicans, who have introduced bills of their own to delay regulations aimed at abating climate change, or to bar the government from using any environmental law to fight global warming pollution. Officials said the House bill, which was to be offered Wednesday, would nullify all of the steps the EPA has taken to date on the issue, including a finding that greenhouse gases endanger public health. In addition, it seeks to strip the agency of its authority to use the law in any future attempts to crack down on the emissions from factories, utilities and other stationary sources. Many scientists say carbon dioxide and other heat-trapping pollution contribute to global warming, and the attempt to reduce them is a major priority for President Barack Obama as well as environmentalists. Critics argue the evidence is thin and new rules would drive up costs for businesses and consumers and cause job losses. The officials who described the GOP plans did so on condition of anonymity, saying they were not authorized to pre-empt the release of a draft measure prepared by the House Energy and Commerce Committee, chaired by Rep. Fred Upton, R-Mich. Numerous House Republicans already have introduced legislation that would hamstring the EPA from moving forward with regulations to reduce heat-trapping pollution. The efforts mark yet another arena in which newly empowered House Republicans are moving quickly to challenge the administration. Sworn into office less than a month ago, the House has already voted to repeal last year's health care law and is advancing toward a series of expected confrontations with Obama over Republican demands for deep spending cuts. Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, recently announced support for legislation to restrict abortions. A vote on the greenhouse gases bill would occur first in the Energy and Commerce Committee, and is expected later this winter. The measure would then go to the House floor, where Republicans express confidence they have a strong enough majority to overcome objections by Democrats, many of whom are expected to oppose it on environmental grounds. Republicans are attempting similar restrictions in the Senate, where the political situation is more complicated. Sen. John Barrasso of Wyoming has introduced a more sweeping measure than the one House Republicans are drafting. At the same time, Sen. Jay Rockefeller, D-W.Va., has proposed a two-year moratorium on EPA attempts to regulate greenhouse gases, a plan that already has attracted a handful of Democratic supporters. The Supreme Court ruled in 2007 that the EPA has authority to regulate greenhouse gases under the Clean Air Act, but it wasn't until the Obama administration took office that the effort began. Initially, the administration's principal focus was on passage of legislation to impose restrictions, but that attempt failed when the Senate balked at a bill Democrats pushed through the House in 2009.

**Obama’s veto is the only defense to destruction of the EPA**

Bradenton Herald 7/22 (7/22/11, " House bill restricting EPA water rules wrong ", http://www.bradenton.com/2011/07/22/3364299/house-bill-restricting-epa-water.html)

The U.S. House of Representatives took a wrong turn last week with passage of a measure that would restrict the Environmental Protection Agency from imposing stricter water quality standards on states. This comes partly as a backlash to EPA action to require tough numeric standards on nitrogen and phosphorous in Florida. The bill’s sponsor, Rep. John Mica, R-Winter Park, argued that the federal agency exceeded its authority in the enforcement of the Clean Water Act. Such government overreach would be too costly on public water treatment plants and private polluters, bill supporters maintain. This is a disservice to Florida’s fragile and polluted waterways -- coming at a time when a toxic green slime covered the Caloosahatchee River near Alva. Such disgusting algae blooms, caused by sewage, manure and fertilizer pollution, kill marine life, contaminate drinking water supplies and force beach closures over the public health threat. During the weeks-long Caloosahatchee mess, fishing, swimming and camping ceased at Caloosahatchee River Regional Park. Businesses compared the economic devastation to last year’s BP oil spill. Residents railed about plunging property values. Thanks to an outgoing tide, Bradenton recently escaped such a terrible fate after 3.5 million gallons of sewage leaked into the Manatee River downtown. While proponents of the congressional measure asserted tougher EPA enforcement would kill jobs, clean water creates and saves jobs. Polluted rivers, lakes and bays kill jobs in the tourism and fishing industries, which, in turn, kills other jobs that depend on income from those two economic powerhouses. The Clean Water Act came about in 1972 because states spurned pollution regulations. Since water flows between states and knows no boundaries, this is a federal issue -- not a states’ rights issue as many contend. One example of this is the longstanding legal battle between Florida, Georgia and Alabama over the water in Lake Lanier and the Chattahoochee River. Without federal control over water, downstream communities and ecosystems could suffer from diminished access to water as upstream cities drain supplies or allow pollution to flow downriver. Supporters of the House bill also cited the EPA’;s refusal to allow a West Virginia coal mining operation to blast a mountaintop and dump waste into waterways headed to North Carolina, which has an undeniable right to not have its rivers fouled by a neighbor. Not too surprising, the House vote went mostly along party lines with Republicans in overwhelming approval. But the Democratic-controlled Senate is highly unlikely to go along, and the Obama administration has signaled its intent to veto any such legislation that reaches the White House.

**Republicans accuse the EPA of being overfunding – they are closing in on plans to cut it back**

Rufer 7/12/11 ("No More Sympathy for the EPA" Amelia is a writer for U.S. election newshttp://uselectionnews.org/no-more-sympathy-for-the-epa/854459/)

While congressional Republicans introduced new spending cuts from environmental agencies in a debt talk Wednesday, they refused to allow an increase of federal aid to the National Science Foundation, one of Obama’s biggest investors. GOP lawmakers proposed a $ 7.15 billion dollar cut from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), a $1.53 billion dollar (18%) cut from the current level of federal funding. Republicans also submitted a plan to cut $315 million dollars (21%) from the Fish and Wildlife Service, alongside an $9.9 billion dollar (8%) cut to the Interior Department, reducing its budget to $720 million dollars less than the previous year’s. A fight between defense and non-defense related spending for a rightful chunk of 2012′s federal budget has left the Pentagon at odds with environmental agencies in particular. According to the House Appropriations Committee, Pentagon funding is said to increase by $17 billion dollars in 2012 while the other agencies are now to receive $45 billion dollars less for the remainder of the fiscal year than what was formerly agreed upon earlier in April. Altogether, EPA and Western land agencies will be allotted a $27.5 billion dollar budget, $2.1 billion dollars less than 2011, and $3.8 billion dollars below Obama’s request. In a statement, Republican committee members held that “The EPA has been funded at unparalleled high levels over the past several years, leading to wasteful and unnecessary spending within the agency, as well as contributing to the agency’s regulatory over-reach, which has a detrimental effect on American businesses and the recovering economy.” “Americans are sick to death of excessive government spending and regulation that is pushing us further and further away from economic recovery,” said House Appropriations Committee Chairman Harold Rogers (R-KY). Remember that Republicans have seen the EPA as a regulatory means to accomplish what the cap-and-trade bill could not after it failed in congress. The Committee on Government Oversight and Reform filed a report in May formally accusing Obama of having such an intent. Republican moves concerning the EPA are thus calculated to remove the authority that enabled the agency to, as Republicans hold, overstep their bounds. Their legislation would prohibit the EPA from 1. assigning greenhouse gas emission to power plants and refineries; 2. further regulation capabilities from categorizing coal ash as hazardous waste; 3. oversight of power plant cooling water intake systems through the Clean Water Act; 4. oversight of the air permits necessary to allow drilling for oil and natural gas on the Outer Continental Shelf.

## CTBT

**Obama push is key to passing CTBT --- prevents others from nuclear testing**

Cornwell 11 (Susan, Journalist, “Obama administration to push for test ban treaty,” Reuters, 5/10/11, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/05/10/us-nuclear-usa-testing-idUSTRE7496M020110510>

The Obama administration said on Tuesday it was preparing a push for approval of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, arguing that Washington no longer needs to conduct nuclear tests but needs to stop other countries from doing so. Undersecretary of State Ellen Tauscher said a legally binding global ban on testing would help pressure states like Iran from engaging in illicit nuclear activities and discourage an arms race in Asia, where rivals India and Pakistan have conducted nuclear explosions. She declined to give a precise time when President Barack Obama would seek the Senate vote on the treaty, which the chamber rejected in 1999 when Bill Clinton was president. There is widespread international support for the test ban treaty, which has been ratified by more than 140 countries, but it cannot come into effect because some nuclear powers like the United States and China have not ratified it. Proponents say U.S. ratification could help get other countries with nuclear programs to sign on. In the coming months, the administration would seek to educate the Senate and public on the treaty's merits, Tauscher said. When the Obama administration does seek a vote, "we intend to win that vote," Tauscher said in remarks to the Arms Control Association in Washington. "Whatever it takes to make that argument, and how long it takes to make that argument, the president is committed to do that," she said. Opponents of the treaty argued in 1999 that a permanent end to testing could erode the reliability of the U.S. nuclear arsenal. Some questioned whether cheaters on a test ban treaty could be detected.

**Obama pushing and key to CTBT**

Kimball, 11. (Daryl is the Executive Director of the Arms Control Association. May 18, 2011, “Obama Administration to Begin Effort to Engage Senate on CTBT,” <http://www.projectforthectbt.org/TauscherCaseforCTBT>, )

In the most detailed and substantive address by a senior Barack Obama administration official to date, Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security Ellen O. Tauscher (to the left) spoke at the Arms Control Association's May 10 annual meeting on "The Case for the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty." She made it clear that the administration would soon engage with Republican and Democratic Senators on the CTBT and provide updated information on the key technical issues that gave some Senators reason for pause during the 1999 debate on the treaty. Tauscher explained in detail why prompt U.S. approval is in the United States national security interests. She said: "... we are in a stronger position to make the case for the CTBT on its merits. To maintain and enhance that momentum, the Obama Administration is preparing to engage the Senate and the public on an education campaign that we expect will lead to ratification of the CTBT." "In our engagement with the Senate, we want to leave aside the politics and explain why the CTBT will enhance our national security. Our case for Treaty ratification consists of three primary arguments: "One, the United States no longer needs to conduct nuclear explosive tests, plain and simple. Two, a CTBT that has entered into force will obligate other states not to test and provide a disincentive for states to conduct such tests. And three, we now have a greater ability to catch those who cheat." Under Secretary Tauscher's prepared remarks are available online. A video and full transcript of the event is available online. Tauscher's address speech builds upon National Security Advisor Tom Donilon's March 29 reiteration of the administration's commitment to ratification and entry into force of the CTBT. He said: "We are committed to working with members of both parties in the Senate to ratify the CTBT, just as we did for New START. We have no illusions that this will be easy. But we intend to ... make our case to the Senate and the American people." "So, When's the Vote?" Reporters at the event asked Tauscher and other speakers, including Sen. Robert Casey, Jr. (D-Pa.): - "In what timeframe do you think the Senate should act on the CTBT?" - "Do you think it should take this vote before the 2012 elections?" - "And what your assessment of how the votes are lining up?" But given that the Senate hasn't engaged on the topic in over a decade and given that the hard work of making the case for the CTBT has really just begun, its just too early for clear answers to such questions. Senator Casey said it well when he said: "In my judgment, we should act before the 2012 elections. I don’t have a high degree of confidence that we will. I think that would obviously be preferable, but I don’t have great confidence that will happen. In terms of the vote count, I’m not paid to do that. There are others who do that as part of their job. So, even if I were – even if I wanted to hazard a guess, it would be – the margin of error would have to be substantial. So it’s hard to – it’s hard to predict. Obviously I don’t think you can – that any of us can overlay the votes on New START on this vote. It’s going to be a different debate in some ways, and frankly a more difficult debate, from my side of the debate. It’s going to be, I think, a longer and more difficult challenge to get the treaty passed. But what’s why I think it’s important to start now, as best we can, to keep the treaty in the news, so to speak, to begin the outreach and engagement and education process." Under Secretary Tauscher said: "We recognize that a Senate debate over ratification will be spirited, vigorous and likely contentious. The debate in 1999 unfortunately was too short and too politicized. "The treaty was brought to the floor without the benefit of extensive committee hearings or significant input from administration officials and outside experts. We will not repeat those mistakes. But we will make a more forceful case when we are certain the facts have been carefully examined and reviewed in a thoughtful process. We are committed to taking a bipartisan and fact-based approach with the Senate." "For my Republican friends who voted against the treaty in 1999 and might feel bound by that vote, I have one message: Don’t be. The times have changed. Stockpile stewardship works. We have made significant advances in our ability to detect nuclear testing. As my good friend and fellow Californian, George Shultz, likes to say – those who opposed the treaty in 1999 can say they were right. But they would be more right to vote for the treaty today." "So we have a lot of work to do to build the political will be need to ratify the CTBT," Tauscher said. The Bottom line: making the case on the CTBT will take time but the process has finally begun. The White House and treaty proponents must now follow through with a serious, sustained effort to highlight the case for the CTBT. For their part, all Senators have a responsibility to take another look at the treaty in light of the new evidence that has accumulated in the decade since the Senate's brief review of the subject in 1999 and not rush to a judgement based on old information or misconceptions.

**Obama is pushing CTBT, but it won’t be ready for a vote until after the election. If he loses, it won’t be ratified.**

Schneidmiller 11 (Chris, "Senate Decision Key to Future of Test Ban Treaty," Global Security Newswire, 7/18/11, <http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw_20110714_9351.php>)

The Obama administration is preparing for a lobbying campaign that could determine the future of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (see GSN, July 15). Administration officials have declared in recent months that they intend to follow through on their long-stated pledge to seek the U.S. Senate’s advice and consent on the accord. Still to be determined are when that will occur and whether the White House can overcome entrenched divisions on Capitol Hill to secure necessary Republican support for ratification. The stakes are significant: U.S. approval could draw other holdout nations into the treaty regime, bringing it that much closer to becoming international law, proponents say. Failure would provide those states with continued reason to dismiss the pact -- though critics say they might do that anyway. Before seeking a vote, the administration intends to carry out a program to educate lawmakers and the public on the value of the treaty, Undersecretary of State for Arms Control and International Security Ellen Tauscher has said on multiple occasions this year (see GSN, May 11). The effort would address issues likely to be debated in the Senate -- the viability of the U.S. nuclear arsenal without testing, whether all CTBT member states have accepted an absolute ban on any trial blasts, and the ability to catch any state that attempts to cheat. “We continue a long, methodical process to lay the groundwork for Senate consideration of the CTBT,” the State Department said last month in a statement toGlobal Security Newswire. “Currently, we are in the process of engaging with members of the Senate and their staff on the importance of the CTBT.” It added: “We are not moving for a Senate vote, don’t expect one anytime soon, and will not push for one until we have done the engagement work needed to secure approval.” Several analysts agreed that the White House would not begin the fight until it felt secure the result would be an improvement on the last time a Democratic president tried to persuade the Senate to approve the treaty. The United States signed the pact in 1996, but three years later the Clinton administration ratification effort ran into a brick wall of skeptical lawmakers. The Senate voted 51-48 against approval. A two-thirds affirmative vote would be required for the United States to become a full participant in the accord. Washington is among 44 capitals that must ratify the test ban before it can enter into force. Thirty-five nations have taken that step, leaving only China, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran, Israel, North Korea, Pakistan and the United States. President Obama might wait to make his push until after publication of a new National Academy of Sciences report on the treaty, said arms control specialist Jeffrey Lewis. The follow-up to a 2002 academy study is expected to assess the effect that ratification would have on the U.S. capability to keep its nuclear weapons in working order without testing and on the capacity to identify atomic detonations in other nations. The new report is undergoing classification review, which could take weeks or years, according to Lewis. A classified National Intelligence Estimate on the matter was sent to Capitol Hill last August, but has not been seen by most lawmakers, said Daryl Kimball, executive director of the Arms Control Association. The document is said to offer an updated, thorough assessment of the ability to detect secret nuclear tests, according to Kimball. Senator Robert Casey (D-Pa.) suggested at the Arms Control Association’s annual meeting in May that the Senate might not take up the treaty until after the 2012 election. "In my judgment, we should act before the 2012 elections. I don't have a high degree of confidence that we will," the lawmaker said, echoing time line estimates from other observers. “I don’t think [the Obama administration is], at least in the near term, serious about putting this to a vote,” said Lewis, director of the East Asia Nonproliferation Program at the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies. “I don’t think there’s a desire to have a vote if they think they’re going to lose, and I don’t think the votes are there yet.” Only 41 lawmakers who considered the treaty in 1999 remain in the Senate, Kimball said in a recent issue brief. Newer senators must be briefed on the matter, while the chamber as a whole must be informed of technical developments since 1999 that would promote entry into force. Politics plays a role in congressional policy debates and nuclear security will be a topic of discussion during the 2012 presidential election campaign, Kimball said. The White House is already taking heat over what Republicans say are inadequate attempts to rein in suspected proliferation activities in nations such as Iran and Syria (see GSN, March 30). Still, the Senate’s ratification last year of the U.S.-Russian New START nuclear arms control pact is cause for optimism about the test ban’s chances on Capitol Hill, Kimball said. Thirteen GOP senators voted in favor of the bilateral agreement. The two years it took Moscow and Washington to negotiate and approve New START “was relatively fast for a treaty,” according to Kimball. He said the administration should take whatever time is needed to see the test ban passed. “I would hope that the issue of the test ban treaty does not become a partisan political football because there is strong Republican support for the test ban treaty out there,” Kimball said. “If the treaty is not seriously considered by the Senate until after 2012, that will be because it took that much time to sort through the issues and to develop enough support to go ahead with the final stages of the ratification effort.” That plan, though, would hinge on Obama’s re-election. **Should he be defeated next year, the pact would almost certainly remain frozen in place in Washington**.
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## Health Care

**Repealing health care reform causes increased deficit spending – CBO score**

Cohn 11(John, American author and journalist who writes mainly on United States public policy and political issues, “CBO Paints Grim Picture of Repeal,” The New Republic, 1/6/11, <http://www.tnr.com/blog/jonathan-cohn/80967/breaking-cbo-confirms-repeal-stuff-you-wont>)

A few days ago I asked whether the Republicans would wait for a Congressional Budget Office score before voting on their proposal to repeal health care reform. To their credit, they have. And the news from the CBO is exactly what you would have thought: Getting rid of the Affordable Care Act will mean higher deficits. The CBO is projecting that repeal would increase the federal deficit by around $230 billion in the next decade and by an even larger amount after that. Wait, there's more. The CBO also estimated how repeal would affect insurance premiums. And, once again, the effect is entirely predictable. Premiums for people buying coverage on their own would fall a bit, but only because people were getting less protective insurance and because many with pre-existing conditions would be locked out of the market altogether. And even though premiums would be lower, many people buying coverage on their own would still end up paying more for their policies, because they would not benefit from the enormous subsidies that the Affordable Care Act makes available. Speaking of people locked out of the insurance market, the CBO ran the numbers on the uninsured. An additional 32 million people would be expected to go without health insurance, bringing the percentage of non-elderly adults without coverage to 17 percent, which is more or less what it is today. So there you have it: According to one of our most reliable and nonpartisan authorities, repealing the Affordable Care Act would mean higher deficits plus insurance that is less comprehensive, less available, and in many cases more expensive.

**An effective health care system is key preventing the spread of disease – stops bioterror**

Green 4 ("Bioterrorism and Health Care Reform : No Preparedness Without Access" Shane K PhD. is Program Leader in Ethics Interim Program and Leader in Commercialization McLaughlin-Rotman Centre for Global Health http://virtualmentor.ama-assn.org/2004/05/pfor2-0405.html)

The temporal correlation between the occurrence of wars or epidemics and attempts at health care reform exists in large part because the health of the public gains importance when its absence threatens a nation's integrity and security. The US learned this valuable lesson during the Revolutionary War, when American colonial forces were weakened early on as nonimmunized soldiers fell victim to smallpox, while British soldiers, who had encountered the disease in England and had thus acquired immunity, were relatively unaffected. Recognizing that protecting national interests in times of war necessitates a healthy fighting force, the US government instituted health care coverage for members of the US Armed Forces and Merchant Marine [1]. But with the US presently engaged in a "war on terror," in which not only soldiers but also civilians are targets, a healthy fighting force is no longer enough to ensure national security; the time has come for this country to take up reforms that promote the health of *all* Americans. Reassuringly, this is not a novel proposal. Reflecting upon statements made in 1944 by American medical historian Henry E. Sigerist, MD, concerning the power of external security threats to stimulate reform, a recent editorial in the American Journal of Public Health suggested that, "[t]his incendiary moment may be just the time for rekindling reform" [2]. Similarly, emergency physician and medical ethicist C. Griffin Trotter, MD, PhD, recently declared: "National security, I submit, is the new banner for health care reform" [3]. Consider the threat of bioterrorism: the potential use of biological weapons against this country raises the specter of a unique kind of war in which battles will be fought not against soldiers and artillery but against epidemics. Without significant reform to ensure access to health care for all Americans, the US will be unable to fight such battles effectively. Why Access? Using infectious diseases as weapons, bioterrorism threatens to weaken the civilian workforce and, hence, a nation's ability to go about its daily business. Moreover, in the case of diseases that are transmissible person to person, each infected individual becomes a human weapon, infecting others, who then infect others, and so on, tying up medical responders and overwhelming medical resources. A nation's greatest defense against bioterrorism, both in preparation for and in response to an attack, is a population in which an introduced biological agent cannot get a foothold, ie, healthy people with easy access to health care. Yet, in spite of spending significantly more *per capita* on health care than any other developed nation, the US is peppered with communities in which many people have little or no access to health care. This may be due to a lack of adequate health insurance—a fact of life for over 43 million demographically diverse Americans—or to cultural barriers that inhibit proper utilization of available services, or to inadequate distribution of health professionals and services. These communities are more vulnerable to infectious diseases [4] and therefore might be considered the nation's Achilles' heal in a bioterrorism attack. Take, for example, vaccination. A lack of access to health care among US citizens, particularly immigrant populations and those living in poverty, is associated with a failure to be vaccinated. This can have a serious impact on the spread of contagion, as evidenced by a rubella outbreak in 1997 in Westchester County, New York, in which a readily containable virus managed to infect a community composed largely of immigrants who had not been immunized [5]. Granted, US federal law permits all persons, including immigrants living here illegally, to receive emergency health care, immunizations and treatment of communicable diseases; those who are unable to pay can receive these services through Medicaid. Studies have shown, however, that immigrants are often disinclined to apply for Medicaid for fear that doing so will compromise their residency status or citizenship applications [6]. Still others avoid the health care system altogether due to mistrust or language barriers [7].

**Plagues from bioweapons could not be stopped – most probable route to extinction**

Ochs 2 ("Biological Weapons Must Be Abolished Immediately" Richard is a Project Management Principal Leader at CSC http://www.freefromterror.net/other\_articles/abolish.html)

Of all the weapons of mass destruction, the genetically engineered biological weapons, many without a known cure or vaccine, are an extreme danger to the continued survival of life on earth. Any perceived military value or deterrence pales in comparison to the great risk these weapons pose just sitting in vials in laboratories. While a "nuclear winter," resulting from a massive exchange of nuclear weapons, could also kill off most of life on earth and severely compromise the health of future generations, they are easier to control. Biological weapons, on the other hand, can get out of control very easily, as the recent anthrax attacks has demonstrated. There is no way to guarantee the security of these doomsday weapons because very tiny amounts can be stolen or accidentally released and then grow or be grown to horrendous proportions. The Black Death of the Middle Ages would be small in comparison to the potential damage bioweapons could cause. Abolition of chemical weapons is less of a priority because, while they can also kill millions of people outright, their persistence in the environment would be less than nuclear or biological agents or more localized. Hence, chemical weapons would have a lesser effect on future generations of innocent people and the natural environment. Like the Holocaust, once a localized chemical extermination is over, it is over. With nuclear and biological weapons, the killing will probably never end. Radioactive elements last tens of thousands of years and will keep causing cancers virtually forever. Potentially worse than that, bio-engineered agents by the hundreds with no known cure could wreck even greater calamity on the human race than could persistent radiation. AIDS and ebola viruses are just a small example of recently emerging plagues with no known cure or vaccine. Can we imagine hundreds of such plagues? **Human extinction is now possible**.

**Repealing health care causes economic shock --- Geithner statement**

Reuters 11 ("Geithner says healthcare repeal bad for U.S. economy," 1/19/11, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/01/19/us-geithner-healthcare-idUSTRE70I50520110119>)

U.S. Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner on Wednesday said repealing healthcare reforms would damage the economy, as the House of Representatives debated the law's repeal. "Repealing the Affordable Care Act would be bad for business and bad for the economy," Geithner said in a blog posting on the Treasury's website. "We are at a crucial stage of the economic recovery. While the private sector has expanded payrolls for 12 straight months, the unemployment rate remains at an unacceptable level," Geithner said. "Given where we are, we must do things that help bolster the recovery, and repealing the Affordable Care Act would be a step in the wrong direction." The House is expected to vote on the repeal late on Wednesday, pressed by many newly elected Republicans who made campaign promises to repeal President Barack Obama's overhaul of the healthcare sector passed last year. While the Republican-controlled chamber is expected pass the bill, it looks certain to die in the Senate, which is still controlled by Democrats. Republicans have characterized the Obama healthcare law as "job-killing," arguing that it saddles businesses with high costs and complicated regulations and encourages firms to shed employees to avoid certain requirements to provide coverage. But Geithner said the act will help reduce health insurance premiums charged to businesses and government by eliminating hidden costs to cover the uninsured. Nearly 95 percent of Americans will be covered under the law. He also said the reforms will slow spiraling growth in healthcare costs, which otherwise would make it increasingly difficult for businesses and government to provide insurance. It will redirect resources from unnecessary healthcare spending toward more economically productive priorities, he said. "It provides businesses and the government certainty that health care costs will be contained in the future," he said, encouraging businesses and families to invest.

**Healthcare is key to economic growth --- repeal massively increases spending over the coming decades**

Geithner 11 (Tim, Secretary of the US Treasury, "Affordable Care Act: Increasing Certainty for American Businesses, Economic Growth," <http://m.whitehouse.gov/blog/2011/01/19/affordable-care-act-increasing-certainty-american-businesses-economic-growth>)

This week the House will vote on a bill to repeal the Affordable Care Act (ACA) of 2010.  Repeal of the Affordable Care Act would deny 32 million uninsured Americans access to health insurance.  Repeal would mean children with pre-existing conditions could once again be denied coverage, young adults would be thrown off their parents’ policies, and the chronically ill who have already enrolled in pre-existing condition insurance plans would have their coverage cancelled.  This would be a major setback for the tens of millions of people affected and would harm economic growth as a result. Repealing the Affordable Care Act would be bad for business and bad for the economy.  We are at a crucial stage of the economic recovery.  While the private sector has expanded payrolls for 12 straight months, the unemployment rate remains at an unacceptable level.  Given where we are, we must do things that help bolster the recovery, and repealing the Affordable Care Act would be a step in the wrong direction.   The ACA helps businesses and the overall economy by eliminating hidden costs that currently contribute to higher health care premiums charged to businesses and the government.  For example, health care costs for the uninsured are currently passed on through higher premiums to those to those who pay for health insurance – an estimated cost of an additional $1,000 per worker with family coverage each year.  Expanding health insurance coverage to nearly 95 percent of Americans will help to bring down premiums by removing this added cost.   In the absence of reform, health care costs are projected to rise at an unsustainable rate, which will make it increasingly difficult for both businesses and the government to provide health insurance.  The ACA includes many provisions that will slow this unsustainable cost growth, including adding to investment in preventive care, linking provider incentives to outcomes, and providing additional tools to control Medicare costs through the Independent Payment Advisory Board.  In addition to benefitting businesses that are facing rising costs of providing health insurance, slowing the growth of health care costs significantly improves fiscal sustainability by saving the federal government more than $100 billion in the first ten years and considerably more in the second ten years. We need to take serious steps, including fully implementing the ACA, to bring down future government spending.  Failure to address our long-term fiscal problems will lead to higher interest rates, lower business investment and slower overall economic growth.   The Affordable Care Act makes small businesses more competitive by making health insurance more accessible and more affordable.  Many have struggled to compete with larger businesses and attract the best workers because of difficulties in providing health insurance.  The Affordable Care Act changes that.  It helps offset health care costs for small businesses through a tax credit that is worth up to 35 percent of health insurance premiums and is available immediately.  And this credit will rise to 50 percent starting in 2014.  The health insurance exchanges created under the law will begin in 2014 and allow small businesses to pool their buying power and benefit from reduced administrative costs.  Small businesses will also benefit from additional protections under the ACA.  For example, the ACA prohibits insurers from inflating premiums when a small business employs a sick worker.    The ACA also ensures that workers will have continuous access to affordable health care, regardless of their employment status or where they work.  This increases the flexibility and dynamism of the labor market, as workers will be able to transition between jobs without worrying about losing their insurance.  A dynamic labor market contributes to U.S. productivity and competitiveness through increased entrepreneurship and better matches between employees and employers.   Finally, the benefits of the ACA go beyond these immediate effects on the economy and businesses.  By reducing wasteful spending and promoting high quality care, the ACA redirects our limited resources away from unnecessary health spending towards more important priorities that will make Americans healthier, will create jobs, and will help generate economic growth.   The Affordable Care Act provides Americans certainty that they will have continuous access to affordable health insurance.  And it provides businesses and the government certainty that health care costs will be contained in the future.  Additional certainty encourages businesses and families to invest, laying the foundation for stronger economic growth.  This is exactly what we need at this crucial stage of the economic recovery.

**Healthcare key to jobs and economic growth**

WSJ ‘9 (Jacob Goldstein, “As U.S. Economy Sheds Millions of Jobs, Health Care Adds Workers,” Wall Street Journal, <http://blogs.wsj.com/health/2009/01/12/as-us-economy-sheds-millions-of-jobs-health-care-adds-workers/>) Andrew Muo

The economy is crumbling and business are cutting jobs in almost every sector across the country. But health care is hiring. As the number of employees on nonfarm payrolls fell by more than two million between Dec. ’07 and Dec. ’08, the health care sector added more than 30,000 jobs. That included more than 14,000 jobs in ambulatory health-care services, nearly 12,000 hospital jobs, 5,000 jobs in home health services and another 5,500 in residential care facilities and nursing homes. See for yourself in Table B-1 in the jobs report the feds put out on Friday. With the aging population and the likelihood of billions of new federal dollars being directed toward health care, it seems pretty safe to expect the growth to continue

## Immigration Reform

**Foreign talent should be encouraged to stay in the US – immigrants facilitate diverse economy and fuel the job market**

Locke and Gutierrez, 11. (Gary Locke is the US Secretary of Commerce and Carlos Gutierrez was the US Secretary of Commerce under George W. Bush. July 15, 2011, “Building competitiveness through immigration reform,” <http://www.ajc.com/opinion/building-competitiveness-through-immigration-1019415.html>, )

America’s economic future depends on the strength and innovative capacity of our people. We must make the American workforce the strongest in the world. That means educating and training our people. It also means ensuring we continue to bring to our shores those individuals with the skills, innovative capacity and entrepreneurial energy to create the jobs of the future. America in the 21st century needs a 21st-century immigration policy that meets our national security needs, but also our diverse economic needs. It’s an economic imperative. Today, Democrats and Republicans agree that the immigration system we have is broken, but we need to translate that agreement into action. The jobs of the future are at stake. And it’s clear why. Immigrants have started some of our nation’s most successful businesses. According to the National Venture Capital Association, immigrants have started 25 percent of U.S. public companies that were venture-backed — including Google, eBay, Yahoo, Sun Microsystems and Intel. Further, immigrant-founded, venture-backed public companies employ 220,000 people in the United States. Meanwhile, immigrant inventors or co-inventors have contributed to more than a quarter of U.S. global patent applications. The right kind of immigration policy means more jobs for Americans at home and greater competitiveness for American companies abroad. Unfortunately, that’s not the policy we now have. But we know what it would look like. For one thing, it would ease the path for the best and brightest foreign students to use their skills to start a business or new industry in the United States. Each year, we provide approximately 400,000 visas to students from around the world to come here to study at our top universities. According to the National Science Foundation, these students receive between 45 and 60 percent of all engineering, mathematics, computer science, physics and economic doctorates awarded in the United States. But once our colleges and universities educate these bright, young minds, our immigration laws essentially tell them to take a hike. As President Barack Obama and President George W. Bush have both said, this makes no sense. That’s why both have supported changes as a part of efforts to pass comprehensive immigration reform. We need to encourage top foreign talent in priority fields to stay in the U.S. after their post-graduate study at American universities.

**Immigration reform encourages talent to remain in the US – solves the economy and improves America’s image**

Herman and Smith, 10. (Richard Herman is an attorney and author specializing in immigration. Robert L. Smith is a veteran journalist who covers international cultures and immigration issues for the Cleveland Plain Dealer. May 5, 2010, “A winning path to immigration reform; Let's welcome the job creators,” <http://www.lexisnexis.com.turing.library.northwestern.edu/hottopics/lnacademic/>, )

With Arizona embroiled in debate over tough new immigration laws and white-hot radio debate practically calling for snipers at the border, President Obama says it's time to take another crack at comprehensive immigration reform. His call to renew the immigration debate no doubt leaves many Americans thinking, "Here we go again," exhausted as we all are from the national brawl over health care reform. Goodbye, public option, hello amnesty? But there lies a path to immigration reform that could transform an outdated system and also win the speedy approval of most Americans. Already floating around the Senate in various immigration proposals is a dash of high-skill immigration reform. More specifically, the plan would offer fast-track visas to immigrants with rare talent and ingenuity. It would, in other words, extend a wider welcome to men and women most likely to enhance America's competitiveness and create jobs. Now that's an idea a skeptical public might not bother to oppose. There are other far-reaching and surely controversial proposals in various bills, according to what the senators have divulged so far. Tamper-proof national ID cards. A mea culpa from immigrants who entered illegally. Harsher sanctions for employers who willingly hire them. But the high-skill stuff is the game-changer. So powerful and sensible is high-skill immigration, it might as well inspire its own reform bill. Senators might keep that in mind if comprehensive change proves impossible in a poisonous political climate. To welcome high-skill immigrants is to promote a lucrative and little-known phenomenon. While the country was preoccupied with illegal immigrants, legal immigrants were building the new economy. Many of the founders of Google, Intel, Yahoo, Sun Microsystems, AST Research, eBay and YouTube are immigrants. New Americans are behind more than half of the high-tech companies in Silicon Valley and about a quarter of the biotech companies in New England. In a global economy fueled by technology and innovation, high-skill immigrants have become America's competitive edge. Always a self-selected group of strivers, today's immigrants often hail from nations that stress math and science education. Drop them into a smart economy in a free-market democracy, and marvels happen. Today's immigrants are more likely than native-born Americans to earn an advanced degree, invent something and be awarded a U.S. patent. According to research by the Kauffman Foundation, they are almost twice as likely to start their own business. Despite the anti-illegal-immigrant attitudes of recent years and recent weeks, America remains the greatest nation on Earth, and the world's best and brightest still want to come here. The problem is, often they cannot get in. Every day, we bar and eject world-class talent - legal, high-skilled immigrants - because we have not decided what to do about illegal immigrants. Harvard researcher Vivek Wadhwa warns of a reverse brain drain under way. For probably the first time in U.S. history, he argues, skilled immigrants are leaving America in large numbers - partly because of the prospect of jobs elsewhere in a rapidly developing world and partly because of frustration with the U.S. immigration process, which often makes them wait years for an immigrant visa. New Senate proposals offer an immigrant visa to any international student who graduates from a U.S. university with a master's or a doctoral degree in one of the critical fields of science, technology, engineering or mathematics. "It makes no sense to educate the world's future inventors and engineers and then force them to leave when they are able to contribute to our economy," backers have argued. As the editors of Inside Higher Ed have noted, that simple step would likely boost efforts by American universities to recruit the planet's top scientists and graduate students. It also could calm the fringe crowd and enlighten the discussion. "Solving illegal immigration is more often than not phrased as a choice between amnesty and mass deportation," wrote Jena McNeill, a homeland security analyst at the Heritage Foundation, in the foundation news blog the Foundry. "Most Americans want a solution that does neither," she added. "They want an immigration system that enforces the law, helps the economy, betters America's image, and brings new immigrants into the United States, much like their ancestors did not so long ago." Stressing high-skill immigration reform is a winning formula, moving the debate away from fear and prejudice and toward jobs and opportunity. More important, they remind us what immigrants bring to America and why their talents may be needed now more than ever.

**Immigration reform brings entrepreneurs that lower unemployment and jumpstart the economy**

**Clifford 7-19** (Catherine Clifford, Writer for CNN Money, 7-19-11, “Need Jobs? Bring in the foreign entrepreneurs!,” http://money.cnn.com/2011/07/19/smallbusiness/visas\_for\_entrepreneurs/)

Giving more foreign entrepreneurs visas could help lower unemployment and jumpstart the economy, a nonpartisan research organization said. The politically charged recommendation comes out of the Startup Act, a sweeping proposal released by the Kauffman Foundation Tuesday. The Act proposes giving foreign entrepreneurs more access to visas and extending green cards to foreign students that graduate from U.S. universities with STEM degrees (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics). "The startup engine is sputtering," said Robert Litan, vice president of research and policy at the Kauffman Foundation and one of the authors of The Startup Act. The number of startups that employ people has been declining as has the number of jobs that new firms are generating, he said. Opponents to immigration reform argue that letting foreigners into the country would mean fewer jobs for Americans. But proponents counter that the United States needs foreign entrepreneurs who start companies and create jobs. Immigrant entrepreneurs founded 25.3% of engineering and technology companies between 1995 and 2005, according to research by the Duke University Master of Engineering Management program. And over half -- 52.4% -- of Silicon Valley startups had at least one immigrant key founder. The idea of extending visas is not new. In March, bills from the House and the Senate proposed that immigrant entrepreneurs should have easier access to visas. The bills, however, haven't gone anywhere yet. But the high unemployment rate could breathe new life into the issue -- even as the nation's immigration policy meets with stiff opposition. "I am a little bit more optimistic about entrepreneur visas than I may have been two or three months ago," said Litan. "If the unemployment numbers stay high, there will be growing interest in this kind of reform as a way to bring the unemployment rate down." Others agree. "This is exactly the type of legislation that would strengthen the economy and create jobs in the long run," said Darrell West, vice president of governance studies at the Brookings Institution. "So it is crazy that we don't move ahead." "Fight like hell": Sen. John Kerry, a Democrat from Massachusetts, Sen. Richard Luger, a Republican from Indiana, and Sen. Mark Udall, a Democrat from Colorado, introduced the Startup Visa Act of 2011 in March. At the same time, Congresswoman Carolyn Maloney, a Democrat from New York, released a matching bill in the House of Representatives. The bills call for a new temporary visa, known as the StartUp Visa, or the EB-6, which is more accessible to entrepreneurs. The requirements for the current Visa -- the EB-5 -- are high: Entrepreneurs must invest $1 million in a U.S. business that creates at least 10 jobs. Many of those visas go unused each year. Less than half of the 9,940 EB-5 visas allowed yearly are allocated, according to the Kauffman Foundation. Not passing this bill could mean America "losing out on these competitive, job creating businesses," said Senator John Kerry in an email. "And I for one am going to fight like hell to make sure that doesn't happen." One reason the legislation has gotten stuck is because of opposition to immigration reform. Immigration reform advocates are also at fault. They refuse to support it unless it is part of a more comprehensive immigration package. "Visas for entrepreneurs would pass both houses were it not for the highly polarized political environment and the interest of some individuals holding the popular elements hostage to the less popular ones," said West of the Brookings Institution and author of *Brain Gain: Rethinking U.S. Immigration Policy*. The proposed legislation in the House and Senate softens the restrictions, but still maintains the cap on the number of visas. The Kauffman Foundation's proposal suggests a higher limit or no limit at all. "Look, if anyone can meet that criteria, why kick 'em out? Why have a limit? Let's bring 'em in," said Litan. "There is no downside to it. None. Zero."

## EPA

**EPA regulates dangerous greenhouse gases - key to solve global warming**

Broder 9 (John M., journalist for the New York Times, “E.P.A. Clears Way for Greenhouse Gas Rules,” The New York Times, 4/17/09, <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/04/18/science/earth/18endanger.html>)

WASHINGTON — The Environmental Protection Agency on Friday formally declared carbon dioxide and five other heat-trapping gases to be pollutants that endanger public health and welfare, setting in motion a process that will lead to the regulation of the gases for the first time in the United States. The E.P.A. said the science supporting the proposed endangerment finding was “compelling and overwhelming.” The ruling initiates a 60-day comment period before any proposals for regulations governing emissions of heat-trapping gases are published. Although the finding had been expected, supporters and critics said its issuance was a significant moment in the debate on global warming. Many Republicans in Congress and industry spokesmen warned that regulation of carbon dioxide emissions would raise energy costs and kill jobs; Democrats and environmental advocates said the decision was long overdue and would bring long-term social and economic benefits. The E.P.A. administrator, Lisa P. Jackson, said: “This finding confirms that greenhouse gas pollution is a serious problem now and for future generations. Fortunately, it follows President Obama’s call for a low-carbon economy and strong leadership in Congress on clean energy and climate legislation.” The United States has come under fierce international criticism for trailing other industrialized nations in regulating emissions of carbon dioxide and other pollutants tied to global warming. With this move and steps by Congress toward a cap-and-trade system to curb heat-trapping gases, the American government can now point to progress as nations begin to write a new international treaty on climate change. The European Union already has a system of trading permits for industrial emissions of heat-trapping gases in which polluters can meet limits either by reducing emissions or buying credits from more efficient producers. Europe also has a system for regulating emissions of heat-trapping gases from vehicles. Japan and several other nations have programs limiting tailpipe pollution that are more stringent than the limits expected to be proposed by the E.P.A. The E.P.A. announcement did not contain specific targets for reductions of heat-trapping gases or new requirements for energy efficiency in vehicles, power plants or industry. Those will come after a period of comment and rule-making or in any legislation that emerges from Congress. Senator Christopher S. Bond, Republican of Missouri, said the agency’s regulation of heat-trapping gases would be expensive and cumbersome. “The Obama administration’s actions today,” Mr. Bond said, “will do more to endanger families, farmers and workers with new energy taxes and lost jobs than it does to protect the environment.” As the E.P.A. begins the process of regulating the climate-altering substances under the Clean Air Act, Congress is writing wide-ranging energy and climate legislation that would alter, combine with or override the actions taken by the agency. Mr. Obama and Ms. Jackson have said they much prefer that Congress address global warming rather than have the E.P.A. tackle it through administrative action that could be subject to lawsuits. When the agency announced its finding, Mr. Obama was en route from Mexico City to Trinidad and Tobago for a meeting of Western Hemisphere nations. The agency made its decision public in a news release and an 133-page explanation of the scientific and legal basis of its proposed finding. In 2007, the Supreme Court, in Massachusetts v. E.P.A., ordered the agency to determine whether heat-trapping gases harmed the environment and public health. The case was brought by states and environmental groups to force the E.P.A. to use the Clean Air Act to regulate heat-trapping gases in vehicle emissions. Agency scientists were virtually unanimous in determining that those gases caused such harm, but top Bush administration officials suppressed their work and took no action. In his first days in office, Mr. Obama promised to review the case and act quickly if the findings were justified. The announcement Friday was the fruit of that review. According to the E.P.A. announcement, the finding was based on rigorous scientific analysis of six gases — carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons and sulfur hexafluoride — that have been widely studied by scientists. The agency said its studies showed that concentrations of the gases were at unprecedented levels as a result of human activity and that it was highly likely that those elevated levels were responsible for an increase in average temperatures and other climate changes. Among the ill effects of rising atmospheric concentrations of the gases, the agency found, were increased drought, more heavy downpours and flooding, more frequent and intense heat waves and wildfires, a steeper rise in sea levels and harm to water resources, agriculture, wildlife and ecosystems. Environmental advocates applauded the decision, which they had sought for years. Auto companies, utilities and others tied to polluting emissions had long dreaded this day but generally reacted with caution because the regulatory process had just begun and they hoped to address their concerns in the legislation before Congress. The Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers said its members were developing cars and trucks to meet the expected tougher emissions standards.

**Ocean acidification is the biggest threat to marine environment – EPA is key to stop it**

Center for Biological Diversity 10 (“EPA Affirms Threat of Ocean Acidification”, Recommends Coastal States Take Action," 11/17/10, <http://www.enn.com/press_releases/3562/>)

SAN FRANCISCO - November 16 - Responding to a lawsuit by the Center for Biological Diversity, the Environmental Protection Agency is recommending that coastal states begin addressing ocean acidification under the Clean Water Act. The announcement arose from the settlement of a lawsuit filed by the Center in Washington state, the first of its kind challenging the EPA's failure to address ocean acidification under the Clean Water Act. "This marks an important step toward protecting life in our oceans," said Miyoko Sakashita, oceans director at the Center. "The Clean Water Act has successfully reduced water pollution for decades, and now it can be brought to bear on ocean acidification, a huge and growing threat to marine life around the globe." As oceans absorb carbon dioxide pollution from the atmosphere, waters are becoming more and more acidic. The water is increasingly corrosive to shellfish and corals and impairs the ability of marine animals to build the protective shells they need to survive. Nearly every marine animal studied to date has experienced adverse effects due to acidification. Under stress from ocean acidification, some corals are already growing more slowly and will begin to erode faster than they can build within decades. Acidification has contributed to oysters failing to reproduce for the past six years in the Pacific Northwest. "Ocean acidification is one of the biggest threats to our marine environment," said Sakashita. "Oyster hatcheries are already failing, and fishermen fear the collapse of the ocean food web. CO2 is changing ocean chemistry so rapidly that the corals, plankton, fish and shellfish are at risk. We need prompt action to curb CO2 pollution, and the Clean Water Act can help." According to the EPA, states should identify waters impaired by ocean acidification under the Clean Water Act. Also, the EPA is urging states to gather data on ocean acidification, develop methods for identifying waters affected by ocean acidification, and create criteria for measuring the impact of acidification on marine ecosystems. Scientists have confirmed widespread ocean acidification due to CO2 pollution. A survey off the West Coast showed that waters affected by ocean acidification are already upwelling onto the continental shelf and exposing marine life in surface waters to corrosive conditions. The Arctic also faces imminent consequences, and areas of the Arctic are expected to become corrosive by 2016. The EPA plans to publish guidance for the states on addressing ocean acidification under the Clean Water Act. Meanwhile, it is encouraging states to focus their efforts on waters that are most vulnerable to ocean acidification, including those with coral reefs, fisheries and shellfish resources. The Center for Biological Diversity has petitioned all coastal states to identify their waters as impaired by ocean acidification. The Washington state lawsuit arose from one of those petitions.

**Ocean acidification leads to extinction**

Veron 8 (J.E.N., former chief scientist of the Australian Institute of Marine Science and the author of numerous books, including the three-volume Corals of the World, “Mass extinctions and ocean acidification: biological constraints on geological dilemmas,” Coral Reefs, 5/6/08, ehttp://www.springerlink.com/content/085g2151l3nlt871/fulltext.pdf)

If acidification was in fact a major cause of mass extinctions and reef gaps as the above discussion suggests, prospects for the future are frightening, not because of any immediate impact on corals, but because of commitment. Commitment embodies the concept of unstoppable inevitability, according to which the nature and health of future environments will be determined, not by our actions at some future date but by what is happening now. The oceans, including the ocean depths, respond slowly to atmospheric conditions, whether a temperature increase or a CO2 build-up, which means that the full effects of acidification will take decades to centuries to develop. Nevertheless, this is only a delay: the factors causing acidification will have irretrievably committed the Earth to the process long before its effects become anywhere near as obvious as those of mass bleaching today. About half of all CO2 from anthropogenic sources still remains in the atmosphere. Of the remainder, most has been taken up by the ocean (Raven et al. 2005), a process that has now used up about one-third of the total storage capacity of the ocean surface (Sabine et al. 2004). The rest has been taken up by terrestrial life (Feely et al. 2004). It is clear that, without uptake of anthropogenic CO2 by the oceans, atmospheric levels would be about 55 ppm higher than at present (IPCC 2007). The pre-industrial levels of carbonate ions in seawater were about 85% HCO3 – and 15% CO3 2–; doubling atmospheric CO2 will alter this ratio to about 90% HCO3 – and 10% CO3 2–. On time scales of decades to centuries, if dissolved ocean surface CO2 continues to increase in proportion to atmospheric CO2, a doubling of the latter from pre-industrial levels will result in a 30% decrease in carbonate ion concentration and a 60% increase in hydrogen ion concentration in surface waters. These changes will increasingly diminish the ocean’s capacity to absorb CO2 from the atmosphere—the proportional net rate of ocean extraction from the atmosphere declining in a self-reinforcing cycle, even though the physical rate of exchange of CO2 between atmosphere and ocean will remain approximately constant. If CO2 levels are allowed to increase to 650–700 ppm, as is projected to occur later this century, a return to twice the pre-industrial level of 560 ppm will take disproportionately longer (hundreds of years) owing to this slowing of the rate of uptake by the oceans. It is generally unappreciated just how long it will take to bring CO2 concentrations back down to normal levels (Raven et al. 2005). If we continue to produce CO2 at the present rate, we can expect the atmosphere to retain significant effects from it for between 30,000 and 35,000 years, which, when modelled, means that 17–33% of the excess CO2 currently in the atmosphere will still be there a thousand years from now. The acidification effect caused by increasing atmospheric CO2 will initially be buffered by bicarbonate– carbonate ion exchange, but once the buffers are overwhelmed (depending on as yet unpredicted depth effects) it will change relatively abruptly. Unlike enhanced greenhouse temperature increase, the acidification effect of CO2 will not bounce back to a benign level if atmospheric CO2 returns to normal; the oceans will remain acidified until they are neutralised by the dissolving of marine carbonate rocks and the weathering of rocks on land, a hugely protracted process. When CO2 levels increase to 560 ppm, the Southern Ocean surface waters will be undersaturated with respect to aragonite, and the pH will be reduced by about 0.24 units— from almost 8.2 today to a little more than 7.9. At the present rate of acidification, all reef waters will have a Xaragonite of 3.5 or less by the middle of this century (Guinotte et al. 2003). Should CO2 levels reach 800 ppm later this century, the decrease will be 0.4 units (Riebesell et al. 2000; Caldeira and Wickett 2003) and dissolved carbonate ion concentration will have decreased by almost 60%. At that point all the reefs of the world will be eroding relicts. The levels of CO2 and pH predicted by the end of this century may not have occurred since the Middle Eocene, but the all-important rate of change we are currently experiencing has no known precedent. There can be no evolutionary solution for such a rate of change. Ultimately—and here we are looking at centuries rather than millennia—the ocean pH will drop to a point at which a host of other chemical changes, including anoxia, would be expected. If this happens, the state of the oceans at the end of K/T, or something like it, will become a reality and the Earth will enter the sixth mass extinction. Another 1–3 decades like our last will see the Earth committed to a trajectory from which there will be no escape.

**Ocean life is key to sustaining all life on earth**

Nichols 6 (Dr. Wallace J., Research Associate at the California Academy of Sciences, “The ocean is a key component of life on Earth,” Buffalo News, 6/8/06, <http://findarticles.com/p/news-articles/buffalo-news/mi_8030/is_20060608/ocean-key-component-life-earth/ai_n42923088/>)

Breathing. Eating. You may not think of the ocean when you do these things. Thank a mostly blue planet that you can. From the Iraqi desert to San Francisco Bay, our air, food and climate are the gifts of an oceanic life-support system reaching across every man- made political boundary. Ecological thinkers understand that the engine of our global economy runs on salt water. Plankton in the Mediterranean may have provided the oxygen now in our lungs. Ocean currents like the Gulf Stream control our weather and dictate shipping routes, and the ocean is the ultimate heat sink -- a buffer against rapid global warming. Home to 80 percent of the world's creatures, the ocean knows no divisions. Consider that a single molecule of sea-water circulates around the entire world ocean in seven years. Sea turtles, whales, tuna and sharks weave together the ocean world with their thousand- mile migrations. A sea turtle born in Mexico may graze on a coral reef in Hawaii or pluck jellyfish from Indonesian seas.

**Global warming causes extinction, empirics prove**

Britt 5 (Roy is a writer for livescience, “Global Warming Likely Cause of Worst Mass Extinction Ever”, http://www.livescience.com/3807-global-warming-worst-mass-extinction.html 19 jan 2005)

Despite some controversial evidence that an asteroid or comet caused the worst mass extinction in history, most researchers now believe a combination of volcanic activity and a warming climate was the cause. New research announced today further supports this majority view. The Great Dying, as it is called, occurred 250 million years ago, at the end of the Permian Era. More than 90 percent of all species were wiped out. That much is well documented in the fossil record. In previous work, scientists led by Luann Becker of the University of California, Santa Barbara claimed evidence for impacts by space rocks in layers of Earth dated to the end-Permian event. Several experts on asteroid impacts have doubted those results, however. The new study, reported Thursday in the online version of the journal Science, found no evidence for impacts. It indicates the culprit was probably atmospheric warming linked to greenhouse gases from erupting volcanoes. "Animals and plants both on land and in the sea were dying at the same time, and apparently from the same causes - too much heat and too little oxygen," said University of Washington paleontologist Peter Ward, lead author of the latest paper. It is the second study in less than two months to reach a similar conclusion. Ward and his colleagues examined Permian-Triassic vertebrate fossils, including 126 skulls from reptiles and amphibians. They found evidence for a gradual extinction over about 10 million years leading up to the boundary between the Permian and Triassic periods, then a sharp increase in extinction rate at the boundary that then lasted another 5 million years. That's not what you'd expect from a catastrophic asteroid impact, which theorists say could obliterate a lot of life instantly and set up a global winter that would kill off other species in mere months or years. A search for material expected to be left by an asteroid or comet impact in the same layers of Earth turned up nothing. If there was an impact, it was a relatively minor contributor to the extinction, Ward's team contends. The work provides a glimpse of what can happen when the climate heats up over long periods, Ward said. The evidence for a warming planet back then is pretty solid based on studies of continuous volcanic eruptions in an area known as the Siberian Traps. As the planet warmed, large amounts of frozen methane gas under the ocean might have been released to trigger runaway greenhouse warming, Ward said. "It appears that atmospheric oxygen levels were dropping at this point also," he said. "If that's true, then high and intermediate elevations would have become uninhabitable. More than half the world would have been unlivable." Atmospheric oxygen, now at about 21 percent of the content of air at sea level, dropped to around 16 percent during the Great Dying, evidence suggests. The effect would be like trying to breathe atop a 14,000-foot mountain. "It got hotter and hotter until it reached a critical point and everything died," Ward said. "It was a double-whammy of warmer temperatures and low oxygen, and most life couldn't deal with it." A study out of the University of Vienna, announced in December, also found no evidence for a large space rock collision near the time of the Great Dying.

## CTBT

**Ratification of CTBT is key to revitalize the NPT and stop global proliferation and nuclear terrorism**

Joseph 9 (Jofi, senior Democratic foreign policy staffer in the United States Senate, “Renew the Drive for CTBT Ratification,” The Washington Quarterly, April 2009, <http://www.twq.com/09april/index.cfm?id=338>) [Iulianon]

As the historic first 100 days of President Barack Obama’s administration fly by, he faces a tsunami of advice on the key priorities he should pursue over the next four years. Ranging from energy independence and national health care reform to improving America’s image with the Islamic world and revamping our foreign assistance structure, the president must decide where to focus his scarce time, resources, and political capital. One initiative he should strongly consider this year is calling upon the U.S. Senate to once again take up the ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) to outlaw nuclear testing around the world, even though the initiative failed in October 1999 by a 51—48 vote. Obama has assumed office at a time when the nuclear nonproliferation regime is seriously tattered. Iran is making significant progress on an ostensibly civilian uranium enrichment program that can be quickly converted into a weapons program. North Korea has quadrupled the size of its fissile material stockpile since 2002 and joined the nuclear club in 2006 with a nuclear weapons test. The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), the lynchpin of global efforts to halt the spread of nuclear weapons, is under heavy strain. Revitalizing the nonproliferation regime, and reducing the odds that a terrorist group can seize a nuclear weapon for use in a terrorist attack, must be at the top of any president’s to-do list.

**Nuclear testing causes increased volcanic activity and the explosion of the Earth**

Chalko 3 (Dr. Tom J., MSc, PhD, Head of Geophysics Division, Scientific E Research P/L, Mt Best, Australia, “Can a Neutron Bomb accelerate Global Volcanic Activity?” 3/3/03, <http://sci-e-research.com/neutron_bomb.html>)

Consequences of using modern nuclear weapons can be far more serious than previously imagined. These consequences relate to the fact that most of the heat generated in the planetary interior is a result of nuclear decay. Over the last few decades, all superpowers have been developing so-called "neutron bombs". These bombs are designed to emit intensive neutron radiation while creating relatively little local mechanical damage. Military are very keen to use neutron bombs in combat, because lethal neutron radiation can peneterate even the largest and deepest bunkers. However, the military seem to ignore the fact that a neutron radiation is capable to reach significant depths in the planetary interior. In the process of passing through the planet and losing its intensity, a neutron beam stimulates nuclei of radioactive isotopes naturally present inside the planet to disintegrate. This disintegration in turn, generates more neutron and other radiation. The entire process causes increased nuclear heat generation in the planetary interior, far greater than the initial energy of the bomb. It typically takes many days or even weeks for this extra heat to conduct/convect to the surface of the planet and cause increased seismic/volcanic activity. Due to this variable delay, nuclear tests are not currently associated with seismic/volcanic activity, simply because it is believed that there is no theoretical basis for such an association. Perhaps you heard that after every major series of nuclear test there is always a period of increased seismic activity in some part of the world. This observable fact CANNOT be explained by direct energy of the explosion. The mechanism of neutron radiation accelerating decay of radioactive isotopes in the planetary interior, however, is a VERY PLAUSIBLE and realistic explanation. The process of accelerating volcanic activity is nuclear in essence. Accelerated decay of unstable radioactive isotopes already present in the planetary interior provides the necessary energy. The TRUE danger of modern nuclear weaponry is that their neutron radiation is capable to induce global overheating of the planetary interior, global volcanic activity and, in extreme circumstances, may even cause the entire planet to explode.

# Aff Answers

## Link Turns

**Link turn – the American public believes increases spending will stimulate the economy**

Lind 10 (Michael, Policy Director of the Economic Growth Program at the New America Foundation in Washington, D.C, “The American people want more government spending,” Salon Magazine, 7/6/10, http://www.salon.com/news/opinion/feature/2010/07/06/spending\_public\_opinion)

The new conventional wisdom in Washington is that more spending to promote job creation is out of the question, because the public has changed its priorities and is obsessed with the danger of federal deficits. Really? What public? The Paraguayan public? The Moroccan public? The actual views of the American people are at odds with the corporate media’s portrayal of a nation of deficit hawks. According to a June 11-13 USA Today/Gallup Poll, 60 percent of Americans favor "additional government spending to create jobs and stimulate the economy." Only 38 percent of the respondents opposed the proposal, while 2 percent had no opinion. Federal deficits are an obsession with American elites, including many establishment Democrats. But deficit reduction is not the leading priority of the American people. In another USA Today/Gallup Poll, taken March 26-28, the list of issues considered “extremely important” by voters was headed by the economy (57 percent), followed by healthcare (49 percent) and unemployment (46 percent). The federal budget deficit came in fourth, at 45 percent. Note to the Obama administration and Congress: Fewer than half of Americans think that the federal budget deficit is an “extremely important” issue. Back in March, the only group in which a majority listed the federal budget deficit as extremely important comprised independents (52 percent). The deficit was less important for Democrats (37 percent) and Republicans (47 percent). Inasmuch as supply-side economics is a variant of Keynesianism, it is not surprising that conservative Republicans and liberal Democrats alike should be less concerned about deficits than independents, who seem to share the views on this subject of Ross Perot's followers of the 1990s.

**Link turn – space exploration is popular with the public – NASA survey proves**

Carreau 11 (Mark, reporter on U. S. human and robotic space exploration for more than two decades, “Poll Finds Americans Support Human Space Exploration,” Aviation Week, 7/14/11, http://www.aviationweek.com/aw/blogs/space/index.jsp?plckController=Blog&plckScript=blogScript&plckElementId=blogDest&plckBlogPage=BlogViewPost&plckPostId=Blog%3A04ce340e-4b63-4d23-9695-d49ab661f385Post%3A16c96341-25dc-420e-9d7e-0e0596286898

Seventy four percent of adult Americans believe it is at least somewhat important for the United States to have a human space exploration program, and 77 percent of those surveyed have a favorable opinion of NASA, according to a new public opinion survey from Rasmussen Reports. Seventy three percent also believe it’s important for the United States to excel at robotic exploration, according to findings released on July 12. Those who share a favorable view of NASA are up from 64 percent in January 2010, and nearly match the 80 percent from October. The telephone survey of 1,000 adults conducted on July 9-10 found that 50 percent of Americans believe NASA's 30-year-old space shuttle program has been worth the investment. The poll, taken within two days of the launching of shuttle Atlantis on NASA's STS-135 final shuttle program mission, shows little change in support for the shuttle from October. But support for the shuttle is up from the 40 percent revealed by a similar survey in January 2010. When asked about the future, 38 percent of Americans said the federal government should continue to invest in the space program, and 33 percent believed the private sector should finance the endeavor. The results show little change from an October survey.

**Link turn – the public supports space solar power**

Snead, 07(Mike, Aerospaceengineer and consultant, “Space solar power and America's energy future (Part 3)”, 12/23/07, <http://spacefaringamerica.net/2007/12/23/19--space-solar-power-and-americas-energy-future-part-3.aspx>)

How should the U.S. respond to the demands of most other nations that we cut our greenhouse gas emissions by 25-40 percent within 12 years? The stage has been set for the next president to squarely address this issue and to deal with the selected implementation throughout their administration. Add this to the issues of U.S. dependency on imported petroleum, the high cost of petroleum, and the pending world-wide shortage of conventional oil, and it is possible that energy and the environment could move to center stage of the American presidential campaign. Voters may see this as a central "pocket-book" issue with greater personal importance than Iraq and illegal immigration. Bali's impact on the potential for space solar power What is important to advocates of space solar power is that, returning to the list of selection criteria for future energy sources, the public's feelings regarding energy acceptability is moving towards the acceptance of the need for new energy sources. Thus, the public may be open to new information on space solar power as a new and acceptable energy source. Heightened Congressional interest in how the U.S. will respond to the Bali and the likely debates of this issue during the fall will provide an important opportunity to introduce and expand on the discussions of the potential of space solar power for meeting mid- and far-term U.S. and world energy needs.

**Turn – McCain supports CTBT, he’s key to get other GOP on board**

AP, 09. (Desmond Butler is a reporter for the Associated Press who cites the head of the Arms Control Association. July 27, 2009, “Influential Republicans Could Throw Weight Behind CTBT,” <http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw_20090727_1871.php>, )

U.S. Senator John McCain (R-Ariz.) said he no longer opposes the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, potentially putting the Obama administration one vote closer to ratifying the international pledge to cease all nuclear weapons tests, the Associated Press reported (see GSN, June 16). McCain said he would consider voting to approve the ban, which he voted against a decade ago although he said he had lingering doubts. "The devil is in the details," he said. "If we could get it done, if it is acceptable, then it is a step forward on the path to the president's goal and mine of a nuclear-free world." If McCain supported the treaty, Obama would only need six additional Republican votes to be able to pass the ban, which he has made part of his nonproliferation agenda. Because McCain -- the last Republican candidate for the presidency -- is so influential in his party, his vote could attract others, aid Daryl Kimball, head of the Arms Control Association. "John McCain is one of the only Republican senators who is independent-minded enough to break out of the partisan dividing lines on this issue," Kimball said. "He has the gravitas to influence others in the caucus." Another potentially undecided vote is Senator Richard Lugar (R-Ind.), who, despite his outspoken advocacy for nuclear nonproliferation, says he has not decided whether he would support a comprehensive ban on testing. Lugar is currently focused on helping engineer a successor to the 1991 Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty -- a pact designed to further reduce the number of atomic warheads in each country -- before the existing agreement expires at the end of this year (see related GSN story, today). Lugar said he would weigh the merits of the test ban treaty if Congress considered it, but he would prefer for the pact not to arrive on the Senate floor anytime soon because it could complicate arms reduction negotiations with Moscow (Desmond Butler, Associated Press/Yahoo!News, July 24).

**Turn – 75% of the public wants astronauts back in space**

Reuters 7/21/11 ("We still want U.S. to dominate space, poll finds" http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/43846354/ns/technology\_and\_science-space/t/we-still-want-us-dominate-space-poll-finds/

Most Americans still think their country should play a dominant role in space exploration, a new poll showed on Thursday as the 30-year U.S. space shuttle program came to an end. The national survey released by CNN confirmed, however, that enthusiasm about the space race had declined considerably since the early 1960s and the glorious run-up to the Apollo moon landings. The poll was made public hours after Thursday's landing of space shuttle Atlantis, which drew a line under the end of the American shuttle program. This has raised widespread doubts about future U.S. dominance in space. According to the poll, half of all Americans believe the end of the shuttle program was bad for the United States, since it left the superpower with no immediate program to push ahead with human spaceflight. Sixty-four percent of respondents said it was important for the United States to be ahead of Russia and other countries in space exploration. But only 38 percent ranked space leadership as "very important," down from 51 percent in a similar poll conducted in 1961, CNN said. The latest poll was carried out by CNN/ORC International. China, among other countries, is making major investments in space. With the retirement of the American shuttles, the United States will now depend on Russia to ferry its astronauts to the International Space Station. Three-quarters of participants in the telephone poll said they wanted the United States to develop a new spacecraft capable of carrying U.S. astronauts back into space.

**Turn – SETI is popular with the public --- most think extraterrestrial life exists and that it would be extremely important if we found it**

Malik 5 (Tariq, Staff Writer, "Most Americans Believe Alien Life is Possible, Study Shows," Space.com, 5/31/05, <http://www.space.com/1150-americans-alien-life-study-shows.html>)

While most depictions of extraterrestrials are confined to science fiction, nearly two-thirds of Americans believe that some form of alien life exists somewhere in the universe, according to a new survey. The telephone poll, which questioned 1,000 Americans, found that 60 percent of those surveyed believe extraterrestrial life exists on other planets. Of those who believed, most agreed that they would be "excited and hopeful" upon learning of the discovery of extraterrestrial life while 90 percent of them said Earth should reply to any message from another planet, the poll reported. At least two-thirds of those polled who said they did not believe in extraterrestrial life also stated that Earth should respond to an alien signal if the situation arose, the survey reported. Conducted by the Center for Survey and Research Analysis at the University of Connecticut, the telephone poll surveyed 523 women and 477 men above the age of 18 between April 20 and May 2. The survey was commissioned by the National Geographic Channel, which debuted its television special 'Extraterrestrial' on May 30, in association with the Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence (SETI) Institute. "It is quite likely that there is life elsewhere in our galaxy, and there's a real possibility that we will find evidence of intelligent extraterrestrial life by the year 2025," said Seth Shostak, senior astronomer for SETI, who appeared in 'Extraterrestrial.' Shostak, a SPACE.com contributor, said that the public's interest in the possibility of alien life can be seen in instances such as the 1996 announcement by researchers claiming to find evidence of ancient microbes inside a Martian meteorite, which sent shockwaves through media and scientific circles at the time. The find has remained controversial. "But it indicates how important it would be to find life, even dead microbial life," said Shostak of the meteorite debate in a telephone interview. "Because it [would] tell you it is very common." Of those polled who believed in the possibility of extraterrestrial life, 77 percent thought alien life forms could develop on planets very different from Earth. About eight of 10 Americans believe it is likely that intelligent aliens on other planets are more advanced than humans, the poll found. The poll also reported that belief in alien life did not split across political lines, but did vary depending on religious practices. Democrats and Republicans were equally likely to believe in life on other planets, while regular churchgoers were less likely to believe in extraterrestrial life (about 46 percent) than non-churchgoers (about 70 percent), the poll stated. "One never knows what we'll find, but...we'd like to have a very long list of planets that are suspected of having biology," Shostak said, adding that future space observatories like the Terrestrial Planet Finder would be vital. "If you have thousands and thousands of those [planets], then you'll have a very good direction for the SETI experiment."

**Turn – Space tourism is popular with the public**

Collins ‘3 (Dr. Patrick, “Growing Popular Interest in Space Tourism: Challenge and Opportunity for Space Agencies,” <http://www.spacefuture.com/archive/growing_popular_interest_in_space_tourism_challenge_and_opportunity_for_space_agencies.shtml>) Andrew Muo

A major potential benefit for space agencies of devoting resources to aiding the development of commercial space tourism is the self-interested one of being seen to aid the development of space activities which are popular with the general public. This is a far more desirable role than being seen as Cold War relics doing work of little economic value. The huge difference between civil aviation and space was well illustrated by a comment by Alain Bensoussan when president of Cnes: "What we need is a space programme like Airbus" [14]. He was in fact arguing for an increase in Esa's budget, apparently oblivious to the irony that Airbus's success is due to its serving hundreds of millions of the general public as passengers - while Esa officials refuse even to discuss the possibility. Moreover, there is no "European Aviation Agency" acting solely as a "middle-man" between airlines and manufacturers - and Airbus also earns a far better return for European taxpayers than Esa, which is still heavily loss-making, with no end in sight. Currently, staff and media spokespeople from space agencies like to emphasise their educational role, and they encourage school-children to study science and to apply to become astronauts - although the probability of success is barely one per million. The rapidly dwindling interest in the sciences, and particularly in aerospace, among young people in OECD countries, is increasingly recognised as a cause for concern [15], and shows that these efforts are of limited efficacy. By contrast, it is well known that the Apollo project had a unique stimulating effect in encouraging record numbers of young Americans to study engineering and science. Both that one-off event and recent media interest in Dennis Tito's flight and Scaled Composites' sub-orbital activities suggest strongly that growing availability of space tourism activities, and corresponding growth of employment in the nascent space travel service industry, will spark a new boom in young peoples' interest in science, engineering and particularly aerospace [16]. Perhaps the ultimate prize of receiving popular support is for space agencies to be seen to be offering the general public an optimistic vision for the 21st century. The opportunity still exists for space agencies to be seen as the leading edge of humans' future peace and prosperity, but only if they seriously commit themselves to stimulating the rapid commercial supply of the space tourism services which we know the public wish to purchase, and which could contribute importantly to economic growth.

**Turn – Public is inspired by space programs**

Smith '8 (O. Glenn, "Harvest the Sun-From Space," NYT, July 23, 2008, <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/07/23/opinion/23smith.html?pagewanted=print>) Andrew Muo

Over the past 15 years, Americans have invested more than $100 billion, directly and indirectly, on the space station and supporting shuttle flights. With an energy crisis deepening, it’s time to begin to develop a huge return on that investment. (And for those who worry that science would lose out to economics, there’s no reason that work on space solar power couldn’t go hand in hand with work toward a manned mission to Mars, advanced propulsion systems and other priorities of the space station.) In fact, in a time of some skepticism about the utility of our space program, NASA should realize that the American public would be inspired by our astronauts working in space to meet critical energy needs here on Earth.

**Turn – The cancellation of the Constellation and Mars program has increase public support for space exploration.**

National Opinion Research Center ’11 (“Public Support for Space Exploration: 2010 Update,” <http://brainoids.wordpress.com/2011/02/22/public-support-for-space-exploration-2010-update>, 2/22/11) Andrew Muo

If the numbers hold, the change from 2008 to 2010 indicates an increasing “partisanship” around space exploration program support, with increases in the number of respondents who say too little is being spent, as well as increases in the number who say too much is being spent. (The number of “baby bears” in the middle has decreased). This would be consistent with the current highly polarized situation around national space policy and the cancellation of the Constellation moon/Mars program. The net change (+0.7% per year) is essentially no different than for the preceding decade of slow-but-steady gains in support. The focus of the increased antipathy towards the space program can be seen by plotting the “NATSPACY” variant of the GSS survey question, which asks only about spending on “space exploration” (no use of the word program). Whether this is tied to the new space policy, or to the broader economic situation in the country, it is noteworthy that the “too little” respondents increased in 2010, suggesting that space exploration overall, while still a “niche” priority, is not losing mind-share.

**Films, television and media are raising public interest of NEO detection**

Tate 3 ("Near Earth Objects - a treat and an opportunity” Jonathan is a former directing Army officer and director of the Spacegaurd Centre www.iop.org/journals/physed)

In the past decade the hazard posed to the Earth by Near Earth Objects (NEOs) has generated considerable scientiﬁc and public interest. A number of major ﬁlms, television programmes and media reports have brought the issue to public attention. From an educational perspective an investigation into NEOs and the effects of impacts on the Earth forms a topical and dynamic basis for study in a huge range of subjects, not just scientiﬁc. There are clear routes to chemistry, physics, mathematics and biology, but history, psychology, geography, palaeontology and geology are just a selection of other subjects involved. A number of projects have been established, mainly in the USA, to determine the extent of the hazard, and to develop ways of countering it, but the present situation is far from satisfactory. Current detection and follow-up programmes are underfunded and lack international coordination.

## Obama No

**Non-unique – economic struggle and unemployment leaves Florida very unlikely to vote for Obama – if Obama loses Florida he loses the White House**

Crowley 7/7/11 (“Why Obama could lose Florida” Patrick is a political analyst for WPTV NewsChannel and NBC http://www.crowleypoliticalreport.com/2011/07/why-obama-could-lose-florida.html )

Ending with car crashes and a train wreck, the new Republican National Committee ad being shown in Florida more than suggests that the Obama administration has wrecked America. And the ad takes Obama's 2008 campaign promise of "change" and thows it a back at him. You can see the ad on the next page. Here is the text of the voiceover: He promised to change direction - $800 billion in stimulus. Trillions for government health care. Two million jobs gone. Left turn after left turn. America's headed the wrong way fast. Six million foreclosures. Fourteen trillion in debt. $500 billion in higher taxes. And the worst long term unemployment in generations. Don't let Obama drive us to disaster. Change direction. This RNC ad basically asks the same questions that Ronald Reagan asked Jimmy Carter during the 1980 election. One week before voters went to the polls, Reagan closed the deal with voters by asking: "Are you better off than you were four years ago? Is there more or less unemployment...than there was four years ago?" Those questions are usually reduced to the simpler, "are you better off than you were four years ago?' Florida Democratic strategists are worried. Several have told Crowley Political Report that they think 2012 could be very difficult. And for good reason. There has been little sunshine in the Sunshine State since Barack Obama won the White House. Unemployment remains high. Job propects remain gloomy and signs of an economic recovery are few. **If Obama loses Florida in 2012, he loses the White House**. And if Obama goes down in Florida, he is likely to take Democratic U.S. Sen. Bill Nelson with him. Should Nelson lose, the Democrat's tenuous hold on the Senate will be in jeopardy. Floridians could also be forgiven for asking the question - where is Obama? The president has spent far too little time here. His appearances have tended to be quick media opportunities on his way to a fundraiser or two. Since Reagan's victory in 1980, Florida has only voted for a Democratic president twice, Bill Clinton in 1996 and Obama in 2008.

**Non-unique - high oil, rising food costs, and a still weak economy makes it impossible for Obama to be re elected**

Morris 11 (“No Way Obama Wins in 2012” Dick is a former adviser to Sen. Trent Lott (R-Miss.) and President Clinton http://thehill.com/opinion/columnists/dick-morris/149765-no-way-obama-wins-in-2012)

The combination of high oil and gasoline prices, rising food costs, higher health insurance premiums and the likelihood of future inflation has jarred consumer confidence, creating a major crisis for the Obama administration. The collapse has been sudden and dramatic. Then reality dawned. Unemployment remained persistently high, economic growth was largely stagnant and partisan bickering resumed. The confidence level on Feb. 11 dropped to 84.5. Then the bottom fell out. The daily Rasmussen polling reflected a drop day after day until, by March 11, the index had fallen to 73.1, its lowest level since it registered a 69 in July of 2009, in the depths of the recession. The false dawn of January has faded and the hard, cold reality of a likely second recession is setting in. But this recession is accompanied by the likelihood of inflation, a stagflation syndrome that will probably grip America for years. And which will likely take a manmade recession, on the order of 1979-82, to counter it. **Will Obama get reelected? No way**! In the teeth of the economic catastrophe that is shaping up, his chances are doomed. The tsunami in Japan, perhaps the greatest tragedy since 9/11, will further impede any prospect for economic growth. There will be a demand for spending to repair the devastation of the quake. But Japan is tied with China as the world’s second largest economy, generating 12 percent of the global GDP. With Japan neither producing nor buying for the foreseeable future, the drag on the global economy will be profound. Worse, the Fed and the administration are out of tools to help. Interest rates are already at zero. Fiscal stimulus — the deficit — already consumes 40 percent of our total government outlays. The Fed is printing money at a ferocious rate under its qualitative easing (QE-2) program. What is left to do? Only dramatic cuts in the federal deficit, a rollback of regulations that cripple small and community banks, a cancellation of future tax increase plans, a big reduction in federal spending, repeal of ObamaCare, freeing manufacturing from the prospect of carbon taxation and unleashing our domestic energy potential can solve our problems. But Obama is not about to undo his legacy of disaster for the American people. And then there is the longer-term oil and gasoline crisis. Instability in the Middle East is going to mount, not recede. The chances of disruption in Saudi oil supplies and the possibility of an overthrow of the regime (triggered by the best efforts of Iran) will continue to force prices upward. The drag on the economy and the rising consumer discontent in the United States spell further problems for the Obama presidency. As the Rev. Jeremiah Wright said — outrageously and wrongly — about 9/11, “the chickens are coming home to roost.” The policies of this administration — the disastrous overspending, the irresponsible borrowing, the social experimentation — all are magnifying and amplifying the impact of the recession. Relief is not going to come anytime soon. Instead, the true legacy of the Obama years is likely to be stagflation and an entire decade wiped out by his policies, budget and programs. Long after he is gone in 2013, we will still be repairing the damage of his terrible decisions.

**Obama is tied Romney – would lose if elections were held now - polls prove.**

Smith et al 7/22 (smith and friends works for 4press.biz, “US Presidential Elections 2012: warning signs for Obama” http://4press.biz/?s=US+Presidential+Elections+2012%3A+warning+signs+for+Obama&x=0&y=0 july, 22, 2011)

It will not be a smooth sail for Barack Obama in the US Presidential Elections 2012, at least that’s what The Public Policy Polling survey has discovered. Since, July, 2010, for the first time, Obama is not leading Mitt Romney, the front running Presidential candidate for the Republicans. They both are tied at 45%. 46% of the voters approved Obama, whereas 48% of the voters completely disapproved. According to the survey, independent voters are split in a 44-49 ratio. Independent voters are considered to be the deciding factor in the 2012 election and such a stat will definitely not make Obama happy. In 2008 Presidential elections, independents helped Obama to win the election; however, the same voters gave their support to Republicans in the 2010 Congressional election. Political analysts mainly predict a victory for Obama in the 2012 elections due to a number of factors: lack of a prominent presidential candidate for Republicans, the huge finances that Obama will have from his supporters to manage the campaign etc. However, according to the survey, Obama may even lose if elections were held now.

**Obama is losing independent voters – 15% drop in confidence**

Shahid 7/22 ("Obama would lose Presidential election to Republican \_ ANY Republican - if held today : poll" Aliyah is a Daily News Staff Writer http://www.nydailynews.com/news/politics/2010/07/22/2010-07-22\_gopers\_leads\_president\_barack\_obama\_in\_2012\_presidential\_race\_poll\_disapproval\_a.html?r=news&utm\_source=feedburner&utm\_medium=feed&utm\_campaign=Feed%3A+nydnrss%2Fnews+(News)&utm\_content=Netvibes)

Two-plus years before the 2012 election, a Republican candidate — any Republican candidate — has a better chance of being President than current White House occupant Barack Obama does. According to a new Quinnipiac University poll , Americans would rather vote for an unnamed Republican than Obama in 2012 by a 39% to 36% margin. Obama's approval rating is now at an all-time low. According to the poll, 44% of Americans approved of the president, while 48% disapproved. Just two months ago, 48% of voters approved while 43% did not. "It was a year ago, during the summer of 2009 that America's love affair with President Barack Obama began to wane," said Peter A. Brown., assistant director of the Quinnipiac University Polling Institute. And it is the confidence of those critical independent voters he is losing the most. "Today, his support among Democrats remains strong, but the disillusionment among independent voters, who dropped from 52% to 37% approval to 52% to 38% disapproval in the last 12 months, is what leads to his weakness overall when voters start thinking about 2012."

**Independent voters will be the deciding factor – Obama is losing them**

4 Press 7/22 ("US Presidential Election 2012: warning signs for Obama" http://4press.biz/us-presidential-elections-2012-warning-signs-for-obama/4283/)

It will not be a smooth sail for Barack Obama in the US Presidential Elections 2012, at least that’s what The Public Policy Polling survey has discovered. Since, July, 2010, for the first time, Obama is not leading Mitt Romney, the front running Presidential candidate for the Republicans. They both are tied at 45%. 46% of the voters approved Obama, whereas 48% of the voters completely disapproved. According to the survey, independent voters are split in a 44-49 ratio. Independent voters are considered to be the deciding factor in the 2012 election and such a stat will definitely not make Obama happy. In 2008 Presidential elections, independents helped Obama to win the election; however, the same voters gave their support to Republicans in the 2010 Congressional election. Political analysts mainly predict a victory for Obama in the 2012 elections due to a number of factors: lack of a prominent presidential candidate for Republicans, the huge finances that Obama will have from his supporters to manage the campaign etc. However, according to the survey, Obama may even lose if elections were held now.

**Romney takes advantage of Obama’s dropping approval rate leading independents by 9 points and cross party by 5 percent**

Thomma 7/23 ("Failure to reach 'grand bargain' on debt makes 2012 harder for Obama" Steven is a staff writer for McClatchy Newspapers http://www.miamiherald.com/2011/07/23/2328030/failure-to-reach-a-grand-bargain.html

Barack Obama could lose the presidency to Mitt Romney if the election was held today, poll results indicate. The results show the Mr Obama and the front-runner for the 2012 Republican nomination in a dead heat on 45 per cent each - the first time the President has lost his lead over a Republican rival. They come as U.S. politicians scrabble to reach a compromise that will raise the country's debt ceiling to prevent the government defaulting on its debts. 'There's a very good chance Barack Obama would lose if he had to stand for re-election today,' said Dean Debnam, president of Public Policy Polling, which carried out the poll. 'This is his worst poll standing in a long time and he really needs the economy to start turning around.' This month, President Obama's approval rating is 46 per cent, with 48 per cent of voters indicating they disapprove of the job he is doing. And the figures reveal two particularly troubling weaknesses for the President. Independent voters are split against him by a 44/49 margin, and 16 per cent of Democrats are unhappy with his performance while only 10 per cent of Republicans give him good marks. Mr Romney takes advantage of those weaknesses. Among independents, the Republican front-runner leads the Mr Obama by nine points, at 46-37. And he boasts more cross-party support, with 13 per cent of Democrat supporters saying they would vote for him while just 8 per cent of Republicans are behind Mr Obama.

**Republicans use jobless rate and debt ceiling to question Obama – his approval rates continue to drop**

Famodimu 7/21("New Popularity Poll Gives Obama Reason for Doubt" James is a Christian Post Contibutor http://www.christianpost.com/news/new-popularity-poll-might-give-president-cause-for-concern-52641/)

Public Policy Polling survey revealed on Wednesday that President Obama is now tied with Republican Mitt Romney in the group's monthly national poll on the 2012 election race. The survey shows that both candidates received a 45 percent vote in the recent poll. The Gallup Polling organization also reports that Obama's job approval currently stands at 42 percent with 48 percent disapproving of his work. President of Public Policy Polling, Dean Debnam states on their website, “There's a very good chance Barack Obama would lose if he had to stand for re-election today…This is his worst poll standing in a long time and he really needs the economy to start turning around." Obama's approval rating has been in a slow decline as Americans grow weary of the 9.2 percent U.S. jobless rate, as well as the rising unrest between Republicans and Democrats over the U.S. debt ceiling. Republican candidates have used these issues to question whether Obama is capable of strengthening America’s economy.

**Obama is losing independents and majority of undecideds disapprove of his performance**

Boyer 7/21 ("Poll: Weakened Obama would lost vote today"Dave is a White House correspondent for the Washington Times http://www.washingtontimes.com/blog/inside-politics/2011/jul/21/poll-weakened-obama-would-lose-vote-today/)

A Democratic polling firm said President Obama's already weak job-approval numbers are "worse than they appear" and he likely would lose the election if it were held today. For the first time in a year, Mr. Obama does not lead former Massachusetts Gov. Mitt Romney in Public Policy Polling's monthly national poll on the 2012 presidential race. They are tied at 45 percent, and Mr. Obama is losing among independent voters by a margin of 49 percent to 44 percent. Worse for Mr. Obama, PPP said, the "vast majority" of undecideds disapprove of the president's performance. The survey of registered voters was conducted July 15-17. "There's a very good chance Barack Obama would lose if he had to stand for re-election today," said Dean Debnam, president of PPP. "This is his worst poll standing in a long time, and he really needs the economy to start turning around." In an interview this week with a Kansas City, Mo., TV station, Mr. Obama said the election will be more about his record than the platform of the eventual Republican nominee. "Americans understand that we didn't get into this problem overnight," Mr. Obama told KMBC-TV, one of three interviews he gave to regional TV outlets at the White House on Wednesday. "If next November they feel like I've ... been working as hard as I can and have been getting some things done to move us in the right direction, then I'll win. If they don't, then I'll lose."

**Obama has lost Republicans and Independents – even Democrats are frustrated**

Burnett 7/22 ("What's Happened to Obama" Bob is a Berkeley writer and a Silicon Valley exec http://www.huffingtonpost.com/bob-burnett/obama-2012-reelection\_b\_906600.html)

As he heads for the debt-limit showdown with Republicans, President Obama cannot be comforted by the latest Gallup Poll that shows him trailing the generic Republican presidential candidate by five percentage points. Republicans won't vote for him; Obama has lost support among Independents and has alienated many Democrats. What happened? Fortunately for Obama, there is no "generic" Republican presidential candidate; the GOP isn't offering vanilla but instead varieties of tutti-frutti. Head to head the president leads each of the announced candidates including Romney and Bachmann. But that shouldn't cause observers to discount his drooping poll numbers. The president has a problem that may thwart his reelection bid.

## Impact Stuff

**Warming doesn’t exist-Warmists even now are admitting that their models are wrong.**

Business Insider 7/11 (James Delingpole, Columnist for the Spectator, 7/11/11, " So, Climatologists—Whatever Happened To Global Warming? ", http://www.businessinsider.com/what-ever-happened-to-global-warming-2011-7)

Recent Posts Are music festivals better with children? ‘BBC’s biased climate science reporting isn’t biased enough’ claims report The Murdochalypse: bread and circuses One of the many great pleasures for those of us on the "Realist" side of the debate over man-made global warming has been watching the contortions of the "Warmists" as they try to explain away a very inconvenient truth: There has been no statistically significant global warming in more than a decade. Yes, you read that right: "global warming" stopped in around 1998. This, as you can imagine, has proved somewhat of an embarrassment for all those various interest groups—grant-hungry scientists, rent-seeking businesses, publicity-grabbing environmental NGOs—whose livelihood depends on the public's continued belief that a) the world is getting hotter and b) it's all our fault. Among the first to notice the problem was the climatologist and IPCC lead author Kevin Trenberth, who notoriously expressed his concerns in a 2009 "Climategate" email to fellow Warmist Michael Mann: "The fact is that we can't account for the lack of warming at the moment and it is a travesty that we can't." Interesting use of the word "travesty" there. In the old days, a scientist like Trenberth wouldn't much have minded whether the climate was getting warmer or getting colder: His job would merely have been to observe its changes accurately and form his judgements on that basis. But what the Climategate emails clearly showed was that, in the field of "Climate Science" at least, it's common practice to do the exact opposite. First you decide what your temperature data ought to be doing; then you try to cherry-pick your data so that it suits your pet theory. The technical term for this new, "Post-Normal" approach to the scientific method is "torturing the evidence till it screams." So how do the Warmists plan to scare us now that global warming seems not to be quite the clear and present threat it was a decade ago? Well, one recent imaginative solution comes courtesy of the paper reconciling anthropogenic climate change with observed temperature 1998-2008 [PDF] by a team led by Robert Kaufmann at the Department of Geography at Boston University. This ingeniously argues that even though global warming hasn't been happening, it has been happening really. We just can't see it because of the distorting effect of the pollution being pumped into the atmosphere by the Chinese. “Results indicate that net anthropogenic forcing rises slower than previous decades because the cooling effects of sulfur emissions grow in tandem with the warming effects greenhouse gas concentrations. This slow-down, along with declining solar insolation and a change from El Nino to La Nina conditions, enables the model to simulate the lack of warming after 1998,” the paper explains. What the paper is claiming, in other words, is that "Man-Made Global Cooling" is cancelling out the effects of man-made global warming. "Tweaking computer models like this proves nothing. The real test is in the real world data. The temperature hasn't increased for over a decade. For there to be any faith in the underlying scientific assumptions the world has to start warming soon, at an enhanced rate to compensate for it being held back for a decade. Despite what the authors of this paper state after their tinkering with an out-of-date climate computer model, there is as yet no convincing explanation for the global temperature standstill of the past decade." Nor is the (more Warmist) Judith Curry, Professor of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences at the Georgia Institute of Technology, much more convinced: "Their argument is totally unconvincing to me. However, the link between flat/cooling global temperature and increased coal burning in China is certainly an interesting argument from a political perspective. The scientific motivation for this article seems to be that that scientists understand the evolution of global temperature forcing and that the answer is forced variability (not natural internal variability), and this explanation of the recent lack of warming supports a similar argument for the cooling between 1940 and 1970. The political consequence of this article seems to be that the simplest solution to global warming is for the Chinese to burn more coal, which they intend to do anyways." And who can blame them for their skepticism? For years the Warmists have been telling us that they're so sure of their computer models that they know, they just know, that CO2 has a forcing effect on global temperatures and that combined with positive feedbacks this is going to cause catastrophic warming. And now they're saying, without a blush, “Well all right, some of those feedbacks might actually be negative and, er, completely cancel out the terrifying thing we were telling you to worry about.

**Warming is a hoax-particle studies prove.**

American Daily 7/24 (Alan Caruba, 7/24/11, " It's Just a Heat Wave ", http://americandaily.com/index.php/article/4954)

The most surprising thing about the current heat wave affecting much of the United States is that no global warming charlatan is claiming that it is the result of carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions. Since the late 1980s, Americans were assailed with the global warming hoax until, in November 2009, the release of emails between the trolls ginning up false “climate models” were exposed. These days the term “climate change” is used as a substitute for “global warming”, but fewer of us are fooled by this. Al Gore is planning a last-ditch effort in September to revive the hoax, but that will fail. Even those in the mainstream media are too embarrassed to report the absurd notion that CO2, a trace gas in the Earth’s atmosphere (0.0380%) vital to all vegetation on the planet has anything to do with climate cycles. A new cooling cycle that kicked in around 1998 is the predictable result of less solar activity. This is not to say it’s not hot. Heat waves are as common to summer months as blizzards are to winter ones. For those who possess the memory of fungus, there was a heat wave that engulfed the East Coast from July 4 through 9th in 2010. Weather records reflect that heat waves are a natural event, often following or preceding record setting cold waves. While Al Gore and the last holdouts of the global warming hoax continue to tell us that CO2 emissions (the use of fossil fuels for energy to produce electricity, drive anywhere, and manufacture anything) will destroy the world, the world’s most sophisticated particle study laboratory, CERN in Geneva, Switzerland, will soon announce a finding that will blow the CO2 nonsense to bits. Dennis T. Avery of the Hudson Institute, reports CERN has demonstrated “that more cosmic rays do, indeed, create more clouds in the earth’s atmosphere.” Cosmic rays are subatomic particles from outer space. More clouds means that less of the sun’s warmth reaches the Earth’s surface. This completely overturns the torrent of lies that the UN’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has been churning out for decades. The IPCC’s scientists went into full panic mood as a new cooling cycle asserted itself in 1998. As Avery points out, the IPCC scientists had deliberately ignored “the Medieval Warming (950-1200 AD), the Roman Warming (200 BC-600BC) or the big Holocene Warmings centered on 6,000 and 8,000 BC.” There was also a Little Ice Age from 1300 to 1850 to account for as well. While the global warming crowd has been telling everyone that they must stop burning coal, using oil or natural gas, and “reduce our carbon footprint”, a recent volcanic eruption in Iceland, in just four days, negated every government-mandated effort to control or reduce CO2 emissions worldwide for the past five years! When Mt. Pinatubo erupted in 1991, it put so much smoke and other gases in the atmosphere that it cooled the Earth’s temperatures for a few years until they dissipated. Meanwhile, the Environmental Protection Agency is frantically issuing new rules and regulations to reduce the CO2 emissions from utilities and manufacturing facilities before the public realizes that its actual goal is to kill the U.S. economy by increasing the cost of electricity and everything else. It is insanely trying to shut down the mining of coal, while other elements of the Obama regime are trying to stop any drilling for oil. Unable to scare everyone with the global warming hoax, new horrors are being invented, from ocean acidification to the claim that the atmosphere is being overloaded with nitrogen. Relax, there’s four times more nitrogen in the atmosphere than oxygen and it’s no big deal. Americans need to be aware that major environmental organizations such as the Sierra Club and Friends of the Earth are desperate to maintain the fictions required to deprive the U.S. of the energy it needs to function. New York Mayor Michael Bloomberg just gave $50 million to the Sierra Club to support its “Beyond Coal” campaign. Bloomberg actually thinks it’s a good thing the Sierra Club has managed to stop 150 coal-burning plants from being built. Meanwhile, during the current heat wave, providers of electricity are worrying whether they can continue to meet the increased demand for it. Coal provides 50% of all the electricity we use in America. Friends of the Earth are in a panic that Republicans might actually get the U.S. government to cut back on the insane spending that has put the nation on the edge of sovereign default. Lately they’re claiming that Majority Leader, Eric Candor (R-VA) “is threatening to sink the American economy and undermine environmental protections so that his wealthy friends, including big oil corporations, can keep sitting on their cushions.” That’s the same Big Oil that hasn’t been able to build a single new refinery in the U.S. since the 1970s. That’s the same Big Oil that has seen ten oil rigs leave the Gulf of Mexico since the May 2010 Obama “moratorium” for drilling sites in Egypt, Congo, French Guiana, Liberia, Nigeria, and Brazil. They took a lot of jobs and revenue with them, If you wanted to destroy America, all you have to do is make it impossible to access several century’s worth of its own huge reserves of coal and the billions of barrels of oil inland and offshore that would, indeed, make America more energy independent. The next time anyone speaks about “sustainability”, they are talking about turning out the lights and emptying the highways of America. The next time anyone talks about “the environment”, they mean the same thing. So, remember, it’s just a heat wave. It will end just like all the others and, in a few months, we will all be talking about the blizzards.

**Even if warming is real, it is caused by orbital mechanic changes or sun spot activity.**

Mercury 7/22 (7/22/11, " Al Gore keeps pushing the global warming hoax ", http://pottsmerc.com/articles/2011/07/22/opinion/srv0000012653472.txt)

Has a natural and inexorable cycle of climate change brought together a predictable alliance of anarchists, socialists and hucksters? Over the past 2 million years, the geological record reveals that with uncanny regularity and on dozens of occasions, the site occupied by New York City rests beneath a half-mile of glacial ice. We are presently on track to an intuitively warmer midpoint between the last and next glacial advance. Polar Bears, which I have had the privilege of working with, have been around as we know them for an estimated 700,000 years. This period of time included an interglacial meltdown when the Arctic was virtually ice free. The resilient bears adapted. As for the Northwest Passage, it has been navigable with some frequency, including the early years of the last century. While man-made global warming could not have been the causal agent in any of these circumstances, what might have been? Most likely, but not exclusively, changes in orbital mechanics e.g. the tilt of earth's axis and solar variability e.g. sun spot activity, neither of which is within the realm of human intervention. With each passing year, it becomes more apparent that you and I have been duped by an unprecedented scheme in which critical thought and scientific method have been subordinated to political, academic and economic opportunism. When Al Gore offered us "An Inconvenient Truth," a critical thinker might have asked, "What the hell does Al Gore know about climatology?" An English court agreed and found no fewer than nine scientific errors or omissions in his documentary. In Mr. Gore however, the scheme found a high-profile spokesperson not beyond compromise. It was after all this Nobel Laureate who remained an advocate for the tobacco industry long after his sister succumbed to lung cancer. Once planted, the notion of man-made apocalypse drew in the willing like moths to a flame, the most dangerous of which had and continue to have access to our children as educators. When the academic opposition was dispatched with assassin-like efficiency, a critical thinker might have asked, "Why are these people being shut up?"

**Turn – The passage of Obamacare slowed economic recovery to a halt – unemployment is no longer dropping**

Sherk 11 ("Recovery Stalled After Obamacare Passed" James is Heritage’s senior policy analysis http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/07/economic-recovery-stalled-after-obamacare-passed)

Private-sector job creation initially recovered from the recession at a normal rate, leading to predictions last year of a “Recovery Summer.” Since April 2010, however, net private-sector job creation has stalled. Within two months of the passage of Obamacare, the job market stopped improving. This suggests that businesses are not exaggerating when they tell pollsters that the new health care law is holding back hiring. The law significantly raises business costs and creates considerable uncertainty about the future. To encourage hiring, Congress should repeal Obamacare. Initially Solid Job Growth The economy is recovering at an unusually slow pace. Typically, employment grows strongly after a severe recession.[[1]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/07/economic-recovery-stalled-after-obamacare-passed" \l "_edn1) In the year and a half following the last comparable recession (1981–1982), the unemployment rate fell by 3.3 percentage points.[[2]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/07/economic-recovery-stalled-after-obamacare-passed#_edn2) Initially the economy appeared on track for a steady recovery. In August 2009, the White House projected the unemployment rate would fall to 8 percent by the end of 2011 and 7.5 percent by the end of 2012.[[3]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/07/economic-recovery-stalled-after-obamacare-passed#_edn3) This would represent a recovery roughly one-third slower than after the 1981–1982 recession.[[4]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/07/economic-recovery-stalled-after-obamacare-passed#_edn4) Job creation data supported these forecasts. The economy went from losing 841,000 jobs in January 2009—the recession’s low point—to gaining 229,000 jobs in April 2010.[[5]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/07/economic-recovery-stalled-after-obamacare-passed#_edn5) By the spring of 2010, the Administration confidently predicted a “Recovery Summer.”[[6]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/07/economic-recovery-stalled-after-obamacare-passed#_edn6) Obamacare Discourages Hiring In March 2010, Congress passed President Obama’s health care reform legislation. The bill had appeared in serious jeopardy, and after the upset special election victory of Senator Scott Brown (R–MA), many analysts expected the bill to fail. Instead, it became law. The law discourages employers from hiring in several ways: Businesses with fewer than 50 workers have a strong incentive to maintain this size, which allows them to avoid the mandate to provide government-approved health coverage or face a penalty; Businesses with more than 50 workers will see their costs for health coverage rise—they must purchase more expensive government-approved insurance or pay a penalty; and Employers face considerable uncertainty about what constitutes qualifying health coverage and what it will cost. They also do not know what the health care market or their health care costs will look like in four years. This makes planning for the future difficult. Recovery Stalls Post–Obamacare Within two months of Obamacare’s passing, the recovery stalled. Figure 1 shows net private-sector job creation from January 2009 onward. The red line shows the trend in job creation before and after April 2010. Private-sector job creation improved by an average of 67,600 jobs per month before April 2010.[[7]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/07/economic-recovery-stalled-after-obamacare-passed#_edn7) That month, private-sector employers added 229,000 net jobs. In May 2010, the job situation stopped improving. Employers created just 48,000 net jobs, and the trend in job creation changed. Starting in that month, private-sector hiring took a new course, improving by only 6,500 jobs per month—less than one-tenth the previous rate.[[8]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/07/economic-recovery-stalled-after-obamacare-passed" \l "_edn8) This change in course is statistically measurable. Econometric testing shows that a structural break in job growth occurred between April and May 2010. The Heritage Foundation used the Bai–Perron breakpoint test to test for both the likelihood and location of a structural break in job growth. [[9]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/07/economic-recovery-stalled-after-obamacare-passed" \l "_edn9) That test showed that both the level of and the trend in job growth changed between April and May 2010. The Obama Administration also altered its post–Obamacare economic estimates to forecast a significantly slower recovery. The Administration now projects unemployment of 9.1 percent at the end of 2011 and 8.2 percent by the end of 2012.[[10]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/07/economic-recovery-stalled-after-obamacare-passed" \l "_edn10) The widely expected labor market recovery never happened. Businesses Say Obamacare Is Holding Them Back The fact that improvements in the job market ground to a halt after Congress passed Obamacare does not prove that the health care law caused it—correlation cannot prove causation. However, the fact does lend strong weight to the voices of businesses who say that the law is preventing hiring. In a recent survey, 33 percent of business owners said the health care law was either their greatest or second-greatest obstacle to new hiring.[[11]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/07/economic-recovery-stalled-after-obamacare-passed" \l "_edn11) Federal Reserve officials report similar concerns. Dennis Lockhart, President of the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, reports that: In addition to slow and uncertain revenue growth, contacts in this recovery are frequently citing a number of other factors that are impeding hiring. Prominent among these is the lack of clarity about the cost implications of the recent health care legislation. We’ve frequently heard strong comments to the effect of “my company won’t hire a single additional worker until we know what health insurance costs are going to be.”[[12]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/07/economic-recovery-stalled-after-obamacare-passed" \l "_edn12) Data Show Reason for Concern The economy is experiencing an unusually slow recovery. While the labor market improved steadily from January 2009 to April 2010, it suddenly stalled in May. This coincided with the passage of President Obama’s health care overhaul, which significantly raised both the costs and uncertainty involved for businesses providing employer-sponsored health insurance. Many businesses report that this legislation is holding back hiring. The data suggest that these complaints are not idle

## Internal Link Stuff

**No internal link-the GOP has recognized the importance of the EPA.**

**Houston Chronicle** **7/18** (Jennifer Dlouhy, 7/18/11, " Yellowstone spill puts Republicans in tough spot ", http://fuelfix.com/blog/2011/07/18/yellowstone-spill-puts-republicans-in-tough-spot/)

Republicans eager to undo regulatory burdens they say are hindering economic growth have advanced a series of proposals designed to rein in the power of the Environmental Protection Agency and other federal agencies. They have taken aim at the EPA's power to regulate greenhouse gas emissions, pollution from offshore drilling projects in the Arctic and ash from coal-fired power plants. And Republicans in control of the House just advanced a federal spending bill that would place other limits on the EPA and Interior Department's power to regulate. But the July 1 oil spill from an Exxon Mobil pipeline in Montana and a series of other pipeline accidents may be changing that dynamic. House Republicans are feeling new pressure to abandon their strategy, at least when it comes to federal oversight of pipeline safety. At the same time, the Yellowstone River spill also is putting Republicans in a politically tricky position advancing a top priority: legislation that would force the Obama administration to soon decide whether it will approve the proposed Keystone XL pipeline to carry oil sands from Alberta, Canada, to Gulf Coast refineries. Rep. Fred Upton, R-Mich., the head of the House Energy and Commerce Committee — and one of the EPA's leading congressional antagonists — has pledged to swiftly move new safety legislation this year. Under Upton's watch, the panel is developing legislation that would boost civil penalties for pipeline spills and force federal regulators to reassess whether existing standards are good enough. That measure dovetails with a bill advanced by a Senate committee in May that would boost existing civil fines for violating pipeline regulations and would create new penalties for violations that cause medical injuries or damage to the environment. The Senate bill also would authorize more federal safety inspectors.

**Immigration reform not a big issue**

Keeter 9 (Scott is the director of survey’s at the Pew Research center in Washington DC “Where the Public Stands on Immigration Reform” Pewsearch.com)

Immigration has been a low- to mid-tier issue with the U.S. public for the past three years. In January this year, just 41% said that dealing with illegal immigration should be a "top priority" for the new president and Congress to deal with, down 10 points from January 2008 and 14 points from 2007, when Congress was considering legislation on the issue. Even among Republicans, who placed more significance on the issue than did Democrats, illegal immigration was not among their most important priorities. Immigration also was not a key issue in the presidential election, other than for a brief period during the campaign for the Republican Party's nomination. Pew Research polling during fall 2008 found just 49% saying that immigration was a "very important" issue in their vote -- 11th on a list of 13 issues probed. By comparison 91% said the economy was very important, 80% said jobs, 78% said energy and 77% said this for health care. Immigration was a low priority in the election not only for the public as a whole but for **Latinos as well**. Both before and after the election, Latinos surveyed by the Pew Hispanic Center rated immigration as significantly less important than issues such as jobs and education. In December, just 31% said it was an "extremely important" issue for the new president to deal with. One reason for the relatively low profile of the immigration issue may be the very high profile of other issues, most notably the economy and health care reform, not to mention the war in Afghanistan. But the potential power of the issue was in evidence on Sept. 9 when Rep. Joe Wilson shouted "You lie" at President Obama during his address on health care; that shout was in response to the president's statement that: "There are also those who claim that our reform efforts would insure illegal immigrants. This, too, is false." Another reason for the low profile of the immigration issue could be that the flow of immigrants into the U.S. has slowed. According to Pew Hispanic Center analyses, migration from Mexico has dropped substantially over the past three years. At the same time, there is no clear evidence that migration out of the U.S. and into Mexico has risen during this time. And, of course, Mexico is not the only source of immigration into the U.S. So there are still many unauthorized immigrants in the U.S. -- approximately 11.9 million in 2009, according to the Pew Hispanic Center's senior demographer, Jeffrey Passel.

**Obama not key to CTBT --- McCain supports and could get other Republicans on board**

Butler 9 (Desmond, "Influential Republicans Could Throw Weight Behind CTBT," Associated Press, 7/27/09, <http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw_20090727_1871.php>)

U.S. Senator John McCain (R-Ariz.) said he no longer opposes the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, potentially putting the Obama administration one vote closer to ratifying the international pledge to cease all nuclear weapons tests, the Associated Press reported (see GSN, June 16). McCain said he would consider voting to approve the ban, which he voted against a decade ago although he said he had lingering doubts. "The devil is in the details," he said. "If we could get it done, if it is acceptable, then it is a step forward on the path to the president's goal and mine of a nuclear-free world." If McCain supported the treaty, Obama would only need six additional Republican votes to be able to pass the ban, which he has made part of his nonproliferation agenda. Because McCain -- the last Republican candidate for the presidency -- is so influential in his party, his vote could attract others, said Daryl Kimball, head of the Arms Control Association. "John McCain is one of the only Republican senators who is independent-minded enough to break out of the partisan dividing lines on this issue," Kimball said. "He has the gravitas to influence others in the caucus." Another potentially undecided vote is Senator Richard Lugar (R-Ind.), who, despite his outspoken advocacy for nuclear nonproliferation, says he has not decided whether he would support a comprehensive ban on testing. Lugar is currently focused on helping engineer a successor to the 1991 Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty -- a pact designed to further reduce the number of atomic warheads in each country -- before the existing agreement expires at the end of this year (see related GSN story, today). Lugar said he would weigh the merits of the test ban treaty if Congress considered it, but he would prefer for the pact not to arrive on the Senate floor anytime soon because it could complicate arms reduction negotiations with Moscow (Desmond Butler, Associated Press)

**Turn – Republicans supporting CTBT – no more reason to object**

Hanley, 09. (Charles reports for the Associated Press. April 17, 2009, “Schultz Calls on Republicans to Support CTBT Ratification.” http://gsn.nti.org/gsn/nw\_20090420\_9472.php, )

A new generation of nuclear detonation sensors should convince Senate Republicans to endorse the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, former U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz said Friday (see GSN, March 30). (Apr. 20) - Former U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz, shown last year, on Friday encouraged Republican lawmakers to support a worldwide ban on nuclear-weapon test detonations (Sara Johannessen/Getty Images). Republicans voted almost uniformly to block the pact in 1999, citing concerns that a small-scale underground test detonation might not be detected by a worldwide network of seismic sensors and other monitoring equipment, the Associated Press reported. The treaty received 48 supporting votes at that time, falling far short of the two-thirds majority it needed to win approval. The treaty's opponents "don't have to say they changed their mind. They can say there's new evidence that we have, and on the basis of new evidence" they could support the pact, said Shultz, top U.S. diplomat during the Reagan administration. Republicans "might have been right voting against it some years ago, but they would be right voting for it now, based on these new facts," he said. More effective detection technologies have been deployed over the last 10 years, he said, noting that the system detected North Korea's small 2006 nuclear test detonation. In addition, the United States has established a new system since 1999 to certify the reliability and security of its nuclear weapons, according to Shultz, who has joined other U.S. statesmen in advocating eventual global nuclear disarmament (see GSN, April 17). That negates the need for test blasts that would be prohibited by the treaty, he said. "