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1. Uniqueness –

Compromise coming on trade adjustment and trade agreements now

Schneider, Washington Post, 6-15-11

[Howard, 6-15-11, Washington Post, “Deal near on trade agreements, worker aid”, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/business/economy/deal-near-on-trade-agreements-worker-aid/2011/06/15/AGHg3XWH_story.html>, accessed 6-16-11, AFB]

The Obama administration and congressional leaders are nearing consensus on three pending trade agreements and the renewal of support for workers who have been displaced by global trade, ending a standoff that some feared would put U.S. exports at risk, said business, administration and congressional officials close to the discussions.

Free trade agreements with South Korea, Colombia and Panama have become a centerpiece of the Obama administration’s efforts to boost U.S. sales overseas, a foray into trade politics by a president who, as a candidate, expressed skepticism about the benefits of prior free trade pacts. The Korea deal is expected to generate more than $10 billion in additional annual sales for U.S. companies.

But the controversy over the U.S. deficit has stalled the deals, with Republicans opposing renewal of the billion-dollar-a-year Trade Adjustment Assistance program. The Obama administration has said it would not submit the trade pacts unless the assistance program is reauthorized to help workers hurt by outsourcing or increased imports.

After weeks of talks, however, “they are within striking distance of a deal,” U.S. Chamber of Commerce President Thomas J. Donohue said at a news conference Wednesday morning — an assessment shared by administration and congressional officials familiar with the negotiations.

None of those involved would provide details of a possible deal. But support among congressional Democrats and the White House for the trade assistance program has been widespread, and Don­o­hue suggested that Republican opposition to the program was narrower than suspected.

He said that a recent Republican Study Committee letter opposing Trade Adjustment Assistance drew only 11 signatures and that dozens in the class of GOP freshmen had endorsed approval of the free trade pacts.

The Chamber has been lobbying for approval of the three agreements and also supports the assistance program. Donohue said the Chamber is “optimistic” that the trade agreements can be in place by July 1 — when a separate agreement between the European Union and South Korea takes effect, potentially putting U.S. exporters at a disadvantage.

A House subcommittee is expected to begin reviewing the agreements next week. Carole Guthrie, a spokeswoman for the U.S. Trade Representative’s Office, said the administration is “hopeful” that an agreement over the trade adjustment program can be reached “in the near future.”

Congressional approval is by no means guaranteed. All three agreements are holdovers from the Bush administration, whose trade policies President Obama criticized on the campaign trail as damaging to U.S. workers.
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1. Links

1. Price causes Mars support to evaporate – the plan kills capital

Wapniak, AARRIS Architects project manager, 7

(Adam Aaron, project manager @ AARRIS architects, “An Astrosociological Approach to Defining Indigenous Martian Architecture”, Sept 2007, <http://www.astrosociology.com/Library/PDF/Contributions/Space%202007%20Articles/Defining%20Indiginous%20Martian%20Architecture.pdf>) JPG

The 1988 perihelic opposition of Mars occasioned an upturn in public interest as the Red Planet shone unusually brightly in the summer sky. A year later, on the 20th anniversary of the first manned landing on the Moon, President George Bush called for a return of manned missions to the Moon and for manned missions to Mars and directed NASA to report to him in 90 days. It did, and the price tag was half a trillion dollars. Political support for the vision, which had been weak at best, evaporated with the sticker shock. The unfolding savings and loan debacle, which ultimately cost the federal government about the same amount of money, didn’t help. In the cold light of new budgetary reality, even Al Gore, who had been on the Mars bandwagon during his brief campaign for the Democratic presidential nomination in 1988, said to his fellow senators in 1991, “Before discussing a mission to Mars, the Administration needs a mission to reality.” NASA got real a year later with its Mars Design Reference Mission, which incorporated in situ resources utilization concepts to reduce the cost by a factor of ten to about $46-$55 billion. However, the political damage had been done, and the new Clinton Administration had no interest in expending precious political capital on re-fighting a lost battle for Mars.
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2. Obama’s political capital key to agenda – must use it strategically

Harvard Political Review 1-14-11

(“President Obama’s Political Capital: [Rajiv Tarigopula](http://hpronline.org/author/rtarigopula/) 1-14-2011 MLF Harvard Political Review <http://hpronline.org/hprgument/president-obamas-political-capital/>)

Much [hullabaloo](http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-503544_162-20027301-503544.html) has been made in the last two weeks over the state of the 112th Congress and how it can possibly operate without political gridlock. By popular media’s account, a three-way Western-style showdown between Speaker Boehner, Leader Reid, and President Obama is all but imminent.  In the [words](http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2011/0104_congress_galston.aspx) of William A. Galston, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institute,

The polarization of American politics will make a tough job even harder.  The two parties disagree on economic fundamentals, and because each now enjoys a share of real power, nothing will get done unless they manage to agree…Flash-points will occur early and often in 2012…Many analysts are predicting two years of gridlock, and it’s easy to see why.

Indeed, as the 112th Congress kicks off, our President and the Democratic Party he leads is headed down a grim road for passing any major legislation on its short-term and long-term policy agenda.  The pause in harsh rhetoric and fierce contention borne of the tragic, horrifying events of Tucson is unfortunately going to be short-lived, by many [accounts](http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=132911323).  Even as legislators’ [efforts for unification](http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-503544_162-20028499-503544.html) might bring together the parties for symbolic purposes such as the State of the Union address, House and Senate Republicans are largely [seeking](http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Politics/2011/0113/With-new-oversight-powers-House-GOP-aims-to-put-Obama-on-defensive) to exercise their mandate to check the perceived Democratic excesses of the last two years.  The President of Change is going to have to grapple with the [ways of the past](http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0111/47526.html), if the House GOP intends to keep its promise to implement the Pledge to America.  Inherent in all of these impending political firefights is the realization that President Obama’s intelligent utilization of his quickly diminishing political capital is going to play a larger role than ever in our national political process over the next two years, and may very well determine the outcome of the 2012 presidential race.

Every [move](http://www.courierpress.com/news/2010/dec/31/congress-looks-to-avoid-gridlock/) our president takes with respect to advancing his domestic and foreign policy agenda in the halls of the 112th Congress will be heavily scrutinized – even more so than is normally the case – by virtue of the fact that the GOP controls the United States House of Representatives.  Given this new status quo, will Obama pass any major Democratic legislation by the end of his first term?  The chances are zero to none, even with calculated political moves on the part of the Administration such as the [appointment](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/01/06/bill-daley-chief-of-staff_n_805184.html) of experienced outsider Bill Daley as the new White House Chief of Staff.  In fact, it is apparent that many in the Administration implicitly acknowledge the quickly diminishing political capital Mr. Obama has; after all, campaign promises and pledges have been neglected in the name of political capital stinginess.  For instance, as Bernard Aronson of the Washington Post [points out today](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2011/01/13/AR2011011304926.html): Latin American free trade agreement advocacy, which President Obama undertook in last year’s State of the Union address, was quickly forgotten by the legislative pragmatists, those political capital Scrooges working in the White House’s West Wing – all in an ostensible effort to preserve what is left of Obama’s waning political capital.

In a post 2010-midterm election world, Republicans not only functionally have the numbers to [kill President Obama’s policymaking agenda](http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2011-01-13/issa-targets-obama-s-legislative-agenda-with-two-new-investigative-panels.html), but American public support for the President and his party continues to [diminish](http://blogcritics.org/politics/article/barack-obama-and-the-new-republican/) each day.  Distress and discontent with a[stagnant economy](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2011/01/13/AR2011011306651.html), flip-flops on campaign [promises](http://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/promises/obameter/rulings/promise-broken/), uncontrollable and excessive[spending](http://www.usdebtclock.org/), and [incoherent](http://www.nytimes.com/2011/01/11/world/europe/11iht-politicus11.html) foreign policy decisions have decimated Obama’s political capital amongst the American populace and especially amongst policymakers.  With Republican congressmen vowing to [obstruct](http://www.boston.com/news/nation/washington/articles/2011/01/12/partisanship_threatens_us_kerry_says/?rss_id=Boston.com+--+Top+political+stories) at great cost, the GOP’s confidence and momentum following the midterms, and the surprisingly productive but ultimately ideologically unsatisfactory lame-duck session of Congress have made the situation impossible for President Obama to gain any meaningful political capital through bipartisanship.  Quite frankly, through a pragmatic lens, Obama will undoubtedly be unable to yield or generate sufficient political capital to pass his agenda items at least in the next year. As one prominent liberal critic of the President, Roger Hodge, [puts it](http://www.thetakeaway.org/2011/jan/11/critic-calls-obama-create-job-end-assault-civil-liberties-2011/),

[President Obama] spent the last two years squandering his political capital on initiatives that did not put Americans back to work.

With this waste of his 2008 mandate, and the elimination of said mandate in the 2010 midterms, Mr. Obama’s political capital [account](http://washingtonexaminer.com/politics/white-house/2011/01/obama-tapping-personal-charm-political-capital-combat-gop) is running dangerously close to being overdrawn.  Let us wish for the general success of our President, because with his success rests that of our nation.  Without a quick, miraculous infusion of political capital, though, it is difficult to see where the specific Democratic policy agenda can possibly succeed in the 112th Congress.  And, with the voters having spoken, maybe that’s not such a bad thing after all.

1NC Shell (4/5)

1. Impacts

1. Failure of SKFTA shatters the alliance

Cooper, Congressional Research Service International Trade and Finance specialist, et al. 9

(William, Specialist in International Trade and Finance for the Congressional Research Service, Mark Manyin, specialist in Asian Affairs @ CRS, Remy Jurenas, Specialist in Agricultural Policy @ CRS, and Michaela Platzer, Specialist in Industrial Organization and Business @ CRS, "The Proposed U.S.-South Korea Free Trade Agreement (KORUS FTA): Provisions and Implications," Mar 24, [http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/crs/rl34330.pdf ] AD: 6-3-11, jm)

In contrast, while the passage of the KORUS FTA is unlikely to have a major substantive impact on the strategic relationship, a collapse of the KORUS FTA would probably have a profound symbolic effect, particularly upon the way South Koreans view the alliance. If the KORUS FTA is rejected or subjected to a prolonged delay by the United States, it would be a psychological blow to many South Korean policymakers, many of whom would likely see it as a betrayal. This would be particularly true since, in their eyes, they made politically costly concessions on autos, beef, labor, and the environment to help ensure the agreement would be more favorably received in the U.S. Congress. The KORUS FTA’s failure in the United States, according to some Korean politicians and policymakers, would lend credence to arguments in South Korea that the U.S. commitment to Korea and Northeast Asia is declining. If these perceptions take hold, it would increase the political costs of South Korean leaders’ taking unpopular decisions on behalf of the alliance, such as increasing South Korean payments for relocating U.S. troops on the Peninsula. If the KORUS FTA is rejected or delayed in the United States, U.S. policymakers could attempt to somewhat ameliorate the negative symbolic effects in South Korea by taking high profile steps to expand U.S.-ROK strategic, rather than economic, relations.
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2. US-ROK alliance key to Asian stability – deters conflict, facilitates US-Japan alliance, key to power projection, and checks Chinese aggression

Hwang, PhD & Heritage Foundation Asian Studies Center Senior Policy Analyst for Northeast Asia, 6

(Balbina Y., 10-16-6, “The U.S.-Korea Alliance on the Rocks: Shaken, Not Stirred”, Heritage Lecture #970, <http://www.heritage.org/research/AsiaandthePacific/hl970.cfm>, accessed 2-4-10)

At the heart of our discussion about the state of the U.S. alliance with the ROK today must be a broader consideration of future U.S. grand strategy in Asia. Beyond the immediacy of the seemingly intrac­table North Korean “problem” of today lie more pro­found challenges for the United States, including the eventual unification of the Korean peninsula, the rise of China, and the resurgence of Japan. It is clear that the U.S. goal for the mid- to long-term future is to play an active and positive role in maintaining stability in East Asia. The promotion of prosperity, freedom, and cooperation in the region are beyond a doubt integral to the American national interest. The best and perhaps only way for the United States to maintain its influence in the region is through its alliances with key partners. While the primary goal of the U.S.–ROK alliance was and is to deter North Korea through the Amer­ican commitment to the Armistice, its broader objective has always been to maintain regional sta­bility. It has done so by contributing to the strength of the U.S.–Japan alliance, not only by dispersing the U.S. force presence beyond Japan, but also by alleviating the Japanese burden of managing insta­bility on the Korean peninsula. The alliance has also mitigated hostilities between the ROK and Japan and served to counter China’s growing regional influence and dissuade any precipitous action on the peninsula. But perhaps most important, maintenance of a U.S.–ROK alliance will continue to serve as a bed­rock for America’s commitment in the region. An end to the alliance would undoubtedly jeopardize our credibility with all our allies and partners in the region, from Mongolia to Australia. And it will send the wrong message to China, whose ambitions are to create a regional multilateral structure of nomi­nal equality but underlying Chinese dominance; the strength of America’s alliances with the ROK and Japan is the single greatest factor thwarting Chinese regional hegemony. But sole U.S. reliance on Japan will be problematic given the level of mis­trust for that country in the region.

3. Weakened US commitment risks nuclear escalation

Gray, University of Reading Professor and Center for Strategic Studies Director, 5

[Colin S, “How has war changed since the end of the cold war?”, Parameters, Pg. 14(13) Vol. 35 No. 1]

Logically, the reverse side of the coin which proclaims a trend favoring political violence internal to states is the claim that interstate warfare is becoming, or has become, a historical curiosity. Steven Metz and Raymond Millen assure us that "most armed conflicts in coming decades are likely to be internal ones." (21) That is probably a safe prediction, though one might choose to be troubled by their prudent hedging with the qualifier "most." Their plausible claim would look a little different in hindsight were it to prove true except for a mere one or two interstate nuclear conflicts, say between India and Pakistan, or North Korea and the United States and its allies. The same authors also offer the comforting judgment that "decisive war between major states is rapidly moving toward history's dustbin." (22) It is an attractive claim; it is a shame that it is wrong. War, let alone "decisive war," between major states currently is enjoying an off-season for one main reason: So extreme is the imbalance of military power in favor of the United States that potential rivals rule out policies that might lead to hostilities with the superpower. It is fashionable to argue that major interstate war is yesterday's problem--recall that the yesterday in question is barely 15 years in the past--because now there is nothing to fight about and nothing to be gained by armed conflict. Would that those points were true; unfortunately they are not. The menace of major, if not necessarily decisive, interstate war will return to frighten us when great-power rivals feel able to challenge American hegemony. If you read Thucydides, or Donald Kagan, you will be reminded of the deadly and eternal influence of the triad of motives for war: "fear, honor, and interest." (23)

\*\*\*Uniqueness

Uniqueness – TAA-FTA Compromise Likely Now (1/5)

Compromise coming now

Schneider, Washington Post, 6-15-11

[Howard, 6-15-11, Washington Post, “Deal near on trade agreements, worker aid”, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/business/economy/deal-near-on-trade-agreements-worker-aid/2011/06/15/AGHg3XWH_story.html>, accessed 6-16-11, AFB]

The Obama administration and congressional leaders are nearing consensus on three pending trade agreements and the renewal of support for workers who have been displaced by global trade, ending a standoff that some feared would put U.S. exports at risk, said business, administration and congressional officials close to the discussions.

Free trade agreements with South Korea, Colombia and Panama have become a centerpiece of the Obama administration’s efforts to boost U.S. sales overseas, a foray into trade politics by a president who, as a candidate, expressed skepticism about the benefits of prior free trade pacts. The Korea deal is expected to generate more than $10 billion in additional annual sales for U.S. companies.

But the controversy over the U.S. deficit has stalled the deals, with Republicans opposing renewal of the billion-dollar-a-year Trade Adjustment Assistance program. The Obama administration has said it would not submit the trade pacts unless the assistance program is reauthorized to help workers hurt by outsourcing or increased imports.

After weeks of talks, however, “they are within striking distance of a deal,” U.S. Chamber of Commerce President Thomas J. Donohue said at a news conference Wednesday morning — an assessment shared by administration and congressional officials familiar with the negotiations.

None of those involved would provide details of a possible deal. But support among congressional Democrats and the White House for the trade assistance program has been widespread, and Don­o­hue suggested that Republican opposition to the program was narrower than suspected.

He said that a recent Republican Study Committee letter opposing Trade Adjustment Assistance drew only 11 signatures and that dozens in the class of GOP freshmen had endorsed approval of the free trade pacts.

The Chamber has been lobbying for approval of the three agreements and also supports the assistance program. Donohue said the Chamber is “optimistic” that the trade agreements can be in place by July 1 — when a separate agreement between the European Union and South Korea takes effect, potentially putting U.S. exporters at a disadvantage.

A House subcommittee is expected to begin reviewing the agreements next week. Carole Guthrie, a spokeswoman for the U.S. Trade Representative’s Office, said the administration is “hopeful” that an agreement over the trade adjustment program can be reached “in the near future.”

Congressional approval is by no means guaranteed. All three agreements are holdovers from the Bush administration, whose trade policies President Obama criticized on the campaign trail as damaging to U.S. workers.

Uniqueness – TAA-FTA Compromise Likely Now (2/5)

Compromise on TAA-FTAs coming now

Gersh, PBS Washington Bureau chief, and Kirk, US Trade Representative, 6-17-11

[Darren, PBS Nightly Business Report, 6-17-11, “Future of Foreign Trade”,

<http://www.pbs.org/nbr/site/onair/transcripts/future_of_foreign_trade_110617/>, accessed 6-17-11, AFB]

DARREN GERSH, NIGHTLY BUSINESS REPORT CORRESPONDENT: Right, but Republicans argue that trade adjustment assistance which helps workers who lose their jobs because of trade, they don`t want it. They say that it`s not an effective program. They want to pass these agreements without it. Why is that such a priority for the administration?

KIRK: Well, Democrats on the other hand say trade has become a primer for shipping our jobs overseas. And the trades, you know, the unfair trade deals are the reason we`ve seen manufacturing and they don`t want the trade deals. Well, the reality and part of our challenge in this administration, what President Obama tasks me to do is say we`ve got to find common ground. There`s no way we`re going to disadvantage American exporters and manufacturers by saying we`re going to put us on less favorable terms in these markets that other countries are getting. But at the same time, we can`t dismiss the concerns of those that have said honestly that a lot of Americans, through no fault of their own, that happen to work for an industry that may have been displaced by trade, they typically are 46 years old, Anglo and the sole breadwinner of their family and they have good skills. And if we can get them the training, the coaching that they need, they can become reemployed. We not only save their job, we keep those families intact. And in many cases we keep those communities intact.

GERSH: But really what this comes down to is how are you going to do? How are you going to get this done because many of our biggest trade programs are on hold right now, have expired. How are you going to get this done and when?

KIRK: All along we have made a point. Our goal was not just to pass a trade agreement. We`re trying to build a new paradigm and a new rationale to the American public that is increasingly skeptical about trade, about how we can do trade in a different way. And for us there has to be that holistic approach that you combine new market access through trade agreements with strong enforcement, which we`ve done at USTR and we reflect our core values as represented by our commitment to trade adjustment assistance. That`s how you get it done. And we`re closer than I think most people think we are.

Uniqueness – TAA-FTA Compromise Likely Now (3/5)

FTAs will pass – both sides are willing to compromise now

Elkin, Business Insider political and economic analyst, 6-3-11

(Larry Elkin – Political and Economic Analyst writing for Business Insider, Obamas Trade Adjustment Quid Pro Quo, 6/3/11, Lexis) AC

How does a Democratic president with a business-bashing record get stalwart Republican governors like Utahs Gary Herbert Indianas Mitch Daniels and Mississippis Haley Barbour to support a proposal that favors organized labor? He might try to put together a truly effective program and then use charisma, logic and rhetoric -- the sorts of skills one might acquire as a community organizer, to persuade the other party to support it. Or he might just find some other worthwhile government endeavor and hold it hostage to a payoff for the presidents political base. The current president chose hostage-taking. The hostages in question are the free trade agreements that the United States has negotiated with South Korea, Colombia and Panama. Despite the fact that President Obama has acknowledged that these agreements can create thousands of sorely needed American jobs, he is refusing to send those agreements to the Senate for ratification until Congress hands over cash to support a bloated and ineffective Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) program. Not coincidentally, the presidents union allies detest free trade agreements but are enthusiastic about TAA benefits. TAA is a 50-year-old program intended to help workers who have lost jobs due to competition from foreign imports. Participants receive job training in addition to extended unemployment benefits and wage subsidies. In 2002, the program was expanded to include workers whose jobs disappeared due to outsourcing. Then in 2009, the economic stimulus bill gave the program extra funding. As a result, last year TAA consumed $975 million to help 234,000 workers. The additional funding for the program expired in February, and the TAA program itself will begin to be phased out at the end of the year if Congress does not extend it. The trade agreements Obama is using for leverage have broad support from politicians in both parties, as well as from business leaders. The deal with South Korea, in particular, would be hugely beneficial to the agricultural sector. U.S. beef exports to Korea, for example, are expected to triple, from $600 million to $1.8 billion. The agreement as a whole would generate more than $11 billion in new exports, the government estimates. The result would be more jobs for American workers. Before he decided to sit on the trade package, Obama called on Congress to pass the South Korean deal when he delivered his State of the Union address in January. Unfortunately for Obama and for American workers, the rest of the world has not gone on hiatus just because our presidents priorities have changed. A free trade pact between South Korea and the European Union takes effect next month. Failure to ratify our own deal will put American businesses and workers at a serious disadvantage. Obama shows little interest in producing the greatest economic good for the greatest number of U.S. workers; otherwise he would not be delaying agreements that could help the nation get closer to his goal of doubling U.S. exports. The presidents approach could be better described as producing some good for most U.S. workers, but only after we give preferential treatment to the small minority of workers who happen to belong to unions and might qualify for TAA benefits. Joblessness as a result of foreign competition is an unfortunate by-product of free trade, just as joblessness in general is an unfortunate byproduct of business and economic cycles. Thats why we have unemployment insurance. It is also why passing trade agreements to help create jobs and to improve the countrys global competitiveness is so important. There is no reason why workers who lose jobs due to trade or outsourcing are more entitled to government handouts than those who lose jobs because of the weak economy “ which Obamas hot-and-cold
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approach to business has worsened “ or because the industries in which they might have worked were driven overseas long ago by high tax rates and excessive regulation. Obamas pressure tactics have prompted about two dozen state governors to sign a letter urging Congress to accept the TAA-for-trade-agreements deal. The Republican governors who signed the letter probably have no particular interest in wasting federal money by throwing bones to unions. But then again, its only federal money. The added tax money their states will reap as a result of the trade deals, on the other hand, will go into their own coffers. And if some TAA money ends up filtering into their states as it flows out of the federal treasury, the governors will take that too. Abandoned by their gubernatorial counterparts, congressional Republicans have been left to fight the deal on their own. Sen. Orrin Hatch, R-Utah, has taken the lead, arguing that there is no reason why Congress should have to hand the president money for one of his pet causes in order to pass something he supports anyway. The TAA program is unrelated to the trade agreements, Hatch has argued, and spending money on the program doesnt make sense at a time when the budget is already stretched. I wish Hatch the best of luck. The cost of TAA may be minimal when stacked beside the entirety of the federal spending binge, but that is no reason to give in. I suspect that if the White House sees that congressional Republicans are unwilling to budge, it will ultimately cave. As much as he may want to please organized labor, the president cannot afford to come into 2012 with neither the extended TAA funding nor the trade deals. If he can only have one of the two, I think he’ll take the one he can get.

Uniqueness – TAA-FTA Compromise Likely Now (5/5)

Democrats can get a compromise on the TAA but the GOP is still worried about deficit

Hadar, Business Times Singapore Washington correspondent, 6-3-11

(Leon Hadar – Washington Correspondent Business Times Singapore, Headwinds for Obama trade agenda, 6/3/11, Lexis) AC

AS PART of its stated commitment to help American companies double their exports by 2015, the Obama Administration has been pressing Congress to approve the proposed free trade agreements (FTAs) with South Korea, Colombia and Panama. Indeed, early this year in his State of the Union speech, President Barack Obama hailed a trade deal with South Korea 'that will support at least 70,000 American jobs'. In fact, President Obama and his aides had to deal with strong opposition from Democrats in Congress and their supporters in the labour unions who opposed the three pacts that were negotiated by former president George W Bush and that enjoyed the backing of a majority of the pro-business Republicans on Capitol Hill. The White House was able to eventually secure Democratic support only after making some modifications to the Korean bill. At a time when the US economy is recovering from the worst recession since the Great Depression, enacting the three pacts could help accelerate economic growth by boosting US exports by an estimated US $13 billion a year, most if it to the South Korean market. At the same time, the Colombia and Panama deals would eliminate most of the tariffs faced by US agricultural and industrial products exported to those countries. Moreover, officials in Washington warn that there is a danger that the US would be left behind in the global trade arena if Congress doesn't approve these FTAs. An FTA between the European Union and South Korea is going to take effect next month and Colombia could be forced to focus on its existing trade partners, such as the South American trade group Mercosur and Canada. Congressional passage of an FTA with Seoul should also be considered to be a strategic priority at a time when the US is trying to resolve the ongoing North Korean nuclear crisis. Similarly, Colombia is an important military ally of the US in South America, where anti-American policies are being promoted by Venezuela. So, against this backdrop, it was not surprising that the expectation in Washington has been that the three FTAs would probably be approved by Congress before the end of its session this year. That could still happen. But the momentum to approve these trade deals - as the first step in trying to re-energise the entire global trade agenda - may have come to a halt as the issues have been caught up in the partisan bickering on how to cut federal government spending. At the centre of this latest squabbling has been the 50-year-old Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) programme, which provides support for workers who have been displaced as a result of foreign competition and which expired in February. The programme consists of cash allowances given to unemployed workers displaced by foreign competition so they can attend training to find new work. It cost about US $1 billion last year and helped around 250,000 Americans.Â The TAA has been a regular feature of US global trade policies for half-a-century. But then the US federal deficit ballooned. And while the White House and its Democratic allies in Congress want to extend the programme, Republicans argue that the TAA is not effective and have proposed abolishing it as part of a wider effort to reduce the deficit. But the Obama administration insists that it will not submit the three FTAs to a vote if Congress doesn't renew the TAA. The White House position is backed by 41 Democratic Senators who in a letter issued last week stated that, notwithstanding their 'differing views on elements of the trade agenda', they were 'unified in our belief that the first order of business, before we should consider any FTA, is securing a long-term TAA extension'. The FTAs have to be ratified by the Senate, and since the Democrats control that legislative body, the Republicans will have to reach some sort of compromise with the Democrats over extending the TAA if they and their allies in the business community want to see the three pacts approved by Congress this year. The Senate Finance Committee led by Max Baucus, a pro-free trade Democrat from Montana, has conducted a series of hearings on the three trade pacts, operating under the understanding that they will be approved before the August recess. Senator Baucus and other supporters of the pacts are concerned that it could become much more difficult to get them approved next year in the midst of the heated Congressional and presidential elections campaign when public opinion polls point to rising protectionist sentiment among many Americans. As Orrin Hatch, a senator from Utah, and the Republican top member on the Senate Finance Committee, pointed out, a failure to submit the three agreements to a vote this year would send 'a chilling signal around the world that the United States is not a trusted ally on trade'. The question is whether Mr Hatch and his Republican and Democratic colleagues will succeed in overcoming their current political differences and ensure that the US indeed remains a trusted trade partner.

Uniqueness – Obama Not Pushing Mars

Obama isn’t pushing Mars

Vogt, Helium history writer, 10

(D, grad degress in intl studies and history, writer and historical researcher @ Helium, “When could humans first set foot on Mars?”, http://www.helium.com/items/1875900-manned-missions-to-mars) JPG

Interest in Mars died off during the 1970s, after the lunar missions, but was revived during the 1980s. At this time NASA originally hoped that the [International Space Station](http://astronomy.helium.com/topic/5075-international-space-station) could provide a political and technical jumping-off point for a mission to Mars, but Congress cancelled funding for this expedition during the George H.W. Bush [administration](http://www.helium.com/items/1875900-manned-missions-to-mars). Private organizations like the Mars Society then developed potential plans, such as Mars Direct, which were never taken up by actual space travel organizations. Finally, NASA was originally commissioned by the Bush administration in 2004 to plan a mission to Mars following a return to the Moon in the 2020s. The Bush plan, the Vision for Space Exploration, was always more ambitious in scope than in funding, and few expected that all of its objectives would be achieved on schedule. Nevertheless, it did seem that NASA would eventually put manned men on the Moon. The Obama administration cancelled this project, too. At the time, in early 2010, Obama vaguely claimed that astronauts would probably still reach Mars in the 2030s, although without funding or research projects to get there, it is unclear how his administration believes that would actually happen.

Link Uniqueness – Spending Compromise Coming Now

Lawmakers hate current situation – ready for deal now

Fox News, 6-9-11

(“Money Men Want a Debt Deal – Now: [Chris Stirewalt](http://www.foxnews.com/author/chris-stirewalt/index.html) 6-9-2011 MLF Fox News <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2011/06/09/money-men-want-debt-deal-now/>)

Capitalists love certainty. They ultimately care more about predictable rules than what the rules specifically are.

So one can imagine how much capitalists hate the current situation in Washington.

Lawmakers have been unable to make a deal over [President Obama](http://www.foxnews.com/topics/politics/obama-administration/barack-obama.htm#r_src=ramp)’s request that the nation’s $14.3 trillion debt limit, which was bumped up $1.9 trillion in February 2010, be increased yet again.

In the process, they have piled more and more things “on the table,” as in “everything is on the table.” That means tax rates, government spending, long-term entitlement and welfare payments and even defense policy are all, to varying degrees, up in the air.

The economy is facing a lot of what the administration deems “headwinds” or “bumps in the road” – like the [Japan](http://www.foxnews.com/topics/japan.htm#r_src=ramp) tsunami and high gas prices – but there is also the overarching problem of uncertainty.

While some of the issues, like the president’s health-insurance overhaul, have to wait for court decisions or the 2012 elections to be resolved, the current mess over debt, spending and budgets is doing plenty to quell the animal spirits of [investors](http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2011/06/09/money-men-want-debt-deal-now/) and business leaders.

The message rising up from economists across the spectrum is that Washington must move quickly to come to a conclusion, whatever it is. With a government shutdown, rising interest rates, tax hikes and massive cuts all in the mix, the money needed to keep the economy from slipping deeper into recession will not materialize.

This is a capital strike and as Vice President [Joe Biden](http://www.foxnews.com/topics/politics/obama-administration/joe-biden.htm#r_src=ramp) enters his latest round of negotiations with Republicans and moderate Senate Democrats over how to do a deal, he knows that the trajectory of the economy, and, by extension, his own chances for re-election are at stake.

Link Uniqueness – Obama Wants NASA Privatization

Obama wants NASA to do other things, space flight becoming privately funded

Loftus, 1-24-10

(“The New NASA: When In Doubt Privatize: Jack Loftus 1-24-2010 Jack Loftus: Contributing Editor at Gizmodo.com MLF Gizmodo <http://gizmodo.com/5455917/the-new-nasa-when-in-doubt-privatize>)

The [WSj](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704375604575023530543103488.html) is reporting this evening that the Obama Administration, in an attempt to get NASA doing more space and environmental stuff, will float the idea of using private companies to ferry astronauts into space, among other things.

The policy change, described as controversial by those in the know, will be included in the Administration's next budget proposal.

Ultimately, the plan would establish "a multiyear, multi-billion-dollar initiative allowing private firms, including some start-ups, to compete to build and operate spacecraft capable of ferrying U.S. astronauts into orbit-and eventually deeper into the solar system," reports the WSJ.

Safety concerns are at the top of the list of objections to the plan, as are concerns over shifting NASA funds for existing programs to a private initiative. Other additions to the NASA budget include stepped up climate-monitoring programs, and better cooperation internationally for manned and unmanned space programs.

Unsurprisingly, private contractors like Lockheed Martin are lobbying for such a shift, as they could experience substantial gains should a new private NASA wing open in the near future.

Those opposed to the change, like Arizona representative Gabrielle Giffords, argue that because NASA's budget will remain the same under the new program, at about $18.7 billion, the private programs will only serve to spread the agency more thinly (hence the shifting funds worry stated above). During a hearing last month, Giffords said the private funds could weaken NASA and put human space flight "on hold for the foreseeable future."

Case in point, only $200 million are earmarked for privatization this year, but that number is expected to increase to about $3.5 billion over the next five years.

Obama is in favor of privatizing space.

Wall Street Journal, August 2009 (<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB125107281002652587.html>)

The Obama administration is leaning toward outsourcing major components of its space program, such as ferrying cargo and astronauts to the International Space Station. The scale and nature of sending this type of work to private contractors, unheard of in the history of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, could help the administration cope with an increasingly dire budget situation and fill crucial gaps in its program.

Space Exploration Technologies Corp., a trailblazer in this commercial space arena, hopes the initial launch of its Falcon 9 heavy-lift rocket will happen by early 2010. It initially invested its own money to develop a smaller cargo rocket and then received taxpayer money to support that project.

Now, the company and its founder Elon Musk -- a former Internet entrepreneur -- are lobbying Congress and urging the White House to come up with similar financial support for the more-powerful rocket.

"At the end of the day," said Larry Williams, the company's point man in Washington, "a commercial approach requires industry to share the development investment risk" but also permits greater rewards by selling the technology to other customers. "It's a much more free-market approach."

SpaceX, as the company is known, has had two successful launches of its smaller rocket after three straight failures.

Other smaller industry players and various start-up firms are also bound to compete for the new business, which is slated to go into operation around the middle of the next decade.

The contract winners would use corporate funds to build and test rockets, provide compatible space capsules and then try to recoup those investments by offering commercial-style transportation services to the agency. Essentially, NASA would be paying a set fee for every pound or person transported to orbit.

\*\*\*Links

Link – Congress Opposes Mars Prioritization

Major opposition to Mars – Bush proves

Pop, International Institute of Space Law member, 4

(Virgiliu, Ph.D. Candidate @ Glasgow, member @ Intl Inst. Of Space Law, “Is Space Exploration Worth the Cost?”, 1/19/4, http://www.spacedaily.com/news/oped-04b.html) JPG

The new space policy of the Bush administration, aimed at taking the humankind back to the Moon and on to Mars, came under fire before even being released. In their bid at the Democratic nomination for the White House, several politicians criticized George W. Bush's grand space plans, arguing that the money would find a better use here, on Earth. "I also want to explore planet Earth and planet D.C.," Dennis Kucinich said. Al Sharpton too suggested that Bush instead try to discover the lower-income parts of Washington. "I mean, it won't cost as much ... and it would be just as enlightening for him". Joseph Lieberman stated that the money would be needed "right here on Earth to give health care that's affordable to ever! Ybody, to improve our education system, and do better on veterans' benefits and homeland security". And Howard Dean agreed that "space exploration is terrific", but went on to ask � "Where is the tax increase to pay for it? It is not worth bankrupting the country."

Link – Democrats Oppose Mars Prioritization

Vocal Dems oppose prioritizing spending on Mars boondoggle

Space Politics 6

(http://www.spacepolitics.com/2006/06/28/a-move-against-mars-mission-funding/) JPG

The full House is currently debating [HR 5672](http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/z?c109:H.R.5672:), the Science, State, Justice, and Commerce appropriations bill, although they have not yet debated any of the NASA provisions of the bill. However, the AP reports this morning that some members will attempt as early as today to cut exploration program funding from NASA and distribute it elsewhere within—or outside—NASA: Democrats plan to try to cut spending for the moon-Mars initiative, which would return U.S. astronauts to the moon by 2020 and to Mars after that, and spend the money instead on other NASA programs or grants to local police at a time when violent crime rates are rising. Opponents of the Mars mission says it’s too expensive and that unmanned space travel produces better science per dollar spent. Others say there are more pressing needs here on Earth. “It’s a complete and total waste of money,” said Rep. Barney Frank, D-Mass. “The manned shot to Mars is a pure boondoggle.”

Link – Public Opposes Mars Mission

Majority of people oppose manned Mars missions

Rasmussen Reports, 9

(Rasmussen Reports “51% Oppose U.S. Manned Mission to Mars”, 7/2/9, http://www.rasmussenreports.com/public\_content/lifestyle/general\_lifestyle/july\_2009/51\_oppose\_u\_s\_manned\_mission\_to\_mars) JPG

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.

Link – NASA Spending Costs Political Capital

Small increases in the NASA budget cost capital – Bush proves

Stover, Popular Science editor, 4

(Dawn, freelance journalist, editor of Popular Science, “Are We Really Going to the Moon Again?”, pp. 62, Vol. 264, No. 4, Popular Science magazine, April 2004, google books) JPG

The White House and NASA have yet to determine how they’ll meet the objectives spelled out in the new policy: sending exploratory robotic missions to the moon by 2008; completing the International Space Station and retiring the space shuttle by 2010; developing a Crew Exploration Vehicle and sending it on its first manned flight by 2014; and launching an “extended” human mission to the moon by 2020. Only 12 people have ever set foot on the Moon, and none have stayed for longer than three days. If astronauts are to spend weeks or months there, they’’ have to bring a lot more supplies and gear with them – everything from food and water to machines for exploring the Moon’s surface and extracting useful resources. Also, the equipment for the mission will have to be more durable than that used for by the Apollo moonwalkers, whose spacesuits are now falling apart in museums. And Bush proposed to set his ambitious new plan in motion with a mere $1 billion dollar increase in NASA’s budget over the next five years – about the cost of two space shuttle launches. “The main problem is cost,” says David Gump, president of the space start-up LunaCorp. “We’ve got technology out the wazoo, but we don’t have the technology we can afford to fly.” Many news reports greeted Bush’s announcement as if it were a road map to a Moon base and then on to Mars. It fell well short of that. Although the January 14 speech was the boldest attempt yet to reignite the excitement many Americans felt when John F. Kennedy called for a U.S. Moon Landing more than 40 years ago, hardly anyone believes that NASA can establish a manned base – much less a launch pad – on the Moon without a far more generous budget than Bush proposed. And glaringly, when the president delivered his State of the Union address – less than a week after he announced the new space policy – he made no mention of the Moon or Mars, suggesting to many NASA employees and supporters that he is unwilling to invest much political capital.

Space spending faces uphill battle – ensuring opposition

Space.com 3/8/11

(http://www.mnn.com/earth-matters/space/stories/can-nasa-afford-missions-to-mars-and-jupiter) JPG

NASA’s current budget woes, however, might delay some or all of these missions, the report warns. NASA, like all federal agencies, is currently operating without an official 2011 budget – the government is working under a temporary spending measure called a continuing resolution. President Barack Obama's 2012 budget request for NASA, which could set the stage for the flagship missions in the new report, also faces an uphill battle in Congress.

Link – NASA Prioritization Triggers Debate

Plan ensures debate over NASA prioritization

Former US Representative Bacchus, 3-16-11

(James Bacchus is a former Member of Congress, from Florida’s 15th Congressional District, which includes the Kennedy Space Center. He was one of the principal Congressional sponsors of the International Space Station., 3-16-11, “American competitiveness needs space program” http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/economy-a-budget/150091-american-competitiveness-needs-space-program TJL)

Yet, for all the considerable promise of private commercial space exploration, it is not at all clear that commercial rockets will be able to be “man-rated” by NASA to taxi astronauts any time soon. And, sadly, one of the very few recent examples of bipartisanship in Washington has been the utter bipartisan failure thus far to figure out what to do next in human space flight, how to make it work, and how to pay for it at a price our chosen leaders think we can afford.While the Congress and the President try to find some way to work together to sort all this out, the only way we will have to get American astronauts to the space station, once the shuttles stop flying, will be on the Russian Soyuz spacecraft

Link – GOP Backlash Against NASA Spending (1/2)

Plan would trigger GOP backlash – Republicans targeting space program funding for cuts

Foley, Huffington Post contributor, 2-11-11

(Elise, Contributor, Huffington Post, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/02/11/republicans-bill-spending-cuts-60-billion\_n\_822250.html)

House Republicans filed a bill Friday evening proposing $60 billion in spending cuts for current levels and hundreds of millions of dollars in funding reductions for education and programs that help families pay their rent. With government shutdown a looming threat--funding runs out on March 4--House Republicans said they would continue to push for deeper cuts to meet the promises laid out in their [Pledge to America](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/09/22/republican-pledge-to-america-tax-spending-cuts_n_735876.html), even if it means passing a bill that will be defeated or limited by the Senate.

Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) has called threats of government shutdown "extreme" and said the Senate will not lie down and accept all of the House GOP's severe spending cuts. "You can lose a lot of weight by cutting off your arms and legs," he said on Thursday. "But no doctor would recommend it."

The continuing resolution introduced on Friday would drastically reduce funding for many government programs, including NASA and state and local law enforcement. The Department of Education would see a funding cut of about $4.9 billion under the bill, with nearly $1.4 billion coming from grants for state training and employment programs. The bill would also remove $715 million from funds for the Department of Housing and Urban Development's rental assistance program, which is already unable to help many of the 7.1 million low-income households found to be in a "worst-case" housing situation in a HUD report released on Friday.

Some of the cuts were directed at long-time targets of Republican ire, such as the Environmental Protection Agency, which would see a $60 million cut under the bill, $16 million of which will be eliminated from climate protection activities. The bill also would create a funding limitation that would prevent the EPA from prohibiting or restricting emissions. The health care law, another frequent Republican target, would be given reduced spending for community health centers, the National Health Service Corps, and the Maternal and Child Health Block Grant.

The bill also includes a few increases, most notably in defense. It would increase funding for the Department of Defense by $8.1 billion, and would give $312 million more for nuclear weapons infrastructure than 2010 funding.

With only a few weeks to pass a bill, House Republicans acknowledged on Friday that they may be forced to enact a short-term continuing resolution at current funding levels instead, allowing the two chambers more time to duke it out over the level of cuts. The two chambers must eventually agree on a resolution--or continue short-term continuing resolutions at the current level--to prevent government shutdown.

"Leadership does not want a government shutdown," Rep. Mike Simpson (R-Idaho), head of the Appropriations subcommittee on Interior and the Environment. "Could it ultimately end up there? Sure, it's possible. But most people realize it's going to take us some time to try to get a conference report."

At the same time, though, the House leadership faces a conservative faction that says they will not accept less than $100 billion in cuts, the figure promised in the GOP's Pledge to America in September. The House leadership faced a revolt this week when conservative freshmen rebelled over the original plan for the continuing resolution, which would have cut $74 billion from the never-enacted 2011 budget proposed by President Barack Obama. That proposal would have eliminated about $32 billion in spending. On Thursday, House Republicans announced they would instead introduce a continuing resolution that would cut $100 billion from Obama's never-enacted 2011 budget, amounting to about $60 billion in cuts from current levels.

Freshman Rep. Allen West (R-Fla.) said on Friday that he told leadership he would not vote for a continuing resolution that introduced less than $100 billion in cuts. "We've got to hold people accountable," he told reporters off of the House floor. "You've got to step out there and take these bold and aggressive moves."

Still, he said there would not be a government shutdown over the continuing resolution. "The government's not going to shut down, and I think one of the things we've got to look at is, the president is the CEO of this corporation called the United States of America," West told reporters on Friday afternoon.

Earlier in the afternoon, Democrats promised to fight to prevent cuts to education. "We cannot let the dreams and aspirations of the young people of this nation fall victim to the positions of the more extreme elements of this Republican caucus," Rep. Tim Bishop (D-N.Y.) said at a press conference.

Link – GOP Backlash Against NASA Spending (2/2)

Republicans oppose spending on space programs, ensuring plan unpopular

WFTV, 10

(11-3-10, “Does GOP Control of the House Jeopardize NASA’s future?”, <http://www.wftv.com/news/25624624/detail.html>)

While Discovery is on the launch pad ready to lift off, WFTV is asking if NASA's future is in jeopardy now that Republicans have control of the House. The Republicans ran their election campaigns promising to cut government spending and that puts the extra shuttle mission, and much of NASA's future in question. Congress still has to approve billions for NASA. It gave its OK to fly Discovery, Endeavour and Atlantis one more time, but it hasn't provided funding for that last extra Atlantis mission. In fact, NASA needed more money for it and the space agency could be fighting just to keep what it has under the new Congress. While there have been a lot of discussions, and even a vote in Congress to allow NASA to fly the space shuttle Atlantis one more time next year, there's a chance the change in power in Congress could not only keep Atlantis from making that extra trip, it could cut into NASA's future. "NASA is going to have to decide which of its children it chooses to protect," said Dale Ketcham, Spaceport Research and Tech Institute. Congress has yet to fund the extra Atlantis mission or the President's new direction for NASA. Ketcham, who advised the White House on space policy, says Congress could still cut NASA's budget despite the President's proposal to increase it by $1 billion. That would also affect plans to invest in commercial rockets and a new, so-called, heavy-lift spacecraft.

"There is definitely not going to be enough money for all of them to thrive," Ketcham said.

NASA wants to launch Atlantis one more time to take advantage of flight equipment already built and give the space agency one more chance to take spare parts to the space station. It would also delay thousands of layoffs at the Space Center. "There's no question the shuttle launch will be put into jeopardy, because they are going to have to get the money from somewhere," Ketcham said.

But NASA may be put in the position of deciding whether the extra shuttle launch is worth cutting into future programs. It's up to the lame-duck Congress to decide if they are going to fund NASA and add the extra money for the Atlantis mission, or they could put it off on the new Congress in January to decide what to do.

Link – GOP Backlash Against Spending (1/2)

Republicans won’t support legislation without guarantee of spending cuts

Berger, New York Times, 1-24-11

(Joseph, Contributor, New York Times, “Senate Republicans to oppose Obama’s Spending Plans,” <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/01/24/us/politics/24repubs.html?_r=1>)

The Senate’s top Republican, [Mitch McConnell](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/m/mitch_mcconnell/index.html?inline=nyt-per) of Kentucky, said on Sunday that his party will vigorously oppose the spending initiatives [President Obama](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/o/barack_obama/index.html?inline=nyt-per) plans to include in his [State of the Union address](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/s/state_of_the_union_message_us/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier) on Tuesday because “it’s not a time to be looking at pumping up government spending.”

And the number two Republican in the House, Representative [Eric Cantor](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/c/eric_cantor/index.html?inline=nyt-per) of Virginia, said that his party would press ahead with its plans for immediate cuts in spending, including in the defense budget. “Every dollar should be on the table,” he said.

In a video Mr. Obama sent to supporters on Saturday that gave a preview of the speech, the president indicated that he would seek to balance an attack on the deficit with increased spending in fields like education, research and technological innovation that he called crucial to long-term job growth.

Speaking on Fox News Sunday, Mr. McConnell countered that “The American public, as one pundit put it, issued a massive restraining order,” against government spending and excessive debt in November’s Congressional elections.

Indeed, Mr. McConnell seemed at times gleefully sardonic about President Obama’s efforts to depict himself as a centrist trying to find common ground with Republicans. The president, he said, has certainly moved to the enter , but mostly “rhetorically.”

“The president needs to pivot,” Mr. McConnell said. “He seems to be pivoting on virtually everything else, and I don’t put him down for that. I mean he obviously saw what happened in the November election and is trying to go in a different direction. He’s quit bashing business and is now celebrating business.”

“Well it’s about time,” Mr. McConnell added, “because the only way we’re going to get unemployment down and get out of this economic trough is through private sector growth and development. I think excessive government spending, running up debt, making us look like a Western European country is the wrong direction.”

In the video, Mr. Obama called for an attack on the budget deficit, but indicated that his “No. 1 focus is going to be making sure that we are competitive and we are creating jobs not just now but well into the future.” His advisors have said that he will make the case for “investments” in areas like education, transportation and technological innovation.

Mr. McConnell tartly ridiculed that plan as a camouflage for spending.

“With all due respect to our Democratic friends, any time they want to spend, they call it investment, so I think you will hear the president talk about investing a lot Tuesday night.”

But Mr. McConnell said that was the wrong approach because Americans were incensed by the $1 trillion annual deficits in each of the past two years, much of which went for an economic stimulus bill that Mr. McConnell contended had no impact on the job creation or growth in private industry. While Republicans will examine Mr. Obama’s recommendations, he said, “this is not a time to be looking at pumping up government spending in very many areas.”

Appearing on the same show, Senator [Richard J. Durbin](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/d/richard_j_durbin/index.html?inline=nyt-per) of Illinois, the Democratic whip, cautioned that cutting spending could be detrimental to a rebounding economy, noting that the president’s bipartisan [deficit commission](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/n/national_commission_on_fiscal_responsibility_and_reform/index.html?inline=nyt-org) had issued such warnings.

“They said be careful,” Mr. Durbin, a member of the commission, said. “Don’t start the serious spending cuts until we’re clearly out of the [recession](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/r/recession_and_depression/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier) in 2013. Maybe it will be sooner. But that warning is something we shouldn’t forget. We learned in history with President [Franklin Roosevelt](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/r/franklin_delano_roosevelt/index.html?inline=nyt-per) that after [the Great Depression](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/g/great_depression_1930s/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier) when they started to hit the deficit brakes too soon, they went into a double dip recession and higher unemployment.”

Mr. Cantor, the House majority leader, said in an appearance on [NBC](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/business/companies/nbc_universal/index.html?inline=nyt-org)’s “Meet the Press,” that a key confrontation between Democrats and Republicans over the issue of spending would come when Congress will be asked by the president to raise the ceiling on the national debt. Mr. Cantor has called that vote “a leverage moment,” when Republicans can extract concessions for their support.

[**CARD CONTINUES]**

Link – GOP Backlash Against Spending (2/2)

[**CARD CONTINUED, NO TEXT REMOVED]**

“Let me be clear,” Mr. Cantor said. “Republicans are not going to vote for this increase in the debt limit unless there are serious spending cuts and reforms.”

He said Republicans would try to fulfill promises of cutting the budget by $100 billion this year, but noted that the figure would be met on an annualized basis, since the current fiscal year, which ends Sept. 30, is already well along. In tackling such cuts, he said, “every dollar should be on the table,” including defense, whose budgets Republicans have historically safeguarded.

“No one can defend the expenditure of every dollar and cent over at the Pentagon,” he said. “And we’ve got to be very serious to make sure that they are doing more with less as well.”

Mr. McConnell did not outline where he would like to cut spending, but Senator [John McCain](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/m/john_mccain/index.html?inline=nyt-per) of Arizona, the Republican presidential candidate in 2008, said Washington needs “to take on some of the sacred cows.”

“Agriculture subsidies are outrageous today,” he said, in an appearance on CBS’s “Face the Nation.”. “Ethanol is a joke.” Another target should be federal subsidies to the Post Office, which Mr. McCain called a “model of inefficiency.”

“And then we have to go after entitlements,” Mr. McCain said. “And entitlements have to be on the table sooner rather than later. You and I could write the solution to [Social Security](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/s/social_security_us/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier) problems on the back of an envelope.”

In his appearance, Mr. McConnell also promised that Republicans would find a parliamentary way to have the Senate vote on repealing President Obama’s health care overhaul. If repeal doesn’t pass, as he conceded it probably would not, Republicans would try to take the law apart piecemeal. The Republican-dominated House voted last Wednesday to repeal, a symbolic move since leaders of the Democratic-controlled Senate have said that they will not act on the repeal measure.

Link – AT – GOP Likes NASA/Space (1/2)

Even if GOP loves NASA, they don’t like space spending in a tough economy – link outweighs the turn

Klamper, Spacenews.com, 10

(Amy, 11-5-10, Writer, Spacenews.com, “Election result could increase pressure on NASA budget,” <http://www.spacenews.com/policy/101103-election-brings-new-leadership-nasa-oversight-committees.html>)

The takeover of the U.S. House of Representatives by Republicans promising a new era of fiscal restraint has spawned concerns that NASA’s budget will suffer, but lawmakers poised to assume key committee chairmanships next year have been strong supporters of the space agency.

As of press time, the Republicans had picked up 60 seats in the House as a result of the Nov. 2 elections, well above the 39 needed to regain the majority when the new Congress convenes in January. While the Senate will remain under Democratic control, Republicans picked up seats in that chamber as well.

Opinions vary on what the House leadership change means for NASA, although there is some agreement that the agency, already struggling with a mismatch between the programs it is charged with executing and the funding it has available, will face additional downward pressure on its budget. House Minority Leader John Boehner (R-Ohio), for example, the presumptive speaker of the House, has pledged to cut domestic federal spending to 2008 levels, a move that could put the $19 billion authorized by Congress for NASA in 2011 in jeopardy. Boehner voted against that measure, which ultimately passed and was signed into law by U.S. President Barack Obama Oct. 11.

“We’re ready to cut spending to pre-stimulus, pre-bailout levels, saving taxpayers $100 billion almost immediately,” Boehner said in a weekly Republican address Oct. 30. “And we’re ready to put in place strict budget caps that limit spending from here on out, to ensure that Washington is no longer on this spending binge.”

In a written response to a Space News question, Bill Adkins, a former professional staff member on the House Science and Technology Committee, said in previous years NASA’s budget was spared from freezes while other nondefense agencies saw their budgets held flat.

“But the game is changing,” said Adkins, now principal with the Center for Strategic Space Studies here. “The current [2011] budget may be NASA’s high-water mark for a while.”

Adkins said if NASA’s budget is pared back to 2008 levels — effectively a 10 percent cut to the $19 billion authorized for next year — the agency could be forced to address fundamental questions about the size and scope of its mission. Such cuts might be a harder sell in the Senate, Adkins said, but he noted that budget hawks there are emboldened.

Adkins said the specter of looming spending cuts is not all bad for NASA. “It may be counterintuitive, but a little budget pressure may actually provide clarity to the choices the agency faces and hasten the process of focusing on solutions, but it’s a delicate balance,” he said. “Cut too deep and the country risks losing irreplaceable capabilities.”

Marcia Smith, a space policy consultant here and editor of SpacePolicyOnline.com, was more blunt in her assessment. “The Republican takeover of the House is not good news for NASA,” Smith said in a written response to a question from Space News. “It’s not that Republicans don’t like NASA. … But they love NASA more in good economic times than in bad, and these are really bad economic times.”

Smith said the Republican victory likely will put more political pressure on Obama to do more to rein in federal spending as he looks ahead to the 2012 presidential election. She also said NASA’s Earth science program, which is earmarked for spending increases by the Obama administration but has long been a target of Republican lawmakers, “may encounter rough seas ahead instead of the smooth sailing it enjoyed this year.”

Link – AT – GOP Likes NASA/Space (2/2)

The Tea Party makes spending a key issue in space policy

Foust 11

(Jeff – Aerospace Analyst and Ph. D in Planetary Sci MIT, Briefs: strange space bedfellows, human spaceflight poll, Mars mission budget squeeze, 6/8/11, http://www.spacepolitics.com/2011/06/08/briefs-strange-space-bedfellows-human-spaceflight-poll-mars-mission-budget-squeeze/) AC

Here’s something you don’t see every day: a Tea Party group saying it’s in agreement with a pair of Democratic senators. Florida-based TEA Party in Space (TPIS), part of the larger Tea Party Patriots coalition, announced Monday that it has “publicly praised” a letter from Sens. Barbara Boxer (D-CA) and Dianne Feinstein (D-CA) to NASA administrator Charles Bolden last month asking for a competitive bidding process for NASA’s Space Launch System heavy-lift rocket. In the statement, TPIS claimed Congress “tried to earmark $12 billion for existing Shuttle and Constellation contractors” with the language in last year’s NASA authorization act. “It is time to bring competition and fiscal sanity back into the NASA procurement system,” TPIS spokesman Everett Wilkinson said in the statement.

Link – AT – Mars Spun Popular

Mars spin is not sustainable support – not enough to overwhelm risks and cost

Robinson, University of Hartford history professor, 10

[Michael, Ph.D., October-November, Journal of Cosmology, “The Problem of Human Missions to Mars”, http://journalofcosmology.com/Mars134.html, DOA: 1/11/11

In short, the debate over Mars is really a debate over the nature of exploration itself. It will not be solved by news designs for booster or crew capsules. While robotic missions may not generate the excitement of human ones, they have become a proven means for gathering data about Mars at reasonable cost. What would human missions give us? Advocates have not effectively made their case. Too often, they have gotten lost in the estuaries of Mars debate: on the benefits of future technological spin-offs, new aerospace engineering jobs, or a national advantage in space.

However realistic or important these benefits may be, they are the windfalls of discovery, not its object. To say that we should spend a trillion dollars to send astronauts to Mars in order to employ engineers and develop spin-offs is like saying that we built the Empire State Building because of its excellent views of Manhattan. The promise of jobs and new patents may temporarily boost Congressional and public support, but they will not sustain it; they do not offer a compelling motive that would support such projects over the long haul. Sending humans to Mars requires a vision of exploration that convincingly explains why we should place humans at the center of an exploration program despite risk and expense (Logsdon 2003).

For the pro-human camp, making this case is difficult. The core aims of Mars human missions attach to goals that are hard to measure: ensuring the survival of the species, inspiring new generations, fulfilling a human destiny to explore, or fostering social or biological evolution. While all of these goals are important, they are visionary, long-term, or intangible. As such they are tricky to assess as matters of policy. How much would a Mars human space program inspire young people? What are the key threats to our species survival? Would they best be met by sending humans to Mars? What is the metric for measuring exploration as a creative or evolutionary activity?

Link – Spending

Spending costs capitol – GOP and voters

Dade, NPR, 5-5-11

[Corey Dade, writer, “GOP's Debt Focus Seen Limiting Obama On Economy” NPR, May 5, 2011, <http://www.npr.org/2011/05/05/136023608/gops-debt-focus-seen-limiting-obama-on-economy> EJONES]

Faucher says the federal government should provide more stimulus-oriented programs to shore up hemorrhaging state and local governments. He notes that state and local governments have shed about 500,000 jobs since 2008, including an average of 20,000 positions per month in the past six months. "This is going to be a drag on growth, but people aren't talking about it because it's not popular," Faucher says. He also recommends expanding federal guarantees of small business loans to encourage banks to approve more loans for companies to reinvest in their operations and hire more workers. Republicans argue that the stimulus funding, and other measures undertaken by Obama, merely increased the deficit without having a sustainable improvement to the economy. Their messaging has resonated with voters and made further spending politically unpopular. And Republicans' control of the House makes such a debate virtually a nonstarter, as evidenced by their success in framing upcoming 2012 budget talks exclusively around finding spending cuts. "There's no economist that I think Republicans are going to listen to now that says the solution to our problems is more deficit spending," Ayres says. "Right now, with the result of the stimulus package, I think it would be very difficult to say the answer is having the federal government go borrow more money from China."

Link – Spending Link Outweighs Space Enthusiasm

Spending link outweighs interest in space

Vedda, North Dakota University space studies professor, 7

(James, PhD in poli sci @ Florida U, policy analyst for govt contractor, specializes in security space issues, assoc prof of space studies @ North Dakota U, “Humans to Mars: Logical Step or Dangerous Distraction?”, Sept 2007, <http://www.nasa.gov/pdf/372849main_Vedda%20-%20AIAA%202007.pdf>) JPG

According to the advocacy group The Mars Society, “We're ready. Though Mars is distant, we are far better prepared today to send humans to Mars than we were to travel to the Moon at the commencement of the space age. Given the will, we could have our first teams on Mars within a decade... No nobler cause has ever been.”36 The Mars Society’s assertion about our readiness level for the journey is debatable, but the group’s enthusiasm is undeniable. In general, Mars advocates can come up with a list of reasons for sending humans to Mars, but to date none of these reasons can satisfactorily answer concerns about the cost, the risk, and the urgency.

Cost kills political and public support

Christianson, Columbia Daily Tribune, 3/11

(J Scott, writer @ Columbia Daily Tribune, “We can’t afford manned mission to Mars”, http://thefreerangetechnologist.com/2011/03/manned-mission-to-mars/) JPG

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.

Link Magnifier – Spending Key (1/2)

Spending tanks bipartisanship – it’s the key issue

Lindsay, Council on Foreign Relations Director of Studies, 11

(James, Senior Vice President, Director of Studies, and Maurice R. Greenberg Chair @ Council on Foreign Relations, Jan 5, "New Congress and the Spending Thicket," [www.cfr.org/congress/new-congress-spending-thicket/p23727] AD: 6-9-11, jm)

The 112th Congress, convening today, promises to be one of the most politically charged sessions in recent memory--and one in which government spending will dominate the agenda. Barring a sudden crisis, foreign policy will be an afterthought amid an intensifying debate over the debt and the deficit. Both parties have taken one potentially explosive national security issue--cuts in defense spending--off the table. Obama is unlikely to demand a vote on any controversial treaties after his bruising fight to secure passage of New START. The White House has signaled that any Afghan drawdown that starts this summer will be small and slow, which will give Republicans little to complain about. The White House and Republicans might actually cooperate to pass several modest trade agreements that have been languishing. Yet the tone has already been set for political battles on the domestic agenda. Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-KY) vowed just before Christmas that if the Democrats "think it's bad now, wait 'till next year." But the Senate's political dynamics are not changing much. The big change instead lies on the other side of Capitol Hill, which is back in Republican hands after four years of Democratic control. New House Speaker John Boehner has his hands full. He will be heading a Republican caucus that has eighty-seven new members, many of them proud Tea Partiers bent on remaking Washington. Therein lies Boehner's challenge. Washington is not easily remade. Republicans discovered that after their epic victory in the 1994 elections. Boehner hopes to avoid former Speaker Newt Gingrich's mistakes and fate. That requires balancing the competing demands of a caucus that leans hard right, a White House poised to paint Republicans as extremists, and a public that wants Washington to fix its problems and protect its favorite programs. The substantive showdown between the House and President Barack Obama will come over spending. Sometime this spring, Congress will have to vote on whether to increase the ceiling on the national debt or risk pushing the federal government into default. Republicans will demand deep cuts in domestic discretionary spending as their price for voting for more debt. Presidents typically win budget showdowns, and the feared crisis is averted. But the risk of political miscalculation during the 112th is significant. December's tax-cut fight might lead Republicans to think that Obama will blink if pushed hard enough; the White House might believe that it cannot afford to repeat its tax-cut surrender. Complicating matters is that the House Republicans' commitment to slicing $100 billion in domestic discretionary spending could prove popular in the abstract and lethal in its particulars. Constituents might recoil when they learn that slashing foreign aid and trimming the House's own budget will not by themselves generate anywhere near $100 billion in savings. Instead, cuts averaging 20 percent will need to be made to thousands of programs that benefit millions of Americans. That could lead some Republicans to waver in their commitment to fiscal discipline, or at least convince the White House that they will waver.

Spending issues will make or break the FTA

Williamson, Wall Street Journal national political correspondent, 11

(Elizabeth, national political correspondent for the Wall Street Journal, May 28, “Dispute Threatens Key Deals on Trade,” [online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304066504576349832361669832.html] AD: 6-9-11, jm)

WASHINGTON—The centerpiece of the American trade agenda—a trio of international trade pacts worth $13 billion in new U.S. exports—is in peril as Democrats and Republicans battle over a program that provides aid to U.S. workers. The dispute over the future of the 50-year-old Trade Adjustment Assistance program, which provides benefits to American workers displaced by foreign competition, is putting pending free-trade pacts with South Korea, Colombia and Panama in jeopardy by pulling them into the contentious debate over federal spending. The Obama administration and Democrats in Congress want the TAA program renewed. Some Republicans question its value and say it should be scaled back to narrow the deficit.

Link Magnifier – Spending Key (2/2)

Spending is the top priority for Republicans

BBC News, 6-1-11

(“Republicans press Obama for plan on spending cuts”, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-us-canada-13619249>)

Republican lawmakers have pressed President Barack Obama for a detailed plan on budget cuts as he seeks their backing on raising the US debt ceiling. Mr Obama met House Republicans at the White House in his latest bid to end a standoff his administration warns could upset financial markets. The US treasury department has warned the US risks default if Congress does not authorise more borrowing by August.

With the deficit set to hit $1.4tr this year, Republicans want spending cuts. Leaders of both parties agree to the need to trim the budget, but Republicans have refused to allow tax increases, while Democrats have vowed to protect costly social programmes. The US national debt is $14.3 trillion (£8.7 trillion), and the annual budget deficit is roughly $1.4 trillion. The White House argues the United States would face "catastrophic" consequences if Congress does not raise the cap on total US government borrowing by 2 August."If we're going to raise the debt limit, the spending cuts should exceed the increase in the debt limit, otherwise it will serve to cost us jobs in our country," House Speaker John Boehner told reporters outside the White House, following the meeting. "It's not what the American people want," he added. President Obama warned the meeting there could be dire consequences to failing to increase the US debt ceiling, White House spokesman Jay Carney said. "The president made clear that he believes there is no margin here for in any way casting doubt on the possibility that the debt ceiling would be raised, that the effect of even suggesting that it won't happen could be highly negative and could have dire consequences for our economy and the global economy," Mr Carney said. The meeting with Republicans from the US House of Representatives came a day after House Republicans rejected their own bill to raise the US debt limit by $2.4tr. Analysts said the vote was a symbolic attempt to demonstrate that a bill to increase the borrowing cap with no spending cuts attached would not be passed.

Link Magnifier – GOP Focus – Spending

The GOP is focused on stopping Obamas’ spending

CNN 6-5-11

(Tom Cohen, 6/5/11, " Economic woes give Republicans early campaign focus", http://www.cnn.com/2011/POLITICS/06/05/republicans.obama/ 6-05-11 TJL)

Eight months before the Iowa caucuses, a spate of bad economic reports last week gave Republicans a chance to start framing the 2012 campaign on their topic of choice -- President Barack Obama's record.With the unemployment rate ticking up to 9.1 percent, home prices falling further and consumer confidence down, GOP strategists and possible and declared presidential contenders harmonized their criticism of Obama administration economic policies that they say have stymied recovery."The problem in the economy ... is that he has a toxic mix in terms of policy, of excessive regulation, of onerous mandates, of massive debt, and of higher taxes that are stifling our economy," former Republican National Committee chairman Ed Gillespie said Sunday on CNN's "State of the Union." "That will be the choice in November of 2012."

The GOP has one, firm, and consistent message: cut spending

Erickson 6-8-11

(Erick Erickson serves as a contributor and conservative political analyst on CNN’s John King, USA. In addition to serving as a CNN contributor, Erickson is the Editor-in-Chief of RedState.com Under Erickson’s leadership, RedState has become the preeminent right of center community online and is the most widely read right-of-center blog on Capitol Hill.” Short Memories And Republican Successes” 6-08-11 http://www.redstate.com/erick/2011/06/08/short-memories-and-republican-successes/ TJL)

In the debt ceiling fight, it appears I was right. As the GOP has held a firm and consistent line insisting on massive spending cuts and entitlement reform, their poll numbers have gone up — exactly opposite what the chattering class of compromising good government types insisted would happen. In a new Washington Post/ABC poll of adult Americans, the headline drawing the big buzz is that Mitt Romney is head of Obama among registered voters. That’s huge and good news for Romney. It’s even better than the poll suggests because that data comes from the registered voters. Obama and Romney are tied among all adults. But registered voters, unlike likely voters, also skews to the Democrats by a few points, though not as badly as among all adults. So if Romney is ahead of Obama by 3 points among registered voters, he’s probably ahead 5 or more points among likely voters. That headline, however, overshadows a more important finding.In another indicator of rapidly shifting views on economic issues, 45 percent trust congressional Republicans over the president when it comes to dealing with the economy, an 11-point improvement for the GOP since March. Still, nearly as many, 42 percent, side with Obama on this issue. This is among all adults surveyed. So in a pool of respondents that favors the Democrats, the GOP is ahead 3 points. With registered voters, I’d suspect the GOP is ahead more and even more with likely voters.For the GOP to be ahead on this issue is significant. And what has the GOP message been for the past month and half? Significant cuts in spending and reforming entitlement programs. The GOP has had a consistent message and drawn a firm line in the sand. It has been portrayed as terrible, heartless, nasty, and impractical. But the public is responding to it. The public recognizes the need for it.

CP Avoids Link – Privatization Politically Popular (1/3)

Conservatives want privatization – perceive it lowers spending and boosts the economy

Nelson, Daily Caller, 2-8-11

[Steven Nelson, writer, “Fiscal conservatives call for increased privatization of space”

The Daily Caller, February 8, 2011 <http://dailycaller.com/2011/02/08/fiscal-conservatives-call-for-increased-privatization-of-space/> EJONES]

Space spending has long been the multibillion-dollar government project that is rarely discussed and even more infrequently brought up as a primary focus by fiscal conservatives. Tuesday morning the Competitive Space Task Force, a self-described group of fiscal conservatives and free-market leaders, hosted a press conference to encourage increased privatization of the space [industry](http://dailycaller.com/2011/02/08/fiscal-conservatives-call-for-increased-privatization-of-space/). Members of the task force issued several recommendations to Congress, including finding an American replacement to the Space Shuttle (so to minimize the costly expenditures on use of Russian spacecraft) and encouraging more private investment in the development of manned spacecraft. Former Republican Rep. Robert S. Walker of Pennsylvania [said](http://www.spaceref.com/news/viewpr.html?pid=32687), “If we really want to ‘win the future’, we cannot abandon our commitment to space exploration and human spaceflight. The fastest path to space is not through Moscow, but through the American entrepreneur.” Task Force chairman Rand Simberg, of the Competitive Enterprise Institute, [said](http://www.spaceref.com/news/viewpr.html?pid=32687), “By opening space up to the American people and their enterprises, NASA can ignite an economic, [technological](http://dailycaller.com/2011/02/08/fiscal-conservatives-call-for-increased-privatization-of-space/), and innovation renaissance, and the United States will regain its rightful place as the world leader in space.” Also speaking at the press conference was Tom Schatz of Citizens Against Government Waste. Keith Cowing of NASA Watch [wrote](http://nasawatch.com/archives/2011/02/tea-partylibert.html) that he pressed Simberg about his feelings on the Obama administration’s priorities. He wrote that Simberg, “did not think that the President cared either way about space commercialization.” Cowling also wrote that he “asked [Citizens Against Government Waste] how they can reconcile statements in support of [commercial](http://dailycaller.com/2011/02/08/fiscal-conservatives-call-for-increased-privatization-of-space/) transport to the [International Space Station] when they have derided the [International Space Station] as a boondoggle for more than a decade. They said that they saw no contradiction.”

Privatization is universally popular

Powell 10

(Stewart, journalist for the Houston Chronicle, Aug 2, "Obama, NASA at crossroads over privatization of space travel," [www.stltoday.com/news/national/article\_3c9e0470-b176-5309-9065-c0a07dc52cc5.html] AD: 6-9-11, jm)

WASHINGTON • The protracted struggle between President Barack Obama and Congress over the future of NASA's manned space program is boiling down to how much responsibility and how much money the nation wants to hand over to private companies that would carry astronauts into orbit aboard commercial spacecraft for the first time. As Congress wraps up its work before the summer recess, this much is clear: The president won't get the entire $812 million down payment that he requested to launch an unprecedented $6 billion effort over five years to ferry cargo and Houston-trained astronauts to the orbiting international space station via commercial enterprises. But the Senate — and to a lesser extent the House — have signaled that the White House will probably get enough of its request in the $19 billion NASA budget to begin a historic change in direction for the space agency. Up to now, NASA has relied exclusively on its own spacecraft — or NASA-contracted Russian rockets — to carry every American astronaut into orbit since John Glenn's breakthrough orbital mission in 1962. "From the earliest days on the American frontier, commercial interests have always followed the steps of explorers," says Howard McCurdy, an American University scholar who wrote "Inside NASA: High Technology and Organizational Change in the U.S. Space Program." "There's widespread political consensus now for the commercial space sector to have a go at transportation into low earth orbit." Adds space historian John Logsdon, "This is a turn in the road toward where Obama wants to go."

CP Avoids Link – Privatization Politically Popular (2/3)

Bi-partisan support for cost cutting measures and privatization

Simberg, Aerospace Engineer and Chairman of the Competitive Space Task Force, 11

(Rand – Aerospace Engineer and Chairman of the Competitive Space Task Force, Space politics makes strange bedfellows, 6/8/11, http://washingtonexaminer.com/blogs/opinion-zone/2011/06/space-politics-makes-strange-bedfellows) AC

Staffers for California's Democratic Senators Barbara Boxer and Dianne Feinstein were no doubt nonplussed to discover that their bosses had been praised by the Tea Party on Monday. It's all of a piece of the political bizarro world in which space policy has been immersed for the last year and a half, ever since the Obama administration canceled the disastrous Constellation program in favor of a more commercial approach, and the response of many supposed conservatives in Congress was to demand a "public option." So, how did the two senators earn the support of the Florida Tea Partiers? As part of the final Continuing Resolution to fund the government through the end of the fiscal year, Congress, at the behest of space state Senators (Utah, Florida, Texas and Alabama), included an earmark of almost $2 billion dollars for a new heavy lift vehicle, which was supposed to use existing Shuttle and Constellation contracts and contractors. Specifically (among other features, or bugs, depending on one's point of view), it was intended to use Shuttle solid rocket motors, manufactured in Republican Sen. Orrin Hatch's Utah by ATK. But a fly entered the senatorial ointment. Late last year, Aerojet General, the smallest of the big three propulsion companies, declared its intention to pursue the first-stage engine business, and threatened to sue NASA to force it to open the planned sole-source contract to ATK to competition. Now enter the California senators. It is actually unusual for the California congressional delegation to pay much attention to space policy, despite the large amount of space industry in the state; traditionally, they have either taken it for granted, or ignored it entirely (for instance, there were few complaints back in the nineties when NASA moved a lot of Shuttle-related work from southern California to Texas and Florida). But Aerojet is based in Sacramento, the capital of the state, and apparently the company persuaded its senators, Boxer and Feinstein, to weigh in on its behalf. Late last month, they sent a letter to NASA administrator Charles Bolden, asking him to open up the propulsion contract to competition: In this time of constrained budgets, it would be inexcusible to funnel billions of taxpayer dollars into a non-competitive sole-source contract for the new Space Launch System. By allowing a competitive process, NASA could realize hundreds of millions of dollars in annual savings, and billions in savings over the life of the program. Furthermore, a competitive process will build capacity and enhance the critical skills and capabilities at a wide range of aerospace technology companies. We believe a competitive process is consistent with the NASA Reauthorization Act of 2010. As you know, this legislation directed the agency to construct a new human rated spacecraft by 2016 while utilizing existing contracts where "practicable." However, NASA itself has already concluded that such a plan is not practicable. The January 2011 report issued by your agency entitled the "Preliminary Report Regarding NASA's Space Launch System and Multi-Purpose Crew Vehicle" concluded that "NASA does not believe this goal is achievable based on a combination of the current funding profile estimate, traditional approaches to acquisition, and currently considered vehicle architectures." Based on this conclusion, we believe that it is not "practicable" to continue the existing contracts. Instead, we believe that NASA should open a competitive bidding process for the SLS to ensure that the agency obtains the best technology at the lowest possible cost. These words were music to the ears of both the Competitive Space Task Force (full disclosure: of which I am chairman) and Tea Party in Space, a Florida-based group that promotes a vigorous but fiscally responsible space program (something exactly the opposite of what those who make space policy on the Hill seem to want). Hence, Monday's press release lauding the two senators' action.

CP Avoids Link – Privatization Politically Popular (3/3)

Popular with defense lobbies

Pasztor 10

(Andy, senior special writer at the Los Angeles bureau of The Wall Street Journal, "White House Decides to Outsource NASA Work," Jan 24, [online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704375604575023530543103488.html], jm)

The idea of outsourcing a portion of NASA's manned space program to the private sector gained momentum after recommendations from a presidential panel appointed last year. The panel, chaired by former Lockheed Martin Corp. Chairman Norman Augustine, argued that allowing companies to build and launch their own rockets and spacecraft to carry American astronauts into orbit would save money and also free up NASA to focus on more ambitious, longer-term goals.

Key leaders support privatization

Moskowitz 11

(Clara, Space.com Senior Writer, "55 Space Leaders to Congress: Support Private Spaceflight Now," Mar 3, [www.space.com/11021-nasa-budget-congress-commercial-spaceflight.html], jm)

A group of more than 55 space leaders is petitioning Congress to support commercial spaceflight in an open letter this week. The plea comes as lawmakers are debating a new federal budget, including the question of how much money to devote to NASA. President Obama and NASA chief Charlie Bolden are advocating for more funds to spur the development of private spaceships to replace the iconic space shuttle as the flagship of U.S. astronaut transportation to the International Space Station. That plan, they say, would allow NASA to invest in a longer-term project to build a rocket that can carry astronauts beyond low-Earth orbit to asteroids and Mars.

Link – AT – Winners Win (1/2)

Mars isn’t a win – kills capital in the long run and cost generates opposition from congress, the media and public

Vedda, North Dakota University space studies professor, 7

(James, PhD in poli sci @ Florida U, policy analyst for govt contractor, specializes in security space issues, assoc prof of space studies @ North Dakota U, “Humans to Mars: Logical Step or Dangerous Distraction?”, Sept 2007, <http://www.nasa.gov/pdf/372849main_Vedda%20-%20AIAA%202007.pdf>) JPG

The primary reason for the failure of SEI was that virtually no one outside the immediate benefactors in the space community was willing to commit to a decades-long project of this magnitude in a budget climate characterized by record deficits. The NASA 90-day study, mentioned earlier, followed up on the president’s announcement with a long wish-list of programs that had been waiting for a window of opportunity for many years. But NASA managers misjudged how much the window had opened. Thirty-year cost projections in the range of $300 billion to $400 billion were more than the Congress was willing to accept. SEI, intended to be a bold vision, turned into an embarrassment for the president. Negative reaction to the long-term cost of the project was only part of the reason why SEI was short-lived. The president’s enthusiasm may not have been as deep as his Apollo anniversary speech seemed to indicate. After the initial rhetoric and start-up budget requests, he never again intervened on behalf of the program. Even if his conviction was strong at the beginning, he may have decided, after digesting the unfavorable initial reviews from Congress and the public, that it wasn’t worth investing political capital in something which may not show results for 30 years. The work of promoting SEI was left to the National Space Council, but its actions proved to be divisive rather than unifying. The Council’s immediate rejection of NASA’s 90-day study, and its initiation of the Synthesis Group effort to solicit cheaper alternatives from outside the space agency, alienated some inside the agency. NASA Administrator Richard Truly, who wanted the agency to stay focused on the shuttle and space station, openly expressed his disdain for SEI, further complicating the relationship with the Council. This friction between Truly and the Council contributed to Truly’s departure as Administrator in early 1992. The Council’s relationship with Congress was frosty as well. More precisely, the Council’s staff and congressional staffers were not communicating very well, much less cooperating. Concerned congress-members came to view the Council, which the legislature had eagerly endorsed just a short time earlier, as a means of wresting control of space policy from the Congress and NASA and consolidating it in the White House. Members began to call for more access to the inner workings of the Council and Senate confirmation of its executive secretary.29 These dysfunctional relationships were counterproductive, undermining the support coalition needed for the program to succeed. SEI’s Moon-Mars plan proved to be a hard sell throughout its short life. No strategically significant rationale was articulated to justify the project’s cost and risk. In his Apollo anniversary speech, and in a commencement address several months later,30 President Bush used the familiar rhetoric of discovery, destiny, inspiration, national prestige, and investment in the future. This type of language was sufficient at the height of the Cold War to justify Project Apollo, but by 1989 policy-makers and the public were already looking for more. What assets and/or capabilities does this bring to us that we wouldn’t have had otherwise? Are those benefits worth the cost and risk? What are the opportunity costs of not investing the resources elsewhere? SEI, like Apollo, was a destination-based human spaceflight program that never got to the point of establishing a permanent exploration agenda. Unlike Apollo, it generated disinterested or negative reactions throughout the Congress, the media, and the public. Stakeholders persisted in asking, “Why do this?” or at least “Why do this now?” NASA and the Administration provided no answers that satisfied a sufficient coalition of decision-makers and the public.

Link – AT – Winners Win (2/2)

No internal link – wins are not key to legislative outcomes – ideology outweighs presidential persuasion

Dickinson, Middlebury College political science professor and presidential scholar, 10

[Matthew, 12-26-10, Presidential Power, “A New START to the Obama Presidency?”, <http://blogs.middlebury.edu/presidentialpower/>, accessed 2-5-11, AFB]

My point here is not to argue that Obama and the Democrats fail to benefit by the START ratification – clearly they do. Look no further than the media spin! It is to claim however, that START ratification does not signal a resurgence in Obama’s “influence”, or his regaining political “momentum”. Instead, it illustrates the reality of the political context that dominated congressional proceedings for most of the 111th Congress. Simply put, Obama’s “success” in Congress was largely determined by Democrats’ ability to craft legislation that targeted the moderate legislators occupying the pivotal voting positions along the ideological spectrum, or by “pairing” legislation, as with the extension of unemployment legislation and the Bush tax cuts that I discussed in an earlier post. When Obama would not or could not frame legislation in this way, it failed to pass. Indeed, stories heralding Obama’s resurgence overlook Democrats’ failure during the lameduck session to pass the DREAM immigration act, the inability of the Democratically-controlled Senate to confirm a number of Obama’s judicial nominees and, most notably, Congress’ failure to pass a new budget.

Did we just see the reboot of the Obama presidency along with a change in presidential-congressional dynamics? Hardly. Instead, what we saw was a reminder of the limits of presidential power. When presidents “succeed” in getting their legislation through Congress, it is usually not because they have changed legislators’ minds. Instead, it is because they have framed legislation to appeal to the pivotal congressional members’ political interests, as determined primarily by these members’ constituency-driven electoral calculations. The ratification of START is a clear reminder that a president’s “persuasive” power is largely conditioned by the interests of those with whom he is bargaining.

Political capital is finite – a win on one issue doesn’t spill over

Gangale, San Francisco State political science lecturer, 5

(Thomas, poli sci lecturer @ SF State, 1/23/5, “To Amend or Not to Amend”, http://pweb.jps.net/~gangale/opsa/ps2/ToAmendOrNotToAmend.htm) JPG

Abolishing the Electoral College is somewhat of a progressive issue in that it is based on the principle of "one person, one vote." However, more than anything it is a "large states vs. small states" issue, and that is why it is a perennial loser. The reality is that there are many more Idahos and Nebraskas than there are Californias and New Yorks, and since a small state has as many votes in the US Senate as a large state, any proposal to do away with the Electoral College cannot hope to win the required two-thirds majority. It is destined to defeat. Even worse, the issue pits progressive states large and small against each other, weakening progressive solidarity. If you fight someone tooth-and-nail on one issue, it’s hard to muster any more than lukewarm support on another issue on which you agree. Political capital is like ammunition: use too much of it up in an unwise action, and you have to wait to be resupplied. Meanwhile, your forces may be in disarray and vulnerable to a counterstrike. Abolishing the Electoral College isn’t the only constitutional amendment that’s being bandied about this year. There’s also talk of an amendment to ban gay marriage.

Link – AT – McCain Link Turn

McCain’s support is weak – he’ll prioritize the economy

Simberg, Popular Mechanics columnist, 9

(Rand, columnist @ popular mechanics, “How Clinton, Obama and McCain Could Change U.S. Space Policy: Geek the Vote Guest Analysis”, 10/1/9, http://www.popularmechanics.com/science/space/4260504) JPG

John McCain The Rhetoric "He is proud to have sponsored legislation authorizing funding consistent with the President's vision for the space program, which includes a return of astronauts to the Moon in preparation for a manned mission to Mars. He believes support for a continued US presence in space is of major importance to America's future innovation and security. He has also been a staunch advocate for ensuring that NASA funding is accompanied by proper management and oversight to ensure that the taxpayers receive the maximum return on their investment." ([johnmccain.com](http://www.johnmccain.com/informing/issues/7366faf9-d504-4abc-a889-9c08d601d8ee.htm)) The Reality Sounds good, right? Well, there are a couple of things the senator leaves open-ended. It could very well be that upon gaining office, McCain will determine that taxpayers haven't been receiving that "maximum return." That's certainly the opinion of many in the space community--that NASA's program is too expensive for too little return, with many billions to be spent over the next few years for nothing more than a repeat of the Apollo program. If so, it could result in a major restructuring of the agency. What should be of even more concern for those who favor NASA's current plans is the senator's [recent pledge](http://biz.yahoo.com/cnnm/080415/041508_mccain_economic_plan.html?printer=1) to freeze all domestic discretionary spending as part of an effort to reduce the federal budget deficit. "Every program comes with a built-in assumption that it should go on forever, and its budget increase forever," McCain said in a speech about the economy in Pittsburgh last week. "My administration will change that way of thinking." Along with that goal comes a one-year, approximately $460 billion freeze on discretionary agencies and operations--NASA included.

Link – AT – Texas Link Turn

Texas clout in Congress is at an all-time low

Pershing, Washington Post, 11

(Ben, writer @ Washington Post, “Texas slips in House leadership clout”, 1/3/11, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2011/01/03/AR2011010305091.html?wprss=rss\_politics) JPG

They say everything is bigger in Texas, but is the state's clout in Congress actually getting smaller? A decade ago, the 107th Congress was sworn into office with two Texans - Richard K. Armey and Tom DeLay - occupying the No. 2 and No. 3 House GOP leadership positions, making the state the clear heavyweight in the chamber. On Wednesday, the 112th Congress will begin with two Texans in the House leadership, but on lower rungs. Rep. Jeb Hensarling will be Republican Conference chairman, and Rep. Pete Sessions will chair the National Republican Congressional Committee. On the committee front, two Texas Republicans lost bids last month for House panel chairmanships to lawmakers from Michigan: Rep. Fred Upton bested Rep. Joe L. Barton for the gavel of the powerful Energy and Commerce Committee, and Rep. Mike Rogers edged out Rep. William M. "Mac" Thornberry to head the Intelligence Committee. Texas will hold two chairmanships this year - of the Judiciary and the Science and Technology panels - but California and Alabama also hold two apiece, and their committees are arguably more desirable than Texas's. Michigan and Florida lead the way, with three full committee gavels each. All this is despite the fact that, with 23 members, Texas's Republican delegation continues to be the biggest in the House. (California and Florida are next with 19 Republicans apiece.) So, what's the matter with Texas? Calvin Jillson, a political science professor and expert on Texas politics at Southern Methodist University in Dallas, said the state's decline in Congress has been a long process. "If you look back over the last century, Texas's clout is at a low point, even if it has come back a bit the last couple of election cycles," Jillson said. The state has provided three of the last 14 House speakers and used to dominate the ranks of committee chairmen. But Texas has lately been the victim of two factors: term limits and turnover. Barton failed to keep hold of the Energy and Commerce Committee largely because he couldn't persuade GOP leaders to waive a six-year term limit for top panel Republicans. (Another Texan, Bill Archer, had to surrender the coveted Ways and Means Committee gavel a decade ago for the same reason.) More important, seniority still plays a major role in chairmanship decisions. Many Texas lawmakers are relatively junior: Fourteen of the state's 23 House Republicans have been elected since 2002, in many cases replacing senior Democrats who held powerful positions in their party.

\*\*\*Internal Links

Political Capital Key to Trade Agreements (1/2)

Capitol is key to trade agreements – empirics prove

McLarty, former Clinton Chief of Staff and Cunningham, former Clinton aide, 11

[Thomas McLarty, former chief of staff to Clinton and Nelson Cunningham, aide to President Clinton and to then Sen. Biden, 1-24-11, “Obama's Free Trade Opportunity,” Council of the Americas, January 24th 2011   <http://coa.counciloftheamericas.org/print.php?type=article&id=2958> EJONES]

Our experience tells us that the only way to push a major trade agreement through Congress -- even one where the nominally pro-trade GOP rules the House -- is with strong and unyielding presidential leadership, a unified White House staff and cabinet, and a genuinely bipartisan approach to stakeholders and the Congress. First, the president must be fully committed. Nafta was a bipartisan success in no small part because of the personal involvement of Mr. Clinton and sometimes tortuous negotiations with members of Congress. It's true that some pork was doled out and more than one bridge was built as a result of a Nafta vote -- something they probably still understand in Chicago. Second, the White House and cabinet must be unified in pulling for passage. Everyone from Vice President Joe Biden to Secretary of State Hillary Clinton to Labor Secretary Hilda Solis and U.S. Trade Representative Ron Kirk must be fully engaged, without hesitation. Don't forget the crucial role that then-Vice President Al Gore's 1993 debate with Ross Perot played in swinging public opinion in favor of Nafta. Third, the effort must be genuinely bipartisan. We'll need scores of members from both sides to make passage possible (this is particularly true with a large tea party GOP caucus that is as yet undefined on trade).

Political Capital Key to Trade Agreements (2/2)

Obama’s capital is necessary to pass Free Trade, he needs to push to win over Democrats

Palmer and Cowan, Reuters, 11

(Doug and Richard – Reuters, Boehner says Obama push needed to pass trade deals, 5/5/11, http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/05/05/us-usa-trade-boehner-idUSTRE74453V20110505) AC

(Reuters) - The U.S. House of Representatives hopes to pass long-delayed free-trade agreements with Colombia, South Korea and Panama by August, House Speaker John Boehner said Thursday. "We can move pretty quickly but it's going to take help by the president as well," Boehner told reporters. Although Republicans, who now control the House, are generally pro-trade, some members of the party are skeptical of trade deals. "I do believe a lot of work will have to be done with our own members," Boehner said. In addition, a large portion of Democrats are likely to vote against the pacts, especially the Colombia agreement, which is generally seen as the most controversial of the three trade deals because of a long history of violence against union workers in the Andean country. "The president is going to have to be out there as well talking about the importance of these three agreements. We hope to have them finished by the August recess," Boehner said. U.S. Trade Representative Ron Kirk told reporters separately he was optimistic Congress would pass the three trade deals with "good bipartisan support." But talking to reporters after a speech, Kirk said it was "critical" lawmakers also renew an expanded Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) program to help retrain workers who have the lost their jobs because of foreign competition. "TAA is for us, again, part of the package," Kirk said. Congress approved an expanded TAA program as part of the 2009 economic stimulus bill, but it expired early this year. Efforts to renew the program failed when some Republicans in the House of Representatives objected to its cost. The beefed-up program has helped "a half a million workers and families in every state ... and it is critical that we have that program authorized at those levels," Kirk said. After striking side deals to address outstanding concerns about each of the three trade pacts, the Obama administration now has "agreements that we think are going to garner good bipartisan support," Kirk said. "We believe we can work with the leadership in the House and the Senate to get them passed," Kirk said. The trade agreements with South Korea, Colombia and Panama were signed during the administration of President George W. Bush, but they stalled in the face of Democratic opposition. Since December, the Obama administration has negotiated new auto provisions for the Korean agreement, a tax information exchange treaty with Panama and an action plan with Colombia to address longstanding US concerns about anti-union violence. Administration officials said Wednesday they were prepared to begin technical discussions with Congress on implementing legislation for all three agreements, after Colombia met initial benchmarks in the labor action plan. The officials said they expected further action from Colombia on the labor front before formally submitting the Colombia trade bill to Congress for a vote. The next set of benchmarks that Colombia must meet under the action plan are in mid-June. Meanwhile, the Senate Finance Committee has scheduled a hearing next week on the Colombia agreement in anticipation it would soon be sent to Capitol Hill.

Political Capital Key to Agenda (1/3)

Political capital is the capacity to remove political obstacles through cooperation

Harvey, University of Mississippi School of Business Administration Dean and Global Business Chair, et al 03

(Michael Harvey is the Dean and Hearin Chair of Global Business, School of Business Administration University of Mississippi, The development of political skill and political capital by global leaders through global assignments

The International Journal of Human Resource Management, Volume 15, Issue 7, 2004, Pages 1173 - 1188 EBSCO TJL )

A concomitant set of actions that needs to be undertaken by global leaders involves the building of political capital. The notion of political capital relates to the capacity of global leaders to develop political skill during their global assignments. The dimensions of individual political capital include; 1) reputational capital (i.e. leaders that are in the global network as having the political skill for 'getting things done' expediently); and 2) representative capital (i.e. reflecting the constituent support and/or legitimacy that a leader may acquire/be granted using his/her reward/coercive, positional, expert, legitimate, and referent bases of power) (Lopez, 2002). Political capital is not the same as the 'social grease' attributed to social capital but is a capacity that rests within leaders to remove obstacles to co-operation due to their political goodwill as perceived by others. There are six behaviours that can influence the formation of political capital, they are: 1) social approximation - the degree of synchronicity of the interaction with the leader and those in the organization with which the leader has political capital; 2) level/type of interaction - access to the leader and the type of interaction (i.e. face-to-face, electronic or other) that individuals have with the leader; 3) scope and reach - the breadth of the network of individuals who perceive the leader having political capital; 4) dispersion of knowledge - the knowledge level within the global network of the political capital of the leader; 5) durability - the 'lasting' or residual capacity of the political capital of the leader; and 6) degree of formality - the degree to which the political capital of the leader is legitimized in the organization by position or formal authority. It is important to recognize the individual components when attempting to formalize programmes to develop global leaders' political skill and resulting political capital. Table 1 illustrates the differences in formative characteristics between global leaders' social and political capital.

Political capital is critical to overcoming all obstacles to passage

Harvey, University of Mississippi School of Business Administration Dean and Global Business Chair, et al 03

(Michael Harvey is the Dean and Hearin Chair of Global Business, School of Business Administration University of Mississippi, The development of political skill and political capital by global leaders through global assignments

The International Journal of Human Resource Management, Volume 15, Issue 7, 2004, Pages 1173 - 1188 EBSCO TJL )

Political capital is as critical to leaders in global organizations because it can reduce the level of conflict and dysfunctional consequences among foreign subsidiaries. With an adequate level of political capital, others (i.e. peers, subordinates and even superiors) in the global network organization will tend to acquiesce with the leader who has demonstrated political skill. They will establish political capital and seldom challenge his/her reputation to represent diverse interests in the global organization.

Political Capital Key to Agenda (2/3)

Capitol key to the agenda – nothing is as important

Light, Brookings Governance Studies senior fellow, 99

[Paul Light, Senior Fellow of Governance Studies, Director of the Center for Public Service the President’s Agenda: Domestic Policy Choice from Kennedy to Clinton, 3rd Edition p. 34 EJONES]

In chapter 2, I will consider just how capital affects the basic parameters of the domestic agenda. Though the internal resources are important contributors to timing and size, capital remains the cirtical factor. That conclusion will become essential in understanding the domestic agenda. Whatever the President’s personal expertise, character, or skills, capital is the most important resource. In the past, presidential scholars have focused on individual factors in discussing White House decisions, personality being the dominant factor. Yet, given low levels in presidential capital, even the most positive and most active executive could make little impact. A president can be skilled, charming, charismatic, a veritable legislative wizard, but if he does not have the basic congressional strength, his domestic agenda will be severely restricted – capital affects both the number and the content of the President’s priorities. Thus, it is capital that determines whether the President will have the opportunity to offer a detailed domestic program, whether he will be restricted to a series of limited initiatives and vetoes. Capital sets the basic parameters of the agenda, determining the size of the agenda and guiding the criteria for choice. Regardless of the President’s personality, capital is the central force behind the domestic agenda.

Obama’s political capital is high and effective

Mason, Washington Examiner White House correspondent, 11

(Julie, White House Correspondent for the Washington Examiner, Jan 4, [washingtonexaminer.com/politics/white-house/2011/01/obama-tapping-personal-charm-political-capital-combat-gop], jm)

After a string of late-session victories last month that included repealing the ban on gays serving openly in the military, cutting a tax-cut deal with Republicans and ratification of a nuclear arms treaty with Russia, Obama also is politically reanimated. His job approval ratings are back up to 50 percent after a long run in the mid-40s. Obama also has a potent weapon in the arsenal: a high personal approval rating of 73 percent, according to a recent CNN/Opinion Research Corp. poll. Even people who don't approve of the job Obama is doing like him personally. Chris Reardon, a political scientist and pollster at the University of New Hampshire, noted that presidents with high personal likability ratings can often be more effective than their popularity job approval ratings would suggest or political opponents might expect. "He hasn't done anything horrendous, people see he is a family man," Reardon said. "He might be cold and so forth, but he hasn't betrayed the country -- it's how he is perceived as a person."

Political Capital Key to Agenda (3/3)

Political capital determines the agenda

Silber 7

(Marissa, Political Science PhD @ U of Florida, “WHAT MAKES A PRESIDENT QUACK? UNDERSTANDING LAME DUCK STATUS THROUGH THE EYES OF THE MEDIA AND POLITICIANS”, 9/2/7, http://www.allacademic.com//meta/p\_mla\_apa\_research\_citation/2/1/0/8/9/pages210893/p210893-1.php) JPG

Political capital, based on external resources “determines whether the President will have the opportunity to offer a detailed domestic program, whether he will be restricted to a series of limited initiatives and vetoes” according to Light (34). A President’s political capital determines the size and parameters of his agenda. Capital is based on external sources such as party support in Congress, public approval and electoral margin, and reputation. Capital reflects a President’s strength; low levels of political capital make it difficult for a President to get anything done. A lame duck President is plagued by past policy failures, while not benefiting as much from policy successes (Dunn 2006). George Bush has been plagued by his lack of response to Hurricane Katrina and first term foreign policies after 9/11 to deal with the War on Terrorism (Dunn 2006). Past Presidents have also been plagued by both domestic and foreign policy failures, affecting both party and public support. Party support is the chief ingredient in Presidential capital; even if public approval ratings go down, a President can still succeed if he has party support. Although congressional support does not guarantee victories on crucial votes, it helps more than public support (Light 27). The following example seems to suggest the importance of political capital and congressional support needed for a second-term President. Sundquist (1973) explores the loss of Presidential control over congress occurring when a President is a lame duck. Using the example of Dwight D. Eisenhower, he describes the “jockeying” that occurs among parties in congress. In the case of a lame duck, the President’s power to impose discipline recedes while factions and individuals within Congress are less willing to cooperate (281). Conciliation is unlikely except for “matters where public pressure is overwhelming, or where some other circumstance makes legislative action imperative” since the President and his party want to maintain control and the opposing party tries to take advantage of a weak President (281). In the case of Eisenhower, Democrats showed limitless disdain for the President’s domestic proposals. Rather than holding hearings about the President’s proposals, they focused on advancing their own measures and forced Eisenhower to veto many bills. Democrats forced Eisenhower to use his veto, hoping to emphasize to the public the differences among parties. While Eisenhower welcomed the opportunity to veto in attempts to “castigate the opposition as a party of reckless spendthrifts and depict his own party as safe, sane, and prudent,” the 1960 election showed that the Democrats’ strategy was successful (281).

Internal Link Brink – Narrow Window for Capital

Window narrowing for Obama to use capital

Light, NYU public policy professor, 6-2-11

[Paul, Light on Leadership, “Fixing US debt: Boehner’s offer to Obama” <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/light-on-leadership/post/fixing-us-debt-why-obama-shouldnt-swing-when-boehner-says-its-time-to-play-large-ball/2011/03/18/AGQOSIHH_blog.html>, accessed 6-18-11, AFB]

Moreover, Obama has just one chance—and one chance only—to take the lead on the debt solution. He cannot be pulled into a long-running game. Contrary to the conventional wisdom, presidents have very little political capital to spend on much of anything in their third and fourth years. And Obama will have barely a nanosecond to set the policy agenda if reelected. Here’s the thing: Every Democratic president since Lyndon Johnson has [sent a smaller domestic agenda](http://www.brookings.edu/papers/2004/1012governance_light.aspx) to Congress than his predecessor, as has every Republican president since Richard Nixon. And as for the fifth-year myth, forget about it. Ronald Reagan did not forward a single new proposal to Congress in the first year of his second term, Bill Clinton forwarded six and George W. Bush just three (and most of these nine were repeats of earlier proposals). How has Obama done by comparison? At least for now, he's on trend. His first-year agenda was compact at best. Only the stimulus package, health-care reform and a vast expansion of Americorps led the agenda, leaving few other initiatives to celebrate. Bound by the economic calamity, he had little room to propose grand ideas and was forced to settle for a few big ones that were quickly ground down in the legislative process. Yes, there were other big Obama proposals, but most don't compare with the breadth or number of the Johnson, Carter and Clinton initiatives.

Political Capital Finite (1/2)

Political capital is finite, Obama must prioritize his agenda

Bracknell, Marine lieutenant and Atlantic Council senior fellow, 5-26-11

(Butch Bracknell is a Marine lieutenant colonel and a senior fellow at the Atlantic Council, http://articles.latimes.com/2011/may/26/opinion/la-oe-bracknell-icc-20110526/2, 5-26-11 “The U.S. and the International Criminal Court: An unfinished debate” TJL)

The answer for public consumption is that U.S. accession to the Rome Statute, which established the International Criminal Court, is not an imminent issue because U.S. processes for achieving accountability function well: The military and civilian courts are open, the government already is bringing cases to court where the evidence warrants, and convictions are occurring on a sufficiently regular basis. The subtext is that the Obama administration has to prioritize where to spend political capital and carefully select its fights. Nonetheless, as a nation, we need to revive the debate over joining the ICC.

Political Capital Finite (2/2)

Severe economic decline uniquely makes Obama’s political finite- he must focus on jobs or he’s done

Financial Mail 5-6-11

(“Barack Obama's political capital” 5-6-11 nexislexis TJL)

The death of Osama bin Laden at the hands of American special forces is more of a symbolic event than an actual dent in the fight against terrorism. By all accounts Bin Laden had long ceased to be the principal mover in Al-Qaeda and the group has over the years become more of a Hydra, with many heads in different parts of the world.In business parlance you could say Al-Qaeda had become a very successful, though deadly, terrorist franchise. It is as such perhaps too early for US president Barack Obama to say the world is now a "safer place" with his death. A byproduct, though, for Obama in the ordering of the attack on Bin Laden and the apparent instruction, similar to his predecessor George W Bush's instructions to bring him back "dead or alive", is the boost to his flagging political fortunes that could have some important implications. Obama has been under siege in the US in recent months over concerns that he was aloof, unable to lead decisively or take unpopular decisions, compounded by the deadlock in negotiations over the US budget. Also, there have been persistent questions raised in some quarters, including by his former rival and current secretary of state, Hillary Clinton, during the campaign for the Democratic nomination in 2008, that his inexperience in military matters and foreign affairs meant he didn't have the necessary credentials to be a commander-in-chief. This has all been forgotten in the aftermath of this weekend's event. The question now is, can Obama use the political capital he has gained to tackle perhaps an even bigger threat to the US - its ballooning debt and an inability to find a deal with a Republican Party emboldened by its historic victory in last November's congressional elections? Obama may be tempted to deploy his newfound popularity for his re-election next year. But the budget crisis is more urgent. There are perhaps just a couple of weeks until the US is expected to reach its US $14,7trillion debt limit. US lawmakers have indicated that they will not extend this limit until a deal is brokered between the Republicans and Democrats on how the government will cut America's federal budget deficit.The situation has reached such a dire point that rating agency Standard & Poor's took the unprecedented step of placing US treasuries on a negative outlook last month. The agency warned that unless the Obama administration and the US congress found a way to slash the deficit within the next two years, the US could lose its prized AAA+ credit rating.The problem, though, is that the Democrats and Republicans remain poles apart on a solution. This despite the chairman of the budget committee, who is trying to find a deal that will be acceptable to both parties, saying they were getting closer to a deal. What is clear is that the US government cannot continue on its present path of providing expensive social benefits such as Medicare to its citizens without raising taxes. But this is not palatable to the Republicans and neither party wants to risk losing votes, especially with presidential elections taking place next year, by cutting social welfare benefits.So why should SA care? A failure to secure a deal could have dire consequences for the rest of the world, which remains in a fragile economic position. The US economy is still the world's largest, and an important part of the global economic engine. Without a deal, the US government risks paralysis and a shutdown of its administration. Unless it takes drastic action in tackling its rising debt and interest payments, the US could conceivably risk facing an "interest spiral" where a greater and greater proportion of its budget is spent servicing its debt. And this will have disastrous implications for both the US and world economy.So though the political capital Obama has gained in dealing with Bin Laden might not mean he will get his and the Democrats' way in the budget negotiations, it is perhaps the best time for him to use it to find a solution before it's too late.

Internal Link – Passage of TAA Key to FTAs

TAA deal is key to passing FTA - Democrats won’t vote without it

Jackson, USA Today, 5-16-11

(David Jackson – USA Today Staff Writer, USA Today, Obama to hold up free trade pacts unless GOP provides more worker aid, 5/16/11, <http://content.usatoday.com/communities/theoval/post/2011/05/obama-to-hold-up-free-trade-pacts-unless-gop-provides-more-worker-aid/1>) AC

While President Obama met with flood victims and addressed high school graduates today in Memphis, his aides back in Washington threatened to hold up a trio of free trade agreements unless Senate Republicans agree to expand a U.S. worker aid package. Free trade agreements (FTAs) with South Korea, Panama, and Colombia now hinge on expanding the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program (TAA), which provides retraining to Americans workers who lose jobs to foreign competition. "We will not submit the FTAs without an agreement on an enhanced TAA," said Gene Sperling, director of the National Economic Council. "But we also believe we can work on congressional leadership to get that accomplished." Some Republicans objected to what they called political blackmail. Sen. Orrin Hatch, R-Utah, top Republican on the Senate Finance Committee, said tying free trade agreements "to unrelated spending is hugely disappointing to American workers, farmers, and job creators, who are losing out to foreign competitors with every passing day." "It makes no sense to shut the door on increasing U.S. exports by over $10 billion in order to fund a costly program," Hatch said. "With our economy struggling and our nation broke, it's time to stop the excuses and give our exporters fair access to international markets."

\*\*\*South Korean Free Trade Agreement Good

Alliance Good – Asia Stability Scenario (1/3)

Weakened alliance ensures collapse of global heg, triggering Japanese rearm, and Asian escalation

Goh, University of Oxford Department of Politics and International Relations lecturer, 8

(Evelyn Goh, Lecturer in International Relations in the Department of Politics and International Relations at the Univ of Oxford, “Hierarchy and the role of the United States in the East Asian security order,” in International Relations of the Asia-Pacific, 2008 8(3):353-377, Oxford Journals Database)

The centrality of these mutual processes of assurance and deference means that the stability of a hierarchical order is fundamentally related to a collective sense of certainty about the leadership and order of the hierarchy. This certainty is rooted in a combination of material calculations – smaller states' assurance that the expected costs of the dominant state conquering them would be higher than the benefits – and ideational convictions – the sense of legitimacy, derived from shared values and norms that accompanies the super-ordinate state's authority in the social order. The empirical analysis in the next section shows that regional stability in East Asia in the post-Second World War years can be correlated to the degree of collective certainty about the US-led regional hierarchy. East Asian stability and instability has been determined by U.S. assurances, self-confidence, and commitment to maintaining its primary position in the regional hierarchy; the perceptions and confidence of regional states about US commitment; and the reactions of subordinate states in the region to the varied challengers to the regional hierarchical order. 4. Hierarchy and the East Asian security order Currently, the regional hierarchy in East Asia is still dominated by the United States. Since the 1970s, China has increasingly claimed the position of second-ranked great power, a claim that is today legitimized by the hierarchical deference shown by smaller subordinate powers such as South Korea and Southeast Asia. Japan and South Korea can, by virtue of their alliance with the United States, be seen to occupy positions in a third layer of regional major powers, while India is ranked next on the strength of its new strategic relationship with Washington. North Korea sits outside the hierarchic order but affects it due to its military prowess and nuclear weapons capability. Apart from making greater sense of recent history, conceiving of the US' role in East Asia as the dominant state in the regional hierarchy helps to clarify three critical puzzles in the contemporary international and East Asian security landscape. First, it contributes to explaining the lack of sustained challenges to American global preponderance after the end of the Cold War. Three of the key potential global challengers to US unipolarity originate in Asia (China, India, and Japan), and their support for or acquiescence to, US dominance have helped to stabilize its global leadership. Through its dominance of the Asian regional hierarchy, the United States has been able to neutralize the potential threats to its position from Japan via an alliance, from India by gradually identifying and pursuing mutual commercial and strategic interests, and from China by encircling and deterring it with allied and friendly states that support American preponderance. Secondly, recognizing US hierarchical preponderance further explains contemporary under-balancing in Asia, both against a rising China, and against incumbent American power. I have argued that one defining characteristic of a hierarchical system is voluntary subordination of lesser states to the dominant state, and that this goes beyond rationalistic bandwagoning because it is manifested in a social contract that comprises the related processes of hierarchical assurance and hierarchical deference. Critically, successful and sustainable hierarchical assurance and deference helps to explain why Japan is not yet a ‘normal’ country. Japan has experienced significant impetus to revise and expand the remit of its security forces in the last 15 years. Yet, these pressures continue to be insufficient to prompt a wholesale revision of its constitution and its remilitarization. The reason is that the United States extends its security umbrella over Japan through their alliance, which has led Tokyo not only to perceive no threat from US dominance, but has in fact helped to forge a security community between them (Nau, 2003). Adjustments in burden sharing in this alliance since the 1990s have arisen not from greater independent Japanese strategic activism, but rather from periods of strategic uncertainty and crises for Japan when it appeared that American hierarchical assurance, along with US' position at the top of the regional hierarchy, was in question. Thus, the Japanese priority in taking on more responsibility for regional security has been to improve its ability to facilitate the US' central position, rather than to challenge it.13 In the face of the security threats from North Korea and China, Tokyo's continued reliance on the security pact with the United States is rational. While there remains debate about Japan's re-militarization and the growing clout of nationalist ‘hawks’ in Tokyo, for regional and domestic political reasons, a
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sustained ‘normalization’ process cannot take place outside of the restraining framework of the United States–Japan alliance (Samuels, 2007; Pyle, 2007). Abandoning the alliance will entail Japan making a conscience choice not only to remove itself from the US-led hierarchy, but also to challenge the United States dominance directly. The United States–ROK alliance may be understood in a similar way, although South Korea faces different sets of constraints because of its strategic priorities related to North Korea. As J.J. Suh argues, in spite of diminishing North Korean capabilities, which render the US security umbrella less critical, the alliance endures because of mutual identification – in South Korea, the image of the US as ‘the only conceivable protector against aggression from the North,’ and in the United States, an image of itself as protector of an allied nation now vulnerable to an ‘evil’ state suspected of transferring weapons of mass destruction to terrorist networks (Suh, 2004). Kang, in contrast, emphasizes how South Korea has become less enthusiastic about its ties with the United States – as indicated by domestic protests and the rejection of TMD – and points out that Seoul is not arming against a potential land invasion from China but rather maritime threats (Kang, 2003, pp.79–80). These observations are valid, but they can be explained by hierarchical deference toward the United States, rather than China. The ROK's military orientation reflects its identification with and dependence on the United States and its adoption of US' strategic aims. In spite of its primary concern with the North Korean threat, Seoul's formal strategic orientation is toward maritime threats, in line with Washington's regional strategy. Furthermore, recent South Korean Defense White Papers habitually cited a remilitarized Japan as a key threat. The best means of coping with such a threat would be continued reliance on the US security umbrella and on Washington's ability to restrain Japanese remilitarization (Eberstadt et al., 2007). Thus, while the United States–ROK bilateral relationship is not always easy, its durability is based on South Korea's fundamental acceptance of the United States as the region's primary state and reliance on it to defend and keep regional order. It also does not rule out Seoul and other US allies conducting business and engaging diplomatically with China. India has increasingly adopted a similar strategy vis-à-vis China in recent years. Given its history of territorial and political disputes with China and its contemporary economic resurgence, India is seen as the key potential power balancer to a growing China. Yet, India has sought to negotiate settlements about border disputes with China, and has moved significantly toward developing closer strategic relations with the United States. Apart from invigorated defense cooperation in the form of military exchange programs and joint exercises, the key breakthrough was the agreement signed in July 2005 which facilitates renewed bilateral civilian nuclear cooperation (Mohan, 2007 ). Once again, this is a key regional power that could have balanced more directly and independently against China, but has rather chosen to align itself or bandwagon with the primary power, the United States, partly because of significant bilateral gains, but fundamentally in order to support the latter's regional order-managing function. Recognizing a regional hierarchy and seeing that the lower layers of this hierarchy have become more active since the mid-1970s also allows us to understand why there has been no outright balancing of China by regional states since the 1990s. On the one hand, the US position at the top of the hierarchy has been revived since the mid-1990s, meaning that deterrence against potential Chinese aggression is reliable and in place.14 On the other hand, the aim of regional states is to try to consolidate China's inclusion in the regional hierarchy at the level below that of the United States, not to keep it down or to exclude it. East Asian states recognize that they cannot, without great cost to themselves, contain Chinese growth. But they hope to socialize China by enmeshing it in peaceful regional norms and economic and security institutions. They also know that they can also help to ensure that the capabilities gap between China and the United States remains wide enough to deter a power transition. Because this strategy requires persuading China about the appropriateness of its position in the hierarchy and of the legitimacy of the US position, all East Asian states engage significantly with China, with the small Southeast Asian states refusing openly to ‘choose sides’ between the United States and China. Yet, hierarchical deference continues to explain why regional institutions such as the ASEAN Regional Forum, ASEAN + 3, and East Asian Summit have made limited progress. While the United State has made room for regional multilateral institutions after the end of the Cold War, its hierarchical preponderance also constitutes the regional order to the extent that it cannot comfortably be excluded from any substantive strategic developments. On the part of some lesser states (particularly Japan and Singapore), hierarchical deference is manifested in inclusionary impulses (or at least impulses not to exclude the United States or US proxies) in regional institutions, such as the East Asia Summit in December 2005. Disagreement on this issue with others, including China and Malaysia, has stymied potential progress in these regional institutions (Malik, 2006). Finally, conceiving of a US-led East Asian hierarchy amplifies our understanding of how and why the United States–China relationship is now the key to regional order. The vital nature of the Sino-American relationship stems from these two states' structural positions. As discussed earlier, China is the primary second-tier power in the regional hierarchy. However, as Chinese power grows and Chinese activism spreads beyond Asia, the United States is less and less able to see China as merely a regional power – witness the growing concerns about Chinese investment and aid in certain African countries. This causes a disjuncture between US global interests and US regional interests. Regional attempts to engage and socialize China are aimed at mediating its intentions. This process, however, cannot stem Chinese growth, which forms the material basis of US threat perceptions. Apprehensions about the growth of China's power culminates in US fears about the region being ‘lost’ to China, echoing Cold War concerns that transcribed regional defeats into systemic setbacks.15 On the other hand, the US security strategy post-Cold War and post-9/11 have regional manifestations that disadvantage China. The strengthening of US alliances with Japan and Australia; and the deployment of US troops to Central, South, and Southeast Asia all cause China to fear a consolidation of US global hegemony that will first threaten Chinese national security in the regional context and then stymie China's global reach. Thus, the key determinants of the East Asian security order relate to two core questions: (i) Can the US be persuaded that China can act as a reliable ‘regional stakeholder’ that will help to buttress regional stability and US global security aims;16 and (ii) can China be convinced that the United States has neither territorial ambitions in Asia nor the desire to encircle China, but will help to promote
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Chinese development and stability as part of its global security strategy? (Wang, 2005). But, these questions cannot be asked in the abstract, outside the context of negotiation about their relative positions in the regional and global hierarchies. One urgent question for further investigation is how the process of assurance and deference operate at the topmost levels of a hierarchy? When we have two great powers of unequal strength but contesting claims and a closing capabilities gap in the same regional hierarchy, how much scope for negotiation is there, before a reversion to balancing dynamics? This is the main structural dilemma: as long as the United States does not give up its primary position in the Asian regional hierarchy, China is very unlikely to act in a way that will provide comforting answers to the two questions. Yet, the East Asian regional order has been and still is constituted by US hegemony, and to change that could be extremely disruptive and may lead to regional actors acting in highly destabilizing ways. Rapid Japanese remilitarization, armed conflict across the Taiwan Straits, Indian nuclear brinksmanship directed toward Pakistan, or a highly destabilized Korean peninsula are all illustrative of potential regional disruptions. 5. Conclusion To construct a coherent account of East Asia's evolving security order, I have suggested that the United States is the central force in constituting regional stability and order. The major patterns of equilibrium and turbulence in the region since 1945 can be explained by the relative stability of the US position at the top of the regional hierarchy, with periods of greatest insecurity being correlated with greatest uncertainty over the American commitment to managing regional order. Furthermore, relationships of hierarchical assurance and hierarchical deference explain the unusual character of regional order in the post-Cold War era. However, the greatest contemporary challenge to East Asian order is the potential conflict between China and the United States over rank ordering in the regional hierarchy, a contest made more potent because of the inter-twining of regional and global security concerns. Ultimately, though, investigating such questions of positionality requires conceptual lenses that go beyond basic material factors because it entails social and normative questions. How can China be brought more into a leadership position, while being persuaded to buy into shared strategic interests and constrain its own in ways that its vision of regional and global security may eventually be reconciled with that of the United States and other regional players? How can Washington be persuaded that its central position in the hierarchy must be ultimately shared in ways yet to be determined? The future of the East Asian security order is tightly bound up with the durability of the United States' global leadership and regional domination. At the regional level, the main scenarios of disruption are an outright Chinese challenge to US leadership, or the defection of key US allies, particularly Japan. Recent history suggests, and the preceding analysis has shown, that challenges to or defections from US leadership will come at junctures where it appears that the US commitment to the region is in doubt, which in turn destabilizes the hierarchical order. At the global level, American geopolitical over-extension will be the key cause of change. This is the one factor that could lead to both greater regional and global turbulence, if only by the attendant strategic uncertainly triggering off regional challenges or defections. However, it is notoriously difficult to gauge thresholds of over-extension. More positively, East Asia is a region that has adjusted to previous periods of uncertainty about US primacy. Arguably, the regional consensus over the United States as primary state in a system of benign hierarchy could accommodate a shifting of the strategic burden to US allies like Japan and Australia as a means of systemic preservation. The alternatives that could surface as a result of not doing so would appear to be much worse.

SKFTA Good – Trade Policy

SKFTA is the linchpin of US free trade policy

Cooper, Congressional Research Service International Trade and Finance specialist, et al. 9

(William, Specialist in International Trade and Finance for the Congressional Research Service, Mark Manyin, specialist in Asian Affairs @ CRS, Remy Jurenas, Specialist in Agricultural Policy @ CRS, and Michaela Platzer, Specialist in Industrial Organization and Business @ CRS, "The Proposed U.S.-South Korea Free Trade Agreement (KORUS FTA): Provisions and Implications," Mar 24, [http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/crs/rl34330.pdf ] AD: 6-3-11, jm)

The fate of the KORUS FTA could affect U.S. efforts to institutionalize its economic presence in East Asia, a goal the Bush Administration has been pursuing in part through FTAs. In addition to the KORUS FTA, the United States has an FTA with Singapore. It has been negotiating with Malaysia and Thailand, but these negotiations have been slow or dormant. In September 2008, the United States announced it would launch negotiations to join the Trans-Pacific Strategic Economic Partnership Agreement (also called the “P-4” agreement), a trade liberalization arrangement among Brunei, Chile, New Zealand, and Singapore. The U.S. use of FTAs in Asia also has been a response to the plethora of bilateral and multilateral FTAs that are being negotiated in the region. None of the actual or proposed multilateral agreements include the United States. Failure of the KORUS FTA could be viewed as a serious blow to the U.S. “competitive liberalization” strategy. With FTAs throughout East Asia proliferating, a failure of the KORUS FTA to be implemented would also likely mean that the United States would be shut out of regional economic groupings in East Asia. In contrast, the implementation of the KORUS FTA could spark interest of other East Asian countries, such as Japan, to negotiate FTAs with the United States in order not to lose their share of the huge U.S. market to South Korea. Thus, if the proponents of the “competitive liberalization” argument are correct, the fate of the KORUS FTA could play an important role in accelerating or decelerating the move to open market regionalism in East Asia. Similarly, the fate of the KORUS FTA is likely to be seen as a bellwether for broader U.S. trade policy, which is now in a period of re-evaluation. In addition to the KORUS FTA, U.S. FTAs with Colombia and Panama are pending and may be acted on during the 111 th Congress. The Doha Development Agenda round in the WTO is, for all intent and purposes, on life support, if not dead. This raises questions in the minds of U.S. policymakers and other experts, regarding the future role of the WTO and multilateral negotiations in shaping the international trading framework. The KORUS FTA will likely play a role in this reassessment. For better or worse, its rejection or indefinite delay might call into question the viability of FTAs as a serious U.S. tool to strengthen economic ties with major trading partners.

Trade Scenario - Japan

FTA key to Japanese economy

Yomiuri Shimbun, 11

(The Yomiuri Shimbun, a Japanese national newspaper, "Policy changes needed to break economic deadlock," Jan 5, [www.yomiuri.co.jp/dy/editorial/T110104001356.htm] AD: 6-3-11, jm)

The Japanese economy's recovery has slowed to a stall. Amid ongoing deflation, the working population has started to decline, and the impact on production and consumption is very worrying. Will Japan, which was once an economic giant second only to the United States, follow a path of decline without doing anything? Many people must now feel they will be unable to lead a stable postretirement life in light of the possible collapse of social security and the nation's finances. To break through the growing sense of stagnation, the government needs to drastically change its economic policies. The Japanese economy has overcome the global recession and somehow turned around since spring 2009. However, this was made possible by the temporary tailwinds of major economic stimulus measures and short-lived expansion of foreign demand pushed by the growth of other Asian countries. The unreliable nature of the economy in terms of maintaining sustainable growth is quite clear if one looks back at the economic standstill since autumn of last year. Automobile sales sharply declined due to the termination of eco-car subsidies in September. The scaling down of the eco-point system for household appliances in December put a brake on sales of flat-screen TVs and other appliances. Furthermore, growth in exports is almost flat because of the yen's appreciation and the slowdown of overseas economies. Govt policy no help The employment situation is also severe. The unemployment rate remains at a high level in the 5 percent range. Many young people, freezing in the midst of the so-called job-hunting ice age, have been struggling in their "shukatsu" job-hunting activity. Yet the government and the Bank of Japan maintain their forecast that overseas economies such as those in other parts of Asia will steadily pick up and the Japanese economy will also recover on a possible increase in exports. Many people will neither feel satisfied with nor see any relief in such an optimistic scenario that depends on other countries. Repeated policy mistakes by the Democratic Party of Japan-led government since the party took the helm of government in September 2009 could prevent the Japanese economy from recovering. One such recent policy mistake by the DPJ-led government is its decision not to officially participate in talks for the Trans-Pacific Partnership strategic economic partnership agreement. The TPP is designed for participating countries from the Asia-Pacific area to mutually abolish tariffs and liberalize trade and investment. Nine countries including Australia, Singapore and the United States are now negotiating a final agreement. Japan has fallen behind its Asian rivals, including South Korea, in economic partnership agreements. If Japan does not participate in the TPP, it will be excluded from the framework of free trade and investment. This would be a fatal blow to the nation, which is a trade-oriented country. Even so, Prime Minister Naoto Kan easily put off a decision to join the framework for some later occasion. He did this because he listened to the opinions of the Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries Ministry and Diet members backed by voters in farming areas. They argued that abolition of tariffs would invite massive imports of cheap foreign agricultural products and Japan's agriculture would collapse. But the value of farm products affected by abolishing the tariffs is relatively small. Even that of rice, the nation's staple food, does not reach 2 trillion yen. That for konnyaku potato, the tariff rate of which is 1,700 percent, is only 14 billion yen. That for butter, which carries a 360 percent tariff, is 78 billion yen. Competitiveness crucial Indeed, it is important to maintain high rates of self-sufficiency for the nation's main agricultural products. However, Japan will not be able to compete internationally if it remains closed by continuing to protect farm products that account for only a small share of the entire Japanese economy.

Trade Scenario - Japan

Collapse spills over and causes Asia war

Auslin, American Enterprise Institute’s Japan Studies director and Yale MacMillan Center history professor, 9

(Michael, AEI's director of Japan Studies, associate prof of history and senior research fellow @ MacMillan Center for International and Area Studies at Yale U, "Japan's Downturn Is Bad News for the World," Feb 17, [online.wsj.com/article/SB123483257056995903.html] AD: 6-3-11, jm)

Recently, many economists and scholars in the U.S. have been looking backward to Japan's banking disaster of the 1990s, hoping to learn lessons for America's current crisis. Instead, they should be looking ahead to what might occur if Japan goes into a full-fledged depression. If Japan's economy collapses, supply chains across the globe will be affected and numerous economies will face severe disruptions, most notably China's. China is currently Japan's largest import provider, and the Japanese slowdown is creating tremendous pressure on Chinese factories. Just last week, the Chinese government announced that 20 million rural migrants had lost their jobs. Closer to home, Japan may also start running out of surplus cash, which it has used to purchase U.S. securities for years. For the first time in a generation, Tokyo is running trade deficits -- five months in a row so far. The political and social fallout from a Japanese depression also would be devastating. In the face of economic instability, other Asian nations may feel forced to turn to more centralized -- even authoritarian -- control to try to limit the damage. Free-trade agreements may be rolled back and political freedom curtailed. Social stability in emerging, middle-class societies will be severely tested, and newly democratized states may find it impossible to maintain power. Progress toward a more open, integrated Asia is at risk, with the potential for increased political tension in the world's most heavily armed region.

Japan is on the brink of collapse

Snyder, University of Virginia McIntire School of Commerce graduate, 10

(Michael, graduate of the McIntire School of Commerce at the U of Virginia, "The Coming Economic Collapse Of Japan – And Why You Should Be Extremely Concerned About It," May 3, [inteldaily.com/2010/05/japan-economic-collapse/] AD: 6-3-11, jm)

Most Americans pay very little attention to what is going on in the economies of other nations. But they should. The reality is that in today’s global economy, what is happening on the other side of the world can have a dramatic impact on the U.S. economy. In particular, the ongoing implosion of Japan’s economy should greatly concern us all. Japan is the 3rd biggest economy in the world and is one of America’s most important trading partners. If Japan experiences a total economic collapse it will create a tsunami of financial panic around the globe. In fact, it is likely that a default by the government of Japan would plunge the world into such an economic nightmare that the American Dream would quickly vanish for millions of American families. So just how close is Japan to a financial collapse? Well, Fitch Ratings says that Japan’s gross public debt has reached 201 percent of GDP and is likely to continue to pile up into very dangerous territory for the foreseeable future. It is estimated that this gigantic mountain of debt amounts to 7.5 million yen for every person living in Japan. Needless to say this is extremely troubling. Japan has the highest level of public debt to GDP of any of the industrialized nations. Japan is literally drowing in red ink. Meanwhile, even with all of the massive government spending that has caused all of this debt, Japan’s economy still continues to implode at a frightening pace. Japan’s discouraging battle with deflation dragged into its 13th straight month in March as prices continued to decline and the unemployment rate rose sharply. In fact, the number of unemployed in Japan totalled 3.5 million in March. This represented a 4.5 percent rise from the same period a year ago.

Trade Scenario - Doha

DOHA failure collapses world economy

International Chamber of Commerce 4-6-11

(International Chamber of Commerce, largest, most representative business organization in the world, permanent observer status w/ UN, "Doha failure would have dire consequences on world economy, says ICC," Apr 6, [www.iccwbo.org/uploadedFiles/PR\_Doha\_6April2011.pdf] AD: 6-3-11, jm)

ICC, following a recent statement by WTO Director-General Pascal Lamy on an upcoming deadline for Doha talks, stresses that international trade is critical to restoring the health of the global economy. Concluding the Doha Round after 10 years of deadlocked negotiations would strengthen confidence in the multilateral trading system, stimulate the global economy, create employment opportunities, and contribute to mitigating the effects of climate change. “Achieving this is more crucial than ever in the context of a global downturn that came on the heels of the economic crisis,” says ICC Chairman Gerard Worms. “In the long run, bringing the Doha Round to a successful conclusion will create more jobs by improving the global economy.” ICC has long held that failure to conclude the Doha Round will undermine the multilateral system built by the international community over the past 70 years. This system underpins the promise of peace and prosperity that lies within the reach of developing countries if trade barriers are brought down. Completing the Doha Round would provide the world with a debt-free stimulus package, thereby helping to sustain balanced economic growth across both poorer and rich countries. If current proposals were put into effect, it is predicted that global GDP would grow by $280 billion annually. Not implementing Doha would let an ongoing tide of protectionist measures further thwart an opportunity for growth. Despite commitments from G20 countries to avoid new trade barriers, the threat of protectionism has become worse since the economic crisis. “Hundreds of new protectionist measures in the G20 ‘pipeline’ threaten to derail global economic recovery, trade and employment,” according to a recent report prepared by the Peterson Institute for International Economics and commissioned by the ICC Research Foundation. The report concludes that if only half of these G20 country measures are implemented by the end of 2011, the world economy will face a serious protectionist problem.

SKFTA Good – AT – Deregulation

SKFTA won’t deregulate

Alberti, Remapping Debate writer, 11

(Mike, Staff Reporter for Remapping Debate, B.A from Vassar College, “Could US-Korea trade agreement deter enhanced regulation of financial services?”, Feb 1, [http://www.remappingdebate.org/print?content=node%2F389] AD: 6-3-11, jm)

Despite the disagreements about the implications of Article 13.4, the FTA framework provided another opportunity through which to create clarity. Most free trade agreements contain a so-called “prudential carve-out” section that is designed to protect a country’s right to regulate its economy. The “Financial Services” Chapter of the FTA contains such a provision (see sidebar for full text). The first sentence of the provision says that, despite the limitations imposed by the FTA, both the U.S. and South Korea will still be able to adopt any regulations they need to for prudential reasons, “including for the protection of investors, depositors, policy holders, or persons to whom a fiduciary duty is owed by a financial institution or cross-border financial service supplier, or to ensure the integrity and stability of the financial system.” So, if the U.S. wanted to, say, ban certain kinds of derivatives, or limit the size of banks because they were too-big-to-fail, then, despite the provisions in Article 13.4, this sentence in Article 13.10 would seem to protect the right to impose those regulations if they were seen as necessary to “ensure the integrity and stability of the financial system.”

SKFTA Good – AT – Impact Turns

No uniqueness for any turn – job losses and trade deficit record high now

Morici, University of Maryland School of Business professor, 10

(Peter, prof @ Robert H. Smith School of Business @ U of Maryland, "Why the Trade Deficit Matters So Much," Mar 9, [www.thestreet.com/story/10698409/1/why-the-trade-deficit-matters-so-much.html] AD: 6-3-11, jm)

The Commerce Department Thursday plans to report the January deficit in international trade in goods and services. Analysts expect it to increase to $41 billion from $40.2 billion in December. My forecast for January is $41.5 billion The trade deficit, along with the credit and housing bubbles, were the principal causes of the Great Recession. Now, a rising trade deficit and continued weakness among regional banks threatens to stifle the emerging recovery and keep unemployment near 10% through 2011. At 3.1% of GDP, the trade deficit subtracts more from the demand for U.S.-made goods and services than President Obama's stimulus package adds. Moreover, Obama's stimulus is temporary, whereas the trade deficit is permanent and growing. Money spent on Chinese coffee makers and Middle East oil cannot be spent on U.S.-made goods and services, unless offset by exports. When imports substantially exceed exports, Americans must consume much more than what they earn producing goods and services, or the demand for what they make is inadequate to clear the shelves, inventories pile up, layoffs result, and the economy goes into recession. From 2004 to 2008, the trade deficit exceeded 5% of GDP, and Americans borrowed from abroad to keep the economy going. To consume more than they produced, they posted as collateral overvalued homes financed on shaky mortgages. When mortgages and banks failed, home prices and retail sales tanked, the shortfall in demand for U.S. made goods and services drove up unemployment, further choked consumer and investment spending, and thrust the economy into the worst recession in 70 years. Now huge federal stimulus spending is required to resuscitate business activity. However, as the economy recovers, the trade deficit on oil and with China will grow, taxing demand for U.S. goods and services. Once that money is spent, demand for American products will fall, and the economy will be at risk of a second recession. President Obama ignores the fundamental causes of trade deficit; consequently, his policies to fight the recession will deliver only a moderate recovery in 2010. Imports of oil and Chinese consumer goods will rise as the economy recovers. As stimulus spending runs out, the escalating trade deficit will push the economy down again and threaten a second recession -- the feared "W"-shaped recovery.
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Link Non-Uniqueness – Obama Pushing Mars Now (1/3)

Obama re-orienting NASA mission to take us to Mars

USA Today, 5-26-11

(May 26, “Roundup: Obama's policy aims to revitalize space program”, <http://www.usatoday.com/news/opinion/letters/2011-05-27-Obama-space-policy_n.htm>)

The Obama administration inherited a space program in disarray after eight years of mismatch between vision and budgets, and decades of underinvestment in R&D on the technologies that long-duration crewed missions beyond low-Earth orbit will require. The course correction that the White House has developed in concert with NASA and Congress will preserve the $100 billion International Space Station as the orbiting science lab and technology test-bed we need to prepare for the next steps in space. It will shorten the gap between the retirement of the shuttle and the restoration of a U.S. capability to carry our own astronauts into orbit. And it will focus NASA's unparalleled talents on truly visionary goals — developing and using new technologies to send astronauts to an asteroid for the first time, and then moving onward to Mars — rather than spending the bulk of our limited resources to return astronauts to the moon 50 or 60 years after we did that the first time.

Obama increasing Mars funding now.

Harwood, reporter covering space for over 24 years from Kennedy Space Center, 5-24-11

(William, May 24, “NASA picks Orion-type capsule for deep space missions”, <http://news.cnet.com/8301-19514_3-20065857-239.html#ixzz1OLQ9m7Nl>)

KENNEDY SPACE CENTER, Fla.--A version of the Bush administration's Orion moon capsule, written off by the Obama administration and then resurrected as a space station lifeboat, will be developed instead for use in future manned flights to deep space targets beyond Earth orbit, the agency announced today. Douglas Cooke, associate administrator of NASA's Exploration Systems Mission Directorate, told reporters the Orion concept, described by former NASA Administrator Mike Griffin as "Apollo on steroids," is the most capable spacecraft currently on the drawing board for meeting the Obama administration's "flexible path" approach to deep space exploration. The Multi-Purpose Crew Vehicle, or MPCV, shown with a launch escape rocket and service module. NASA plans to develop the capsule for use in future missions to deep space targets. (Credit: NASA) "This is the Orion-based concept that was designed for deep space missions and had the appropriate accommodations and design requirements for that type of mission," he said. "We did look at alternatives in some of the systems designs we're seeing in the various concepts that are being proposed, for instance, for commercial (vehicles)...And after studying those, we found the design approach we've got is really the best for this type of mission beyond low-Earth orbit." Developed by Lockheed Martin, the solar-powered Multi-Purpose Crew Vehicle, or MPCV, would carry four astronauts on missions lasting up to three weeks, much longer when attached to a larger interplanetary habitation module of some sort. The capsule would have a pressurized volume of 690 cubic feet, weigh approximately 23 tons at launch and end its missions with splashdown in the Pacific Ocean. Using an advanced abort system and a high-performance heat shield, the MPCV is expected to be 10 times safer than the space shuttle. But Cooke said he does not yet know what it will cost to develop the MPCV, when the first manned or unmanned test fight might launch, how much individual vehicles will cost, what rocket will be used to launch them or where they might end up going. To date, he said, NASA has spent more than $5 billion on the Orion concept. "When? Basically, we are still working on our integrated architecture; that includes the space launch system, along with ground systems and other supporting projects in order to put together integrated cost and schedule," he said. "So at this point, we don't have a specific date, although we are working diligently to understand earliest possible test dates within the approach that we are working to lay out." In 2004, the Bush administration ordered NASA to complete the International Space
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Station and retire the space shuttle by the end of fiscal 2010, and to channel the savings into development of new rockets and spacecraft designed to support long-duration outposts on the moon by the early 2020s. Since then, the final shuttle flight has slipped to this July. During Griffin's tenure, NASA came up with the Constellation program to implement the president's directive. The Orion capsule was intended to carry astronauts to and from the moon and to service the International Space Station as required. Two rockets were envisioned, the Ares I to launch Orion capsules into Earth orbit, and a huge heavy-lift Ares V to boost lunar landers and attached Orion spacecraft to the moon. The Obama administration canceled the Constellation program and ordered NASA to adopt a two-pronged approach to space flight that depends on the destination. For flights to and from the space station in low-Earth orbit, NASA will rely on private industry to develop the necessary rockets and spacecraft. The administration told NASA to concentrate on developing new technology and systems that could eventually be used for deep space exploration. No firm timetables or specific targets were set. Faced with widespread criticism, the president later said he would support continued development of Orion as a lifeboat for the International Space Station to help end NASA's post-shuttle reliance on Russia's Soyuz spacecraft. And the president said NASA should start working on a new heavy lift rocket to launch deep space missions in the 2015 time frame. Sen. Bill Nelson, D-FL, and other key lawmakers successfully lobbied for appropriations language calling for immediate work on the new rocket, with initial test flights starting around 2016. With the decision to proceed with development of an Orion derivative, NASA is expected to announce what sort of rocket will be built to launch it later this summer. The decision to proceed with development of the MPCV "is a good thing," Nelson said in a statement. "It shows real progress toward the goal of exploring deep space and eventually getting to Mars. And it's good for Florida, too, because hundreds of Kennedy Space Center employees will have jobs assembling the new crew capsule at the center's Operations and Checkout building." An artist's concept of a Multi-Purpose Crew Vehicle flying in concert with another spacecraft in orbit around Mars. (Credit: NASA) In a statement, NASA Administrator Charlie Bolden said the agency is "committed to human exploration beyond low-Earth orbit and look forward to developing the next generation of systems to take us there...As we aggressively continue our work on a heavy lift launch vehicle, we are moving forward with an existing contract to keep development of our new crew vehicle on track." As currently envisioned, the MPCV would support four astronauts on short-duration flights of less than 21 days. For longer missions to asteroids or even Mars, the capsules would dock with a larger spacecraft of some sort that would provide more room for the crew while in transit. "The approach on this vehicle is primarily for launch and entry with in-space capabilities for certain periods of time," Cooke said. "Generally, for long-term missions that are much longer than 21 days, we would assume we have in-space habitation in a larger module just because the crew needs more space for a longer period of time. "So basically, during these missions--whether it be to lunar orbit or the near-Earth asteroids or to Mars or the moons of Mars--this vehicle would be maintained in a dormant mode while a crew would be in another module, which would have longer-term consumables and capabilities to support them. But basically this vehicle is the one we would use for any of those missions, including Mars."

Obama pushing for Mars now

Werner and Borenstein, Associated Press, 10

(Erica and Seth, 4-15-10, AP, “Obama: Americans to Mars Within His Lifetime,” http://www.usnews.com/science/articles/2010/04/15/obama-americas-still-got-adventures-in-space)

President Barack Obama predicted Thursday his new space exploration plan would lead Americans beyond the moon and to Mars within his lifetime. "I expect to be around to see it," he declared.

Obama's bold prediction was an answer to critics, including several former astronauts, that his changes would deal a staggering blow to the nation's manned space program.

Speaking at the Kennedy Space Center, where America's moon missions originated decades ago, Obama said he was "100 percent committed to the mission of NASA and its future." He outlined plans for federal spending to bring more private companies into space exploration following the soon-to-end space shuttle program.
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"We want to leap into the future," not continue on the same path as before, Obama said as he sought to reassure NASA workers that America's space adventures would soar on despite the termination of shuttle flights.

Obama acknowledged criticism for his drastic changes to the space agency's direction. But, he said, "The bottom line is: Nobody is more committed to manned space flight, the human exploration of space, than I am. But we've got to do it in a smart way; we can't keep doing the same old things as before."

Obama said that by 2025, the nation would have a new spacecraft "designed for long journeys to allow us to begin the first-ever crewed missions beyond the moon into deep space."

"We'll start by sending astronauts to an asteroid for the first time in history. By the mid-2030s, I believe we can send humans to orbit Mars and return them safely to Earth. And a landing on Mars will follow," he said.

Obama said the space program is not a luxury but a necessity for the nation.

He said the Kennedy Space Center has inspired the nation and the world for half a century. He said NASA represents what it means to be American — "reaching for new heights and reaching for what's possible" — and is not close to its final days.

Obama sought to explain why he aborted President George W. Bush's return-to-the moon plan in favor of a complicated system of public-and-private flights that would go elsewhere in space, with details still to be worked out.

"We've been there before," Obama said of the nation's moon landings decades ago. "There's a lot more of space to explore."

He said his administration would support continued manned exploration of space "not just with dollars, but with clear aims and a larger purpose."

The Obama space plan relies on private companies to fly to the space station, giving them almost $6 billion to build their own rockets and ships. It also extends the space station's life by five years and puts billions into research to eventually develop new government rocket ships for future missions to a nearby asteroid, to the moon, to Martian moons or other points in space. Those stops would be stepping stones on an eventual mission to Mars itself.

Obama funding with Mars in sight now

Spilius, 10

(Alex, Contributor, The Telegraph, “Barack Obama: ‘We will reach Mars in my lifetime,’” http://www.telegraph.co.uk/science/space/7595810/Barack-Obama-we-will-reach-Mars-in-my-lifetime.html)

Making his case to a sceptical space community at the Kennedy Space Centre in Florida last night, Mr Obama said his new space exploration plan would lead Americans beyond the moon and to Mars within his lifetime.

“I expect to be around to see it,” he declared. “The bottom line is, nobody is more committed to manned space flight, to human exploration of space, than I am. But we’ve got to do it in a smart way,” he said.

Mr Obama said a $6 billion increase in NASA's budget will help ramp up exploration of the solar system, increase Earth-based observation to improve an understanding of climate change, and bolster support for private space companies which he said have formed a bedrock of America's space programs.

He said he hoped by 2025 that new spacecraft for longer journeys would allow crews to go "beyond the Moon into deep space", resulting in sending astronauts to an asteroid.

He then added: "By the mid-2030s, I believe we can send humans to orbit Mars and return them safely to Earth, and a landing on Mars will follow."

Link Answer – NASA/Space Politically Popular

No link – Space exploration historically has solid bipartisan base support, overwhelming pressure on spending

Klamper, Spacenews.com, 10

(Amy, 11-5-10, Writer, Spacenews.com, “Election result could increase pressure on NASA budget,” <http://www.spacenews.com/policy/101103-election-brings-new-leadership-nasa-oversight-committees.html>)

John Logsdon, professor emeritus at the George Washington University’s Space Policy Institute here, said it is unclear how the change in House leadership will affect NASA spending, though he said if a NASA appropriations bill is approved during the coming lame-duck session of Congress, it likely would fund the agency at levels lower than those authorized in October. NASA, like the rest of the federal government, is operating at fiscal year 2010 spending levels under a continuing resolution slated to expire Dec. 3.

“I think an across-the-board deficit reduction movement is likely, and NASA cannot avoid that,” Logsdon said in a Nov. 4 interview, adding that if an omnibus appropriations bill does not move until the 112th Congress convenes in January, “cuts under Republicans would be greater, but I’m not sure NASA would be a particular target. There is still a fairly strong base of support for a good space program.”

That support was evident over the past year as lawmakers from both sides of the aisle allied against Obama’s plan to cancel NASA’s Moon-bound Constellation program while delaying work on new hardware that could send astronauts to explore deep space. Obama also hopes to spend $6 billion over five years to foster a privately developed crew transportation system for operations in low Earth orbit. The 2010 NASA Authorization Act is widely viewed as a compromise that finds middle ground between the Constellation program and the White House plan.

Reps. Jerry Lewis (R-Calif.) and Frank Wolf (R-Va.), who are expected to assume leadership of the House Appropriations Committee and its commerce, justice, science subcommittee, respectively, opposed funding cuts to Constellation approved in a draft appropriations bill last year. That measure, which was ultimately worked into a broader omnibus spending package, provided $18.2 billion for the agency in 2010, but froze funding for human space exploration pending the findings of a White House-appointed panel tasked with evaluating NASA’s plans in that area.

The following February, when Obama unveiled his new direction for NASA in a budget blueprint sent to Congress, Wolf criticized the plan for ceding U.S. leadership in space. “We would turn over the American space program to allow China to catch us,” said Wolf, a frequent China critic who strongly opposed a recent visit to Beijing by NASA Administrator Charles Bolden.

Wolf also took issue with a plan to foster development of commercial crew taxis to ferry astronauts to and from the space station, which Obama pledged to continue flying through at least 2020. In an April 20 interview, Wolf said private space firms could have “a role to bring cargo back and forth” between Earth and the orbiting outpost, but singled out one of two firms building new hardware for such missions — Hawthorne, Calif.-based Space Exploration Technologies — as not having “the best record in the world.” The other company, Dulles, Va.-based Orbital Sciences Corp., is located in Wolf’s Virginia district.

Wolf ultimately supported the 2010 NASA Authorization Act, which recommends spending $1.3 billion over the next three years to develop commercial crew taxis. The measure also directs NASA to begin work on a heavy-lift rocket in 2011, some five years earlier than Obama envisioned.

Rep. Ralph Hall (R-Texas), who is expected to take the chair of the House Science and Technology Committee next year, voted for the measure, but expressed misgivings. He had previously supported a draft NASA authorization bill — which was ultimately scrapped — that would have gutted NASA’s commercial crew initiative while restoring many elements of the Constellation program.

“While the bill before us today is far from perfect, it offers clear direction for a NASA that’s floundering,” Hall said in remarks on the House floor Sept. 29, shortly before the measure was adopted.

Rep. Pete Olson (R-Texas), the presumptive chair of the House Science and Technology space and aeronautics subcommittee, also opposed Obama’s plan to kill Constellation. Like Hall, Olson voted for the authorization bill that ultimately became law.

“He and his colleagues won an important battle this year over the future of human space flight and he looks forward to continuing that effort,” Melissa Kelly, a spokeswoman for Olson, said in a Nov. 4 e-mail.

Link Answer – NASA Funding for Space Exploration Popular (1/2)

Plan would be spun as reprioritizing NASA, refocusing efforts on exploration – which ensures US competitive edge

Sheppard, Mother Jones Washington Bureau energy and environmental politics writer, 2-11-11

(Kate, Mother Jones, “Taking Climate Denial to New Extremes,” http://motherjones.com/blue-marble/2011/02/republican-climate-nasa-budget)

The spending plan the House GOP was supposed to [roll out on Thursday](http://motherjones.com/blue-marble/2011/02/gop-spending-plan-targets-epa) included a number of cuts meant to prevent the Environmental Protection Agency from doing anything about climate change. But Republicans had to take that plan back to the drawing board Thursday night after tea party members claimed the package of cuts didn't go deep enough. And if a trio of House members get their way, we won't ever have to worry about the climate—since we won't know what's happening with it, anyway.

This week, Reps. Bill Posey (R-Fla.), Sandy Adams (R-Fla.) and Rob Bishop (R-Utah) called for a budget that would "reprioritize NASA" by axing the funding for climate change research. The original cuts to the budget outlined yesterday would have cut $379 million from NASA's budget. These members want climate out of NASA's purview entirely, however. Funding climate research, said Adams [in a statement](http://www.posey.house.gov/News/DocumentSingle.aspx?DocumentID=224016), "undercuts one of NASA's primary and most important objectives of human spaceflight."

"NASA's primary purpose is human space exploration and directing NASA funds to study global warming undermines our ability to maintain our competitive edge in human space flight," said Posey.

The total budget request for NASA for 2010 was $18.7 billion. Of that, just $1.4 billion was for its earth science division. The [agency's climate programs](http://climate.nasa.gov/)—which include modeling and satellite monitoring—are a subset of that. They are responsible for monitoring data that is crucial to our understanding of how our planet works—ocean temperatures, sea level, the ozone layer, sea ice, and, of course, how carbon dioxide emissions are affecting the atmosphere. The [increase in funding](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/03/31/AR2010033104062.html) requested for climate last year was intended to make up for cuts to the program under the Bush administration. But even with that proposed increase, the earth science program accounted for a mere 7.5 percent of NASA's total budget.

Link Answer – NASA Funding for Space Exploration Popular (2/2)

Republicans oppose shifting NASA funding to other programs

Roop, Huntsville Times NASA writer, 2-17-11

(Lee, The Huntsville Times, “Most Republicans in House opposed vote to cut NASA money,” http://blog.al.com/space-news/2011/02/most\_republicans\_in\_house\_oppo.html)

House Republicans in Washington opposed Wednesday's vote to move money from NASA to a community policing program, a Republican freshman from a NASA district pointed out today.  U.S. Rep. Mo Brooks, R-Huntsville, who represents a district that is home to Marshall Space Flight Center, also says "the House got it backwards" with Wednesday's vote.

The House voted 228-203 to move $298 million from NASA's budget this year to COPS, a community policing program. The measure was introduced by Rep. Anthony Weiner, D-New York.

Republicans cast 169 votes against the Weiner amendment and 70 for it. But it passed when 158 Democrats voted yes. Democrats opposing the move totaled 34. "If the White House had argued for NASA among House Democrats, we would have protected NASA from this cut," Brooks said.

The amendment would change NASA funding this fiscal year, because it is attached to a continuing budget resolution the House is drafting. Such a resolution is necessary because no 2011 budget has passed Congress so far. Meanwhile, the 2012 budget battle revved up this week with President Barack Obama's proposal to level-fund NASA next year.

Wednesday's House vote was one of many amending the budget resolution that could face a final House vote later today or tonight. But that isn't the end of the process. The Senate will then have its vote and any disagreements will need to be settled.

Brooks said the challenge is to persuade some in Congress to fund the things that are the federal government's responsibility, such as NASA and defense, while putting the responsibility for things such as police on the state and local governments where he says they belong. "Hopefully, the Senate will fix this error," Brooks said of the House vote.

Link Answer - NASA Funding Bipartisan

NASA programs create jobs- creates bipartisanship

Pearland News ’10

(“Democrats, Republicans hold NASA support rallies”, 9-10-10, Pearland News http://www.yourhoustonnews.com/pearland/news/article\_de1b2316-c5c3-5a65-9b6a-a5539fd3e836.html , TJL)

The rain didn’t keep NASA supporters away Friday night as Democrats and Republicans held twin rallies in League City.A crowd of roughly 200 people braved the weather to voice support for NASA and the Johnson Space Center at the Chester L. Davis Sportsplex.On one side, Democrats still support the President’s budget plans, but said they hoped a workable solution for NASA could be found.Across the way, Republicans weren’t as optimistic about budget cuts that could spell the loss of thousands of jobs at Johnson Space Center. In the end, the Republicans were literally left out in the rain.Sheltered from the weather under a covered park pavilion, the Galveston County Democratic Party and the Texas AFL-CIO held a rally they called “Democrats and Labor Rally to Support NASA Jobs”.Galveston County Judge Jim Yarbrough and Texas AFL-CIO Secretary Treasurer John Patrick served as hosts. Guest speakers included U. S. Congressman Gene Green, U. S. Congressman Al Green and former Congressman Nick Lampson. The speakers called for support for NASA from both Democrats and Republicans.“It’s easy to blame folks. It’s easy to blame people for what’s going on around us,” Galveston County Judge Jim Yarbrough said. “But, the blame game doesn’t get the job done. What the people of America want and deserve are people who will come together to find solutions for the problems we face. Republican, Democrat, Independent, tea party, it doesn’t matter. We’ve got to find solutions to keep those jobs at Johnson Space Center and we need to all be united around that cause.”U.S. Congressman Gene Green said the NASA community should have the chance overcome the missteps made by the Constellation Mission Program.“I have to admit Constellation, the research and the $9 million has not led to the work we think we need,” Green said. “But, we can learn from that research. We don’t need to throw that out. We should give those workers a different task and find something that will get us back to space in a U.S. vehicle.”But, job security was the topic on most everyone’s mind.

NASA funding passed overwhelmingly with Dem and GOP support last year

Bolden, NASA Administrator,’10

(Charles, TheHill, “NASA Bill passes the House by 304-118” 9-30-10, TJL <http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/technology/121891-congress-members-nasa-respond-to-approved-house-bill>)

This important vote today in the House of Representatives on a comprehensive NASA authorization charts a vital new future for the course of human space exploration. We are grateful that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2010 received strong support in the House after its clearance in the Senate, and can now be sent on to the President for his signature.

Link Answer – Mars Funding Popular

Even spending hawks support Mars – they believe it bolsters US leadership, tech, and defense

Altman, Press-Register Washington Bureau, 3-6-11

(George, Al.com, “Top budget hawk Jeff Sessions still wants U.S. to fly to Mars,” http://blog.al.com/live/2011/03/top\_budget\_hawk\_jeff\_sessions.html)

The federal government, “in a word, is broke,” said Sen. Jeff Sessions.

But the Mobile Republican, who has become one of the GOP’s biggest advocates for cutting federal spending, thinks the country should still pay for rockets to Mars.

“It is the one activity that defines the United States as the world’s technological leader,” Sessions said. “If we lose that, and others surpass us ... then I think it will be seen as a passing of the baton.”

Those views are shared by some other fiscally minded Alabama Republicans — Republicans whose districts include NASA’s Marshall Space Flight Center in Huntsville.

Analysts from Washington’s liberal and conservative think tanks alike said it’s typical in Washington for small-government advocates to make big exceptions for programs that benefit their constituents.

“Huntsville is going to be kind of symbolic of the whole thing,” said Larry Korb, a senior fellow at the left-leaning Center for American Progress. “You’ve got people wanting to cut the budget — but not cut their areas.”

Benjamin Friedman, a research fellow at the conservative Cato Institute, said he was disappointed, but not surprised, at Sessions’ position on NASA programs.

“I’m not entirely sure how much good those programs do us,” Friedman said.

In hearings last week before the Senate Budget Committee, on which Sessions serves as the ranking member, he firmly criticized the U.S. secretaries of education and transportation for increased spending on Pell Grants for poor students attending college, among other programs.

Sessions spoke about budget cuts in language evocative of a 1940 speech by Winston Churchill about fighting Nazi Germany.

“We are going to fight for spending cuts this week, next week, next month, and next year,” Sessions said. “We are going to fight for spending cuts in the Budget Committee, in the Appropriations Committee, and on the Senate floor.

“We are going to keep fighting for a leaner, more productive government until we have restored confidence in our economy and put this country back on the right path — the path to prosperity.”

But in an interview last month, Sessions said the U.S. should never surrender its lead in space technology to other countries. He added that budget cuts should avoid the high-tech military research conducted in Huntsville’s Redstone Arsenal.

Rep. Mo Brooks, a Huntsville Republican elected in November as part of a new, fiscally conservative freshman class in Congress, echoed Sessions’ views, saying Washington’s powerbrokers recognize Huntsville as a “technological jewel” that should be protected from steep cuts.

“They understand how important what we’ve done is to our war-fighting capability, and with respect to NASA, our technological achievements,” Brooks said, during an interview last month in his congressional office.

While not addressing NASA or Redstone specifically, Sen. Richard Shelby said in a statement that the federal government is critical to Huntsville, as is Huntsville to the “federal government’s national defense and technological base.”

“I will continue to advocate for Huntsville’s role and make my colleagues aware of the tremendous progress made there,” Shelby’s statement said.

While Sessions and others with districts that include major NASA operations support protecting funding for missions to the Moon and beyond, the Mobile senator acknowledged that the rest of his colleagues in Congress may not feel the same way.

“It’s conceivable that this great mass of humanity that represents the United States of America could lose its appetite for space. At least its elected representatives might,” he said. “But I don’t think the American people have.”

Link – Mars Bipartisan

Bipartisan support for Mars – especially from Texas and Florida

Houston Chronicle 10

(Staff, “JSC rescue: Senate bill bolstering manned space flight welcome news for Houston”, 7/17/10, <http://www.chron.com/disp/story.mpl/editorial/7113041.html#ixzz1OXTSLK3e>) JPG

With a strong push by Texas Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison, a compromise NASA funding bill won unanimous approval from a key committee and has good prospects for approval by Congress with support from the White House. While it cancels a mission to the moon, it also would save key programs and thousands of jobs at Houston’s Johnson Space Center. “The bill that we put out of committee today preserves our workforce, our creativity and the commitment to humans in space,” said Sen. Hutchison after the vote. The Texas Republican and Florida Sen. Bill Nelson, a Democrat, cosponsored the bipartisan effort to craft a budget with a more robust manned spaceflight component than that proposed by President Barack Obama. There’s a lot for Houstonians to like in the $19 billion spending plan. While it cancels the Constellation program moon missions, it substitutes Mars and asteroids as long-term destinations. It will extend the life of the International Space Station through 2020, direct NASA to build a new heavy-lift launch rocket to be operational in six years, and continue development of the Orion crew exploration vehicle. At the same time it preserves the thrust of the Obama plan to support development of commercial launch crews to low Earth orbit. In addition to saving most of the expected 7,000 layoffs at JSC under the Obama plan, the compromise would maintain the Clear Lake facility’s primacy as the center for astronaut training. According to Bob Mitchell, president of the Bay Area Houston Economic Partnership, the Senate measure, if passed by Congress, would solidify JSC’s position as “the home of human space exploration.” The Senate budget also provides for an extra space shuttle flight, extending the life of the program through next year. Sen. Hutchison has called for continuation of shuttle launch capabilities until an alternative launch craft is operational. We believe that is in the national interest and well worth the additional expense.

Link Turn – GOP Supports NASA Funding (1/3)

Republicans ardently support space programs – economic and global motives

Foust, Spacepolitics.com 9

(Jeff, 3-12-9, “Republicans who want to spend more (on NASA),” http://www.spacepolitics.com/2009/03/12/republicans-who-want-to-spend-more-on-nasa/)

In an op-ed that appeared in Thursday’s edition of The Hill, a Capitol Hill newspaper, Congressman Ralph Hall (R-TX), ranking member of the House Science and Technology Committee, [makes the case for increasing NASA’s budget](http://thehill.com/increased-funding-for-nasa-would-stimulate-economy-while-keeping-american-industry-strong.html). The arguments he makes in favor of NASA are pretty standard: the US needs to stay ahead of encroaching international rivals like China and India, NASA gets a tiny part of the overall federal budget, the agency and its technological contributions help the economy, and the space program encourages students to pursue science and engineering careers.

Hall in particular is concerned, like many others, about the Shuttle-Constellation gap. “Accelerating development of the Constellation system would keep American tax dollars working for us here at home and have a multiplier effect throughout the economy by stimulating high-tech manufacturing and networks of suppliers around the country,” he writes. “The extra, relatively small investment to fully fund NASA would provide incalculable economic and national security advantages.” He does not specify, though, exactly how much additional money would be needed to “fully fund” NASA.

Meanwhile, at the other end of the seniority spectrum, Rep. Bill Posey (R-FL), who won the seat last November previously held by Dave Weldon, tells TCPalm.com that [he has asked the chairman and ranking member of the House Budget Committee for extra money for NASA](http://www.tcpalm.com/blogs/us-rep-bill-posey-blog/2009/mar/12/poseypost31209/) for both extending the life of the Shuttle and accelerating Constellation. “Neither the U.S. nor the rest of the world can afford to rely on China or Russia to transport materials into space,” he writes. “[T]hese two nations just don’t have the technology or the success record that we have had with space.” (That may come as a bit of a surprise to the Russians, given their proud history of numerous space firsts.)

Posey also notes that [he has written to President Obama to ask him to select a nominee for NASA administration “as soon as possible”](http://posey.house.gov/News/DocumentSingle.aspx?DocumentID=114241). “NASA cannot afford to remain without an Administrator at this critical juncture. Major decisions are being made that will greatly affect our nation’s future in space,” he writes in the letter to the president. “If this transition is not done right, not only will thousands of American workers at the nation’s space centers and their families be severely and adversely affected, but our nation’s leadership in space will further erode.” All good arguments, but how likely is the president to be persuaded by a freshman representative of the opposing

Link Turn – GOP Supports NASA Funding (2/3)

GOP supports NASA spending - Recent Republican administrations prove

Johnson, CNSNews.com, 3

(Jeff, 2-4-3, CNSnews.com, “Democrats Wrong: Only Clinton Cut NASA’s Budget”, http://archive.newsmax.com/archives/articles/2003/2/4/123904.shtml)

A Senate Democrat, who flew a mission aboard the space shuttle Columbia in 1986 when he was a member of the U.S. House, complained Monday that Republican and Democrat administrations have failed to provide necessary funding for the nation's space exploration program. But government records prove that only Bill Clinton reduced funding for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

"The last two administrations have been starving NASA of money, and because it didn't have enough to do everything it wanted to do along with its cost overruns on the space station, it was delaying the safety upgrades," said Sen. Bill Nelson, D-Fla., on ABC's "Good Morning America" program. "And there's no excuse for that."

Nelson, whose January 1986 flight aboard the Columbia took place two weeks before the explosion of the space shuttle Challenger, said members of Congress could not help but consider what impact budget cuts might have had on safety after the apparent explosion that killed one Israeli and six American astronauts Saturday.

"Inevitably, there will be a discussion out of this about how much NASA should be funded, should there be another orbiter built?" Nelson said. "Has it been so poorly funded in recent years that maybe, just maybe it wasn't as safe as it should be?" he asked.

During a briefing on President Bush's fiscal year 2004 budget Monday, White House Budget Director Mitch Daniels disputed Nelson's claim.

"This administration has increased funding for NASA, increased funding for the shuttle and increased funding for the shuttle maintenance account after a decade of cuts and flat spending," Daniels said. "NASA has been an important priority, and the shuttle specifically, for this president"

Budget records obtained from the Government Printing Office support Daniels' claim. According to the documents, Clinton initially increased the agency's funding by $259 million in 1993, but then cut $715 million from the agency his second year in office. He did not restore the largest portion of the money, $652 million, until three months before he left office in 2001. Clinton's cuts reduced NASA's budget by an aggregate total of $56 million over his eight-year term.

George W. Bush has increased NASA's funding in each of his three submitted budgets since taking office. Those increases have totaled $1.216 billion.

Bush's father, George H.W. Bush, who was president prior to Clinton, increased NASA expenditures by more than $3.437 billion during his single term from 1989 until January 1993.

NASA budgets since fiscal year 1992:

1993 $14.309 billion, existing NASA budget when Clinton took office;1994 $14.568 billion, $259 million increase, first Clinton budget;1995 $13.853 billion, $715 million decrease;1996 $13.885 billion, $32 million increase;1997 $13.709 billion, $176 million decrease;1998 $13.648 billion, $61 million decrease;1999 $13.654 billion, $6 million increase;2000 $13.601 billion, $53 million decrease;2001 $14.253 billion, $652 million increase;2002 $14.892 billion, $639 million increase, first Bush budget;2003 $15.000 billion, $108 million increase (estimated);2004 $15.469 billion, $469 million increase (proposed);

Nelson, a member of the Senate Science, Technology and Space Subcommittee, was quick to clarify his statements, which some saw as blaming the alleged budget cuts for the apparent explosion that killed Columbia's crew.

"Let's hasten to add that this tragedy doesn't appear to be connected with the delay of any of those safety upgrades," Nelson said.

**[CARD CONTINUES]**

Link Turn – GOP Supports NASA Funding (3/3)

**[CARD CONTINUED, NO TEXT REMOVED]**

As Nelson made his comments, the Government Printing Office was preparing to release President Bush's budget for fiscal year 2004. That budget includes a $469 million increase in the NASA budget, bringing the total to nearly $15.5 billion.

According to bullet points heading the 2004 fiscal year (Oct. 1, 2003 - Sept. 30, 2004) budget chapter on NASA, President Bush's proposal "Invests in space launch improvements to extend the Space Shuttle's life, to develop technologies for next generation launch systems, and to design a crew transport backup to the Space Shuttle, which would provide an emergency crew return from the Space Station and improve astronaut flight safety."

The text of the chapter explains the president's new approach to managing costs at the space agency:

"In the past, research was cut back rather than reducing unneeded infrastructure, or containing costs on large programs like the Space Station and the Shuttle," the document states. "To maintain robust research efforts, the president's budget aggressively implements reforms to control Space Station costs and invests in activities to improve flight safety and extend the life of the Space Shuttle."

A performance assessment of the shuttle program referenced in the budget rated it as "moderately successful." The evaluation determined that "Shuttle operations are well managed, but investments to improve the shuttle suffer from inadequate planning and poor cost management." The probe recommended that NASA track the impact of investments on the shuttle's "operational life, flight safety and facilities conditions," and that the agency should do a better job controlling costs.

White House Press Secretary Ari Fleischer said Monday afternoon that the administration would not rule out increasing the NASA budget even more, if necessary. He cautioned, however, that two days is not enough time after the shuttle catastrophe to make such determinations.

"I don't think anybody can reach any conclusions about funding levels and the disaster, the effect on the Columbia," Fleischer said. "Everything needs to be looked into in order to make determinations, but no one can make any conclusions this quickly after the disaster."

Multiple calls to the office of Sen. Nelson were not returned before the publication of this story.

Link Turn – McCain (1/2)

McCain likes the plan

AFP 8

(Staff, “McCain would like to see a man on mars”, http://www.breitbart.com/article.php?id=080606111510.5jnz56gu) JPG

Presumptive Republican White House nominee John McCain said Thursday he would like to see a manned mission to Mars as part of a "better set of priorities" for NASA that would better engage the public. At a townhall event in Florida, the Arizona senator was asked about funding for the US space agency's shuttle program, which is due to end in 2010. He said he "would be willing to spend more taxpayers' dollars" to continue the program but argued that NASA must do a better job of inspiring the American public, as when it sent a man to the moon in 1969. McCain said one of his favorite books as a child had been Ray Bradbury's 1950 novel "The Martian Chronicles," about humans colonizing the Red Planet. "I am intrigued by a man on Mars and I think that it would excite the imagination of the American people if we can say, 'Hey, here's what it looks like," he said.

He’ll generate support – midterms give him clout

Kelly AZCentral.com Washington correspondent, 10

(Erin, Washington correspondent @ azcentral.com, “Vote gives Arizona more clout in U.S. House and Senate”, 11/7/10, http://www.azcentral.com/news/articles/2010/11/07/20101107arizona-congress-delegation-boost.html) JPG

In the Senate, Republican gains will increase the influence of Arizona GOP Sens. John McCain and Jon Kyl in the next Congress, as Democratic leaders are forced to reach out to Republicans to pass bills. The shift will not necessarily mean an increase in earmarked dollars flowing to Arizona, given the GOP's calls for tighter spending and the fiscal conservatism of the state's Republican delegation. But greater say in how, and how much, money is spent and what policies gain traction seems certain.

Link Turn – McCain (2/2)

He’s key to the agenda

Adams, CQ Weekly, 8

(Rebecca, 11/8/08 (“CQ Weekly Vantage Point: Farewell or a Future? McCain Still Has Role as Bipartisan Dealmaker,” LN)

A likelier scenario, observers say, is that McCain will revert to his role as a bipartisan broker of compromise — and, depending on Barack Obama ’s enthusiasm for courting the aid of his presidential rival, McCain could serve as a critical liaison to Senate moderates as the new administration works with a Senate majority just shy of the 60-vote, filibuster-resistant supermajority. That role would permit McCain to bolster the bipartisan credentials he so frequently advertised in his campaign and to refine his legacy in case he decides to retire from public life in 2010, when his fourth term ends and he turns 74. “He can only be a leader for the moderates,” says GOP strategist John Feehery, who worked for 18 years on Capitol Hill. “But at the end of the day, moderates will hold all the power.” Obama could have reason to solicit his support on any number of policy fronts, including the economy, national security (where McCain wields considerable clout as the top Republican on the Armed Services Committee) and the curtailment of global warming — all likely high-priority items on the next president’s agenda. And McCain would probably be keen to add to his already extensive resume of bipartisan collaboration on questions such as nominations to the federal bench, immigration and campaign finance. He probably would not be able to bring major factions of the Senate GOP to the bargaining table, but he could broker agreements on some key issues with influential moderates such as Lindsey Graham of South Carolina and Mel Martinez of Florida. A home-state GOP colleague in the House, John Shadegg , notes that McCain is in closer accord with Democrats than fellow Republicans in some instances, including on legislative proposals curbing global warming. “That’s an area in which there is the potential that Sen. McCain could agree with the president-elect, but I don’t know that McCain can bring along the minority,” Shadegg says. “Given the state of the economy, there will be lots of concerns.” Shadegg predicts that McCain will face minimal opposition if he runs for re-election in two years. But several McCain associates think he may be edging toward retirement. In either case, former McCain aides say he does not intend to fade into the senatorial background as Democrat John Kerry of Massachusetts did after losing the presidency in 2004. “It will be very important that someone in a leadership position in the Republican Party send the signal that they are willing to work with President Obama. McCain is the logical choice,” says Mark McKinnon, a former media adviser for President Bush and for McCain through much of the primary season. “I think Sen. McCain’s interest after this election will be not any political ambition but a genuine desire to make his last chapter in Washington all about bipartisan healing.” The former GOP nominee will be focused on “settling differences rather than settling scores,” McKinnon says. Dan Schnur, a spokesman for McCain in the 2000 election and director of the Jesse M. Unruh Institute of Politics at the University of Southern California, says there is no reason why McCain wouldn’t pick up where he left off in the Senate. “He could be a very valuable ally to President Obama in building bipartisan support for at least some of the administration’s priorities, starting with national security and political reform,” Schnur says. “He spent a lot of years building a reputation as someone who works across the party aisle. He has a strong incentive to spend his last years in the Senate reinforcing that image.”

Link Turn – Texas (1/2)

Congresspersons overwhelmingly supports the plan – especially those from Texas

Powell, Chron.com Washington correspondent, 10

(Stewart, Washington correspondent @ Chron.com, “House OKs new course for manned spaceflight: With Obama's signature, moon missions will give way to Mars”, 9/29/10, <http://www.chron.com/disp/story.mpl/nation/7224649.html#ixzz1O8epC6IM>) JPG

The United States on Wednesday officially abandoned nearly 50 years of pursuing manned moon missions — the galvanizing symbol of space exploration - to lay down a new roadmap calling for NASA to catapult astronauts to distant asteroids and Mars. The course correction came in a 304-118 House vote at 10:35 p.m. Wednesday adopting a 108-page White House-Senate compromise that officially scrapped the last vestiges of Bush-era plans to return astronauts to the moon by 2020. The deal authorized $1.3 billion over the next three years for commercial spacecraft companies to begin ferrying cargo and astronauts to the orbiting space station, freeing NASA to pour billions of dollars into developing heavy lift rockets and crew capsules suitable for deep space exploration. The compromise, in the making for months, was crafted by Sens. Kay Bailey Hutchison, R-Dallas, and Bill Nelson, D-Fla., and now heads to President Barack Obama's desk for signature into law. Officials said any return to the moon under the revised blueprint for manned space exploration would depend upon foreign nations' chipping in up to $2 billion a year for a joint effort with the United States - a scenario that's considered unlikely. The compromise brought together Texas Democrats and Republicans who have little in common on hot button political issues but often support efforts to help NASA and Houston's Johnson Space Center, a complex that accounts for 18,294 NASA and contractor employees and billions of dollars in the local economy. Only Rep. Gabrielle Giffords, D-Ariz., chair of the House subcommittee with jurisdiction over NASA, broke ranks with pro-NASA committee leaders to unsuccessfully urge the House to reject the compromise. Wednesday's outcome represents a symbolic victory for the White House after seven months of contentious negotiations with members of Congress who sought to protect existing NASA projects that provide jobs, payrolls and contracts in their districts. Obama managed to win the most dramatic shift in direction for NASA in more than a generation. In a tense behind-the-scenes moment, backers of the bill said they almost pulled the measure from the House floor because they were shy of the two-thirds majority needed to win approval under a procedural suspension of House rules. Lawmakers said they pressed colleagues through the evening to try to win the support they needed to gain approval for the legislation. The deal calls for extending operations of the space station for five years to 2020; adding one more shuttle flight to the two remaining flights scheduled before the fleet retires in 2011; boosting federal support for the fledgling commercial spacecraft industry and building a deep space rocket and crew capsule by 2016. The compromise still leaves the United States relying on Russia's Soyuz system to get cargo and astronauts to the $100 billion space station for the four- or five-year period between the time the shuttle retires in 2011 and expected delivery of either commercial spacecraft or NASA-built spacecraft that can service the orbiting laboratory. Rep. Pete Olson, R-Sugar Land, ranking Republican on the House committee with jurisdiction over NASA, said he shifted his support behind the compromise because "it was clear" legislation protecting the entire Constellation program could not pass the House and Senate before lawmakers rush home to the campaign trail for the midterm congressional elections. The deal provides "direction to keep important programs at NASA on course," said Olson, whose district includes JSC. The compromise represented what was "best for NASA." Texans, both Republicans and Democrats, took umbrage with some of Obama's vision for the agency but decided a compromise outweighed the risk of more uncertainty. "This is a clear choice between saving the manned space program and thousands of Houston-area jobs - or the president's abstract idea," said Rep. Kevin Brady, R-The Woodlands, ranking House Republican on the Joint House-Senate Economic Committee. "Why should we squander our technological edge and leadership position in space?" Said Rep. Sheila Jackson Lee, D-Houston, "The cup will be half full and not half empty. It lets us live to fight another day." Rep. John Culberson, R-Houston, said the bill provides NASA with the direction and funding needed to preserve the manned space program. And, said Rep. Al Green, D-Houston, "At a time of high unemployment, let's keep Americans working."

Link Turn – Texas (2/2)

Texas controls the 112th Congress

Dunham, Houston Chronicle political analyst, 10

(Dick, political analyst @ Houston Chronicle, 12/18/10, “Election results create a clout shift in Congress”, http://www.newstimes.com/local/article/Election-results-create-a-clout-shift-in-Congress-908596.php) JPG

When the 112th Congress convenes in January, the two states' roles will be reversed. Texas will have four members of the congressional GOP leadership, three House committee chairs and three incoming freshmen to reinforce the 20 conservative Republicans already on hand in Washington. Connecticut will have an all-Democratic House delegation and a freshman senator. The rise of Texas -- and other states with large Republican delegations or key GOP leaders -- is one of the key consequences of a volatile election year that saw Republicans sweep to power in the House of Representatives, while winning a commanding advantage among governorships and state legislative chambers. In Washington, it means a shift in influence from states dominated by liberal Democrats to those heavily represented by Republicans. Texas, which has the most Republican members of Congress, at 25, is a clear winner. The state's leadership team includes Rep. [Jeb Hensarling](http://www.newstimes.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=local&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Jeb+Hensarling%22), chairman of the House Republican Conference, the fourth-ranking post; Rep. [Pete Sessions](http://www.newstimes.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=local&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Pete+Sessions%22), chairman of the [National Republican Congressional Committee](http://www.newstimes.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=local&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22National+Republican+Congressional+Committee%22); and Sen. [John Cornyn](http://www.newstimes.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=local&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22John+Cornyn%22), chairman of the [National Republican Senatorial Committee](http://www.newstimes.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=local&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22National+Republican+Senatorial+Committee%22). There's no doubt that Texas gained more clout than any other state, said [Matt Mackowiak](http://www.newstimes.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=local&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Matt+Mackowiak%22), president of [Potomac Strategy Group](http://www.newstimes.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=local&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Potomac+Strategy+Group%22), a Republican communications and consulting company. Other states with strong conservative influence include Florida, where Republicans seized a nation-leading seven Democratic House seats, and Ohio, home to incoming House Speaker [John Boehner](http://www.newstimes.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=local&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22John+Boehner%22). While most highly Democratic states, like New York and Massachusetts, will see their influence plummet, one Democratic bastion will remain influential: California. The nation's largest state now has a large contingent of [Republican House](http://www.newstimes.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=local&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Republican+House%22) members -- 19 of 53 seats. So it's out with the San Francisco liberals -- led by current House Speaker [Nancy Pelosi](http://www.newstimes.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=local&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Nancy+Pelosi%22) -- and in with the Southern California Republican conservatives, like Rep. [Darrell Issa](http://www.newstimes.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=local&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Darrell+Issa%22), who will needle Obama for two years as chairman of the House's oversight committee, and Rep. [David Dreier](http://www.newstimes.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=local&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22David+Dreier%22), who regains the gavel at the all-important [House Rules Committee](http://www.newstimes.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=local&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22House+Rules+Committee%22). That's something that six states with Republican-free House and Senate delegations can't say. Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Vermont won't be part of conservative policy discussions on Capitol Hill because they have no GOP lawmakers. Totally blue states are relegated to the farthest back bench you can sit on, said Mackowiak. It's a lonely and precarious place for states like Connecticut. The shifts in the political sands will have policy consequences. With deficit reduction a priority, clout on Capitol Hill is a plus. And states with less power are likely to get less federal money.

Link Turn Uniqueness – Obama Win

Obama is pushing Mars

Chang, New York Times, 10

(Kenneth, writer @ NYT, “Obama Vows Renewed Space Program”, 4/15/10, http://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/16/science/space/16nasa.html) JPG

Pointing to [Mars](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/science/topics/mars_planet/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier) and asteroids as destinations, President Obama on Thursday forcefully countered criticisms that he was trying to end the nation’s [human spaceflight](http://www.nytimes.com/info/human-spaceflight/?inline=nyt-classifier) program. This was the first time that the president had lent his personal political capital in an increasingly testy fight over the future of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. “The bottom line is, nobody is more committed to manned spaceflight, to human exploration of space than I am,” he said in a speech to about 200 attendees of a White House-sponsored space conference here.

But he faces uphill battle

Space.com 3-8-11

(http://www.mnn.com/earth-matters/space/stories/can-nasa-afford-missions-to-mars-and-jupiter) JPG

NASA’s current budget woes, however, might delay some or all of these missions, the report warns. NASA, like all federal agencies, is currently operating without an official 2011 budget – the government is working under a temporary spending measure called a continuing resolution. President Barack Obama's 2012 budget request for NASA, which could set the stage for the flagship missions in the new report, also faces an uphill battle in Congress.

Obama prioritizing Mars

Borenstein, Associated Press science writer, and Werner, Associated Press White House reporter, 10

(Seth Borenstein – science writer @ AP and Erica Werner – White house reporter @ AP, “Obama predicts mission to Mars in his lifetime”, 4/16/10, http://articles.sfgate.com/2010-04-16/news/20851667\_1\_mars-asteroid-plans-for-space-exploration) JPG

Obama did not predict a Mars landing soon. But he said that by 2025, the nation would have a new spacecraft "designed for long journeys to allow us to begin the first-ever crewed missions beyond the moon into deep space." "We'll start by sending astronauts to an asteroid for the first time in history," he said. "By the mid-2030s, I believe we can send humans to orbit Mars and return them safely to Earth. And a landing on Mars will follow. And I expect to be around to see it."

Link Turn – Winners Win

Winners win – fiat ensures perception of victory

Ornstein, American Enterprise Institute fellow and political analyst, 1

(Norman J., Roll Call, 9-10-1, “High Stakes and an Overloaded Agenda”, Lexis)

In a system where a President has limited formal power, perception matters. The reputation for success - the belief by other political actors that even when he looks down, a president will find a way to pull out a victory - is the most valuable resource a chief executive can have. Conversely, the widespread belief that the Oval Office occupant is on the defensive, on the wane or without the ability to win under adversity can lead to disaster, as individual lawmakers calculate who will be on the winning side and negotiate accordingly. In simple terms, winners win and losers lose more often than not.

Winning despite the odds bolsters political capital

Ornstein, American Enterprise Institute fellow and political analyst, 3

(Norman J., Roll Call, 9-10-3, “As Issues Pile Up,; Bush Needs New; Approach With Hill”, Lexis)

When a president operates with sky-high approval and a reputation as a winner no matter what the odds, he has immense leverage with Members of Congress who fear his wrath and assume he will prevail. When he stumbles, the assumptions change, and the ability to exercise power attenuates.

CP Links – Privatization Triggers Backlash

Privatization causes congressional backlash

Discover 10

(Discover Magazine, American science magazine that publishes articles about science for a general audience, Feb 1, [blogs.discovermagazine.com/80beats/2010/02/01/obamas-nasa-budget-so-long-moon-missions-hello-private-spaceflight/], jm)

However, the White House’s plan to shift to private spaceflight has already ruffled plenty of feathers. Congressional representatives from states with many NASA jobs, like Florida and Texas, have promised to fight the move all the way. Michael Griffin, the previous NASA administrator who served under President George W. Bush, was even more bitter at seeing Obama cut his prized program: “It means that essentially the U.S. has decided that they’re not going to be a significant player in human space flight for the foreseeable future… One day it will be like commercial airline travel, just not yet. It’s like 1920. Lindbergh hasn’t flown the Atlantic, and they’re trying to sell 747s to Pan Am” [Washington Post].

Privatization unpopular

Pasztor 10

(Andy, senior special writer at the Los Angeles bureau of The Wall Street Journal, "White House Decides to Outsource NASA Work," Jan 24, [online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704375604575023530543103488.html], jm)

The White House has decided to begin funding private companies to carry NASA astronauts into space, but the proposal faces major political and budget hurdles, according to people familiar with the matter. The controversial proposal, expected to be included in the Obama administration's next budget, would open a new chapter in the U.S. space program. The goal is to set up a multiyear, multi-billion-dollar initiative allowing private firms, including some start-ups, to compete to build and operate spacecraft capable of ferrying U.S. astronauts into orbit—and eventually deeper into the solar system. Congress is likely to challenge the concept's safety and may balk at shifting dollars from existing National Aeronautics and Space Administration programs already hurting for funding to the new initiative. The White House's ultimate commitment to the initiative is murky, according to these people, because the budget isn't expected to outline a clear, long-term funding plan.

Internal Link Answer – Political Capital Not Key (1/4)

No internal link – political capital is not key to legislative outcomes – ideology outweighs presidential lobbying

Dickinson, Middlebury College political science professor and presidential scholar, 9

[Matthew, 5-26-9, Presidential Power, “Sotomayor, Obama, and Presidential Power,” <http://blogs.middlebury.edu/presidentialpower/2009/05/26/sotamayor-obama-and-presidential-power/> accessed 2-5-11, AFB]

What is of more interest to me, however, is what her selection reveals about the basis of presidential power. Political scientists, like baseball writers evaluating hitters, have devised numerous means of measuring a president’s influence in Congress. I will devote a separate post to discussing these, but in brief, they often center on the creation of legislative “box scores” designed to measure how many times a president’s preferred piece of legislation, or nominee to the executive branch or the courts, is approved by Congress. That is, how many pieces of legislation that the president supports actually pass Congress? How often do members of Congress vote with the president’s preferences? How often is a president’s policy position supported by roll call outcomes? These measures, however, are a misleading gauge of presidential power – they are a better indicator of congressional power. This is because how members of Congress vote on a nominee or legislative item is rarely influenced by anything a president does. Although journalists (and political scientists) often focus on the legislative “endgame” to gauge presidential influence – will the President swing enough votes to get his preferred legislation enacted? – this mistakes an outcome with actual evidence of presidential influence. Once we control for other factors – a member of Congress’ ideological and partisan leanings, the political leanings of her constituency, whether she’s up for reelection or not – we can usually predict how she will vote without needing to know much of anything about what the president wants. (I am ignoring the importance of a president’s veto power for the moment.)

Despite the much publicized and celebrated instances of presidential arm-twisting during the legislative endgame, then, most legislative outcomes don’t depend on presidential lobbying. But this is not to say that presidents lack influence. Instead, the primary means by which presidents influence what Congress does is through their ability to determine the alternatives from which Congress must choose. That is, presidential power is largely an exercise in agenda-setting – not arm-twisting. And we see this in the Sotomayer nomination. Barring a major scandal, she will almost certainly be confirmed to the Supreme Court whether Obama spends the confirmation hearings calling every Senator or instead spends the next few weeks ignoring the Senate debate in order to play Halo III on his Xbox. That is, how senators decide to vote on Sotomayor will have almost nothing to do with Obama’s lobbying from here on in (or lack thereof). His real influence has already occurred, in the decision to present Sotomayor as his nominee.

Internal Link Answer – Political Capital Not Key (2/4)

Political capital is false – can’t advance the agenda

Rockman 09

[Bert Rockman, Purdue University Political Science professor), “Does the revolution in presidential studies mean "off with the president's head"?,” Presidential Studies Quarterly, v. 39, is. 4. October 2009. EJONES]

Although Neustadt shunned theory as such, his ideas could be made testable by scholars of a more scientific bent. George Edwards (e.g., 1980, 1989, 1990, 2003) and others (e.g., Bond and Fleisher 1990) have tested Neustadt's ideas about skill and prestige translating into leverage with other actors. In this, Neustadt's ideas turned out to be wrong and insufficiently specified. We know from the work of empirical scientists that public approval (prestige) by itself does little to advance a president's agenda and that the effects of approval are most keenly felt--where they are at all--among a president's support base. We know now, too, that a president's purported skills at schmoozing, twisting arms, and congressional lobbying add virtually nothing to getting what he (or she) wants from Congress. That was a lot more than we knew prior to the publication of Presidential Power. Neustadt gave us the ideas to work with, and a newer (and now older) generation of political scientists, reared on Neustadt but armed with the tools of scientific inquiry, could put some of his propositions to an empirical test. That the empirical tests demonstrate that several of these propositions are wrong comes with the territory. That is how science progresses. But the reality is that there was almost nothing of a propositional nature prior to Neustadt.

Political capital and popularity do not alter policymaking.

Bouie, 5-5-11

(Jamelle Bouie, Contributor, *The American Prospect,* May 5, 2011, "Political Capital," <http://prospect.org/csnc/blogs/tapped_archive?month=05&year=2011&base_name=political_capital>)

Colorlines’ Rinku Sen [wants](http://blog.prospect.org/mt-static/html/editor-content.html?cs=utf-8) President Obama to use his newfound political capital: [T]he past week’s events—Obama’s release of his long-form birth certificate and his thrashing of Donald Trump, at a point when he clearly knew the Bin Laden operation was in process—shows that our president is fully capable of masterful political strategy. The president now has the opportunity to redirect the last decade’s trajectory by resetting national priorities. This moment will not come again, and struggling Americans are still waiting for Obama to make good on his promise of change. One enormous obstacle that stood in his way no longer does: an unwinnable “war on terror” that created a budget sinkhole with more than $1 trillion spent in 10 years. Now is the time to end these wars and refocus our energy and resources on the domestic issues that are causing so much misery in the lives of U.S. residents. With his detractors grasping at chewed up straws, here are the three things that Obama should ram through Congress over the coming year. Sen then offers three items—immigration reform, job assistance, and corporate tax reform—that Obama should pursue while he still has the time. Unfortunately, political capital isn’t that straightforward. As we saw at the beginning of Obama’s presidency, the mere fact of popularity (or a large congressional majority) doesn’t guarantee support from key members of Congress. For Obama to actually sign legislation to reform the immigration system, provide money for jobs, or reform corporate taxes, he needs unified support from his party and support from a non-trivial number of Republicans. Unfortunately, Republicans (and plenty of Democrats) aren’t interested in better immigration laws, fiscal stimulus, or liberal tax reform. Absent substantive leverage—and not just high approval ratings—there isn’t much Obama can do to pressure these members (Democrats and Republicans) into supporting his agenda. Indeed, for liberals who want to see Obama use his political capital, it’s worth noting that approval-spikes aren’t necessarily related to policy success. George H.W. Bush’s [major](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/George_H._W._Bush#Major_initiatives) domestic initiatives came before his massive post-Gulf War approval bump, and his final year in office saw little policy success. George W. Bush was able to secure No Child Left Behind, the Homeland Security Act, and the Authorization to Use Military Force in the year following 9/11, but the former two either came with pre-9/11 Democratic support or were Democratic initiatives to [begin](http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/16174.pdf) with. To repeat an oft-made point, when it comes to domestic policy, the presidency is a limited office with limited resources. Popularity with the public is a necessary part of presidential success in Congress, but it’s far from sufficient.

Internal Link Answer – Political Capital Not Key (3/4)

Obama’s capital is useless. No-one wants to be with him because failures sticks to him and anyone he’s with

Washington News 10

(Obama Termed "The Velcro President.", 7/30/10, Lexis AC

Under the headline "Obama The Velcro President," the Los Angeles Times (7/30, Nicholas, Hook, 776K) reports, "If Ronald Reagan was the classic Teflon president, Barack Obama is made of Velcro." Despite efforts by "White House aides" to "better insulate Obama," the President "remains the colossus of his administration -- to a point where trouble anywhere in the world is often his to solve." Yet "what's not sticking to Obama is a legislative track record that his recent predecessors might envy." Eddie Mahe, "a Republican political strategist," tells the Times on an interview, "Stylistically he creates some of those problems. ... His favorite pronoun is 'I.'" The Times adds that "a new White House strategy is to forgo talk of big policy changes that are easy to ridicule," but "at this stage, it may be late in the game to downsize either the president or his agenda." RCP Average Has Obama Job Approval At 46.1%. The RealClearPolitics average of recent polling on President Obama's job approval has the President's approval at 46%, and disapproval at 48.7%. Approval is up 0.1% since yesterday; disapproval is up by 0.2%. A Fox News poll of 900 "registered voters" (7/27-7/28) finds the President's job approval at 43%, and his disapproval at 50%. The latest Gallup poll of 1,500 "adults" (7/26-7/28) shows the President with a 45% approval rating and 49% disapproval. Rasmussen's automated survey of 1,500 "likely voters" (7/26-7/28) finds Obama's approval at 46%, with 53% disapproving of his performance. Democrats Want Obama's Fundraising, Not Campaign Appearances. The Christian Science Monitor (7/29, Feldmann, 48K) reports, "It hurts, but it's true: When you're an unpopular president, candidates from your own party would rather see you raising money for them than standing beside them at a campaign event. Those photo ops with candidates in tight races often turn into attack ads by the other party." President Bush "went through that, and now it's...Obama's turn." The Monitor adds, "Even though some pundits suggest Obama would be better off with a Republican-run House, making the GOP a better foil for his 2012 reelection bid, the White House is making good on its promise to raise money for the House Democrats."

Political capital theory isn’t true with this congress

Bouie 11

(Jamelle, graduate of the U of Virginia, Writing Fellow for The American Prospect magazine, May 5, [prospect.org/csnc/blogs/tapped\_archive?month=05&year=2011&base\_name=political\_capital], jm)

Unfortunately, political capital isn’t that straightforward. As we saw at the beginning of Obama’s presidency, the mere fact of popularity (or a large congressional majority) doesn’t guarantee support from key members of Congress. For Obama to actually sign legislation to reform the immigration system, provide money for jobs, or reform corporate taxes, he needs unified support from his party and support from a non-trivial number of Republicans. Unfortunately, Republicans (and plenty of Democrats) aren’t interested in better immigration laws, fiscal stimulus, or liberal tax reform. Absent substantive leverage—and not just high approval ratings—there isn’t much Obama can do to pressure these members (Democrats and Republicans) into supporting his agenda. Indeed, for liberals who want to see Obama use his political capital, it’s worth noting that approval-spikes aren’t necessarily related to policy success. George H.W. Bush’s major domestic initiatives came before his massive post-Gulf War approval bump, and his final year in office saw little policy success. George W. Bush was able to secure No Child Left Behind, the Homeland Security Act, and the Authorization to Use Military Force in the year following 9/11, but the former two either came with pre-9/11 Democratic support or were Democratic initiatives to begin with. To repeat an oft-made point, when it comes to domestic policy, the presidency is a limited office with limited resources. Popularity with the public is a necessary part of presidential success in Congress, but it’s far from sufficient.

Internal Link Answer – Political Capital Not Key (4/4)

Political capital does not guarantee agenda passage- Clinton Proves

Jones, University of Virginia political science professor, 2K

(Charles Jones is the Professor of Political Science, University of Virginia, Hawkins Professor of Political Science, University of Wisconsin-Madison, John Olin Professor of American Government, Oxford University, Non-resident Senior Fellow, Brookings Institution, President, American Political Science Association “Reinventing Leeway: The President and Agenda Certification” Presidential Studies Quarterly Volume 30, Issue 1, pages 6–26, March 2000 wileylibrary TJL)

President Clinton’s political status on inauguration was tenuous. He entered with limited political capital, more like that of Carter or Kennedy than Johnson or Roosevelt. Still, enthusiasm among Democrats ran high following the election. Expectations among party government advocates were particularly strong given that the Democrats had recaptured the White House and retained majorities on Capitol Hill. As one such advocate observed early in 1993, “The stars are really aligned right for the next four years. The country has finally gotten back to unified government. For the first time in twelve years, somebody is going to be responsible” (Sundquist 1993, 25). The extravagance of these expectations and the reality of limited political capital suggested the need for President Clinton to moderate, not elevate, anticipations. He did the reverse. Specifically on health care, the president chose his wife to head a task force charged to submit legislation to Congress within one hundred days of the inauguration. The task forceworked mostly out of public view to formulate a far-reaching plan. The president promised bipartisanship and yet announced that “This is going to be an unprecedented effort. And let me say, in general, we’re going to set up a workroom, kind of like the war room we had in the campaign ” (Clinton 1994, 14-15). The Democratic National Committee later announced the intention to launch an advertising campaign to build public support for the health reform initiative (Balz 1994).A public campaign for a proposal designed behind closed doors by a Democratic White House did not strike Republicans as bipartisan.

Internal Link Uniqueness Answer – Capital Collapse Inevitable

Obama can’t catch a break, any slip up destroys his popularity

Nicholas and Hook 10

(Peter and Janet – MCT News Service, When it comes to blame, Obama is the Velcro president Voters care little about legislative victories, focusing instead on what he has not done, 8/1/10, Lexis) AC

If Ronald Reagan was the classic Teflon president, Barack Obama is made of Velcro. Through two terms, Reagan eluded much of the responsibility for recession and foreign policy scandal. In less than two years, Obama has become a magnet for blame. Hoping to better insulate Obama, White House aides have sought to give other cabinet officials a higher profile and additional public exposure. They are also crafting new ways to explain the president's policies to a skeptical public. But Obama remains the colossus of his administration -- to a point where trouble anywhere in the world is often his to solve. The president is on the hook to repair the Gulf Coast oil spill disaster, stabilize Afghanistan, help fix Greece's ailing economy, and do right by Shirley Sherrod, the Agriculture Department official fired as a result of a misleading fragment of videotape. QUICKLY FORGOTTEN What's not sticking to Obama is a legislative track record that eluded recent predecessors. Political dividends from passage of a health care overhaul or a financial regulatory bill have been fleeting. Instead, voters are measuring his presidency by a more immediate yardstick: Is he creating enough jobs? So far the verdict is no, and that has taken a toll on Obama's approval ratings. Only 46 percent approve of Obama's job performance, compared with 47 percent who disapprove, according to Gallup's daily tracking poll. "I think the accomplishments are very significant, but I think most people would look at this and say, 'What was the plan for jobs?' " said Sen. Byron L. Dorgan (D-N.D.). "The agenda he's pushed here has been a very important agenda, but it hasn't translated into dinner table conversations." Reagan was able to glide past controversies with his popularity largely intact. He maintained his affable persona as a small-government advocate while seeming above the fray in his own administration. Reagan was untarnished by such calamities as the 1983 terrorist bombing of the Marines stationed in Beirut and scandals involving members of his administration. In the 1986 Iran-Contra affair, most of the blame fell on lieutenants. Obama lately has tried to rip off the Velcro veneer. In a revealing moment during the oil spill crisis, he reminded Americans that his powers aren't "limitless." He told residents in Grand Isle, La., that he is a flesh-and-blood president, not a comic book superhero able to dive to the bottom of the sea and plug the hole. "I can't suck it up with a straw," he said. But as a candidate in 2008, he set sky-high expectations both about what he could achieve and what government could accomplish. Clinching the Democratic nomination two years ago, Obama described the moment as an epic breakthrough when "we began to provide care for the sick and good jobs to the jobless" and "when the rise of the oceans began to slow and our planet began to heal." Those towering goals remain a long way off. And most people would have preferred to see Obama focus more narrowly on the "good jobs" part of the promise. A recent Gallup poll showed that 53 percent of the population rated unemployment and the economy as the nation's most important problem. By contrast, only 7 percent cited health care -- a single-minded focus of the White House for a full year. At every turn, Obama makes the argument that he has improved lives in concrete ways. Without the steps he took, he says, the economy would be in worse shape and more people would be out of work. There's evidence to support that. Two economists, Mark Zandi and Alan Blinder, reported recently that without the stimulus and other measures, gross domestic product would be about 6.5 percent lower. GLOOMY MOOD Yet Americans aren't apt to cheer when something bad doesn't materialize.

Uniqueness & Internal Link Answer – Political Capital Not Key to Trade Agreements

Political capital can’t get FTAs passed – the GOP is blocking the TAA which is the only way the FTAs can even be proposed

Yonhap News Agency, 5-25-11

(Yonhap News Agency, Senate Dems join Obama in call for FTA job retraining, 5/25/11, <http://joongangdaily.joins.com/article/view.asp?aid=2936657>) AC

A group of Senate Democrats Monday threw their support behind the Obama administration’s plans to withhold pending free trade deals with Korea, Panama and Colombia from Congress until Republicans agree to renew funding for retraining displaced workers. “We recognize, as you do, that such a deal will be challenging to secure because it requires significant bipartisan commitments in both chambers of Congress to vote in favor of a Trade Adjustment Assistance extension,” the senators said in a letter to Obama, according to Reuters. “The challenge is worth it. We agree with you that strengthening the safety net for the middle class by extending TAA should be a prerequisite for consideration of new trade agreements.” The 41 senators are siding with National Economic Council Director Gene Sperling, who said last week, “The administration will not submit implementing legislation on the three pending free trade agreements until we have a deal with Congress on the renewal of a robust, expanded TAA program consistent with the objectives of the 2009 Trade Adjustment Assistance law.” Congressional Republicans have opposed the renewal of the TAA program for the retraining of workers displaced due to foreign competition. The program expired in February after being extended two years ago as part of Obama’s stimulus plans to help the world’s biggest economy muddle through the worst recession in decades. Republicans cite the need to cut the burgeoning federal budget deficit.

Impact Non-Uniqueness – No TAA-FTA Compromise Now

SKFTA won’t pass – TAA dispute not settled

Slaughter, Dartmouth Tuck School of Business management professor and former Bush economic advisor, and Lawrence, Harvard Kennedy School professor of international trade and investment and former Clinton economic advisor, 6-8-11

[Matthew J. & Robert Z., New York Times, “More Trade and More Aid”, <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/06/09/opinion/09slaughter.html>, accessed 6-12-11, AFB]

A FEUD over trade has erupted in Washington, and American workers are caught in the middle. Congressional Republicans (and some Democrats) are threatening to hold up approval of free-trade agreements with South Korea, Colombia and Panama if President Obama keeps insisting on renewing expanded benefits under Trade Adjustment Assistance, the main aid program for American workers harmed by foreign trade. Supporters say the program — which offers retraining, relocation and other benefits to workers who lose their jobs due to competition from imports — offers vital protection. Opponents label it an unaffordable boondoggle. If our country fails to resolve this dispute, our economic future will be bleak.

Impact Uniqueness Answer – No TAA-FTA Compromise Now

Orrin Hatch is blocking TAA, concerns about spending

Canham, Salt Lake Tribune, 5-26-11

(Matt Canham – Salt Lake Tribune Staff Writer, Salt Lake Tribune, Hatch stands in way of funds for displaced workers, 5/26/11, http://www.sltrib.com/sltrib/money/51893521-79/trade-hatch-agreements-program.html.csp) AC

Washington • Democrats want to tie the passage of three new trade agreements with more federal help for workers who see their jobs shipped overseas. But Sen. Orrin Hatch, R-Utah, is standing in the way, saying the extra benefits are too expensive and unrelated to trade agreements negotiated with Panama, Colombia and South Korea. “We’re broke,” Hatch said Thursday. “With a $7 billion price tag, this just doesn’t make sense.” The Senate Finance Committee, led by Sen. Max Baucus, D-Mont., has held two hearings on the long-stalled trade agreements this week, where Baucus forcefully called for increased funding for what is known as the “trade adjustment assistance” (TAA) program in conjunction with the free trade agreements. “We are doing them all together or we are not doing any of them at all,” Baucus said. “TAA retrains American workers who have lost jobs due to trade because imports have increased or factories have moved oversees.” But Hatch says this line of reasoning, supported by President Barack Obama, is inconsistent, arguing the trade agreements create jobs, and shouldn’t be linked to an “unrelated spending program” that helps laid-off employees. “The White House can’t have it both ways,” he said. “Every day we delay puts American companies, farmers and workers at an unfair disadvantage against our foreign competitors.” Senators cannot act on the agreements until the president sends them to the Senate for approval, and the White House is using that leverage to pressure the GOP to support the trade assistance program at the higher level Congress approved in the economic stimulus bill of 2009. That expansion expired in February, and the full trade assistance program, which includes job training and extended unemployment, will phase out at the end of the year without further action.

Economy Impact Uniqueness Answer

Economic collapse coming now – food and oil prices

Reich, former Labor Secretary, 3-31-11

(Robert, Fmr. Secretary of Labor; Prof @ UC Berkeley, Mar 31, "The Economic Truth That Nobody Will Admit: We're Heading Back Toward a Double-Dip," [www.huffingtonpost.com/robert-reich/the-truth-about-the-econo\_b\_842998.html] AD: 6-2-11, jm)

Why aren't Americans being told the truth about the economy? We're heading in the direction of a double dip -- but you'd never know it if you listened to the upbeat messages coming out of Wall Street and Washington. Consumers are 70 percent of the American economy, and consumer confidence is plummeting. It's weaker today on average than at the lowest point of the Great Recession. The Reuters/University of Michigan survey shows a 10 point decline in March -- the tenth largest drop on record. Part of that drop is attributable to rising fuel and food prices. A separate Conference Board's index of consumer confidence, just released, shows consumer confidence at a five-month low -- and a large part is due to expectations of fewer jobs and lower wages in the months ahead. Pessimistic consumers buy less. And fewer sales spells economic trouble ahead. What about the 192,000 jobs added in February? (We'll know more Friday about how many jobs were added in March.) It's peanuts compared to what's needed. Remember, 125,000 new jobs are necessary just to keep up with a growing number of Americans eligible for employment. And the nation has lost so many jobs over the last three years that even at a rate of 200,000 a month we wouldn't get back to 6 percent unemployment until 2016. But isn't the economy growing again -- by an estimated 2.5 to 2.9 percent this year? Yes, but that's even less than peanuts. The deeper the economic hole, the faster the growth needed to get back on track. By this point in the so-called recovery we'd expect growth of 4 to 6 percent. Consider that back in 1934, when it was emerging from the deepest hole of the Great Depression, the economy grew 7.7 percent. The next year it grew over 8 percent. In 1936 it grew a whopping 14.1 percent. Add two other ominous signs: Real hourly wages continue to fall, and housing prices continue to drop. Hourly wages are falling because with unemployment so high, most people have no bargaining power and will take whatever they can get. Housing is dropping because of the ever-larger number of homes people have walked away from because they can't pay their mortgages. But because homes the biggest asset most Americans own, as home prices drop most Americans feel even poorer. There's no possibility government will make up for the coming shortfall in consumer spending. To the contrary, government is worsening the situation. State and local governments are slashing their budgets by roughly $110 billion this year. The federal stimulus is ending, and the federal government will end up cutting some $30 billion from this year's budget. In other words: Watch out. We may avoid a double dip but the economy is slowing ominously, and the booster rockets are disappearing.

Impact Answer – South Korea-US Alliance Resilient

Alliance is resilient and their internal links are inevitable

Sneider, Stanford University Asia-Pacific Research Center associate director for research, 6

(Daniel, “RE-IMAGINING THE U.S.-ROK ALLIANCE” <http://www.mansfieldfdn.org/programs/program_pdfs/rok_us_sneider.pdf>, accessed 2-5-10)

The alliance between the Republic of Korea and the United States has been facing new pressures in recent months. Leaders in Washington and Seoul are visibly out of synch in their response to the escalatory actions of North Korea, beginning with the July 4 missile tests and leading to the October 9 nuclear explosion. South Korean leaders seem more concerned with the danger that Washington may instigate conflict than they are with North Korea’s profoundly provocative acts. American officials increasingly see Seoul as irrelevant to any possible solution to the problem. Officials on both sides valiantly try to find areas of agreement and to paper over differences. But if attempts to restart the six-party talks on North Korea falter again, it is likely this divide will resurface.

There is a tendency on both sides of the Pacific to overdraw a portrait of an alliance on the verge of collapse. Crises in the U.S.-ROK alliance are hardly new. As I have written elsewhere, there never was a “golden age” in our alliance that was free from tension. Korean discomfort with an alliance founded on dependency and American unease with Korean nationalism have been a constant since the early days of this relationship. Clashes over how to respond to North Korea have been a staple of the alliance since its earliest days.

Korean-American relations today are much deeper than at the inception of this alliance. Our interests are intertwined on many fronts, not least as major players in the global economic and trading system. We share fundamental values as democratic societies, built on the rule of law and the free flow of ideas. There is a large, and growing, contact between our two peoples, from trade and tourism to immigration.

Alliance relations resilient – history proves

Yonhap (South Korea), 3-10-10

(“Joint exercise”, Lexis)

Key Resolve, as the words imply, is the most visible evidence of the military alliance between South Korea and the United States as the Pentagon spends hundreds of millions of dollars each year to demonstrate the U.S. commitment to the alliance, which has lasted six decades. Key Resolve itself is a command-post exercise with the computer-based simulation of bringing troops and equipment onto the Korean Peninsula in the event of war. More spectacular is the Foal Eagle part of the exercise which features thousands of U.S. troops airlifted here from their duty stations around the world, some in the continental United States.

In the Key Resolve/Foal Eagle 2010, 18,000 U.S. service members, including 8,000 from outside Korea, are engaged in joint maneuvers with Korean armed forces. Historically, it was North Koreans themselves that invited the United States to launch the intercontinental rapid deployment exercises with their series of provocations back in the late 1960s. After a commando raid in Seoul and the capture of the USS Pueblo in January 1968, the North mounted guerrilla attacks and DMZ forays throughout the year.

The long-range deployment and field exercise that started in 1968 has continued to 2010 without interruption, only changing the codename to Freedom Vault, Team Spirit and to Key Resolve. In the long post-Korean War period, relations between Seoul and Washington have had a few bumps but their military cooperation - buttressed by the joint exercises and the annual ministerial-level Security Consultative Meetings - has not been shaken a bit to date.

SKFTA Bad – Financial Regulation Good

SKFTA will prevent financial regulation – failure to regulation risks financial destabilization

ORFTC 10

(Oregon Fair Trade Coalition, grassroots organization founded by the Oregon AFL-CIO, [http://www.afd-pdx.org/KoreaFTA/KoreaFinancial.pdf] AD: 6-3-11, jm)

Wall Street Loves the Korea Free Trade Agreement Laura Lane, the Senior Vice President of International Government Affairs for Citigroup, has said the Korea FTA contains “the best financial services chapter negotiated in a free trade agreement to date.” Wall Street loves the Korea FTA because it not only guarantees market access for financial service corporations, but also prevents a wide range of commonsense financial regulations from being imposed in the future. The FTA’s prohibitions on new regulations apply both the South Korea and the United States. “Too Big to Fail” Cannot Be Effectively Challenged Under the Korea FTA The Korea FTA prohibits limitations imposed on the size of banks, insurance companies, hedge funds and other financial service providers. The United States would also be obligated to refrain from establishing new firewalls between different types of banking, such as through reinstatement of the Depression-era Glass-Steagall Act or the more recent “Volcker Rule.” Toxic Derivatives Trading Cannot Be Banned Under the Korea FTA Bans on the sale of risky financial products, such as derivatives, are also forbidden under the Korea FTA. The Office of the U.S. Trade Representative actually brags that the FTA’s financial services provisions includes the “adoption of a negative list approach to financial sector regulation.” This means that all types of financial services and products — including any new ones developed in the future — are automatically covered by the FTA unless already explicitly listed for exemption. Commonsense Capital Controls Are Also Prohibited by the Korea FTA Capital control measures that South Korea adopted in the 1990s to limit the effects of the 1997 Asian financial crisis are also prohibited by the proposed FTA, despite recent admissions by the International Monetary Fund that capital controls can be useful tools for avoiding financial destabilization. Korean Firms Granted Special Rights to Challenge New Regulations The Korea FTA’s investor-to-state dispute resolution would provide South Korean banks and insurance companies operating in the United States with the special right to challenge through international tribunals any U.S. laws, regulations and court decisions that negatively effect their profit-making potential. South Korea currently has at least seven different banks and four insurance or securities institutions operating in the U.S. Wall Street firms would likewise be able to challenge South Korean regulations restricting their businesses. The Korea FTA Ignores the Lessons of the Financial Crisis The Korea FTA was negotiated by the Bush administration in 2007 — before the financial crisis. Absolutely none of the lessons learned in recent years about the dangers of financial deregulation are reflected in the agreement.

SKFTA Bad – Financial Regulation Good

SKFTA deregulates – that encourages credit default swaps and “too big to fail” banks

Alberti, Remapping Debate writer, 2-1-11

(Mike, Staff Reporter for Remapping Debate, B.A from Vassar College, “Could US-Korea trade agreement deter enhanced regulation of financial services?”, Feb 1, [http://www.remappingdebate.org/print?content=node%2F389] AD: 6-3-11, jm)

Article 13.4 of the agreement (see sidebar for full text of the Article) prohibits either country from adopting or maintaining a variety of limitations on the “financial institutions of the other Party or investors of the other Party seeking to establish such institutions.” That means that the U.S. would not be able to enforce such limitations on Korean companies, and visa versa. But, as a practical matter, the provisions would also effectively discourage the impositions of such limitations on domestic institutions operating in each country as well, since neither country would want to put its own companies at a disadvantage relative to the other country’s financial institutions. One provision of Article 13.4 prohibits limitations on the “total value of financial service interactions or assets” in respect to the other party. Todd Tucker, the research director of Public Citizen’s Global Trade Watch, claims that, if U.S. regulators or Congress were to decide to limit the size of a bank’s assets or market share in order to avoid situations where banks become too big to fail, the Korean government could challenge that law under the FTA. An official at the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, who was not authorized to speak on the record, vigorously disputes this contention, and asserts that such regulation would not be prohibited. That official argues that the “obligations” of Chapter 13 refer to sector-wide limitations (that is, all institutions in a country), not limitations on individual institutions. But at least one provision of Article 13.4 — paragraph (a)(4) — does appear to refer to both restrictions applicable to either the entire financial sector or an individual financial institution, and the other provisions do not specify “financial sector” only. Ian Fletcher, a research fellow at the Business and Industry Council, argues that the FTA restricts one country from applying “provisions against financial firewalls between financial activities [or] regulation on derivatives” on the financial institutions of the other country. He cites the the provision of the FTA that prohibits either the U.S. or Korea from restricting or requiring “specific types of legal entity or joint venture through which a financial institution may supply a service.” The firewall that existed under the Glass-Steagall Act, for example, prohibited depository banks from offering investment banking services, until it was repealed in 1999. (The repeal of the law has been criticized on the grounds that it allowed some banks to become too big to fail.) A proposal to regulate derivatives by limiting what kinds of institutions could trade in them would also raise issues of how to interpret the FTA’s provision precluding requirements on the “specific types of legal entity” that could provide the service. Tucker also claims that the agreement would prohibit any regulatory bans — such as on credit default swaps or flash trading — because they could be interpreted as a “quota of zero” (see bottom box), and therefore violate paragraph (a)(iii) by limiting the total quantity of financial services output. Though the U.S. would not be barred from imposing such regulations on its own institutions, it is difficult to imagine that it would decide to enact a limitation that could only be applied only to U.S. banks and not to Korean-registered banks operating in the U.S., of which there are currently several.

FTAs Bad – Jobs

FTA devastates job growth

Scott, Economic Policy Institute Senior International Economist and Director of International Programs, 10

(Robert E., Senior International Economist and Director of International Programs at the Economic Policy Institute, Feb 25, "Trade Policy And Job loss," [epi.3cdn.net/2ed5ba48430c9667bd\_xgm6bndi6.pdf] AD: 6-3-11, jm)

Exports tend to support domestic employment, and imports displace production that could support domestic jobs. Most studies of the effects of proposed trade agreements begin by estimating the effects of those agreements on trade flows and then estimating the effects of changes in trade flows on domestic employment. Scott (2008; 2008b) uses a 201 sector model of the economy and detailed data on trade flows in those industries to estimate the effects of changing trade patterns on employment. The projected employment impacts of the U.S.- Colombia TPA and the U.S.-Korea FTA are estimated in Table 5. Averages for the employment impacts of U.S. non-oil exports and imports were used to estimate the likely effects of changing trade flows. 8 In 2008, U.S. imports from Colombia could have supported 127,000 jobs if produced domestically, and exports supported 99,000 jobs, so net trade with Colombia resulted in a net displacement of 27,000 U.S. jobs. Given projected changes, the growth of the U.S. trade deficit with Colombia will displace 83,000 U.S. jobs in 2015, for a net loss of an additional 55,000 jobs. Likewise, the projected growth of U.S. trade deficits with Korea between 2008 and 2015 will displace an additional 159,000 U.S. jobs. Overall, if adopted, the U.S.-Colombia and U.S.-Korea trade agreements will displace a total of 214,000 additional U.S. jobs. 9 The majority of the jobs displaced would be in manufacturing, but many jobs would also be lost in industries that sell other goods and services to manufacturing.

FTAs Bad – AT – Trade Adjustment Assistance Checks

TAA won’t check back the harms - FTAs are structural failures

Fletcher, Coalition for a Prosperous America senior economist, 11

(Ian, Mar 1, educated at Columbia U and the U of Chicago, Senior Economist of the Coalition for a Prosperous America, "We Can’t Just Compensate Free Trade’s Losers," [stopuskoreanafta.org/news/page/2/] AD: 6-2-1, jm)

It is sometimes argued that although free trade has some victims, its benefits exceed its costs, so it is possible for its winners to compensate its losers out of their gains, everyone thereby coming out ahead in the end. This is, in fact, the usual fallback position of mainstream economists once they admit that free trade has drawbacks. (They don’t usually admit to civilians there are drawbacks, but press them even moderately hard and they’ll usually ‘fess up.) It is sometimes even mischievously argued that if such compensation doesn’t happen, any problems are due to society’s failure to arrange it, and are therefore not the fault of free trade per se. Hmm… Sounds like a perfect excuse. Now in theory, they might be right (if the rest of free trade economics is valid), but it also means that a bureaucratic deus ex machina is required to make free trade work as even its supporters admit that it should. So free trade turns out to be laissez faire on life support from big government. (As we all learned from the 2008 financial crisis, if not sooner, this is a recurring pattern in America.) In any case, such compensation rarely occurs, because free trade’s winners don’t have to pay off its losers. They pay off their congressmen instead–to vote for more free trade agreements. How is such compensation supposed to be implemented? Try the U.S. Government’s Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) program, which has provided supplemental unemployment benefits, training subsidies, and relocation assistance since 1974. But this program is small, compared to the damage wrought by free trade: under a billion dollars a year. Few workers have actually used it, and the concept suffers from intrinsic problems. For one thing, it is often impossible to identify who has lost a job due to free trade, as changing technology and consumer tastes also cost jobs (and legitimately so). Furthermore, free trade does not necessarily work its harm by reducing the quantity of jobs: it can reduce their quality, that is their wages and benefits, instead. And when free trade drives down wages, it can do so industry-wide, region-wide, or even nationwide, so its victims are impossible to pinpoint. TAA has tended to function simply as supplemental unemployment insurance while people wait to get their old jobs back, not as a means of helping people transition to new jobs. This is its official purpose, based on the (mistaken) idea that the harm done by free trade consists entirely in transition costs. TAA is also a deeply dysfunctional program. According to a recent ruling by the U.S. Court of International Trade (Former Employees of BMC Software Inc. v. the United States Secretary of Labor), it routinely denies legitimate assistance requests by workers. (For another fairly negative evaluation of TAA’s effectiveness, see the General Accounting Office’s 2000 report on it.) The time is past for free-trade band-aids. We need to stop treating the defects of free trade as mere imperfections to a fundamentally sound policy and realize that free trade itself is the problem, and should be ended.