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## SKFTA SHELL

1. (INSERT UNIQUENESS)
2. (INSERT LINK)

C. PC KEY TO SKFTA – SOLVES THE ECONOMY AND RELATIONS.

GALLI 10. [Teresa, Global Market Research Analyst @ Global Marketing Associates, “The South Korea - US Free Trade Agreement” June 21 -- http://ezinearticles.com/?The-South-Korea---US-Free-Trade-Agreement&id=4520289]

Although riddled with the imperfections inherent to free trade agreements, the KORUS FTA represents an significant opportunity for American exporters. Furthermore, the KORUS FTA is seen as an important way to strengthen American ties to the Asian market, counterbalance South Korea's growing trade ties with China, and possibly even restore the American position as Korea's preeminent trade partner. Finally, the agreement will not only boost economic ties between the two nations, but is also strategically important for the US in shaping future Asian policies. Failure could mean a devastating blow to a key American alliance in an increasingly important region. (The Heritage Foundation). If President Obama is able to garner the political capital necessary to push the KORUS FTA through Congress, it has the potential to send American exports to new heights. However, doing so will require strength, persistence, and much compromise.

RELATIONS SOLVE MULTIPLE SCENARIOS OF WAR.

PRITCHARD ET AL 9. [Jack, President, Korea Economic Institute, John Tilelli, Chairman and CEO, Cypress Int’l, and Scott Snyder, Adjunct Senior Fellow for Korea Studies, “A New Chapter for U.S.-South Korea alliance” Council on Foreign Relations -- June 16 http://www.cfr.org/publication/19635/new\_chapter\_for\_ussouth\_korea\_alliance.html]

While all eyes have been trained on North Korea's belligerent and aggressive actions in recent weeks, it is important to note that the U.S.-South Korea alliance has emerged as a linchpin in the Obama administration's efforts to successfully manage an overcrowded global agenda, and a pivotal tool for safeguarding U.S. long-term interests in Asia. When South Korea's President Lee Myung-bak meets with President Barack Obama at the White House Tuesday, the two leaders must effectively address three main areas: policy coordination to address North Korea's nuclear threat, the development of a global security agenda that extends beyond the peninsula, and collaboration to address the global financial crisis as South Korea takes a lead on the G-20 process. By conducting a second nuclear test in May, followed by a number of missile launches, North Korea has forced its way onto the Obama administration's agenda. First and foremost, effective U.S.-South Korea alliance coordination is critical to managing both the global effects of North Korea's nuclear threat on the nonproliferation regime and the regional security challenges posed by potential regime actions that lead to further crisis in the region. North Korea's internal focus on its leadership succession, and the apparent naming of North Korean leader Kim Jong-il's little-known and inexperienced youngest son as his successor, make the task of responding to North Korea's aggressive and destabilizing actions all the more challenging. Both deterrence and negotiation must be pursued on the basis of close consultations. Presidents Obama and Lee must also develop coordinated contingency plans in the event of internal instability in North Korea. Through effective U.S.-South Korea alliance coordination, it should be possible to forge a combined strategy capable of managing the nuclear, proliferation, and regional security dimensions of North Korea's threat. A coordinated position would also strengthen the administration's hand in its efforts to persuade China to put pressure on North Korea. Both countries also face hostage crises involving citizens detained in North Korea. The recent conviction of two U.S. journalists heightens the stakes for the United States, although the administration has tried to decouple their plight from Pyongyang's missile tests. Second, Presidents Obama and Lee should set the stage for a reinvigorated vision of a broader role for the U.S.-South Korea alliance as an important component of a broader U.S. strategy toward East Asia. A critical aspect of this vision is a mutual commitment to jointly address sources of global and functional instability beyond the peninsula. Lee Myung-bak has offered a vision of a global Korea that features an expanded commitment to peacekeeping and development assistance that is in greater proportion to South Korea's economic clout as the world's 13th largest economy. As the third-largest contributor of troops to Iraq, South Korea has also demonstrated its capacity to make valuable contributions to post-conflict stabilization. The U.S.-South Korea alliance can serve as a platform by which South Korea can make such contributions in many other areas, including Afghanistan. South Korea has already made commitments to send engineers and medical personnel to Afghanistan. It is poised now to expand its contributions, in line with its broadening scope of interest in contributing to global stability and its economic prowess. Third, South Korea is an essential partner in addressing the global financial crisis. Its emphasis on fighting protectionism and promotion of stimuli at the April G-20 leaders meeting in London illustrate how closely its priorities are aligned with those of the United States. A U.S. Federal Reserve Bank line of credit to South Korea last fall played a critical role in stabilizing the South Korean's currency and forestalled a possible repeat of South Korea's difficulties in the Asian financial crisis of a decade ago. The Obama and Lee administrations have the opportunity to send a powerful signal opposing protectionism by winning legislative support in both countries for the Korea-U.S. Free Trade Agreement negotiated by their predecessors. With the necessary revisions to meet new political conditions, Mr. Lee and Mr. Obama should urge their respective legislatures to consider early ratification of the trade pact. This would both support more effective coordination on the global financial crisis and underscore its value as a precedent that sets high standards for trade agreements in Asia, in contrast to the proliferation of Asian trade agreements that do little to promote a more open Asian trade and investment environment. U.S.-South Korean coordination to manage North Korea's challenge to nonproliferation norms, the global financial crisis, and the transition in Afghanistan will underscore the practical value of alliance contributions to meet mutual interests in global security and prosperity. For this reason, Presidents Obama and Lee have a compelling interest in establishing a firm foundation for unlocking the potential of alliance cooperation in the service of our shared interests.

# \*UNIQUENESS

## Yes SKFTA 1NC

Will pass despite TAA fight and committee obstruction – vote soon

Inside US Trade, 7/1/11

The Senate Finance Committee could reschedule the markup for the FTAs next week, since the Senate is in session. While Republicans could again block the consideration of TAA in the draft Korea implementing bill, one lobbyist doubted they would because they will have had more time to review the amendments.Part of the reason Republicans blocked the mock markup this week was because they wanted more time to review the almost 100 amendments that were filed.In addition, these Republicans will not want to appear overly "obstructionist" by blocking a mock markup two times, this lobbyist said. This lobbyist predicted that, if a mock markup were to take place in the Finance Committee, the committee would approve the Korea FTA implementing bill with TAA included .He said Republicans may initially vote together on an amendment to strip TAA out of the bill, but predicted that that amendment would fail because Democrats would unify against it. At that point, at least some Republicans would support the Korea FTA with TAA included due to their support for the FTA, this lobbyist hoped.

## Yes SKFTA

Will pass despite TAA – 5 reasons - deal in place on TAA substance, future compromises, GOP support for SKFTA, ramped up lobbying, expert insiders agree

Inside US Trade, 7/1

"We are confident that we will have a process that will lead to the passage of all of these measures together," one official said.Another official said this confidence in ultimately prevailing is "strengthened" by the fact that the White House and Camp have worked out a deal on the substance of the TAA, which they all described as a fair compromise between Republican and Democratic demands.He expressed the confidence that supporters of the FTAs will not back away from these deals simply because they include the renewal of TAA, a comment that appeared aimed at Republican members of Congress as well as business representatives, which so far have stayed out of the fight over TAA."We are quite confident that this will pass and that those who ... believe in and support these three free trade agreements will not back down ... because of the fact that this bill includes crucial assistance for workers who have been displaced in what is still a recovering economy and labor market," the official said.One official noted that members of the Ways and Means and Senate Finance committees have urged the administration repeatedly to seek passage of the FTAs so that U.S. exporters can reap economic benefits. He said "now is the time" for these members to demonstrate their support for the FTAs so the U.S. can do so.In a related development, Deputy U.S. Trade Representative Demetrios Marantis urged the KORUS Coalition, a group of companies and organizations supporting the FTA, to step up their fight for TAA passage in two June 28 conference calls.Meanwhile, the officials insisted that TAA must be passed with the FTAs, and emphasized that they would engage in further discussions with the congressional leadership on a way forward.One of them also emphasized the importance of seeing how things develop at the mock markup of the three FTAs by the Senate Finance Committee on June 30, and "presumptively" at next week's mock markup of the three FTA bills at the Ways and Means Committee.

### SKFTA will pass – TAA momentum.

### The Hill, 6-28

[Kevin Bogardus and Vicki Needham, “Baucus announces grand bargain to clear three pending trade deals”, [http://thehill.com/blogs/on-the-money/1005-trade/168849-baucus-announces-grand-bargain-on-trade-deals](http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2002_04/moltzapril02))

Sen. Max Baucus (D-Mont.) announced a deal Tuesday that should clear the path for congressional approval of three pending trade agreements with Colombia, Panama and South Korea. Baucus said he had secured an agreement with the White House and Rep. Dave Camp (R-Mich.), chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, to renew the expanded version of Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA). The program, which funds job-training programs and healthcare benefits for workers hurt by trade, will be extended until the end of 2013. “The road to this point has not been an easy one, but our economy needs these jobs and these opportunities,” Baucus said in a statement. “That’s why we have continued to fight to pass these job-creating agreements and restore this vital worker assistance program. We think this package can get the support needed to become law. American workers and our economy can’t afford for us to wait any longer to move forward.” The White House hailed the agreement as a breakthrough.

Will pass – opponents backing down

Klingner 5-16 (Bruce, Senior Research Fellow for Northeast Asia – Heritage Foundation, “KORUS won't help North Korea,” The Hill, 2011, http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/foreign-policy/161429-korus-wont-help-north-korea)

After years of delay, the South Korea-U.S. free trade agreement (KORUS) is rushing toward bipartisan Congressional approval. The Obama administration will formally submit it to Congress this month, and many previously fierce opponents have now jumped onboard as advocates.

Will Pass – New momentum and Deal with GOP over substance of TAA dispute is already in place

Thai Press Reports, 7/1

Section: General News - U.S. President Barack Obama has reached a deal with congressional Republicans on the terms of the Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) program, clearing a major obstacle to the ratification of bilateral trade pacts with South Korea, Colombia and Panama, the White House announced Tuesday. "As a result of extensive negotiations, we now have an agreement on the underlying terms for a meaningful renewal of a strengthened TAA," Press Secretary Jay Carney said in a statement. TAA is designed to provide re-training and health care benefits for workers who lose jobs due to import competition. Obama has said he would not submit the free trade agreements (FTAs) with the three nations before resolving the renewal of the TAA program, which was expanded two years ago and expired in February. The Republicans had refused to agree to extend TAA, citing budget constraints. "The president embraces these critical elements of TAA needed to ensure that workers have the best opportunity to get good jobs that keep them in the middle class. Now it is time to move forward with TAA and with the Korea, Colombia, and Panama trade agreements, which will support tens of thousands of jobs," Carney added. Senate Finance Committee Chairman Max Baucus (D-Mont.) said his committee will hold a "mock" markup on Thursday of the bills on the FTAs with the three trading partners that includes the extension of TAA. But it remains unclear how smooth the process will be. Senate Republican leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) said he would vote against the FTA with South Korea if it includes a renewal of TAA. "Speaking for myself, I've never voted against a trade agreement before. If the administration were to embed a Trade Adjustment Assistance into the Korea trade agreement, I would be voting against it," McConnell said. Sen. Orrin Hatch (R-Utah) also criticized the TAA deal, calling it "highly partisan." "This highly partisan decision to include TAA in the South Korean FTA implementing bill risks support for this critical job-creating trade pact in the name of a welfare program of questionable benefit at a time when our nation is broke," Hatch said in a statement. He added Obama "should send up our pending trade agreements with Colombia, Panama and Korea and allow for a clean vote." The South Korea-U.S. FTA, called KORUS FTA, was signed in 2007 under the previous governments of the two sides. The ratification process has been stalled, however, in both nations. Obama, seeking reelection next year, views the KORUS FTA as a tool to expand exports and create jobs in a sluggish economy. The U.S. government's efforts to get it ratified have gained urgency as South Korea struck a deal with the European Union to put a bilateral free trade agreement into effect in July.

SKFTA WILL PASS – TOP OF THE DOCKET.

GLADE 6-20. [Jim, “White House to send Colombia FTA to Congress before August recess: kirk” Colombia Reports -- http://colombiareports.com/colombia-news/news/17077-obama-administration-to-send-fta-to-congress-before-august-recess-state-dept-official.html]

The Obama administration hopes to send trade agreements with Colombia, Panama and South Korea to Congress before the August recess, said a U.S. State Department advisor Sunday. “Now it seems like the stars are in alignment -- it’s that important to us,’’ economic advisor Kevin Sullivan told the Miami Herald. The initial plan was to send only the South Korean trade agreement for congressional approval before the recess, but because discussions between the Obama administration and Republican legislatures about domestic job assistance programs have been "narrowed substantially," informal debates in Congress are able to begin, said U.S. Trade Representative Ron Kirk on Monday. "We're making good progress. Hopefully we can resolve the few outstanding differences," said Kirk, a champion of the agreement with Colombia. U.S. legislators are busy trying to reach an agreement on the Trade-Adjustment Assistance (TAA) program that aims to provide aid and retraining to workers who lose their jobs as a result of increased imports before congressional debate on the FTA's with Colombia, South Korea and Panama begin. The chair of the House Ways and Means Committee, Rep. Kevin Brady (R, TX), said last week that a panel would start informal debates on the deals this week. Brady was reportedly hopeful that an agreement on the TAA program would be reached before the committee began debating the FTA's.

SKFTA will pass- major obstacle resolved but passage is not guaranteed

New York Times 6/28/11 (Binyamin Applebaum, “White House and Congress Clear Trade Deal Hurdle”, http://www.nytimes.com/2011/06/29/business/29trade.html//)

The White House struck a deal with House Republicans Tuesday to reinstate benefits for workers who lose jobs to foreign competition, addressing a major obstacle to consideration of three free trade agreements with South Korea, Colombia and Panama. Haggling over the modest and obscure benefits program had tied up the trade pacts for months, pitting Democrats concerned about the impact of competition on American workers against Republicans eager to increase foreign trade but loath to increase federal spending on another aid program. But the deal does not assure that Congress will pass the pacts, which are crucial ingredients in the Obama administration’s recipe for reinvigorating economic growth. Indeed, Republicans quickly said they would continue to insist that the benefits program be considered separately from the trade agreements, a condition Democrats described as unacceptable. The Obama administration, which had maintained for weeks that it would not submit the trade pacts to Congress until the deadlock was resolved, by Tuesday night found itself defending its new deal as an important step that might lead to a complete resolution. “As a result of extensive negotiations, we now have an agreement on the underlying terms for a meaningful renewal of a strengthened” benefits program, the White House spokesman, Jay Carney, said in a statement. Other administration officials hastened to clarify that that deal did not extend to the question of how that agreement might be approved. Senator Max Baucus, the Democratic chairman of the Finance Committee, said that he would convene a hearing Thursday morning, starting a process that could end with the bills passing into law before the end of summer. “We think this package can get the support needed to become law,” Mr. Baucus said. “American workers and our economy can’t afford for us to wait any longer to move forward.”

## A2: House Will Block

TAA won’t block house vote on Korea – can still be recombined after voting to trigger senate fast track

Inside US Trade, 7/1/11

Informal guidance by the Senate Parliamentarian gives House Speaker John Boehner (R-OH) the flexibility to make good on his threat to refuse to hold one vote on both the U.S.-Korea free trade agreement and a renewal of Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) program without jeopardizing fast-track protection for the Korea FTA in the Senate.This week, Boehner was steadfast that he would not hold a vote on the Korea FTA implementing bill as drafted by the White House, which included a renewal of the TAA program, if the White House formally submitted it to Congress. Instead, his spokesman said, Boehner would make sure that the House votes on these bills separately."Nothing says we have to consider what they send us," the spokesman said. "We can introduce our own identical Korea FTA without TAA" and introduce a TAA "standalone" bill, he said.He said this will not mean the House will amend the bill that the president submits by stripping out the TAA. Instead, the House would just decline to take up that "construct" submitted by the White House, he said.In a related development, House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Dave Camp (R-MI) has also made clear that he will not consider a TAA-Korea FTA implementing bill at his panel's mock markup, sources said.Earlier this week, the Ways and Means Committee had tentatively aimed for a July 7 mock markup, but it is unclear if that timetable will still hold in the wake of the canceled Senate Finance Committee markup this week (see related story).According to informed sources, the insistence by Boehner that he will not hold a vote on a Korea FTA implementing bill that contains TAA -- but instead will consider those bills separately -- would not necessarily endanger Senate fast-track protections for the Korea FTA bill, so long as two conditions are met.First, the two bills would have to remain unchanged in substance from what the White House submitted when passed by the House, which the House leadership can achieve by considering them without authorizing amendments. Secondly, Boehner would have to combine the Korea FTA bill and TAA legislation into one measure before transmitting it to the Senate. In that case, the Senate parliamentarian would likely find that fast-track is still applicable to the Senate bill despite the fact that the House approved the Korea FTA and TAA separately under regular legislative procedures, not under fast-track rules, sources said.In the Senate parliamentarian's view, it would be immaterial under what procedures the House-passed the bill, so long as the bill passed by the House and received by the Senate is identical to the bill formally submitted by the White House to Congress under fast track.The Senate parliamentarian could consider that fast track in the Senate would be triggered not by the submission of the House-passed bill, but by President Obama's formal submission of implementing legislation with the statutorily prescribed message and the supporting documents.However, it remains unclear whether Boehner will opt to combine the Korea FTA implementing bill and the TAA into one package if the House passes each bill separately.If he does, it would put Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-KY) in a difficult position, as he has insisted that TAA renewal and the Korea FTA must proceed separately. But if he receives one package from the House, McConnell would be forced to consider them together.McConnell has adamantly opposed the inclusion of TAA in any FTA implementing bill, and has insisted that TAA should be considered in the context of renewing the controversial fast-track law. One business lobbyist pointed out that Boehner wants a close working relationship with McConnell on such issues as raising the debt ceiling and cutting the budget deficit, and that Boehner may not be willing to put that at risk by essentially allowing the administration's strategy of insisting that TAA passes with the Korea FTA to prevail. However, another lobbyist was more optimistic, saying that refusing to recombine the two bills before sending them over to the Senate would be a lot for McConnell to ask of Boehner.The other option is for Boehner to send the House-passed TAA and the Korea FTA implementing bill as two separate measures, which would put the onus on Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) to seek passage of both. To pass TAA as a free-standing bill in the Senate, Reid would have to limit amendments, which would be a formidable task because this would would require a degree of cooperation between Reid and McConnell that would be difficult to achieve and to date has been elusive.Up to now, Senate Finance Committee Chairman Max Baucus (D-MT) and his staff have said that it would be impossible to move the TAA bill through the Senate as a standalone measure. They have expressed doubts that they could muster the required 60 votes to stop a filibuster on the bill. In the context of considering how to handle the U.S.-Colombia FTA, which lost its fast-track protection in the House in 2007, the Senate parliamentarian earlier this year informally took the position that the sole act of transmitting an FTA implementing bill passed under regular legislative procedure from the House to the Senate does not trigger fast-track in the Senate.Instead, the parliamentarian informally took the position that the President's formal submission of the Colombia FTA implementing bill to Congress, with a statutorily prescribed message from the president and the supporting documents, could be considered to invoke fast-track in the Senate (Inside U.S. Trade, Feb. 11).

## Yes SKFTA – Korea Will Pass

### Yes passage on both sides

**Yonhap News 6/22** [“AMCHAM chief rosy about Korea-U.S. FTA ratification” June 22, 2011; Yonhap News Agency; ]

The new head of the U.S. business community in South Korea said Wednesday that he is "optimistic" about the early ratification of a bilateral free trade deal and is doing his best to achieve it. The free trade agreement, known as the KORUS FTA, was signed in June 2007, but the two countries re-negotiated to revise controversial terms on auto tariffs and pork late last year. The bill has been awaiting approval from the legislatures of both countries. "In recent public remarks, U.S. President Obama cited 'unprecedented support' for the KORUS FTA in the United States," said Pat Gaines, the newly elected chairman of the American Chamber of Commerce in Korea (AMCHAM). "AMCHAM remains very optimistic that this historic agreement will be ratified in both countries in the near future. AMCHAM is doing everything possible to make this happen." Gaines, also president of Boeing Korea, was elected in May as the AMCHAM chairman, replacing former chairman Frank Little of 3M. Gaines said that a delegation of AMCHAM visited Washington in March and met with members of the U.S. Congress and the government to urge them to make efforts to ratify the FTA deal as soon as possible. "We were very pleased with the amount of positive support we heard related to the agreement," he said. The trade pact passed the Cabinet of South Korea, but it has yet to be presented to the parliament as the main opposition party is against the accord, claiming that it favors the U.S. In the U.S., the Trade Adjustment Assistance, a federal program designed to provide re-training and health care benefits for workers, has been hindering the parliamentary ratification process. But the prospect of ratification has risen recently as Washington is making a push for passing the trade bill within this year, along with FTAs with Panama and Colombia.

### There are enough votes despite opposition

**Kim 6/24** [Rueters, Jack Kim; June 24; “Q+A-Where is the S.Korea, US free trade pact headed?” http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/06/24/korea-usa-trade-idUSL3E7HO0AC20110624]

South Korea President Lee Myung-bak's government has sent the trade bill to parliament but the assembly has yet to set the date to begin reviewing it. A majority of the ruling Grand National Party (GNP) support the deal. Some opposition Democratic Party members oppose it, saying a revision to the deal reached in December damaged the interest of South Korean automakers. The ruling GNP has the number to force it through parliament but does not want to repeat the political embarrassment caused by a previous attempt to do so. IS THERE ENOUGH SUPPORT ONCE IT COMES TO A VOTE? The December revision addressed concerns by U.S. car makers and auto unions that the original deal had favoured South Korean automakers too heavily. U.S. Trade Representative Ron Kirk said those changes meant winning approval in Congress would no longer be "horribly difficult". But it still faces stiff opposition, including from the AFL-CIO, the main U.S. labour group. In South Korea, the pact has broad support from the public and from businesses which see it as a chance to enter a greater U.S. market and to buy cheaper imports at home. In addition to backing from the ruling GNP, some opposition Democratic Party members, who had supported the pact when the former liberal president negotiated it in 2007, are for the deal.

## Top Of Agenda

Top of docket - Committee Setback is only temporary

Cohen, 7/1, Richard E. Cohen is a senior congressional reporter for Politico, Cohen also has been an author of numerous books about Congress. From 2001 until 2010, he was co-author with Michael Barone of The Almanac of American Politics, He was the 1990 winner of the Everett McKinley Dirksen Award for distinguished reporting of Congress. He has served many years as a member of the executive committee of the congressional periodical galleries, and currently is chairman of the committee, Politico.com

Some caveats and nuances are present in the Senate meltdown that forced postponement of the committee's handling of the trade deals with South Korea, Colombia and Panama, and extension of the trade-adjustment assistance program for unemployed workers. For one thing, most committee members support the trade agreements, which likely will return soon for Finance action. And the committee found itself as something of a bystander in the ongoing attacks between House Republicans and the Obama Administration.

TRADE IS TOP OF THE AGENDA.

THE HILL 6-19-11.

Three long-delayed pending trade deals could take center stage in the House next week if negotiators can carve out an agreement within the next few days. Congressional lawmakers and White House officials are engaged in nearly non-stop talks on the details that could lead to an agreement on a trade package that would move three pending accords with Colombia, Panama and South Korea and include a reauthorization of the Trade Adjustment Assistance program (TAA), a program that helps U.S workers who've lost their jobs because of foreign trade.

KORUS is top of the docket – it will pass by July

Merco Press 5-13 (“US trade deals with Colombia, Panama and Korea could be approved ‘by August’,” 2011, http://en.mercopress.com/2011/05/13/us-trade-deals-with-colombia-panama-and-korea-could-be-approved-by-august)

Speaking at a House Agriculture Committee hearing, US Trade Representative Ron Kirk called on Congress to approve an expanded Trade Adjustment Assistance Program for the retraining of workers displaced due to foreign competition. “We are asking Congress to approve TAA as they move forward with these other agreements,” Kirk said, adding the deals then could be ratified “by August”. Kirk was responding to Republican lawmakers pushing hard for the exact timing of the presentation of the deals to Congress for deliberation. Congressional Republicans have opposed the renewal of the program, which expired early this year, citing the need to cut the federal budget deficit. Kirk's remarks are in line with House Speaker John Boehner, who has expressed his intention to have the three deals pass through Congress before the August recess. The Obama administration last week began technical consultations with congressional staff members on the trade deals ahead of their official presentation to Congress. Kirk has said he wants Congress to approve the Korea deal before July first, when a similar deal between South Korea and the European Union takes effect. The Korea FTA, along with the Colombia and Panama deals, were negotiated under the Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002, which requires Congress to vote yes or no without amendments within 90 days of the deal's submission. The Obama administration has in recent months cleared obstacles to the congressional approval of the three trade deals. Last month, Washington reached a new deal with Colombia on labor rights, which have served as a stumbling block to congressional approval of the trade agreement, and another with Panama to allow exchanges of tax information to prevent tax evasion. Panama is often criticized for serving as a tax haven. Miriam Sapiro, deputy US trade representative, told a Senate Finance Committee Wednesday that the exact timing for the deals' submission depends on discussions with Congress. “There are discussions ongoing about the exact sequencing and scheduling, of being able to accomplish all of our trade initiatives this year and we look forward to that discussion continuing and concluding as soon as possible,” she said.

OBAMA PUSH.

AFP 6-17-11.

President Barack Obama's administration made ratification a priority this year, saying the agreement will support 70,000 US jobs and help double US exports to South Korea within five years.

## AT: Debt Ceiling Thumper

BIPART DEBT SOLUTION NOW.

WASHINGTON POST 6-17-11.

Something’s missing in the debate over raising the country’s debt ceiling: anger. The highest-stakes political battle to date in the 112th Congress has been surprisingly absent the partisan rancor, name-calling and – for lack of a better term — blamesmanship that typically mark most spending fights in Washington. The civil tone that’s emerged in the battle over raising the $14.3 trillion debt limit this summer appears to be a product of the cordial working relationships that have developed among the principals in the White House-led talks, particularly between Vice President Biden and House Majority Leader Eric Cantor (R-Va.).

DEAL INEVITABLE AND OBAMA DELEGATED TO BIDEN – NO PC LOSS.

WASHINGTON POST 6-17-11.

The civil tone that’s emerged in the battle over raising the $14.3 trillion debt limit this summer appears to be a product of the cordial working relationships that have developed among the principals in the White House-led talks, particularly between Vice President Biden and House Majority Leader Eric Cantor (R-Va.). But it also might stem from the tacit acknowledgment among all sides that even raising the specter of a federal default could have a catastrophic effect on the global economy. Joining in the bipartisan goodwill this weekend are President Obama, House Speaker John A. Boehner (R-Ohio) and Ohio Gov. John Kasich (R), who are slated to hold their first “golf summit” Saturday. No policy details are likely to be engaged on the links, but goodwill toward reaching a real deal might be enhanced. The bonhomie is a far cry from the loud and personal attacks that have characterized most big Washington debates in recent years. Consider recent statements made by some of the group’s principals as the debt-limit negotiators wrapped up their eighth meeting Thursday evening. “I think the success of these talks thus far is due to the vice president and the way that he has conducted the meetings,” Cantor told reporters Monday.

## Link Uniqueness – A2 Obama Using Capital on Space Now

Obama being passive now on space policy

Whittington, 11 --- author of *Children of Apollo* and *The Last Moonwalker* and has written on space subjects for a variety of periodicals (4/1/11, Mark, “Rep. Bill Posey Argues for More Funding for NASA Space Exploration,” [http://news.yahoo.com/s/ac/20110401/pl\_ac/8187949\_rep\_bill\_posey\_argues\_for\_more\_funding\_for\_nasa\_space\_exploration](http://www.chron.com/content/news/photos/03/07/20/nasa/crosstabs.pdf))

In a recent hearing before the House Budget Committee in preparation for a 2012 budget, Rep. Bill Posey, Republican of Florida, made the case for more funding for NASA's human space flight programs. Most of the arguments Posey used were familiar. They included the need not to fall behind Russia and China in space exploration, technological spin-offs, and the need to maintain an aerospace work force. The main thrust of Posey's arguments were directed against President Barack Obama's space policy, which the congressman suggested had left NASA with no clear mission as well as the White House's continuing opposition to funding space exploration. This, more than the other arguments, is likely to have some resonance for House members, Republicans as well as Democrats. Whether one believes that Russia and China might eventually colonize the Moon—and opinions vary on that—there is a consensus with Congress about the president's space policy. Obama's space policy, sprung on the nation without consultation with members of Congress or anyone else, is dysfunctional in its execution and in its substance. Posey's emphasis on the Moon is an interesting data point. The Obama space plan, such as it is, bypasses the Moon specifically, focusing on Earth approaching asteroids. Posey appears to believe, as was the consensus behind the Constellation program, that the Moon remains the next necessary destination for human explorers. If Posey's view is widely shared in the Congress, some specific language to that effect may appear in the upcoming NASA authorization bill. NASA and the Obama administration is already chaffing over the requirement to build a shuttle derived heavy lifter by 2016, along with the Orion space craft. If a requirement is added to build a lunar lander, thus putting in place all of the elements needed for a return to the Moon, NASA and the White House are likely to chaff even more. The future of human space exploration is in flux. NASA, the White House, and the Congress are pulling in different directions over what if anything human astronauts do beyond low Earth orbit. Posey's testimony before the House Budget Committee is obviously the opening shot in what will be a long war over the future of space exploration that will likely not end before a new president is sworn into office. The authorization committees will try to find a sensible direction. The appropriations committees will try to fund that direction. President Obama, so far at least, has assumed a role of **total passivity** now that the old program is gone and the new one is, at best, uncertain.

# 

# \*GENERAL LINKS

## 1NC: Political Capital Link

Plan spends political capital --- Obama will have to push space exploration/development through Congressional opposition

Powell 9 (Stewart M., Washington Bureau – Houston Chronicle, “Potential Uphill Battle for NASA”, Houston Chronicle, 9-13, <http://www.chron.com/disp/story.mpl/nation/6615751.html>)

NASA supporters are bracing for an uphill battle to get the extra funding needed to take on missions more ambitious than visits to the international space station. A high-level panel told President Barack Obama last week that the space program needs an infusion of about $3 billion more a year by 2014. That may be a tough sell, even though the amount could be considered spare change in a fast-spending capital where the White House and Congress are on track to dole out nearly $4 trillion this year to finance federal operations, including bailouts for Wall Street firms, banks and automakers. “The congressional agenda over the next year is going to be focused on cutting programs, not adding to them,” said Scott Lilly, a scholar at the Center for American Progress. Adding resources to the nation's $18.7 billion-a-year space program would require cuts in other areas, said Lilly, who doesn't think lawmakers are willing to make those trades. Rep. Pete Olson, R-Sugar Land, the ranking Republican on the House subcommittee that has jurisdiction over NASA, said wrangling the additional $3 billion a year would be “an enormous challenge — but one I am prepared to win.” Added Olson, whose district includes Johnson Space Center: “NASA doesn't require bailout funds — it needs the promised level of investment that previous Congresses have endorsed.” The 10-member panel of space experts led by retired aerospace executive Norman Augustine suggested extending U.S. participation in the $100 billion space station for five years, extending budgeting for the retiring shuttle fleet by six months, delaying plans for a 2020 return to the moon and extending the timeline for the next generation of manned spacecraft by two years at least until 2017. But the experts warned in their 12-page preliminary report to Obama on Tuesday that “meaningful human exploration” would be possible only under “a less constrained budget ramping (up) to approximately $3 billion per year” in additional spending by 2014. Former astronaut Sally Ride, a member of the committee, forecast $27.1 billion in additional funds would be needed over the next decade — a 27 percent increase over the $99.1 billion currently planned. Even before Obama publicly reacts to Augustine's report to map the next steps in the nation's manned space exploration, members of Congress are scrambling. “The immediate challenge goes beyond money to just getting NASA on the radar screen when everyone is focused on health care reform,” said a key congressional staffer involved in NASA issues. *Finding support* NASA supporters initially are targeting the Democratic leadership of appropriations subcommittees in the House and Senate with jurisdiction over NASA. Space advocates have an ally in Sen. Barbara Mikulski, D-Md., chairwoman of the Senate Appropriations Committee panel that handles space agency spending. But in the House, pro-NASA lawmakers expect a fight with Rep. Alan Mollohan, D-W.Va., chairman of the House Appropriations Committee panel that cut next year's NASA spending nearly $500 million below what Obama requested. Lawmakers are looking for a House-Senate conference committee to restore the funds that Mollohan cut before the Augustine panel completed its work. Aides to Sen. Bill Nelson, D-Fla., chairman of a Senate subcommittee that oversees NASA, said they have already identified six potential sources of additional NASA funding within the federal budget, including some of the $8 billion promised over the next decade to private energy firms to research fossil fuels and deep drilling for oil and gas. Lawmakers also are exploring the possibility of redirecting some of the two-year, $787 billion economic stimulus package from shovel-ready transportation construction projects and other federally subsidized programs into the NASA budget. The administration so far has only paid out $160 billion of the total, according to Vice President Joe Biden. “A lot of stimulus money has not been spent,” said Sen. John Cornyn, R-San Antonio. “We should redirect some of those stimulus funds to pay for enhancements to the NASA budget because I believe human space flight is so important.” Aerospace executives and veteran space experts are hoping for reliable year-to-year funding. “These are challenging economic times, but this is not the moment to turn away from leading a global space exploration effort,” said Dean Acosta, head of the Houston-based Coalition for Space Exploration. *President's influence* Presidential leadership will be essential to gaining an increase, emphasized John Logsdon, a space policy expert who served on the Shuttle Columbia Accident Investigation Board. “The president has to use some portion of his political capital to put forward an Obama space program.”

## Link: Costs Capital (General)

Empirically true --- *every President* has pushed space policy changes, but Congress has blocked it

Young 8 (Anthony, Author – The Saturn V F-1 Engine: Powering Apollo into History, “Review: Spaceflight and the Myth of Presidential Leadership”, The Space Review, 9-29, http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1218/1)

The authors in this book put forth the views that US presidents do not have that power and certainly cannot mandate the Congress to fully fund ambitious manned and unmanned exploration programs. The reality is that formulating and funding space programs is a much more complex process than it would appear to the man on the street. This myth, the authors contend, probably stems from the iconic speech President Kennedy made before Congress—as part of “Urgent National Needs”—and the seemingly unobstructed carte blanche funding the Congress agreed to provide for Kennedy’s announced space exploration programs. What viewers and voters did not see were the behind-closed-doors Congressional meetings and intelligence briefings that took place weeks before Kennedy’s speech. The Soviet Union’s payload launch capability and obvious technical and scientific prowess and the portent they held for US national security and geopolitical power—not to mention national prestige—were the real drivers behind Congressional willingness to fund an ambitious and expensive manned space program in general and Project Apollo in particular. President Kennedy would not have made such a public request for that national commitment if the money had not already been approved. As Launius and McCurdy state in their book: Most space supporters did not understand how truly exceptional the Apollo mandate was. After the glamor of Kennedy’s moment dimmed, space policy came to rest alongside all the other priorities of government for which presidential leadership played a diminishing role. This eventually disappointed those who believed in the power of presidents to make space exploration special. The Apollo decision was, therefore, an anomaly in the history of the U.S. space program. The chapters in this book were among papers presented at a symposium in 1993 organized by the NASA History Office and the Center for Congressional and Presidential Studies. They include “The Reluctant Racer: Eisenhower and U.S. Space Policy” by David Callahan and Fred I. Greenstein; “Kennedy and the Decision to Go to the Moon” by Michael R. Beschloss; “Johnson, Project Apollo, and the Politics of Space Program Planning” by Robert Dallek; “The Presidency, Congress, and the Deceleration of the U.S. Space Program in the 1970s” by Joan Hoff; “Politics Not Science: The U.S. Space Program in the Reagan and Bush Years” by Lyn Ragsdale; “Presidential Leadership and International Aspects of the Space Program” by Robert H. Ferrell; and “National Leadership and Presidential Power” by John M. Logsdon. Launius and McCurdy include their own “Epilogue: Beyond NASA Exceptionalism”. Perhaps it is because the Kennedy era and Project Apollo achieved such astounding goals for the United States that this is still seen as the model for other presidents to follow. Indeed, almost every subsequent US president has made some formal announcement for the need for a new era of American space exploration. Various advisory councils are established by presidential decree to survey the current status of America’s space program and make recommendations to the president on the direction the country to take in the years ahead. Glossy, impressive, and inspiring documents are produced to give the president, Congress, and the public recommendations and reasons why American should undertake a bold new initiative. The contributors to this book state while these efforts are laudable, they rarely have the desired effect of moving Congress, which holds the purse strings, to fund those goals. Fifteen years have gone by since that symposium was held, but US space policy and goals remained essentially unchanged until the destruction of the space shuttle Columbia and the death of its crew on reentry in 2003. That was primarily true because the International Space Station and the space shuttle orbiter were inexorably linked. The ISS could not be completed without the shuttle orbiter, so the shuttle program continued longer than any manned spacecraft program in US history. The shuttle fleet was nearly a quarter of a century old when Columbia disintegrated during its return to Earth. No American astronauts died during missions in their Mercury, Gemini, or Apollo capsules; fourteen astronauts have died aboard two space shuttle orbiters: seven aboard Challenger during launch and seven aboard Columbia during reentry. The calls for retiring the shuttle fleet were unstoppable. That is what drove the need for a new manned spacecraft, launch vehicle and creation of Project Constellation. *Spaceflight and the Myth of Presidential Leadership* will not only clarify in the reader’s mind the machinations behind US space policy and congressional funding of NASA and its programs, it might also realistically lower expectations of what the next US president will promote and achieve.

NASA programs cost political capital- Congress and President don’t like to get on board, even with popular policies

Richard S. Conley, Associate Professor Department of Political Science University of Florida and Wendy Whitman Cobb PhD Candidate University of Florida, 6/19/2010, “The Perils of Presidential Leadership on Space Policy: The Politics of Congressional Budgeting for NASA, 1958-2008” pg. 10-11

Few presidents have been willing to put their “political capital” on the line for space policy—a “constituentless” policy area (Light 1999)—since the Apollo era. And the international and domestic political context has changed considerably since NASA’s inception. NASA’s raison d’être has become less clear following the end of the Cold War and with increased multinational cooperation on projects, such as the ISS, involving Russia and the European Union (Murray 1991), not to mention China’s emerging interest in space exploration. Still, two presidents—George H.W. Bush in 1989 and George W. Bush in 2004—attempted to articulate long-term visions for NASA. Their relative success was contingent not only on congressional action but also their successors’ commitment as party control of the White House changed. George H.W. Bush proposed the Space Exploration Initiative (SEI) in 1989, with the explicit goal of putting mankind on Mars. The large price tag inhibited congressional action in his inaugural year, and the SEI was not taken up by Congress until 1990 for FY 1991, and that year the president’s budget fell apart dramatically in Congress (Eastland 1992). In 2004 George W. Bush proposed the VSE, which called for phasing out the space shuttle program and emphasizing programs designed to use the moon as a launching pad for eventual exploration of Mars. Yet President Obama, following his 2008 election victory, signaled that such efforts are a low priority on his overall agenda and has attempted to scale back the Constellation project significantly. If presidential commitment to space exploration has been highly uneven in recent decades, NASA’s ability to influence presidential commitment to space policy has been further hampered by bureaucratic intransigence and a failure to alter its own agenda priorities as political control and priorities of the White House and Capitol Hill have alternated. As Klerkx (2005, 57) contends, “the pace of human spaceflight is whatever pace NASA says it should be,” regardless of congressional skepticism or presidents’ “vision” or lack thereof. NASA programs have been criticized for their path dependency—programs taking on a life of their own independent of congressional or presidential calls for change (Roberts 1990, 144; Bruggeman 2002). Path dependency obviously inhibits successful liaison with either Congress or the Office of Management and Budget.

SPACE FUNDING IS POLITICALLY CONTROVERSIAL --- BENEFITS AREN’T PERCEIVED

Cunningham 10 (Walter, Former Apollo Astronaut, “Slashed NASA Budget Would Leave the U.S. No Longer a Space Leader”, Houston Chronicle, 2-6,)

NASA has always been a political football. The agency's lifeblood is federal funding, and it has been losing blood for several decades. The only hope now for a lifesaving transfusion to stop the hemorrhaging is Congress. It is hard to be optimistic. President Obama has apparently decided the United States should not be in the human spaceflight business. He obviously thinks NASA's historic mission is a waste of time and money. Until just two months before his election, he was proposing to use the $18 billion NASA budget as a piggybank to fund his favored education programs. With this budget proposal, he is taking a step in that direction. NASA is not just a place to spend money, or to count jobs. It is the agency that has given us a better understanding of our present and hope for our future; an agency that gives us something to inspire us, especially young people. NASA's Constellation program was not “over budget, behind schedule, and lacking in innovation due to a failure to invest in critical new technologies,” as stated in the White House budget plan. The program's problems were due to perennial budget deficiencies. It would have been sustainable for an annual increase equal to the amount thrown away on the “cash for clunkers” program, or just a fraction of the tens of billions of dollars expended annually on congressional earmarks. It's debatable whether Constellation was the best solution to President George W. Bush's vision of “Moon, Mars and Beyond,” but it was far better than the vacuum in which we now find ourselves, and without a viable alternative in sight. Yes, jobs will be lost and the local economy will suffer. This will hurt and be readily measured. In the long run, intangible losses (those on which we cannot put a price tag) will be far more devastating. The cancellation of Constellation will guarantee several things. Most important, strategically, is the gap, the period during which we will be dependent on Russia to carry Americans to our own space station. With the cancellation of Constellation, that gap will grow longer, not shorter. American astronauts will not travel into space on American-developed and -built spacecraft until at least 2016 or 2017. We are not trying to fix any deficiencies in Constellation; our fate will be in the hands of commercial companies with COTS (Commercial Orbital Transportation Services) program awards. They will attempt to regain our lost greatness with new capsules and new rockets or military rockets, after man-rating them. Supposedly, they will do this faster and cheaper than NASA. Cheaper, maybe; faster is not going to happen. These will be companies that have never made a manned rocket and have little idea of the problems they face trying to man-rate a brand new launch vehicle and space capsule. Even under the best of circumstances, humans will not be flying to the space station on COTS-developed vehicles before 2017. After 50 years and several hundred billion dollars, the accomplishments of NASA and the U.S. space program in science, technology and exploration are unchallenged. They are admired, respected and envied by people and countries around the world. Our space program has provided inspiration to the human spirit for young and old alike. It said proudly to the world that Americans could accomplish whatever they set their minds to. Look at the efforts of China and India in the past 30 years to emulate this success. Young people have always been inspired with talk of sending explorers to the planets. Do you think they will have the same reaction when we speak of the new plan for “transformative technology development”? NASA may have been backing away from the real challenge of human spaceflight for years, but in canceling Constellation and NASA manned vehicles we are, in effect, abdicating our role as the leading spacefaring nation of the world. America will lose its pre-eminence in space. The real economic impact will not be immediate. The public at large is not fully aware of NASA's role as a principal driver in our economy for the past 50 years. They forget that much of the technology we now take for granted either originated in the space program or was utilized and improved by the space program. That is NASA's real legacy. The investments we made in NASA in the 1960s are still paying off in technology applications and new businesses

POLITICAL FOOTBALL – ARM TWISTING INEVITABLE.

FLORIDA TODAY 10. [“Battle for shuttle not yet won” October 10 -- lexis]

The space shuttle orbiters remain a hot commodity, and a big-time political football, as elected officials hammer out the final details of NASA's future. Buried in the legislation outlining such lofty matters as where NASA astronauts might go next in exploring our solar system is a paragraph adding some guidance to NASA on picking retirement homes for two of the three remaining space shuttle orbiters. Senators inserted the clause in the 103-page NASA Authorization bill, directing the space agency to give priority consideration to communities of NASA centers with a "historical relationship with either the launch, flight operations, or processing of the space shuttle orbiters." That would appear to require NASA to give places such as Florida's Space Coast or Houston, Texas, special consideration over, for instance, the bid by New York City to display one of the orbiters at a museum in Manhattan. Some members of the U.S. House of Representatives, presumably representing states without such historical relationships to NASA's space shuttle program, aimed to eliminate that advantage from their version of the authorization bill. The political clock sort of ran out on them, however, as anxious representatives worried that NASA's future could remain in limbo until after the November elections or maybe into 2011. Instead, leaders decided to give up on passing their own NASA bill and simply adopt the Senate's version. That piece of legislation provides several pieces of guidance to NASA as its leaders decide where the space shuttle orbiters Endeavour and Atlantis will be displayed once they've completed their final flights. Discovery is already pledged to the Smithsonian in Washington. Kennedy Space Center Visitor Complex is among the facilities vying to become home to one of the two available spaceships. In addition to the priority given for historical connections to the program, the other guidance from Congress includes giving priority to locations with the best potential to advance education in science, technology, engineering and mathematics. Congress also reiterated previous legislative guidance to consider locations where the most people could see them. The guidance probably doesn't prohibit New York or another community with less space shuttle heritage than Kennedy Space Center or Houston from getting one of the orbiters. Nor is the language politically bullet-proof. Congress still has to pass the funding half of its NASA legislation -- sometime after the November elections -- and it will be just as easy for politicians to insert additional wording in that bill that somehow alters the competitive landscape. In the end, U.S. Sen. Bill Nelson expects NASA Administrator Charlie Bolden to have a committee study all the competitors and make a recommendation to him, which he'll run by the White House first. Then, he'll make the announcement. But make no mistake, the behind-the-scenes political battle is not over. Every piece of NASA legislation being handled in Washington right now will include some give-and-take and attempted horse-trading involving the final destinations of those two spaceships.

MORE EV.

DINERMAN 11. [Taylor, journalist, “NASA’s continuing problems” The Space Review -- April 18]

That effort is complicated by the loss of the Glory spacecraft earlier this year on a Taurus XL launch vehicle made by Orbital Sciences Corporation. This firm is one of the two winners of the commercial space station resupply contracts that NASA hopes will lead to a manned taxi service into orbit. Unfortunately, Orbital Sciences plans to fulfill this contract using a rocket called the Taurus II. Spaceflight is, at the moment, an inherently unsafe business and failures are to be expected, but if the commercial space industry on which NASA is betting its future cannot do better than this, then the agency will be in even worse political shape than it is in already. Reps. Ralph Hall (R-TX) and Eddie Bernice Johnson (D-TX), the chair and the ranking member, respectively, of the House Space, Science, and Technology Committee, have expressed their disappointment—to put it mildly—with the 2012 proposed NASA budget. The administration’s proposal, according to both of them, ignores the NASA authorization bill that President Obama signed last year. Congressman Hall has promised, “I will continue to push NASA to adhere to congressional direction and follow the priorities that are now the law of the land.” US civil space policy is now subject to a bitter and prolonged tug-of-war between Congress and the administration. For future political scientists, the actions of Bolden and the White House’s science policy makers may turn out to be a textbook case in how not to reform a government program.

Link outweighs the turn --- benefits not understood and long term at best

Som, 10 – planetary scientist (7/16/2010, Sanjoy, Space Policy, “An international symbol for the sustained exploration of space,” volume 26, issue 3, pg 140-142)

1. Introduction Space exploration strategies have evolved substantially since their beginnings in the late 1950s, when they were closely associated with military technological prowess. Yet today, some 20 years after the end of the Cold War, space development is still considered a strategic asset. Technological achievements by one nation are often viewed as threats by others, as expressed by satellite-destroying missile demonstrations [1,2]. If history is a witness, then a space race between nations will not beneﬁt humanity in the long run. The most ambitious space program of all time, to place a man on the Moon in a decade, illustrates the amount of resources necessary for such a bold endeavor to succeed. In 1966, during the height of expenditures of the Apollo program, NASA’s budget peaked at 5.5% of the US federal budget, compared with 0.5% today. In 2004, despite a substantial reduction of budget over the years, the US president presented a vision for a human return to the moon and Mars, in addition to a shift in NASA funding for the development of humanrated spacecraft dedicated to exploring those worlds as precursors to human settlements. In 2009, the Augustine report commissioned by the following US administration indicated that this vision was unsustainable with the current budget of the agency. Likewise, the bold vision of the European Space Agency (ESA) for Mars exploration, ExoMars, has been a victim of budget cuts, and will be a scaled-down mission done in collaboration with NASA. Space exploration spending at cold-war levels is not sustainable in the present economic realities of our society. Particularly after the worldwide economic downturn of 2008e2009, mass spending is viewed with a more cautious eye. This underlines the fact that space exploration is a particularly vulnerable ﬁeld, because the associated beneﬁts are typically poorly understood by the general public, and it is an inherently expensive discipline with non-immediate returns on investment. This provides a challenging environment for business ventures because bold explorations such as human lunar landings will, for the foreseeable future, require substantial costs beyond those that a private company can provide, particularly because of international technology transfer restrictions. Consequently, such bold exploration-enabling spending will only be achievable through cooperation between spacefaring nations, as is increasingly occurring [3,4].

Link outweighs – public support is thin and theoretical - overcome by cost concerns

Johnson-Freese, 04 - chair of the Naval War College’s National Security Decision Making Department (Spring 2004, Joan, Naval War College Review, “SPACE WEI QI: The Launch of Shenzhou V,” Vol. LVII, No. 2, pp. 121-145, [http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf&AD=ADA422479)RK](http://www.slate.com/id/2115141/?Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf&AD=ADA422479)RK)

Chinese officials often state that they will take an approach to space designed for long-term development and infrastructure, rather than one based on the Apollo model, which they characterize as visiting the moon and then abandoning the effort. Any new manned space program undertaken by the United States ought to be part of a continuing plan for development, not one with primarily short-term political goals. That being the case, the desire and ability to carry the economic burden alone must be considered. With a rising deficit, eighty-seven billion dollars as the first rebuilding bill in Iraq, an economy still in recovery, and the ongoing costs of the war on terrorism, that the American people would be willing to pay the entire bill for a manned space exploration program—no matter how much they conceptually liked it—is doubtful. As pointed out, manned space has been consistently viewed by the public as a good thing to do but low on the list of funding priorities.

Plan unpopular – even if the public likes it, spending will kill support

Johnson-Freese, 04- chair of the Naval War College’s National Security Decision Making Department (Spring 2004, Joan, Naval War College Review, “SPACE WEI QI: The Launch of Shenzhou V,” Vol. LVII, No. 2, pp. 121-145, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf&AD=ADA422479)

Chinese officials often state that they will take an approach to space designed for long-term development and infrastructure, rather than one based on the Apollo model, which they characterize as visiting the moon and then abandoning the effort. Any new manned space program undertaken by the United States ought to be part of a continuing plan for development, not one with primarily short-term political goals. That being the case, the desire and ability to carry the economic burden alone must be considered. With a rising deficit, eighty-seven billion dollars as the first rebuilding bill in Iraq, an economy still in recovery, and the ongoing costs of the war on terrorism, that the American people would be willing to pay the entire bill for a manned space exploration program—no matter how much they conceptually liked it—is doubtful. As pointed out, manned space has been consistently viewed by the public as a good thing to do but **low on the list of funding priorities.**

Congress opposes program specific NASA earmarks – viewed as restricting flexibility

Moskowitz 11(April 15, Clara, “NASA's 2011 Budget Should Allow Flexibility Despite Cuts”, Space, [http://www.space.com/11411-nasa-2011-budget-cuts-constellation-funding.html](http://sustainablesecurity.org/article/spoon-full-sugar-makes-medicine-go-down-analysis-obama-administration%E2%80%99s-%E2%80%98new%E2%80%99-national-space))

A new federal spending bill represents a cut to NASA's funding, but a lessening of restrictions on how the agency spends that money for the rest of this year. The new measure is a political compromise between democrats and republicans, and includes significant spending cuts in the 2011 federal budget. NASA will have to make do with about $18.5 billion, putting its budget roughly $240 million below last year's funding level.

Drains Capital – Can’t get senate agreement and requires push

Space Politics 11 (Space Politics, 5/20/11, “The big picture of how space policy gets done – or doesn’t get done” http://www.spacepolitics.com/category/congress/page/2/)

The 2011 International Space Development Conference (ISDC) kicked off in Huntsville, Alabama, yesterday with a panel titled “How Space Gets Done” featuring a number of current and former officials and experts. The title was perhaps a bit unintentionally ironic, since panelists described just how inefficiently space policy is getting done in Washington today. “Where we are right now is, I think, rather unprecedented,” said John Logsdon, referring to last year’s events that led up to the passage of the NASA authorization act. “One can question whether that’s the right way to make choices for the next quarter-century or more of the US space program.” Much of the panel was a review of that debate, as well as the creation of the national space policy also released last year. Marine Corps Lt. Col. Paul Damphousse, who served as a fellow in Sen. Bill Nelson’s office last year, mentioned the challenge of crafting authorization legislation that could make it through the Senate by unanimous consent, something Nelson considered the only way such a bill would pass given the limited time available. Peter Marquez, the former director of space policy at the National Security Council, mentioned work on the national space policy, including digging through historical papers and finding a quote from Eisenhower that went into the introduction of the 2010 policy after being asked by an unnamed participant in a senior leadership meeting during the development of the policy about why, rather than how, we do space. Most of that policy work, panelists acknowledged, gets done by a relative small, insular group of people in Washington. “Getting into the old boys network is a very difficult thing to do,” Marquez said. Influencing policy is challenging, but with enough hard work by advocates, he said, good ideas make their way into policy.

Space Funding drains capital – and funding specific programs spurs opposition even if there’s bipartisan support for NASA

Space Politics, ‘5 (1/18, http://www.spacepolitics.com/2005/01/18/spending-political-capital-on-nasa/)

Shortly after winning reelection, President Bush said, “I earned capital in the campaign, political capital, and now I intend to spend it.” Most of the focus on where he plans to spend that capital has been on issues like Social Security and tax reform. However, in an Orlando Sentinel article Monday Bush indicated that NASA may also get an investment: “The space vision met some resistance by some, but we got it fully funded,” said Bush, adding that he likes the idea of going back to the moon, using it as a testing ground and then going beyond. “I spent capital before,” he said. “I’ll spend it again on NASA.” The article also notes, however, that despite effectively full funding for NASA in FY05, the exploration vision, and the agency in general, still face challenges in Congress. Consider this comment from Rep. Sherwood Boehlert (R-NY), chairman of the House Science Committee: Voting on the [budget] did not constitute the endorsement of Congress of any single program… What it did reflect is the considerable influence of the majority leader, and it did reflect the interest of the leadership in providing adequate funding for NASA. But it did not constitute an out-and-out endorsement of any one program.

Drains capital – budget concerns, lack of public support and inevitable competing priorities

Stover, ‘4 (Dawn, Science editor of Popular Science, http://books.google.com/books?id=9jHqE2VeadkC&pg=PA62&lpg=PA62&dq=nasa+%22political+capital%22&source=bl&ots=OsBLoJVbYB&sig=GkoUeiiwkgT6dV-ABmF7w82oHzU&hl=en&ei=y24GTsTZDaPl0QHxpJW-Cw&sa=X&oi=book\_result&ct=result&resnum=1&ved=0CBkQ6AEwADgK#v=onepage&q=nasa%20%22political%20capital%22&f=false)

It's as though time has stood still on the Moon—and also in the human space exploration program. "In the past 30 years, no human being has set foot on another world or ventured farther up into space than 386 miles, roughly the distance from Washington, D.C, to Boston, Massachusetts," President George W. Bush said in announcing a major U.S. space initiative on January 14. Soon, though, he vowed, humans will head "into the cosmos"; his new space policy calls for sending astronauts back to the Moon by 2020. Exactly how they will get there remains to be seen, but many experts agree on one thing: Like those footprints on the Moon, the technology of human spaceflight has changed surprisingly little in 30 years. Improvements in materials, electronics and solar power have made spacecraft lighter, smarter and more energy efficient than in the Apollo days, but with few major advances in propulsion technology since the advent of chemical rocket engines powered by cryogenic liquid fuels, human space flight is not significantly faster or cheaper than it was in the 1970s. Space enthusiasts embraced the new policy ("Geez Louise hot f»««"»g damn!" was the first response to the Bush speech posted on one online forum). Until January 14, the only human spaceflight destination NASA had on its schedule was the International Space Station. "We haven't been exploring for years; we've been going in circles," says fohn M. Logsdon, director of the Space Policy Institute at George Washington University. "Sending people beyond Earth orbit is a big deal." 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 longer than three days. If astronauts are to spend weeks or months there, they'll have 10 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 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 S1 billion 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 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 in a policy that, according to an Associated Press poll, only half the American public supports. For those Americans, though, the new policy whetted a long-suppressed appetite for extending the frontiers of human settlement. With unmanned rovers sending back spectacular images of the Martian surface, the dream today is of a lunar outpost that would test the vehicles, power sources and life-support systems needed for a manned Mars mission. The question every space fan needs to ask is: What seeds did the president's January 14 speech plant, and can they ever grow into a Moon base that wilt help humans travel to Mars and beyond? Cont… PRESIDENT BUSH HAS PROPOSED SPENDING S12 BILLION on NASA's new exploration goals over the next five years, including $1 billion in new funding (the rest will be "reprogrammed" from the existing budget). After that, the NASA budget will increase only enough to keep up with inflation. By contrast, NASA spent about S150 billion in today's dollars on the decade-long Apollo program, according to space historian Howard McCurdy of American University. "Kennedy did not have a dollar figure in front of him when he made the decision," says McCurdy. In the year after Kennedy's announcement, the NASA budget doubled, and it doubled again the following year. This time around, though, the White House intends to keep a tight rein on spending. So, although President Bush has announced specific dates for the development of the CE V and the return to the Moon, it would not be surprising if those deadlines slipped. At a press conference only a few hours after the president's speech, NASA administrator O'Keefe was already telling reporters that the new policy was not about "specific destinations' or "dates certain." Making the financial outlook even worse. NASA is still saddled with the costly space station, whose completion will require at least 25 more space shuttle flights. Many who heard Bush's speech assumed that the funding for human space exploration would come from the phaseout of those two programs, which consume the lion's share of NASA's budget. But that's not the case, at least not for the next five years. Of the S12 billion that will be spent to achieve the new exploration goals, $1 billion will have to be cut from other parts of NASA's budget; the cuts will come mainly from science programs not directly related to human exploration. "[Tin- station] is a hole in space into which NASA is pouring money, and it's not even on the table for debate," gripes Apollo 9 astronaut Rusty Schweickart, who sent a letter to Bush and O'Keefe on |anuary 19 recommending the immediate termination of the shuttle and station programs. Other critics of the new space policy are concerned that the president plans to abandon the space shuttle too soon. With the shuttle scheduled for a 2010 retirement, and the CEV not expected to start flying until 2014, NASA faces a hiatus of at least four years in which it will have no vehicles traveling to space. "A big gap like that threatens the health and vitality of NASA.'says Dan Shapiro, legislative director to senator Bill Nelson of Florida. Some critics have even suggested that the Bush vision is a covert plan to euthanize NASA by phasing out its biggest programs, then shelving the Moon initiative. Even tf that's not the case, it's clear that the bulk of the funding required for a Moon program will be the responsibility of future administrations. Some question whether the president, who has never attended a shuttle launch, is any more serious about space exploration than his father was; in 1989, President Bush Sr. called for a manned mission to Mars, only to drop the idea after learning it would cost $400 billion or more.' I think the American public is justifiably apprehensive about starting another major space initiative for fear that they will learn later that it will require far more sacrifice, or taxpayer dollars, than originally discussed or estimated," said senator John McCain at a January 28 hearing. If the bad news is that a four year battle over spending priorities, vehicle designs and mission planning has just begun, the good news is that, for the first time in a long while, space policy is a matter for national debate rather than idle speculation. Key fodder for discussion is exactly what Americans will do on the Moon once we return. The mission can't simply be a repeat performance of Apollo. "That's not a great vision," says Robert Zubrin, president of the Mars Society. Unless activities on the Moon are focused on testing ideas and equipment for going to Mars (at a much safer distance from home), the Moon could end up a detour on the road to the Red Planet, as Carl Sagan once warned. "The idea of having a permanent base on the Moon could be a quagmire,\* says Louis rneaman, executive director ot the Planetary Society, a nonprofit space advocacy group co-founded by Sagan. "It could be the space station and worse, all over again." And while the United States is fixing its gaze on the Moon, the European Space Agency's much more detailed Aurora plan calls for a human landing on Mars in 2033. Still, Friedman and other space enthusiasts are hopeful that the new NASA policy will finally set the agency back on a path toward the heavens. Until a few months ago, when the White House began to hint that President Bush was planning a new space agenda, it looked like the next big NASA program would be the Orbital Space Plane—a new spacecraft that would simply ferry astronauts back and forth to the\* space station, which is even less than the current shuttle does. "That was the space program version of Groundhog Day' says Zubrin. "Now the vision is, We're pushing out."

## Link: Competing Interests

NASA POLICIES ENSURE CONGRESSIONAL FIGHTS – COMPETING INTERESTS AND PREDATORY BUDGET BATTLES.

WHITTINGTON 11. [Mark, space journalist, author of Children of Apollo and The Last Moonwalker, “NASA's Budget Slashed to Hire Police” Yahoo News -- Feb 17 -- http://old.news.yahoo.com/s/ac/20110217/pl\_ac/7881514\_nasas\_budget\_slashed\_to\_hire\_police\_1]

No more glaring result of the chaos that has descended upon space policy has occurred than the successful amendment offered by Rep. Antony Weiner, Democrat from New York, to transfer $298 million from NASA's budget to a community policing program. That NASA's budget is in for some economies is a given, considering the budget crisis. But the Weiner amendment is not a budget deficit measure. It simply practices a time honored Washington game of predatory budgeting by raiding the account of one government agency to pay for another.

MANY HANDS IN THE NASA POT ENSURE OBAMA HAS TO SPEND CAPITAL TO GET THE PLAN.

KELLEY 11. [Mike, staffwriter “Many hands in development of US space policy, panel says” -- http://www.al.com/42/index.ssf/2011/05/many\_hands\_in\_development\_of\_s.html]

Development of U.S. space policy has become increasingly complex, with many government agencies and non-government groups having a hand in policy formation, a panel of space development experts told the opening session of the International Space Development Conference at the Von Braun Center. The conference, being held in Huntsville for the first time since 1993, has attracted more than 500 space enthusiasts, scientists, engineers, and entrepreneurs to the Rocket City. "Fifty years ago the U.S. outlook in space was as confused as it is now," said Dr. John Logsdon, Professor Emeritus at George Washington University and author of a new book, "John F. Kennedy and the Race to the Moon." The national goal to put a man on the moon by the end of the '60s fascinated the American people with space exploration in a way nothing has since, said Logsdon. U.S. space policy, he said, typically originates with the president, then is modified by Congress, influenced by many often competing interests. "Your first necessity is to find out who's doing what, who are the current powerful players," Logsdon said, adding that the Washington space community is a tight community "where almost everyone who makes space policy knows everyone else." Panel members agreed that U.S. space policy has become a political compromise, with many different players. "If you want to influence space policy, make sure your voice is heard," said Peter Marquez of Orbital Sciences. "But it's very difficult to break into the old boys' network."

## Link: New Spending = Unpopular

Budgeting for the plan burns political capital --- Obama will have to fight to negotiate a deal – Even if its popular in a vacuum

Hedman 5 (Eric R., Chief Technology Officer – Logic Design Corporation, “The Politics and Ethics of Spending Money on Space Exploration”, The Space Review, 12-19, [http://www.thespacereview.com/article/520/1](http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/awc/98-173.pdf))

I would like to see NASA get a significant extra boost in spending to get past the transition from flying the shuttle to the CEV. I doubt that anything of great significance will happen in this area. Given that realization, Michael Griffin and his staff have to make hard decisions as to what will be the most effective way to spend the amount allotted. The President and Congress have to use their judgment as to how money gets allocated to each agency with spending guidelines and missions. Like any compromise and negotiated deals, there will always be people unhappy with the outcome. Proponents and agencies need to always fight for more because if they don’t, they will get less because there is always an alternative use for the money they get. When the founding fathers of our country wrote the Constitution, they envisioned people of all occupations getting elected and serving in Congress. They wanted this so that they could bring a wealth of experience from these areas into the decisionmaking process and make better decisions for the country. Politicians love to speak about the strength diversity brings to our country. Sadly the diversity of occupations and experiences that Congress has seems to be diminishing. We typically elect lawyers to Congress. They tend to win over people with other backgrounds because they are trained to present and win arguments. This does not necessarily mean that they understand the arguments the way somebody who has worked in other occupations would about their occupation. Winning an election has less to do with understanding issues and presenting ideas than it is about understanding how to sell to the public. The issues our leaders have to address are increasingly diverse and complicated. By training and experience they are getting less diverse then the general population. I would like to see more economists, scientists, engineers, business leaders, philosophers, artists, and others elected that have a true understanding of the issues that they are making decisions on. Proponents of space exploration need to continuously improve the ability to communicate their ideas and explain why we need NASA to have a clear mission and a sufficient budget to carry it out. We need to be able to explain the benefits in ways that people who do not regularly follow what the space program is doing will understand. We need to be able to explain to lawmakers what the benefits are not only to specific congressional districts but also to the country and the human race as a whole. We also need to be able to sell it without overselling individual points and losing credibility. The Planetary Society recently published on their website a piece by Dr. Louis Friedman complaining about NASA deleting more than two billion dollars from Mars mission planning, including a sample return mission and the Mars Telecommunication Orbiter. He is worried that it will slow or halt work towards an eventual human mission to Mars so NASA can get past its current hurdle of finishing the ISS, retiring the shuttle, and developing the CEV. This is a prime example of different uses competing for the same money within the same agency, in part as a result of competition between government agencies for a share of the pie. While some sacrifices are inevitable and necessary, I agree with Dr. Friedman’s point about losing sight of our goals. In an era of job outsourcing to India and large trade deficits with China, the presence of ever more capable space agencies in these countries has done a great deal to help maintain the growth of funding for, and a drive to give a mission to, NASA. Even if some of the claims of goals by these agencies stretch beyond credibility, it helps maintain public support. Americans are a competitive group and don’t want anyone else to set foot on Mars before we do. Using that fire is one of the best motivations to keep Congress and the next several administrations on our side. Can we ethically spend money on a growing space program when it could be spent on education, or research on a potentially curable disease? Allocation of resources between countries, between groups of people, within governments, and within agencies in capitalistic societies seems to mimic Charles Darwin’s theory of evolution. It is messy and chaotic, but over time it seems to work. There are winners and losers, successes and failures, but over time we as a species steadily move forward. It reminds me of Winston Churchill’s comments on democracy: “Indeed, it has been said that democracy is the worst form of government except all those other forms that have been tried from time to time.” With the story last year that the asteroid Apophis (formerly known as 2004 MN4) had a one in thirty seven chance of hitting the Earth in 2029, spending money looking for near Earth asteroids was given a significant increase in credibility. The fact that it still has a one in eight thousand chance of hitting in 2036 keeps that credibility alive (see [“Sounding an alarm, cautiously”](http://www.nasa.gov/mission_pages/constellation/main/), The Space Review, May 31, 2005). A manned or unmanned mission to Apophis, plus detailed Earth-based observations of its close pass in 2029, could not only generate significant public interest, but also provide us with more of the information needed to defend the Earth if a large object on an impact course is discovered in the next half-century or so. If an object is found, the moral equation of spending the money on space exploration versus expanding education spending or medical research is easy. If not, it is still justifiable in the fact that we need to know as much about all the factors in our universe as we can. We do not know ahead of time where the great discoveries or threats will come from. That is why we who are interested in space exploration need to push our agenda just as other people push theirs.

EXPANDING SPACE EXPLORATION IS PERCEIVED AS CONTROVERSIAL NEW SPENDING -- GUARANTEES BACKLASH.

HANDBERG, 11 - Professor and Chair of the Department of Political Science at the University of Central Florida (Rodger, “Small ball or home runs: the changing ethos of US human spaceflight policy,” The Space Review, 1/17, http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1759/1)

The US space program remained focused, not on duplicating Apollo, but on achieving another difficult goal such as going to Mars, a logical extension truly of the Apollo effort. Twice, the presidents Bush provided the presidential rationale, if not support, for achieving great things. The Space Exploration Initiative (SEI) in 1989 and the Vision for Space Exploration (VSE) in 2004 were announced with great fanfare but neither survived the realities of congressional and presidential budgeting. The VSE appeared on paper more realistic about funding, but its choices were draconian: the ISS and space shuttle were both to be sacrificed on the altar of the new program. The earlier SEI died quickly, so hard choices were not required, while the VSE in the form of the Constellation Program lingers on although its effective demise appears certain. The Obama Administration prefers another approach while the new Congress is likely more hostile to big ticket discretionary spending. If the Tea Party faction in the Republican House caucus means what it says, the future for Constellation or any other similar program is a dim one. The reality is that the Apollo program, the SEI, and the VSE are examples in space terms of the home run approach. Such efforts confront the cruel but obvious reality that the human spaceflight program is considered by the public and most of Congress to be a “nice to have,” but not a necessity when compared to other programs or national priorities. Congressional support is narrow and constituency-driven (i.e. protect local jobs), which means most in Congress only support the space program in the abstract. Big ticket items or programs are not a priority for most, given other priorities. What happens is what can be loosely termed normal politics: a situation where human spaceflight remains a low priority on the national agenda. Funding for bold new initiatives is going to be hard to come by even when the economy recovers and deficits are under control. The home run approach has run its course at least for a time; now the small ball approach becomes your mantra.

FUNDING TRADEOFF GUARANTEES POLITICAL FIRESTORM – EVEN IF PLAN IS POPULAR

HANDBERG, 11 - Professor and Chair of the Department of Political Science at the University of Central Florida (Rodger, “Small ball or home runs: the changing ethos of US human spaceflight policy,” The Space Review, 1/17, http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1759/1)

[NASA Administrator Charles Bolden alluded to that reality recently](http://www.aviationweek.com/aw/generic/story_channel.jsp?channel=space&id=news/asd/2011/01/06/04.xml): “Future NASA space programs must be affordable, sustainable and realistic to survive political and funding dangers that have killed previous initiatives.” This is harsh talk but it reflects the reality confronting all US discretionary programs in the federal budget. The new Republican House majority is determined to cut federal expenditures and appear to have little concern for where the cuts occur. The budget struggles this year and next will find all discretionary programs mobilizing their supporters. Competing agencies like the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and National Science Foundation (NSF) have constituencies who are savvy veterans of getting their way even when budgets are tight. The cure for some disease is always just another appropriation away from happening.

Funding space exploration ignites large debates about the budget --- causes huge controversy

PS 10 (Planetary Society, “Next Steps for the 2011 NASA Budget Proposal”, 6-15, [http://www.planetary.org/programs/projects/space\_advocacy/20100615.html](http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc))

Congress is now considering the controversial new plan for human space exploration, which the Obama Administration first proposed last February. There are three paths in the Congress: (i) budget -- how much money should be allocated to NASA; (ii) authorization -- what programs for NASA should be approved and (iii) appropriations -- what money should NASA really spend. Sometimes there are conflicts among all of these, and when that occurs, it is usually money that talks (i.e. appropriations). Thus far, the new program has been vociferously opposed by representatives in the states most affected by the cancellation of Constellation -- Alabama, Texas, and Utah. Some are fighting to save Constellation, and a few are seeking additional shuttle flights. Both of these outcomes are highly unlikely since they would take a lot more money than is likely to be approved, or even sought, for NASA. There is also fear that the increase in NASA funding proposed by the administration will not be approved, since much attention is now going to budget cuts. The controversy has also emboldened some in Congress who oppose the space program to speak out against the investment in space exploration altogether, although this is a minority view with little traction.

Rhetorical support doesn’t translate into budgetary support

Delgado, 11 - Space Policy Institute, George Washington University (Laura, “When inspiration fails to inspire: A change of strategy for the US space program,” Space Policy 27 (2011) 94e98, Science Direct)

These challenges led the Augustine Committee in 2009 to conclude that the Constellation Program, the main component of the VSE, would not meet its requirements on time without a significant boost of resources [10], a point that led the Obama administration to eventually cancel it. During the summer of 2010, when the administration’s plans were being hotly debated, inspiration was yet again touted as a key issue. The administration’s proposal – which hinged on transforming NASA into a technology development and research agency and which transferred crew and cargo transport to the ISS, the commercial sector –was criticized for killing the space program, and relinquishing US leadership. It also called for ISS continuation past 2016, which, despite being widely supported, was still found uninspiring for some.

Interestingly enough, the reaction from Congress - although aggressive in changing key policy provisions - did not add one cent to this proposed budget, and instead kept it at $19 billion.5 In the context of economic challenges, members of Congress were hard put to argue for double digit increases for a space program that was vehemently defended as a way to keep America being the best. At the end of the day, with growing unemployment, a monstrous deficit, two seemingly never-ending wars, and a myriad of issues facing the country, arguments appealing to space for discovery, leadership, and prestige alone just do not cut it.

MORE EV.

MOSKOWITZ 11. [Clara Senior Writer for space.com MSNBC, “NASA stuck in limbo as new Congress takes over,” 1/7/2011, http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/40967788/ns/technology\_and\_science-space/t/nasa-stuck-limbo-new-congress-takes-over/# [Lockwood]

With a new Congress now in charge, NASA is stuck in a political limbo, waiting for the funding needed to carry out a new objective approved by the last Congress. Lawmakers in October passed — and President Obama signed — a NASA authorization bill that gave America's space agency the go-ahead to abandon its previous moon-oriented human spaceflight program and take aim at new targets: visiting an asteroid and Mars. That bill called for NASA to receive $19 billion in 2011 — a boost from the 2010 NASA budget of $18.3 billion. But that promised funding was not appropriated, since the outgoing lawmakers, along with the president, could not agree on a federal budget. Instead they enacted a continuing resolution — a kind of placeholder law until a full budget can be agreed upon — that froze the federal government , including NASA, at 2010 spending levels through March 4. "Clearly the big issue with NASA in this Congress is money," said Henry Hertzfeld, a professor of space policy and international affairs at George Washington University in Washington, D.C. "The details of the budget really hadn't been fully resolved with the old Congress, which left us with a continuing resolution and nothing more. The question is what happens when they begin to start debating NASA." Based on claims by new House Speaker John Boehner (R–Ohio), who said his party will aim to cut non-military discretionary spending back to 2008 levels, the space agency could be in for some serious budget cutbacks. "There's going to be a lot of hard negotiations," said space policy expert Roger Handberg, a political scientist at the University of Central Florida. "NASA's problem is it's not a priority. When they start slicing and dicing, NASA may be the one that gets to 'contribute to the cause.' I think it could be a disaster for the government part of the program."

Congress opposes the plan

Smith, 11 – Space and Technology Policy Group, LLC, Arlington, VA, USA (Marcia, “President Obama’s National Space Policy: A change in tone and a focus on space sustainability,” Space Policy 27 (2011) 20-23, science direct)

Congress has not yet provided the funds necessary to implement the 2010 NASA Authorization Act. The US Congress has a very complex system for funding agencies that involves “authorizations” and “appropriations”. Authorization acts set policy and recommend funding, but do not actually provide any money. Money is provided to agencies only through the appropriations process. Congress has not passed any of the appropriations bills for FY2011, which began on 1 October 2010 [10]. The US government is currently operating on what is called a Continuing Resolution at FY2010 funding levels until 3 December 2010 and it would not be surprising if that gets extended into 2011. The Republican Party won control of the US House of Representatives in the November 2010 elections largely on promises to cut federal spending and tame the budget deficit. All government agencies, including NASA, are likely to have difficulty convincing Congress of the need for new, expensive programs.

Congress will buck president on space policy – spending is controversial

McCurdy et al. 7 (Howard E, Chairman, School of Public Affairs, American University; Chuck Atkins, Chief of Staff, House Committee on Science and Technology; Lori B. Garver, former Associate Administrator for Policy and Plans, NASA; and Marc Kaufman, Reporter, *The Washington Post* 5/14/7, Woodrow Wilson Center for International Scholars, “Congress and America’s Future in Space: Pie in the Sky or National Imperative?” http://www.wilsoncenter.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=topics.event\_summary&event\_id=201072&topic\_id=1412)

America must continue with its scientific exploration of outer space, though the costs of building a space station on the Moon as a launch pad for sending astronauts to Mars and beyond—-estimated by some at over $400 billion--may be too much for Congress and the public to swallow. That was the consensus of a panel of experts at the Congress Project Seminar on Congress and America’s Future in Space. Professor Howard E. McCurdy of American University traced the history of America’s space program while exploding “the myth of presidential leadership in space.” According to that myth, says McCurdy, all the President has to do is move his lips and say the words, and it will be done. But that ignores both the independence of Congress and the ways of the NASA bureaucracy. Congress sometimes says “no” and sometimes, “go slow.” While Congress did largely defer to the President during the 1960s when John F. Kennedy called for putting a man on the moon within the decade, that began to change with the next stages of our space program. When President George W. Bush announced in 2004 his “Vision for Space Exploration,” which included building a Moon station for manned flights to Mars, he was recycling an idea that’s been kicked around for the last 50 years, says McCurdy. In fact, in 1989 Bush’s father called for the exact same thing, calling it the “Space Exploration Initiative.” But it died a natural death in Congress.

## Spending Link Outweighs Turns

Outweighs all turns – despite overwhelming policy support

Politico.com, ’08 (7/9, lexis)

His message that day was simple: The country needs to use more renewable energy, and companies like solar-panel maker Ausra need tax credits to lure more investment. What the Senate Democratic leader didn't mention was how hard it's been to persuade Congress to renew those clean energy tax credits before they expire at the end of the year. It's a story hundreds of companies, unions and environmental groups know well after months spent lobbying Congress to renew the tax incentives. Few, if any, lawmakers oppose the credits. What's frustrating clean energy supporters is the battle over how to pay for them.

If it does include spending offsets - result is massive fight and gridlock

CongressNow, 08 (1/7, lexis)

Lobbyists and think tank experts tell CongressNow that partisan bickering could stop timely relief from reaching taxpayers. Several observers suggested Congressional pay-as-you-go budget rules that mandate tax cuts and spending increase be offset could slow action. "If you look at the way the politics of paygo works out, it is almost a guarantee of inaction when issues like this [stimulus package] arise," said Michael Franc, vice president of government relations at the Heritage Foundation. "It's almost a guarantee of gridlock."

fight over how to pay swamp popularity and bipart

San Fransisco Chronicle, ’08 (6/18, lexis)

The Senate failed for the second time in a week Tuesday to pass a bill to help businesses and homeowners switch to renewable energy. The tax incentives have strong bipartisan support, but they have been caught up in a fight between Democrats and Republicans over how to pay for them.The stalemate is causing jitters among utilities and investors, including Bay Area venture capitalists and companies that are making billion-dollar bets on new technology, solar power plants and manufacturing sites to build solar panels and wind turbines. Many projects are being put on hold until Congress acts.Arno Harris, CEO of Recurrent Energy in San Francisco, which helps finance and operate large-scale solar power projects, said his company is rushing to finish projects before Dec. 31, when the credits expire. Because large solar projects can take six months to build, the company is delaying new U.S. projects until the credits are renewed. "It creates a hiccup that is very unfortunate," Harris said. The stalemate is a classic example of how even popular programs can fall victim to gridlock in Washington. House Democrats, seeking to abide by "pay-as-you-go" budget rules, insist that the tax credits must be paid for by raising revenue elsewhere. But Senate Republicans have balked at every proposal so far to find that money.

## Link: GOP

NEW GOP CONGRESS SHIFTS THE POLITICAL WIND AGAINST NASA.

LOGSDON, 11 **-** Space Policy Institute, Elliott School of International Affairs, George Washington University (John, “A new US approach to human spaceﬂight?,” Space Policy, February, Science Direct)

To complicate matters even further, the November elections resulted in a shift of party control to Republican leadership in the House of Representatives and a reduced Democrat majority in the Senate. Many Republicans are making reduction in government spending a top priority issue. If the NASA appropriation is not approved until the new Congress convenes in January 2011, NASA could face budget reductions below what the Congress has authorized, making it even more difﬁcult to move forward with what remains of the new human spaceﬂight strategy.

EVEN IF GOP LIKES THE PLAN DEFICITS MEAN THEY’LL FIGHT.

SMITH 10. [Marcia, editor, “What the Election Means for NASA” Space Policy Online Nov 3]

The Republican takeover of the House is not good news for NASA. It's not that Republicans don't like NASA. As far as I can tell, just about everyone in the United States loves NASA. But they love NASA more in good economic times than in bad, and these are really bad economic times. The message from yesterday's election is not just that America is angry at Washington, but that Bill Clinton is still correct -- it's the economy, stupid. If Barack Obama wants to get reelected two years from now, he will have to join the bandwagon to cut federal spending that resonated so loudly with the electorate yesterday. The $6 billion increase over 5 years he included for NASA in his FY2011 budget request was always just a proposal and it is difficult to believe that it can survive the current economic and political climate. As for Congress, the 2010 NASA authorization act did what most compromises do, split the difference. Not only will the government subsidize the commercial sector to build a transportation system to take people to low Earth orbit (LEO), but it will also build a government system to take people to LEO and beyond. That was unaffordable even with the President's $6 billion proposed increase; it surely is unaffordable now. NASA's space science programs are very popular with Congress and the public, but earth sciences have been a political football for a long time. Many Republicans do not believe that climate change is human-induced and question why NASA needs to invest so much in earth science research. With the White House and Senate still in Democratic hands, and Senator Barbara Mikulski still in the Senate to champion Goddard Space Flight Center and its earth science research programs, the news is not entirely gloomy. Still, the President's requested increase for NASA's earth science program may encounter rough seas ahead instead of the smooth sailing it enjoyed this year. Democrats now are intent on regaining the House and keeping the White House in 2012, while the Republicans want to prove that they are the party of smaller, cheaper government and win the Senate and the White House. Every agency is battening down the hatches against inevitable austerity. My best guess is that if Congress passes an omnibus appropriations bill this year, the bottom line for NASA will read $19 billion, the same as the request, but there will be a significant across-the-board reduction for all the agencies at the back of the bill. Such cuts are not uncommon, and usually are a fraction of a percent, but might well be more this time. The FY2012 request for NASA, I bet, will be level funding. The Republicans won the House and made gains in the Senate because people are fearful of today's economy and what tomorrow may bring. Spending money to send people to asteroids, as the President proposes, just doesn't have the allure needed to protect NASA from the impending federal spending cut tsunami.

*Theoretical* support is irrelevant --- Republicans will attack the plan to score political points

Brooks 5 (Jeff, Founder and Director – Committee for the Advocacy of Space Exploration, “Why Democrats Should Support Space Exploration”, The Space Review, 11-21, [http://www.thespacereview.com/article/499/1](http://www.stratfor.com/weekly/foreign_policy_and_presidents_irrelevance))

Needless to say, space policy was not an issue in the local campaign I was involved in. But every once in a while the subject would come up in conversation. Among my Democratic colleagues on the campaign staff, opposition to Bush’s space policy sometimes seemed to fester into opposition to space exploration in general. The old arguments were tossed out again: “Space exploration costs too much. The money would be better spent on healthcare and education.” “Space exploration is dangerous. Look what happened to the poor people on the Columbia.” “Space exploration doesn’t really give us any benefit. What good is it to have people walk around on the Moon? Besides, we’ve already been there.” “We shouldn’t go into space until we have solved all the problems we have here on Earth.” Since this was about politics, it didn’t come as a surprise. Bush was for it, so Democrats were against it. Had President Clinton announced an identical program of space exploration in the middle of his time in office, Republicans undoubtedly would have viciously attacked him for it, probably using many of the same arguments.

GOP Opposes plan – even if they support the concept – they will want it done by private industry

Roop 11 (Lee, analyst who covers NASA and the HudsonAlpha Institute for Biotechnology, NASA supporters find no white knight in GOP presidential field, [http://blog.al.com/breaking/2011/06/nasa\_supporters\_find\_no\_white.html](http://gsnb.rutgers.edu/publications/cs_2001.pdf), 6/19/11, MM)

NASA supporters have strongly criticized President Barack Obama for killing the agency's manned space program after taking office in 2009, but no Republican challenger seems ready to ride to the rescue in 2012. To the contrary, space enthusiasts in Huntsville and other NASA cities were swapping emails last week about the cold shoulder shown the space program by the GOP presidential candidates in a debate in New Hampshire last Monday night. A collective newspaper headline might have read: "NASA, they're just not that into you." For example, reporter Richard Dunham of the Houston Chronicle opened his report by writing, "The Republican presidential field sent a clear message to NASA workers in Texas and Florida: They don't see a federal role in funding human space flight." The critical moment came when CNN moderator John King asked if any GOP candidate would raise a hand to show support for continued federal funding for NASA. On the stage were Texas Rep. Ron Paul, former Massachusetts Gov. Mitt Romney, former Minnesota Gov. Tim Pawlenty, Minnesota Rep. Michele Bachmann, former Pennsylvania Sen. Rick Santorum, former House Speaker Newt Gingrich and former Godfather's Pizza CEO Herman Cain. "Nobody," King commented as the field stood silently with hands down. Pawlenty did step to the microphone after King's "nobody" remark to say NASA had "played a vital role" in American history. "I don't think we should be eliminating the space program," Pawlenty said. But Pawlenty followed up with his idea of a space program, and the word NASA wasn't in it. "We can partner with private providers to get more economies of scale," Pawlenty said, "and scale it back, but I don't think we should eliminate the space program." Gingrich started the discussion when he responded to a debate question by calling NASA a "case study in why a bureaucracy can't innovate." But Gingrich said later that moderator King was mischaracterizing his position. "I didn't say end the space program," Gingrich said. "We built the transcontinental railroads without a National Department of Railroads. You could get into space faster, better, more effectively, more creatively if you decentralized it, got it out of Washington and cut out the bureaucracy." So, for those keeping score, the only Republican candidates talking about space Monday night did so while using phrases such as "scale it back," "get it out of Washington" and "cut out the bureaucracy." Dr. Jess Brown, a political science professor at Athens State University, said he watched the debate and saw little indication of support for NASA. "The best you can say is we're going to do more with the private sector, and the public sector - NASA - is going to have a shrinking role and shrinking scope of responsibilities," Brown said Friday. "And in general policy terms, that's exactly what people here locally criticized Obama for." Reaction by Alabama Republican leaders last week focused on the more-positive comments by Pawlenty, the nature of TV debates, and the hope that GOP candidates will "get it" about NASA before the election. "Anyone who wants to lead this nation needs to understand and embrace the things that have made America great," U.S. Sen. Richard Shelby, R-Tuscaloosa, said in a Thursday statement. "I hope that our Republican presidential candidates understand that balancing the budget does not require abandoning our historic role as space pioneers." U.S. Rep. Mo Brooks, R-Huntsville, blamed the debate format. The future of the space program is more complicated "than you can get to in 30 seconds," he said Thursday. "That results in some of the ambiguity you see on the screen." Brooks said he had not watched the debate footage, but has "not heard anything yet that suggests to me that NASA would be worse off with any of these Republican candidates than we are with Barack Obama." Brown agreed there might be good reasons NASA wasn't high on the priority list of a Midwestern governor (Pawlenty), a Northeastern governor (Romney) and a CEO (Cain) in a high-pressure national TV debate. But if NASA still had its special aura in Washington, Brown asked, why didn't one of the four members or former members of Congress on the stage defend it when given a chance? "Instead, my memory is three of them were silent and one of them called it a deadwood bureaucracy," Brown said. "Is that a fair reading of that debate? That's the way I read that segment. Because if you're a politician in that kind of setting and you're really for something, really committed to it, and you're offered an opportunity to speak for it, you do."

## Link: Public Popularity

Public hates the plan --- they’re strongly against space exploration

Rasmussen 10 (Rasmussen Reports – National Polling, “59% Favor Cutting Back on Space Exploration”, 1-15, http://www.rasmussenreports.com/public\_content/lifestyle/general\_lifestyle/january\_2010/50\_favor\_cutting\_back\_on\_space\_exploration)

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

Prefer our evidence --- empirical data contradicts their sweeping claims

Foust 3 (Dr. Jeff, Aerospace Analyst and Editor – Space Review, “The Gaps in NASA’s Support”, Space Review, 8-18, [http://www.thespacereview.com/article/41/1](http://articles.orlandosentinel.com/2011-01-22/news/os-ed-nasa-congress-clash-012211-20110121_1_nasa-leadership-in-space-exploration-space-agency))

It’s long been assumed that support for NASA in the United States is widespread. From a political standpoint, NASA enjoys a degree of bipartisan support (or, perhaps more accurately at times, bipartisan neglect) not seen in many other government agencies. A typical NASA program is less likely to become a political football for one party or the other than programs at the Defense Department, EPA, or even the Department of Education. Along the same lines, NASA appears to have widespread support from the American people as a whole. While there is a fraction of the public is always critical of the space agency (a fraction that tends to fluctuate depending on NASA’s publicized successes or failures), it’s never seemed obvious that this opposition to NASA is polarized along political, racial, income, or other lines. Upon closer examination, however, that belief is not necessarily true. In late June and early July Zogby International conducted a poll for the Houston Chronicle regarding the American public’s opinions about NASA, the space shuttle, and other programs the agency is undertaking. The Chronicle [published those results](http://www.chron.com/cs/CDA/ssistory.mpl/space/2001674) in its July 21 issue, focusing on the overall numbers. Those results showed that the American public, in general, remained supportive of NASA despite the Columbia accident and its aftermath. A majority of those polled, though, thought that the shuttle should remain grounded until the space program is redefined in some fashion. The Chronicle, to its benefit, provided not just a written summary of the poll results, but the[full final report](http://www.thespacereview.com/article/520/1) submitted by Zogby. The Chronicle also included the [“crosstabs”](http://addins.waow.com/blogs/weather/tag/europa), a detailed breakdown of the poll results, question by question. The crosstabs include data on how different segments of the population—broken down by age, race, gender, education, income, political preference, and more—answered the questions. It’s these data that reveal that NASA’s support, as well as support for space exploration in general, among the American public is not universal.

Staffed space missions are unpopular with the public

Kaufman 8

(7/9/08, Marc, Washington Post, “US Finds It’s Getting Crowded out There”, Global Policy Forum, http://www.globalpolicy.org/component/content/article/152/25824.html)

At the same time, the enthusiasm for space ventures voiced by Europeans and Asians contrasts with America's lukewarm public response to the moon-Mars mission. In its assessment, Futron listed the most significant U.S. space weakness as "limited public interest in space activity." The cost of manned space exploration, which requires expensive measures to sustain and protect astronauts in the cold emptiness of space, is a particular target. "The manned space program served a purpose during the Apollo times, but it just doesn't anymore," says Robert Parks, a University of Maryland physics professor who writes about NASA and space. The reason: "Human beings haven't changed much in 160,000 years," he said, "but robots get better by the day."

## AT: Public Popularity Link Turn

NO RISK OF A TURN – THE PUBLIC AT BEST DOESN’T CARE AT WORST BACKLASHES.

Vedda ‘8 (Vedda, James A.. senior policy analyst at the Aerospace Corporation's Center for Space Policy & Strategy, The Aerospace Corporation, “Astropolitics: Challenges To The Sustainability Of Space Exploration, Jan-Apr 2008, Vol. 6 Issue 1, p22-49, EBSCOHost,)

Space policy is what political scientists would call a ‘‘low salience’’ issue. Civilian space projects have never been significant issues in U.S. election campaigns, and the political parties have not engaged in organized efforts to take sides, at least not in ways that would be visible to voters. As a result, the U.S. public—even the attentive public outside of active members of the space community—has lit- tle incentive to get involved in the political process for space issues. In other words, the public typically has depended on political and technical elites to set the government’s space agenda.7 Members of Congress are found to be most responsive to con- stituents, acting as their dutiful delegates, when issues are salient, signals from the constituency are clear, and consequences are traceable to the individual member’s actions.8 These conditions typically are not true in the case of civil space policies and pro- grams, however. In the absence of clear constituency positions, members who choose to consult public opinion polls on space issues find very limited guidance. The polls are national in scope, not limited to the member’s state or district, and they hold few clues as to how space funding should be allocated. Respondents are fairly evenly divided on the relative importance of human ver- sus robotic missions, but have generally preferred scientific return over space spectaculars like a piloted mission to Mars.9 These vague preferences have remained essentially the same in polls since the 1960s, except for brief peaks in support at the times of the first Moon landing and the space shuttle accidents. The demo- graphics of the respondents taking each position have remained consistent as well: space supporters tend to be white, college- educated, Republican males with incomes above the national household median; indifferent or unsupportive attitudes are most prevalent among women, minorities, people with less than a college education, Democrats, and those with lower-than-median incomes.10 Three decades of surveys by Jon D. Miller have cast doubt on the reliability of the public’s assessment of the value of the space program.11 Miller has found that the interested and attentive pub- lic displays disappointing results on questions of science and space literacy, and the performance of the inattentive public on these questions is significantly worse. In short, even those who like the space program and value its scientific advances would have a dif- ficult time explaining what they have gained from it and why they feel as they do. Miller, like many other analysts, advocates improvements at all levels of public education on science and space, lest the public continue to shun involvement in decision- making on space issues. Given these findings regarding the general level of public knowledge and interest, it is clear that most con- gressional representatives are acting as trustees and=or party con- formists rather than delegates when it comes to space matters.

## AT: Public Popularity Link

Even if the substance of the plan is popular- necessary tax increases are not

Stewart Powell Political Reporter 08 Houston Chronicle, “NASA popular, but tax hike for funding isn't, poll finds” http://www.chron.com/disp/story.mpl/metropolitan/5843539.html

WASHINGTON — Key arguments being made by supporters of increased NASA funding are not resonating with the American public, a new Gallup Poll released Tuesday found. The poll conducted for a business group called the Coalition for Space Exploration found that voters strongly approve of the venerable space agency's work but are reluctant to pay more taxes to finance new initiatives. The Gallup survey — released just a day before the House is scheduled to vote on adding $2.9 billion to the NASA budget — undercut a key argument being used by Texas lawmakers in their bid to persuade Congress to boost spending: that more money is needed to compete in space against China and to close a five-year gap in manned U.S. space operations between retirement of the shuttle fleet in 2010 and launch of the Constellation program in 2015. The Gallup survey of 1,002 adults found that two of three Americans were not alarmed by the prospect that China plans to send astronauts to the moon by 2017 — at least one year ahead of the first scheduled U.S. lunar mission since 1972. Congressional supporters and space agency officials said that public opinion should not be the guiding force behind NASA spending. "The international challenge to our dominance in space and the impending gap in our domestic program pose serious concerns which must be addressed head-on by increasing funding for NASA," said Rep. Nick Lampson, D-Stafford. "It is my hope that it will not take another Sputnik moment for America to reignite the spirit of exploration that changed the world half a century ago and put man on the moon." Lampson is working with other Houston-area lawmakers to increase President Bush's proposed $18.2 billion budget for NASA. The bipartisan measure is expected to pass, over White House objections. NASA supports the president's smaller budget request but will carry out its missions "based upon the budget that ultimately is approved by Congress," said David Mould, NASA's assistant administrator for public affairs. He says the agency "does not and cannot modify its missions and activities in response to polls." Rep. John Culberson, R-Houston, emphasized the strong grass-roots support for NASA, despite tough times in federal budgeting. "Space exploration is an integral part of America's identity, and keeping our competitive advantage in the areas of innovation, exploration, research and development will shape America's future," said Culberson. "This poll proves that Americans understand the link between a successful, well-funded space program and our prosperity as a nation." Group backs more funds Despite the mixed results, Mary Engola, an official with Boulder, Colo.-based Ball Aerospace and Technologies, said her organization hoped the poll would "help support efforts to support an increase in the NASA budget." Engola, a spokeswoman for the pro-NASA coalition, attributed Americans' absence of concern over China's space ambitions to the popular view that China's space program remains "relatively benign and not aligned with the competition that we had with the Russians in the 1960s and the 1970s." Lawmakers pressing to boost NASA spending concede they will fall short of what the coalition of aerospace industries wants — 1 percent of the nation's $2.7 trillion federal budget next year — or $27 billion, an increase of 48 percent. The poll found overwhelming support for NASA's mission and majority backing for a $27 billion NASA budget. But it also found opposition to a federal tax hike to help cut the five-year gap in manned U.S. space operations, with 57 percent opposed and 43 percent in favor. The survey was commissioned by a business coalition of 41 aerospace firms and related industries and associations.

## Link: Frank

Frank hates the plan --- he’ll spin broad opposition

Brooks 8 (Jeff, Founder and Director – Committee for the Advocacy of Space Exploration, “They’re No Jack Kennedys”, The Space Review, 5-12, http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1124/1)

What might be the cause of the disproportionate opposition to space exploration manifested by the Massachusetts congressional delegation? It seems to stem largely from Congressman Frank, who has made his opposition to manned spaceflight something of a pet issue. While his fellow Massachusetts representatives essentially limit their opposition to their votes on the House floor, Frank has repeatedly spoken out against the human space program in the press. Perhaps, therefore, the Massachusetts delegation has lined up against space exploration more out of solidarity with Congressman Frank than because of any deeply-held convictions. After all, he is held in high regard by his colleagues and, as chairman of the powerful Financial Services Committee, is one of the more influential members of the House. Because it does not cost them much political capital to adopt an anti-space position, while they are in a position to gain favor with Congressman Frank by going along with him, the pluses of voting against space exploration clearly outweigh the minuses. Thus far, the Massachusetts opposition to manned spaceflight has not inflicted serious damage on the Moon-Mars initiative. But it may present a problem in the future. The margin of victory over the Weiner amendment was uncomfortably close, indicating that congressional support for manned spaceflight may not be very deep. If Representative Frank ever decides to make his opposition to manned spaceflight more than a mere pet issue, it could signify real trouble. The Massachusetts delegation could form the core of an organized bloc in opposition to manned spaceflight beyond Earth orbit. This question will become much more pressing after the first flight of Orion, when our political leadership will no longer be able to delay the decision about whether or not to push forward with the Moon-Mars initiative.

He’s key to the agenda

Kohlmayer 9 (Vasko, Frequent Contributor – American Thinker, “Who is Barney Frank?”, American Thinker, 3-5, http://www.americanthinker.com/2009/03/who\_is\_barney\_frank.html)

Gallagher is right. As Chairman of the Financial Service Committee in the US House of Representatives, Barney Frank plays a crucial role in determining in what ways much of the bailout and stimulus money is spent. This is because the committee over which he presides oversees the housing and banking sectors, two industries that are at the center of the current economic crisis. But Frank's power and influence extend beyond his chairmanship of the important Financial Services Committee. Outspoken, smart and forceful, Frank has emerged as one of the heavyweights in the Democrat-led House and as such instrumental in shaping its course and agenda. There are some who think that his behind-the-scenes influence exceeds even that of Nancy Pelosi. Whether or not this is so, there can be no doubt that Barney Frank is currently one of the most powerful politicians in the country.

## Link – McCain

McCain Hates NASA funding – especially specific earmarks

Sentinal 8 (10/2/8, Orlando Sentinel, “Fla Dems: McCain voted against NASA funding” http://blogs.orlandosentinel.com/news\_politics/2008/08/fla-dems-mccain.html)

It didn’t take John McCain’s campaign long to come back at Barack Obama, lambasting him for reversing his earlier position that NASA’s budget should be cut to provide more money for education. We put up an earlier post on the GOP response to his statements today — in front of a Brevard County audience that presumably included some NASA workers — that he now supported the Constellation program and even adding an extra shuttle flight after 2010.

Now, the Democratic Party of Florida is coming after McCain, citing his previous votes against some NASA funding, noting the NASA earmarks that would be cut if McCain carried through on his pledge to veto every earmark and how his "fantasy plans" of making the Bush tax cuts permanent and freezing discretionary spending would cost NASA big time.

McCain is key–studies rank him as the single most-influential person on Capitol Hill.

U.S. Newswire 6 (May 16, 2006 – lexis)

The first analysis and ranking system of power in Congress were released today on Congress.org -- http://congress.org. Power Rankings is the culmination of a five-month research project by Knowlegis -- http://www.knowlegis.net -- that sought to measure various characteristics of power. Cont…"We integrated every available piece of publicly available data to create an assessment of each Member of Congress," Fitch said. "We developed criteria and a weighting formula that reflected how members exercise power. Cont…-- Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) scored 1st in the "Influence" Power Category (which measures ability to influence legislative agenda through indirect means), primarily due to his media visibility.

## Link Booster: Cost Overrun Perception

PLAN WILL BE SPUN AS UNPOPULAR – ANTICIPATED COST OVERRUNS.

DINERMAN 11. [Taylor, journalist, “NASA’s continuing problems” The Space Review -- April 18]

Liberty is hardly the only problem NASA is facing today. The agency is lucky that the GOP-controlled House of Representatives managed to cut only $250 million from its 2011 budget. After all NASA’s leaders have done nothing to convince the Republicans—or, for that matter, many Democrats—that they can be wise stewards of taxpayer money. They killed the Constellation Moon exploration program using dubious assumptions about future funding. They show no sign of being any better at keeping the costs of major space science programs like the James Webb Space Telescope or the Mars Science Laboratory under control than previous NASA administrators.

## Link: Prior Consultation

PLAN LACKS PRIOR CONSULTATION WITH CONGRESS --- ENSURES A BUZZ SAW OF OPPOSITION

SIMBERG 10 (Rand, Former Aerospace Engineer – Rockwell International and Consultant on Space Tourism, Commercialization, and Internet Security, “Is NASA Being Set Up To Fail (Again)?”, Popular Mechanics, 7-27, [http://www.popularmechanics.com/science/space/nasa/nasa-senate-appropriations-constellation](http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc))

In all of the furor over the president's new space policy, announced in February with the release of its planned NASA budget, and with all of the hyperbolic commentary about how commercial space isn't ready to take on the tasks of delivering astronauts to orbit, one stark fact has received far too little attention. Simply put, NASA has not successfully developed a new launch system in three decades. The last one was the Space Shuttle, and it was successful only by the minimal criteria that it eventually flew.  It has not been for lack of trying. The history of the agency over the past quarter of a century is littered with failed attempts to build a new system to replace it. This extends from the X-30 Orient Express of the late eighties and the X-33/VentureStar program of the late nineties, through the Space Launch Initiative early in this decade, to the recently canceled Ares program.  Last fall, the Augustine panel had declared that [Constellation](http://www.spacedebate.org/evidence/3150) (which consisted primarily at that point of the Ares I launcher and the Orion crew capsule) was on an "unsustainable trajectory." Part of the intent of the new space policy was to recognize that building cost-effective space transportation is not now and has never been the agency's strong suit, and to refocus it on those things (such as exploration beyond low earth orbit) that it does well.  Unfortunately, the White House and the space agency didn't adequately coordinate with Congress before it rolled out its new plan, and it ran into a buzz saw on the Hill, because for most of those overseeing the NASA budget there, the primary purpose of the agency is not to accomplish useful things in space, but to ensure continued jobs in the states and congressional districts of its overseers.

## Link Booster: Media Spin

Media spins the plan to be unpopular

Brooks 7 (Jeff, Space Advocate and Writer – [Movement for a New Renaissance](http://movementforanewrenaissance.blogspot.com/), “Putting NASA’s Budget in Perspective”, The Space Review, 7-2, [http://www.thespacereview.com/article/898/1](http://www.chron.com/content/news/photos/03/07/20/nasa/finalreport.pdf))

When space advocates hear this argument, it is difficult not to become irritated or even a little angry. When something that one cares about a great deal is treated with such disparagement, getting upset is a natural reaction. However, responding with irritation and anger does not help and, if anything, merely strengthens the other person in his or her belief that space exploration is not something that should be a national priority. It’s important for space advocates to understand that this opinion is held by people not because they are hostile to space exploration, but because they lack sufficient information about it. Thanks to the media, which generally covers space-related stories only when something goes horribly wrong, a general impression has been created that space exploration does nothing more than produce a rather small amount of scientific information, of no practical use to anybody, at enormous cost to the taxpayer. Once people have settled into a comfortable belief about something, getting them to change their opinion is far from an easy task. It is obvious to those who are knowledgeable about the potential of a robust space program that, far from diverting resources away from efforts to solve Earth’s problems, the answers to many of our problems are to be found in space. However, for the purposes of this essay, we shall limit ourselves to examining how the funding for NASA stacks up when compared to the various programs that are often cited as more deserving than the space agency.

Outweighs the turn --- spin ensures no public or Congressional support

PS 10 (Planetary Society, “Next Steps for the 2011 NASA Budget Proposal”, 6-15, [http://www.planetary.org/programs/projects/space\_advocacy/20100615.html](http://www.spacedebate.org/evidence/1415))

The administration continues to do a poor job of making a case for the new program. President Obama's proclamation that more American astronauts will fly to the space station and Earth orbit in the next decade under this new plan does not seem to be understood by many in Congress and in the media. The goal of sending humans into the solar system, and landing on an asteroid by 2025, has aroused some interest and even excitement, but the steps to reach this goal also have not been communicated effectively. The administration sorely needs a spokesperson for the new plan who can clarify the message and inspire public and Congressional support. In the meantime, NASA is paralyzed without an approved budget. If this situation continues through the year, the agency will be unable to start work on the new plan and will be unwilling to continue investing in the old. In response to this stalemate, there is a growing movement for "compromise." The administration offered the first compromise -- use the Orion vehicle, which was planned for Constellation, as a crew rescue vehicle. Keeping Orion in the program helps one of the companies involved -- but does it make sense? While it undercuts the administration's goal of commercial development, it does help utilize the investment they have already made in the vehicle development. And how will NASA pay for this vehicle? Some have suggested taking money from the new advanced technology program or, as in the past, from NASA's robotic science programs. Either would be a significant loss -- developing new technology has been sorely neglected for a decade and its boost was a hallmark of the new plan, and NASA's robotic science programs have been widely popular with the public and extremely successful for the agency in recent years. Another potential compromise is early development of the deep space rocket -- the enabling "infrastructure" vehicle needed to take astronauts anywhere beyond low Earth orbit. A bi-partisan letter suggesting this compromise has been drafted (PDF) and signatures are being collected for it (last we heard, they were up to 33). This letter has been endorsed by our own Neil deGrasse Tyson (PDF), among others. Similarly, Sen Bill Nelson of Florida, leader of the authorization subcommittee in the Senate has just written a letter to Sen Mikulski (PDF) , leader of the appropriations subcommittee stating his support for a earlier start on the deep space rocket. We at The Planetary Society strongly support a heavy-lift (deep-space) rocket, but should it be funded now, five years before we really need it, given that there are no funds yet available to build the spacecraft that will use heavy-lift? And, if so, where do those funds come from? The administration wanted to fund the technology development first; however, proponents fear that if heavy-lift is not started now, it will be indefinitely delayed and there will no real step forward for human exploration. Both sides of this argument have merit. In the coming weeks, the House Appropriations Subcommittee will be marking-up the NASA budget -- that is, allocate funds. They have some members with serious concerns about the President's proposed new plan, including the Chair of the full Committee, Rep. Obey, who is not a fan of space exploration, but others have remained open and generally favorable to it. The Senate Appropriations Subcommittee Chair, Sen. Mikulski, has raised questions about the new plan, and is under a lot of pressure from Republican Senators from Alabama, Texas, and Utah who strongly oppose the administration's proposal. The situation is also mixed in the authorizing committees, where the House Committee has been more negative (although its Chair, Rep. Gordon has not declared his position yet) and the Senate side is more positive (with Sen. Nelson, the Subcommittee Chair, appearing more and more favorable to the plan). Confused? Join the crowd! The debate surrounding the new plan has been clouded with misunderstanding and wild assertions, from all sides. The current administration has been blamed for the six year old decision to retire the shuttle before a new vehicle could be developed. In fact, one of the aims of the new NASA plan is to narrow the gap to replace the shuttle by encouraging commercial competition in launch vehicles. The administration is also being attacked for ending human space exploration, when, in actuality, they seek to revitalize it with more missions to the International Space Station and by taking the first steps into interplanetary space. These attacks based on misinformation further highlight the administration's failure to adequately communicate the new plan.

## Link Booster: Spun as Climate

PLAN WILL BE SPUN AS CLIMATE RESEARCH – GUARANTEES FIGHT.

ADAMS 10. [Guy, LA Correspondent, “Obama consigns moon landings to history” The Independent April 16 -- lexis]

For President Obama, the importance of winning the argument over Nasa's future is increased by the fact that Florida's is a famously close-run swing state. The agency's status as a political football has also been enhanced in recent years by its occasionally controversial role in the debate over global warming. During the Bush era, Nasa scientists repeatedly tried, with mixed success, to interest the administration in fighting climate change, which it believes represents a significant threat to the Earth's future. The Obama plan specifically refers to these concerns, requiring the agency to increase its role in both studying climate change and supporting "green aviation".

## Turn Shield: No Constituency

NO TURN – NO PRO-NASA CONSTITUENCY – ONLY RISK PLAN BUDGET REQUEST CAUSES BACKLASH.

CARROLL 11. [Rebecca, Nextgov.com -- provides coverage and commentary on the management of information technology in the federal government, “As Nasa prepares to retire its final shuttle, agency leaders face an uncertain future” National Journal June 2 -- lexis]

American University's McCurdy says the problem is in the process. "If we're looking for solutions, the gremlin in this story is the annual appropriation," he says. "Congress basically reviews every space program every year." McCurdy thinks bonds might be a better way to fund NASA. Launius dismisses existential concerns about NASA. "It is asked to do far too many things with far less money than is required," he says of the agency, but he notes there is no opposing force in the way there is for other parts of government that do science-based work, such as the Environmental Protection Agency. "Even when there are serious campaigns to do wholesale changes, most of them don't come to pass," he says.

NO POLITICAL SUPPORT FOR THE PLAN.

THOMPSON 11. [Loren, Chief Financial Officer – Lexington Institute, “Human Spaceflight”, April, http://www.lexingtoninstitute.org/library/resources/documents/Defense/HumanSpaceflight-Mars.pdf]

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration’s human spaceflight program is one of the greatest scientific achievements in history. However, the program has been slowly dying since the Challenger Space Shuttle disaster 25 years ago. Faltering political support, failed technologies and competing claims on an under-funded federal budget have made it difficult to sustain a coherent program from administration to administration. The Obama Administration has offered a bold plan for nudging human spaceflight out of its decaying orbit, but the plan received only mixed support in Congress and looks unlikely to sustain political momentum over the long term. Although NASA consumes less than one-percent of the federal budget, it does not connect well with the current economic or social agendas of either major political party. The broad support for the human spaceflight program early in its history was traceable largely to the ideological rivalry between America and Russia that produced the Moon race. Today, no such external driver exists to sustain support of human spaceflight across the political spectrum. The program therefore must generate some intrinsic rationale -- some combination of high purpose and tangible benefit -- to secure funding. Recent efforts at generating a compelling rationale, such as the “flexible path” and “capabilitiesdriven” approaches currently favored by the space agency, are inadequate. They do not resonate with the political culture. In the current fiscal and cultural environment, there is only one goal for the human spaceflight program that has a chance of capturing the popular imagination: Mars. The Red Planet is by far the most Earth-like object in the known universe beyond the Earth itself, with water, seasons, atmosphere and other features that potentially make it habitable one day by humans. In addition, its geological characteristics make it a potential treasure trove of insights into the nature of the solar system -- insights directly relevant to what the future may hold for our own world. And Mars has one other key attraction: it is reachable. Unlike the hundreds of planets now being discovered orbiting distant stars, astronauts could actually reach Mars within the lifetime of a person living today, perhaps as soon as 20 years from now. This report makes the case for reorienting NASA’s human spaceflight program to focus on an early manned mission to Mars. It begins by briefly reviewing the history of the human spaceflight program and explaining why current visions of the program’s future are unlikely to attract sustained political support. It then describes the appeal of Mars as an ultimate destination, and the range of tangible benefits that human missions there could produce. It concludes by describing the budgetary resources and scientific tools needed to carry out such missions. The basic thesis of the report is that human missions to Mars can be accomplished within NASA’s currently projected budgets; that proposed missions to other destinations such as near-Earth asteroids should be reconfigured as stepping-stones to the ultimate goal of the Red Planet; and that if Mars does not become the official goal of the human spaceflight program, then the program will effectively be dead by the end of the current decade.

No Political Support – only risk of link

Rand Simberg, aerospace engineer and consultant in space commercialization, Summer 2009, “A Space Program for the Rest of Us”, http://www.thenewatlantis.com/publications/a-space-program-for-the-rest-of-us

In the blink of an eye, a subject purely in the realm of science fiction became science fact — and a major cultural phenomenon, not to mention a huge government program. At its funding peak during the Apollo years, NASA consumed over four percent of the entire federal budget. The funding would not have flowed so freely if not for the urgency of the race with the Soviets. Had the Soviets been rushing not up to space but down to the bottom of the Marianas Trench (which had in fact just been reached in 1960), the United States would have spent lavishly to get there first. Had Kennedy not been assassinated and had he won a second term, he might well have ended the Apollo program himself as it became clear that we were winning the space race and as the race became less urgent in the face of other national priorities. A couple of months before his death, Kennedy even told NASA Administrator James Webb that he “wasn’t that interested in space.” And that has been **NASA’s fundamental problem** ever since. The American people and their representatives in Congress are just **not that interested** in space, and never have been, going all the way back to Apollo. And it shows in our space policy, which has from the start been **confused and contradictory.**

Any forms of space activities are unpopular

Anderson 11 (Gregory, a member of both The Planetary Society and the National Space Society, Scrap NASA?, [http://thewayoutspace.blogspot.com/2011/05/scrap-nasa.html](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve), 5/28/11, MM)

Former Apollo astronaut and Moonwalker and former U. S. Senator from New Mexico Harrison Schmitt says NASA should be dismantled and replaced by a new agency focused on space exploration. Schmitt acknowledges NASA has some remarkable achievements to its credit, but argues that after fifty years a new start for a new era would be best. NASA should be reformed and refocused, but replacing it and starting from scratch would probably waste money. It's not obvious, after all, why Congress would give more money to a new space exploration agency than it gives NASA. The problem isn't NASA. The problem is that Congress doesn't give space exploration a high priority. There is also the matter of staffing a new agency. Because of the specialized skills and knowledge required for space exploration, a new agency would probably be peopled by many ex-NASA hands. It's not clear, therefore, what advantage a new agency would have over a rejuvenated NASA.

## Turn Shield: Obama Loses Spin

OBAMA FUMBLES SPACE POLICY – ENSURES BACKLASH.

WHITTINGTON 11. [Mark, “White House and Congress Clash Over NASA Funding, Space Cooperation with China” Yahoo News May 8]

The distrust Congress holds toward the administration where it comes to space policy is palatable. Members of Congress have expressed the view that NASA is slow walking the heavy lift launcher. Many are also pretty sure that the White House is trying to circumnavigate the law and is trying to find ways to cooperate with China despite the law. All of this points to the very real possibility that congress will use the power of the purse to restrict White House space policy options and to impose its own will on the future direction of NASA and space exploration. That this clash is happening at all is a direct result of a series of political blunders made by the administration dating back to the cancellation of the Constellation space exploration program and a lack of leadership on the part of the president.

OBAMA WILL ALWAYS LOSE THE MEDIA SPIN GAME – ONLY A RISK PLAN IS SPUN IN NEGATIVE LIGHT.

GANDLEMAN 11-14-10. [Joe, editor-in-chief in Politics, “Is the democratic party really out for the count?” Moderate Voice]

(1)Barack Obama and his team have so far not shown the political smarts, nimbless, or ability to anticipate and strategize that successful political politicians and political teams have shown. This is no Lee Atwater, James Carville, or Karl Rove political operation here. they have been shockingly inept and flat-footed since winning the election. (2)This inability to successfully strategize and anticipate (or to misread: so health care reform was going to HELP Democrats come election time?) means that they are reactive in terms of the real agenda and the news cycle.

DEMOCRATS LOSE THE SPIN GAME – OPPOSITION WILL CONTROL THE PERCEPTION OF THE PLAN.

ECONOMIST 10. [“Lessons for Democrats from health reform” September 17th -- http://www.economist.com/blogs/democracyinamerica/2010/09/electoral\_messaging]

The Democrats are going to have to draw some lessons from the electoral drubbing they're going to receive in November. In these situations, telling yourself that you've simply been misunderstood, that you didn't get your message out clearly enough, can be a tempting way out. Or, in some cases, it's not a tempting way out. It's actually one of the most trenchant self-criticisms you can make. In the case of health-care reform, the Democrats have pretty clearly failed to communicate what their reforms are. It's frankly amazing that after a year-long health-care debate that dominated the mainstream media and blogosphere, many Americans don't seem to know that the Affordable Care Act bars insurers from discriminating on the basis of pre-existing conditions. But this isn't just a superficial public-relations issue for the Democrats. It's the product of a deeper malady affecting the party. Democrats seem to be unable to craft policies that deliver clear results in a fashion which voters can understand and vote on. That's because the policy-making process that takes place among Democratic legislators is so open to compromise, amendment, interest-group giveaways, and bank-shottery that the party's big programmes end up lacking coherence, not just in their details, but in their basic goals and values. Of course, major legislation is necessarily complex. But for all its flaws and complexity, the Bush Medicare Part D reform of 2003 can be summed up in four words: Medicare pays for drugs. The Democrats should have been able to sum up their health-care reform in five words: Every American gets health insurance. But they made concessions from the outset that put that goal out of reach, then launched into a prolonged series of increasingly byzantine compromises on a myriad of issues, and in the end their reform's accomplishments can only be described with bland qualifiers: "makes insurance more affordable for millions," "makes a good start towards bending down the cost curve on Medicare," and so on. Understandably, many voters don't know what the reforms have accomplished, apart from engendering a vicious year-long debate full of deals that mainly seemed based on political considerations rather than substantive ones. Health-care reform was supposed to be a defining moment for Democrats, but Democrats contorted themselves into a bill that's extremely difficult to explain. And when you fail to define yourself in clear terms, you let your opponents define you instead.

OBAMA WILL LOSE THE SPIN GAME.

KRUGMAN 11-14-10. [Paul, Professor of Economics and International Affairs Woodrow Wilson School, Princeton, “The world as he finds it” New York Times]

Even given the economy’s troubles, however, the administration’s efforts to limit the political damage were amazingly weak. There were no catchy slogans, no clear statements of principle; the administration’s political messaging was not so much ineffective as invisible. How many voters even noticed the ever-changing campaign themes — does anyone remember the “Summer of Recovery” — that were rolled out as catastrophe loomed?

OBAMA IS TERRIBLE AT CONTROLLING THE DEBATE – EMPIRICALLY PROVEN.

- debate over the plan will mirror health care debate 🡪 saps pc/crowds out the agenda

GALSTON 10. [William, Senior Fellow, Governance Studies, Brookings, “President Barack Obama’s First Two Years: Policy Accomplishments, Political Difficulties” Brookings Institute -- Nov 4]

The second explanation, associated with the left wing of the Democratic Party, argues that Obama failed politically, not because he was too partisan, but because he wasn’t partisan enough; not because he went too far, but because he didn’t go far enough. The bill of particulars is roughly this: Obama misjudged the willingness of Republicans to meet him halfway and underestimated his ability to get his way without their help. As a result, the stimulus bill was both too small and poorly structured; months were spent negotiating health care with Senate Republicans who never had any intention of getting to yes; the public option was thrown away without a fight; and the time squandered on a needlessly prolonged struggle over the health care bill squeezed out other key items such as climate change and immigration reform. Adding executive insult to legislative injury, the president failed either to close Guantanamo or to end “Don’t ask, don’t tell,” and his Treasury allowed financial institutions and their leaders to survive and prosper without paying any price for their misdeeds. The result was a demoralized base and an emboldened opposition, with predictable electoral results. There is something to this critique as well. Given the intensity of the polarization that predated his presidency, Obama did underestimate the difficulty of mitigating it. Even the White House’s strongest defenders concede that the health care debate went on much longer than it should have, with negative consequences for the rest of Obama’s agenda. And his administration’s kid-glove treatment of big banks and AIG was morally and politically tone-deaf.

THE OBAMA ADMINISTRATION FOCUSES ON POLICY NOT POLITICS – ENSURES PLAN IS SPUN NEGATIVELY.

GALSTON 10. [William, Senior Fellow, Governance Studies, Brookings, “President Barack Obama’s First Two Years: Policy Accomplishments, Political Difficulties” Brookings Institute -- Nov 4]

We do know this: the administration quite consciously chose to disregard the immediate political consequences of enacting its agenda. In his now-famous interview with the New York Times, President Obama put it this way: “We probably spent much more time trying to get the policy right than trying to get the politics right. There was probably a perverse pride in my administration—and I take responsibility for this . . .—that we were going to do the right thing, even if short-term it was unpopular.” If so, by the fall of 2010 he had come to understand the shortcomings of this stance: “anybody who’s occupied this office has to remember that success is determined by an intersection in policy and politics and that you can’t be neglect[ful] of marketing and P.R. and public opinion.”[vi] It remains to be seen whether the president has fully grasped the implications of this “intersection”: in our democracy, popular sentiment necessarily influences, not only strategies of persuasion, but also the selection and sequence of problems for action and the shape of the policies devised to address them. America’s populist political culture normally resists rule by elites who claim to know better than the people—even when the elites represent a meritocracy of the best and the brightest rather than an oligarchy of the richest and best-connected.

## A2: Link Turn: Space Industries/Space State Senators

Backing from space state senators and industries only ensures massive congressional battle – Competing state interests and procurement priorities

Simberg ’11, (Chair of the Competitive Space Task Force, former aerospace engineer Washington Examiner, “Space politics make strange bedfellows”, 6-8-11, http://washingtonexaminer.com/blogs/opinion-zone/2011/06/space-politics-makes-strange-bedfellows]

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. Interestingly and ironically, it sets up a potential battle in the upper chamber over space policy, in which the Democratic senators from California are fighting for a competitive approach (in the interest, of course, of their own home state contractor**),** against a "conservative" Republican senator from Utah who insists on a wasteful, sole-source pork-based one in the interest of his state.Which all goes to show (as we've seen for the last year and a half) that space policy is truly non-partisan, and non-ideological, and it is driven primarily by rent seeking, not a desire to open up space to humanity. As long as space policy remains unimportant, it will continue to be subject to the petty politics of those whose states and districts benefit from the jobs created, even as wealth is destroyed. But the good news is that this may delay things sufficiently long that an expensive, unnecessary rocket never gets built at all.

## A2: Decadal Survey Shields Link

Funding Requirements mean decadal survey doesn’t provide cover – theoretical support doesn’t translate to funding

Carroll 11 (Rebecca, writer for nextgov.com, a website specializing in political news, As NASA Prepares to Retire Its Final Shuttle, Agency Leaders Face an Uncertain Future, [http://www.nationaljournal.com/tech/as-nasa-prepares-to-retire-its-final-shuttle-agency-leaders-face-an-uncertain-future-20110602](http://www.chron.com/disp/story.mpl/nation/6780240.html), 6/2/11, MM)

NASA's Hertz says the previous planetary sciences study predicted the priorities in that field that developed during the past 10 years. "Almost everything we did came from the priorities in the decadal survey," he says. "From my view, the place where we didn't do everything within the decadal survey has to do with the things that required more money than we had available," Hertz says. "But that's not priorities. Priorities are different than budgets." Launius suggests lawmakers have been the thorn for the agency's productivity: "Where NASA's had the most trouble has been when Congress has placed on it certain restrictions that it's had to adhere to," he says, such as when lawmakers stipulate money must be spent within a particular year. NASA is generally permitted two years to spend appropriated money, and freedom to spend in unequal sums is important for contracting purposes, according to Launius

## A2: Not Perceived

NASA constantly critiqued and noticed

Simberg ’10 (Rand, 11/5/10, Pajamas Media, “With NASA Budget, Time for Republicans To Be … Republicans” http://pajamasmedia.com/blog/with-nasa-budget-time-for-republicans-to-be-republicans/?singlepage=true)

The new Congress is going to face some very ugly budget choices, and be looking for savings wherever it can. There is little doubt that NASA will face serious scrutiny, even after the turmoil of the past nine months, since the Obama administration ineptly rolled out its budget request in February. While it’s a small slice of the pie (about half a percent in the current bloated federal budget, though many mistakenly imagine it much larger), it has very high visibility. Also, a great deal of mythology swirls around it, which is one of the reasons that good space policy has historically been hard to come by.

New laws mean plan requires specific congressional approval – congress is increasingly interventionist and plan can’t fly below the radar

Powell 09 (Stewart, political analyst and reporter, Moon mission gets help in Congress, [http://www.chron.com/disp/story.mpl/nation/6780240.html](http://www.planetary.org/programs/projects/space_advocacy/20100615.html), 12/21/09, MM)

Democrats in the House and Senate joined forces with Sen. Richard Shelby, R-Ala., in the end-of-year legislative avalanche to insert language into a must-sign spending package that requires the president to ask Congress for all the money that would be needed to adjust the scope or timetable of human spaceflight. None of the $18.7 billion given NASA to spend this year and in future years “shall be available for the termination or elimination” of any part of the Constellation program, the legislation declares, or to “create or initiate a new program” without “subsequent appropriations acts.” The language prevents the White House from using a common end-run presidents often employ: changing an existing federal program unilaterally and then asking Congress to “reprogram” existing funds to pay for it. Obama signed the language into law on Wednesday as part of a book-thick spending package providing $448 billion to departments and agencies throughout the federal government. The congressional action underscores that the next steps for the costly but politically popular space program must be “a collaborative effort between the Congress and the administration since Congress has the purse, the money,” says Sen. John Cornyn, R-San Antonio. White House quiet The White House and NASA will have to “convince enough key members of Congress of the wisdom of any changes,” added space historian John Logsdon, author of The Decision to Go to the Moon: Project Apollo and the National Interest. “That likely means showing how the changes will serve the interests of constituencies in Florida, Alabama, and Texas — at least in the long run.” Those three states have huge stakes in manned space operations, with Florida's Kennedy Space Center handling launches, Alabama's Marshall Space Flight Center handling propulsion and Houston's Johnson Space Center handling mission control. Obama met with NASA administrator Charlie Bolden, a former astronaut and retired Marine Corps general, on Wednesday to discuss his plans “against a backdrop of serious challenges with the existing program,” said White House spokesman Nicholas Shapiro. White House officials declined to address the impact of the congressional language or outline Obama's timetable for rolling out his own plan for manned space operations. His blueprint is expected as part of his budget request in February for the 2011 fiscal year. Party-line vote Congress' latest move reflects deepening intervention, with “a trend over the last several years for the Senate in particular to be more directive,” says Scott Pace, a former NASA executive directing the Space Policy Institute at George Washington University. Congress, for example, has forced NASA to triple the number of separate appropriation accounts under congressional scrutiny to give lawmakers deeper line-by-line authority over spending. Despite the stakes, the congressional constraints on the president's maneuvering room were adopted on largely party-line votes, with Democrats joined by only three Republicans in the Senate and none in the House.

## Link Turns Solvency

Link alone turns the case --- political backlash causes low-level circumvention that causes the plan to be *ignored* and *under-funded* --- crushing space leadership

MacKinnon 8 (Douglas, Former White House and Pentagon Official and Author – The Apocalypse Directive, “No Place for Partisans on NASA, Space Exploration”, Houston Chronicle, 3-22, <http://www.chron.com/disp/story.mpl/editorial/outlook/5639799.html>)

Should the next president decide to delay or cancel our next generation spacecraft and rockets for partisan reasons, he or she will be condemning the United States to second-class status in space for decades to come. Delays or cancellations will cause a massive loss of capability as the work force with the knowledge and expertise to take us back to the moon and beyond will retire or move on to other careers. The United States has committed itself to this new direction. The next president must ratify such a commitment. When and if the next president enthusiastically commits to — at the very least — staying the course, then he or she is going to have to do something equally important — mind the store. The new president and his or her team must keep a sharp eye on the career civil servants in the Office of Management and Budget who control the purse strings for NASA and our human spaceflight program. In Washington there are often turf wars between the political appointees of presidents and the career bureaucrats who stay from administration to administration. I was once a political appointee and I've seen these battles up close and personal. Many times, the career civil servants think they know better than the president and his team. With such a mindset comes the determination to "wait out" the political appointees — delaying or ignoring direct orders until a president you agree with, is elected. By and large, the career employees of the Office of Management and Budget, are dedicated, hard working, and have the best interests of our nation at heart. That is not to say that some, on occasion, don't forget that they are unelected staff who have the obligation to follow the marching orders of the president. For instance, this president and Congress have directed that the space shuttle fleet fly until 2010 and that the International Space Station be completed. Unfortunately, some at OMB saw it differently and did not allocate the money needed to finish those jobs. Additionally, OMB has taken $3 billion away from the president's space budget. Why? On who's orders? Preeminence in space is critically important to the well-being of our nation. If the next president agrees, then he or she is going to have to diligently ride herd over the unelected staff at OMB. Should our space program flounder, Chinese astronauts will establish the first bases on the moon, and the American people will be the poorer for our lack of leadership.

Even if not, political battles destroy any positive signal from the plan

Orlando Sentinel 11 (Editorial, “Congress in NASA’s Way”, 1-22, [http://articles.orlandosentinel.com/2011-01-22/news/os-ed-nasa-congress-clash-012211-20110121\_1\_nasa-leadership-in-space-exploration-space-agency](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/chris-weigant/how-will-))

With mixed signals and micromanaging, Congress is making a mess of the U.S. space program."I don't think I've ever seen so much confusion in terms of projects, and priorities, and where we're heading," a NASA scientist lamented in a recent report on the website Science Now. NASA was in limbo for months last year as different factions in Congress deadlocked with each other and the White House over the space program's future. They finally settled on a policy outlined in a law signed in October by President Obama. It called for NASA to abandon Constellation — the moon-Mars program running years behind schedule and billions of dollars over budget — and design a new rocket for manned exploration to launch in 2016. But this month the space agency's inspector general reported that NASA is on track to waste $215 million on Constellation by March. Say what? Blame Congress for not repealing language in an earlier law that forces the agency to keep spending money on the program. The language was inserted into the 2010 budget by Constellation backers who wanted to preserve jobs and contracts associated with the program. It exemplified the parochial priorities of lawmakers who are more interested in NASA as a cash cow for their districts than as the agency responsible for maintaining America's leadership in space exploration.

BUDGET CONCERNS ENSURE PLAN IS UNPOPULAR – NASA POLICIES NOT SUSTAINABLE OVER THE LONG TERM WHICH SHORT CIRCUITS SOLVENCY.

CARROLL 11. [Rebecca, Nextgov.com -- provides coverage and commentary on the management of information technology in the federal government, “As Nasa prepares to retire its final shuttle, agency leaders face an uncertain future” National Journal June 2 -- lexis]

For NASA, reaching for the stars is imperative, even when government money is hard to come by, political debate is fierce, and sharp policy changes are frequent. And despite Washington's fits and starts, the agency has to plan years into the future--that's the nature of scientific research. Fifty years after President Kennedy's call to put a man on the moon, the space agency is at a crossroads. NASA is preparing to retire its final shuttle this summer, with no immediate plan to replace the agency's only human space flight program. Amid so much uncertainty--and soul-searching for the agency--NASA scientists still need working plans. Many of NASA's science goals come out of 10-year surveys, which are based on submissions from the broader science community and seek to establish consensus on research priorities. "I believe that a decadal timeline was selected because, for many grand challenges in science, a decade is kind of a minimal amount of time you have to look at to begin to derive some kind of answers," says Elizabeth Cantwell, a National Academies board member, who recently cochaired such a report for NASA. Presidential terms, however, span eight years at most, Congress changes every two years, and the budget is up for consideration every year. These faster cycles can strain any long-term government project, but especially science programs that require methodical continuity.

# \*SPECIFIC LINKS

## Link: Agencies (General

Presidents are tied to agency action – Obama gets the blame

Wallison 3 (Peter J., Resident Fellow – American Enterprise Institute, “A Power Shift No One Noticed”, AEI Online, 1-1, http://www.aei.org/publications/pubID.15652/pub\_detail.asp)

Control over independent regulatory agencies has traditionally resided with Congress, which created all of them. The recent controversy over the Securities and Exchange Commission suggests, however, that now Congress, the White House, and the public all take for granted that the independent agencies are the president's responsibility. The political frenzy surrounding Enron's collapse and other corporate scandals may have produced--or at least exposed--a significant shift in the relationship between Congress and the White House. The efforts of congressional Democrats to pin some of the blame for the scandals on the president and the head of the Securities and Exchange Commission--and President Bush's willingness to act as though the SEC is his responsibility--may signal the end of more than a century of experimentation with independent regulatory agencies as a so-called "fourth branch" of government. History of Independent Agencies Independent agencies such as the SEC have always been regarded as "arms of Congress," outside the control of the executive branch. The president appointed the members and the chairman, but the terms for these officials overlapped presidential administrations, allowing--and encouraging--them to act without policy direction from the White House. The political fallout from the recent scandals has turned all this on its head. These independent agencies are creatures of Congress, not the Constitution. The first, the Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC), was established in 1887 to control the powerful railroad industry. Later, especially during the Progressive and New Deal eras, a number of other agencies were created, several of which still exist--including the SEC, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Federal Communications Commission. Several others, such as the Federal Power Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board, went out of business a quarter-century ago. The ICC closed its doors in 1995. There was no clear reason, or constitutional rationale, why the duties of these bodies could not have been performed by regular executive branch departments. Presidents have expressed their unhappiness with this diminution of their authority, and some have tried to influence agency policies through the appointments process, but they have not confronted Congress on the issue. And Congress--always jealous of its prerogatives in the face of the executive branch's growing power--has never conceded that the independent regulatory agencies could take policy direction from the president. Then, in 1971, the status quo was called into question. The President's Advisory Council on Executive Organization--known as the Ash Council after its chairman, Roy L. Ash of Litton Industries--recommended that almost all of the functions of these bodies be transferred to single administrators, appointed by the president and accountable to him. The Ash Council's rationale for this reform was simple: If the president's policy control did not extend to these independent agencies, then his responsibility for them could not be clearly fixed and voters could not hold him accountable. Moreover, the president's policies, even if adopted by Congress, could be frustrated through contrary actions by the independent agencies. The Ash Council's proposal, like many reform ideas, went nowhere. There was no support in Congress for enhancing the president's power, and the Nixon administration--beset first by economic problems and then by the Watergate scandal--had no stomach for challenging Congress. (The Ash Council's report did lead, however, to the creation of the Environmental Protection Agency, headed by an administrator who answers to the president.) During the Reagan administration, however, the executive branch became more assertive. The Justice Department took the Constitution's separation of powers seriously, which by implication challenged the very legitimacy of the independent regulatory agencies. Nevertheless, because of congressional sensitivities and the continuing sense that these bodies were quasi-judicial in nature, White House officials were warned that all contacts with the independent regulatory agencies had to be approved in advance--or actually carried out--by the White House counsel's office. The Reagan administration never seriously considered taking on Congress through a legislative proposal that would bring these independent agencies within the constitutionally established structure. The Presidential Role All this history appears to have been forgotten in the politics of 2002. The Democrats, hoping to make an election issue out of the SEC's "failure" to stop "corporate corruption," proceeded to blame a Republican president for events that were solely within the authority of the SEC. There was no indication that departments or agencies unquestionably controlled by the president had any role for policing either the securities industry or the companies under scrutiny. So if President Bush was somehow responsible for what happened at Enron, WorldCom, Tyco, and the rest, it had to be as a consequence of some presidential authority over the SEC. To be sure, the president had appointed the chairman and the other members of the SEC, but that in itself would not make him blameworthy unless one assumed that he was also directly responsible for how the SEC acted before, and after, the scandals erupted. That is the nub of the important but largely unnoticed change that has occurred: the unchallenged assumption on the part of all parties--in Congress, in the media, among the public, and even in the White House itself--that the president was fully accountable for an agency that has always been viewed as independent. The significance of this change in the grand government scheme of things can hardly be overstated. Without legislation or judicial decision, the president has suddenly become electorally responsible for the decisions of bodies that were considered to be within the special purview of Congress, susceptible only to congressional policy direction. Of course, this functional revolution did not give the president any new powers with respect to the independent regulatory agencies. But the die is now cast. The way the American people look at the president's responsibilities apparently is changing, and that will affect the attitude of Congress. If the American people believe that the president should be responsible for the actions of the SEC, it will be difficult to convince them otherwise. Significantly, since Harvey Pitt's resignation as SEC chairman in November, the media have routinely referred to the president's choice to head the SEC, investment banker William H. Donaldson, as a member of the Bush "economic team."

## Link: DoD

DOD is tied to Obama

LA Times 8 (“Robert Gates Agrees to Stay on as Defense Chief Under Obama”, 11-26, http://articles.latimes.com/2008/nov/26/nation/na-gates26)

An official close to the Obama transition team said it was likely that Gates would be named Defense secretary when the president-elect begins to unveil his national security team in announcements expected next week. A former government official who has advised the Obama transition said that it was "99% certain" that Gates would remain as Defense secretary for about a year in the Obama administration.

That means he gets the blame

Greene 97 (Abner S., Associate Professor – Fordham University School of Law, “Fidelity In Constitutional Theory: Fidelity As Translation: Discounting Accountability”, Fordham Law Review, March, 65 Fordham L. Rev. 1489, Lexis)

It is hard to argue that accountability does not matter to American constitutional law, in both its affirmative and negative aspects. But accountability does not require that constitutional interpretation be tied either to science or politics (present or past) or that the President be at the top of a chain of command over agency policy-making. Constraints both past and present necessarily exist, and are not in danger of escaping. Regarding the past: We should not forget constraints of endogeneity and of reasoning. Judges in our system cannot help but be constrained, in this broad (and, yes, weak) way, by text, structure, and history. Judges live in our system and have been trained in it. And reasoning provides its own constraints. As a descriptive matter, it's not clear that the interpretation of the majestic and vague clauses - free speech, due process, equal protection, to name three - has been constrained in any stronger fashion than that provided by the constraints of endogeneity and reasoning. Regarding the present, and the presidency: Plenty of ballot box accountability remains even regarding independent agencies. They are created, dismantled, funded, and authorized to act through Acts of Congress that the President must either sign or see enacted over his veto. The agency commissioners are appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate (and must be so reappointed), and the President often has the statutory power to name and remove the agency chair. Further, as a matter of political reality, both executive and independent agencies often seek presidential support, whether the support comes in the form of information or congressional lobbying. [59](http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0411/53495.html?_m=f58cac0712387491e5ddf734eb7ab120&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVtz-zSkAz&_md5=0bceb63f8f09f8cb57f2d16620da398b#n59)

## Link: NASA

NASA action is a political lightning rod

David 4 (Leonard, Writer – Space.com, “Robotic Missions to Save Hubble Proposed”, CNN, 4-5, Lexis)

Lightning rod decisions The look at how best to extend Hubble's useful scientific life has been spurred by a NASA decision to cancel a June 2006 servicing mission by astronauts to the space-based telescope. Furthermore, the observatory's retrieval by a space shuttle at the end of its mission is no longer an option, according to the space agency. In making those judgments, NASA administrator Sean O'Keefe has become a lightning rod for both political and public criticism. NASA policy requires the safe disposal of the Hubble Space Telescope. It is now headed for an uncontrolled reentry into Earth's atmosphere no earlier than the year 2013.

## Link: Asteroids

### AFF WILL BE SEEN AS A “SKY IS FALLING” SCENARIO – SAPS CAPITAL.

DEARING 11. [Matthew, MA in Physics @ Cornell, former intern @ Argonne National Laboratory, “Protecting the planet requires heroes, money, and citizen scientists” Dynamic Patterns Research 4/12 -- http://research.dynamicpatterns.com/2011/04/12/protecting-the-planet-requires-heroes-money-and-citizen-scientists/]

Many of us while growing up and listening to our bedtime stories learned to not freak out and run screaming through the streets if we thought that the “sky is falling.” As little chickens, we were taught at an early age that it was best to be brave, calm, and rational, else be considered a crazed lunatic. This childhood behavioral bias infiltrated adulthood in the relationship between professional astronomers, policy-makers and national budget-number crunchers. When a scientist expresses probabilistic concerns about the impending doom of our planet from a cataclysmic change of a major impact event, say, in the next 100, 1,000, or 10,000 years, it requires just too much risk of political capital and tax-payer dollars to divert significant budget resources to something that might only be a concern for our uber-great grandchildren. The simultaneous efforts of two Hollywood studios in the late nineties of the last century tried to get something stirring in our cultural awareness with their mega-disaster flicks, Armageddon and Deep Impact. These features did bring us through the box office (which was certainly their primary goal!), but they did not push us en masse to the round table to prepare for the ultimate defensive plan for our planet. Combating Earth-bound asteroids, or “near-earth objects” (NEOs), is an unsolved problem, and one that citizen scientists largely ignore because it’s assumed that this issue must be only approached via the domain that has access to the massive amounts of taxpayer dollars and the international collaborations between those nations who can liberally spend all of that money. It’s this requirement of essentially unlimited funds that is the sticking point to making serious progress on defending against an event that may, or may not, happen in the upcoming budget cycle.

NO RISK OF TURNS – NO POLITICAL SUPPORT FOR ASTEROIDS POLICY – ONLY RISK OF BACKLASH.

DEARING 11. [Matthew, MA in Physics @ Cornell, former intern @ Argonne National Laboratory, “Protecting the planet requires heroes, money, and citizen scientists” Dynamic Patterns Research 4/12 -- http://research.dynamicpatterns.com/2011/04/12/protecting-the-planet-requires-heroes-money-and-citizen-scientists/]

There are many issues that NASA must juggle with here, including political, financial, and scientific. Who is willing to risk one’s political capital to champion the destruction of once-in-an-epoch giant fireballs in the sky, albeit one that can destroy our civilization as we know it? How much of taxpayer dollars can be appropriated to a once-in-an-epoch event, albeit one that can destroy our civilization as we know it? And, with deflection technology really already at hand, how professionally interesting is it to track and monitor orbiting rocks, since a Nobel Prize doesn’t target too many rocks these days? The bottom line is that the political will and the money are not available from the United States federal government, so the financing of advancing technology–well in advance of pending doom–is not really an option right now, and will likely continue to not be an option for some time. Methods of averting potentially impacting objects have already been proposed, and should be reasonable to implement without too much of a technological leap, if any, although the funding factor will always be an application killer. In fact, according the the task force’s minutes, NASA should stay out of the direct defensive activities, and leave that to those who know how to defend, like the Air Force. Of course, the United States is already over-criticized for being the police force of the world, so why should it now have to be the defender of the planet and of all civilization?

No Political Support

Park et al. 1994– President of the American Physical Society, PhD (Richard L., Lori B. Garver of the National Space Society and Terry Dawson of the US House of Representatives, “The Lesson of Grand Forks: Can a Defense against Asteroids be Sustained?” Hazards Due to Comets and Asteroids ed. Tom Gherels, pg. 1225-1228)

IV. INVOLVING CONGRESS Efforts to persuade governments lo invest significant resources in evaluation of the hazard of asteroid impacts must overcome what has been called "the giggle factor." Clearly, elected officials in Washington are not being inundated with mail from constituents complaining that a member of their family has just been killed or their property destroyed by a marauding asteroid. Indeed, the prevailing view among government officials who hear about this issue for the first time is that the epoch of large asteroid strikes on Earth ended millions or billions of years ago. Congressional involvement has been confined to the Committee on Science, Space and Technology of the U. S. House of Representatives, whose current chair, George Brown of California, has maintained an interest in the asteroid issue for several years. The Committee directed NASA to conduct two international workshops on the asteroid threat (House Committee on Science, Space and Technology 1990). The objective of the first was to determine the extent to which the threat is "real," and to define a program for significantly increasing the detection rate of large asteroids in Earth-crossing orbits. The second dealt with the feasibility of preventing large asteroids from striking Earth (see the Chapter by Canavan et al.). In March of 1993, the Space Subcommittee held a formal hearing to examine the results of the two workshops. Some members remain skeptical that the threat is real. But even among those who recognize that it is only a question of when a major impact will occur, there was no sense of urgency. Given the severe constraints imposed by the current budget situation, therefore, it seems unlikely that Congress would agree to devote more than a few million dollars per year to asteroid detection and research. If prudently spent, however, even that modest level of resources should significantly speed up the process of cataloging Earth-crossing asteroids. Perhaps the major impact of the workshops has been in NASA itself. The Agency now seems persuaded that near-Earth asteroids are deserving of scientific attention, and that efforts should be made to increase the rate at which such objects are identified.

## Link: Asteroid Mining

No political support for asteroid exploration --- politicians don’t perceive its benefits

Thompson 11 (Loren, Chief Financial Officer – Lexington Institute, “Human Spaceflight”, April, [http://www.lexingtoninstitute.org/library/resources/documents/Defense/HumanSpaceflight-Mars.pdf](http://articles.orlandosentinel.com/2003-02-12/news/0302120124_1_spaceflight-unmanned-missions-astronauts/2))

This all makes sense from a budgetary and scientific perspective. What’s missing is a grasp of the rationale required to sustain political support across multiple administrations. While exploration of the Moon’s far side or nearby asteroids may have major scientific benefits, those benefits are unlikely to be appreciated by politicians struggling to reconcile record deficits. NASA’s current research plans do not connect well with the policy agendas of either major political party, and the flexible path will not change that. To justify investments of hundreds of billions of dollars in human spaceflight over the next 20 years while entitlements are being pared and taxes are increasing, NASA must offer a justification for its efforts commensurate with the sacrifices required. Mars is the only objective of sufficient interest or importance that can fill that role. Thus, the framework of missions undertaken pursuant to the flexible-path approach must always be linked to the ultimate goal of putting human beings on the Martian surface, and the investments made must be justified mainly on that basis. The American public can be convinced to support a costly series of steps leading to a worthwhile objective, but trips to the Moon and near-Earth objects aren’t likely to generate sustained political support during a period of severe fiscal stress.

Congress opposes funding for asteroids

Watson 10 (Traci, 6/28/10, USA Today, “Landing on an asteroid: Not quite like in the movies” http://www.physorg.com/news196920110.html)

In February, Obama took steps toward killing Bush's moon program, which was beset by technical troubles and money woes. Two months later, in a speech at Cape Canaveral, Fla., Obama announced that the astronauts' next stop is an asteroid. So far, the Obama administration has been quiet on the need for a major sum of money to accomplish his goal. And unlike Kennedy, who used Russian spacecraft missions known as Sputnik to promote the moon mission, Obama doesn't have a geopolitical imperative to justify the scheme. Congress is resisting Obama's change of direction, which could delay investment in the program.

## Link: China Space Coop

SPACE COOPERATION WITH CHINA IS MASSIVELY UNPOPULAR – COSTS CAPITAL.

COVAULT 11. [Craig, contributing writer, “AMS: Shedding light on the dark” Aerospace America -- June -- lexis]

Now mounted on the ISS, the Alpha Magnetic Spectrometer will probe cosmic mysteries, seeking evidence that dark matter, dark energy, and antimatter do exist. Such a discovery could explain what occupies most of the known universe. However, political controversy involving China's participation in the effort could cast a shadow over this exciting prospect. BODY: The Alpha Magnetic Spectrometer (AMS), the largest scientific instrument on the ISS, will conduct an unprecedented search for previously undetectable antimatter and for invisible dark matter, which (along with dark energy) makes up 95% of the universe, theorists believe. Astronauts were to deliver the instrument and attached it to the left end of the space station's 300-ft truss during STS-134, the last flight of the shuttle Endeavour and the penultimate mission of the 30-year space shuttle program. The AMS high-energy particle detector will be gathering evidence concerning two of the greatest mysteries of the universe: What caused the disappearance of primordial antimatter, which was formed in equal amounts with the visible matter that makes up the current universe; and just what is this stuff called dark matter, which neither reflects nor emits light, yet bends light from other sources, and exerts such a powerful gravitational force that it has shaped galaxies and formed them into giant linked structures up to 10 billion light-years across? Bone of contention But while the AMS science team probes momentous issues governing the universe, political controversy in Congress and elsewhere could arise over the 4,000 lb of Chinese hardware that has finally made its way onto the ISS as a critical element of the station's most historic instrument. This has occurred in spite of NASA, White House, and congressional opposition to Chinese participation in the ISS program. The 15,000-lb AMS is a Dept. of Energy project, and most of its $1.5-billion cost has been borne by multiple European and Asian participants, including China. The two tons of Chinese components include 4,000 permanent magnets. These comprise the inner walls of the barrel-shaped instrument through which AMS scientists hope to track cosmic particles from the Big Bang so that detectors can measure their properties. The researchers hope that finding key particles and atoms will prove the existence of dark matter, dark energy, and antimatter. The Chinese magnets are important from a U.S. policy standpoint. These magnets and support hardware were retrofitted in place of a canceled multimillion-dollar U.S./European cryogenically cooled electromagnetic system that AMS project leaders determined would not perform as well as hoped. The heating needed to run the electromagnets was greater than expected and would consume roughly double the planned amount of liquid helium, reducing useful life to less than two years. Thus the cryogenic system in the works for 10 years was removed and replaced with the permanent magnets, which can keep the AMS functional through the remaining 20-30-year life of the station. The retrofit of this unique space instrument with such a large amount of Chinese equipment comes face-to-face with strong debate--and some outright hostility--in congressional and policy circles about whether the U.S. should engage in space cooperation with the Chinese, given their internal human rights record and a surging military space program aimed at countering the U.S. There had been congressional oversight and, in 2008, approval to fund delays. However, this came before the decision to replace the cryogenic system with magnets that had been used for a short proof-of-concept flight on STS-91 in 1998.

CONGRESS HATES SPACE COOPERATION WITH CHINA.

WHITTINGTON 11. [Mark, “White House and Congress Clash Over NASA Funding, Space Cooperation with China” Yahoo News May 8]

Another indication that President Barack Obama's 2012 NASA funding request was in trouble occurred when at a hearing of the House Appropriations commerce, justice, science subcommittee on May 3. White House science czar John Holdren came under some sharp questioning by Rep. Frank Wolf chairman of the subcommittee. The questioning revolved around the belief by Wolf that the administration is short changing the development of a heavy lift launcher and the Orion spacecraft that congress views as vital for the long term human exploration of space. The priorities of the administration include subsidies to commercial space firms, Earth science, and technology development. Wolf also questioned why NASA has not gotten a request for an increase of funding, even though some other science oriented agencies have gotten such requests. According to the account of the hearings on Space News, Wolf did not find Holdren's answers to be satisfactory. That suggests that there will be a renewed clash between the congress and the White House on space policy. The clash is not limited to funding and of space policy priorities. Space News also reports that the following day, on May 4, Holdren told members of the subcommittee that cooperation with China is seen as critical for prospects for long term space exploration, such as to Mars. This, mildly speaking, was not welcome news to members of the subcommittee. [ For complete coverage of politics and policy, go to Yahoo! Politics ] The problem is that China is currently ruled by a tyrannical regime that violates the human rights of its own people and is engaged in an imperial drive toward super power status at the expense of the United States. Congress has, in fact, passed a law prohibiting most forms of space and science cooperation with the People's Republic of China. The distrust Congress holds toward the administration where it comes to space policy is palatable. Members of Congress have expressed the view that NASA is slow walking the heavy lift launcher. Many are also pretty sure that the White House is trying to circumnavigate the law and is trying to find ways to cooperate with China despite the law. All of this points to the very real possibility that congress will use the power of the purse to restrict White House space policy options and to impose its own will on the future direction of NASA and space exploration. That this clash is happening at all is a direct result of a series of political blunders made by the administration dating back to the cancellation of the Constellation space exploration program and a lack of leadership on the part of the president.

REPUBLICAN HOUSE ENSURES BACKLASH.

INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS TIMES 11. [“Analysis: Space: a frontier too far for US China cooperation” January 2]

The prospects for cooperation between the United States and China in space are fading even as proponents say working together in the heavens could help build bridges in often-testy relations on Earth. The idea of joint ventures in space, including spacewalks, explorations and symbolic "feel good" projects, have been floated from time to time by leaders on both sides. Efforts have gone nowhere over the past decade, swamped by economic, diplomatic and security tensions, despite a 2009 attempt by President Barack Obama and his Chinese counterpart, Hu Jintao, to kick-start the bureaucracies. U.S. domestic politics make the issue unlikely to advance when Obama hosts Hu at the White House on January 19. Washington is at odds with Beijing over its currency policies and huge trade surplus but needs China's help to deter North Korea and Iran's nuclear ambitions and advance global climate and trade talks, among other matters. Hu's state visit will highlight the importance of expanding cooperation on "bilateral, regional and global issues," the White House said. But space appears to be a frontier too far for now, partly due to U.S. fears of an inadvertent technology transfer. China may no longer be much interested in any event, reckoning it does not need U.S. expertise for its space program. New obstacles to cooperation have come from the Republicans capturing control of the U.S. House of Representatives in the November 2 congressional elections from Obama's Democrats. Representative Frank Wolf, for instance, is set to take over as chairman of the appropriations subcommittee that funds the U.S. space agency in the House. A China critic and human rights firebrand, the Republican congressman has faulted NASA's chief for meeting leaders of China's Manned Space Engineering Office in October. "As you know, we have serious concerns about the nature and goals of China's space program and strongly oppose any cooperation between NASA and China," Wolf and three fellow Republicans wrote NASA Administrator Charles Bolden on October 15 as he left for China.

\*Massive Congressional opposition exists to space cooperation with China

Brown 10 (Peter J., Satellite Journalist – Asia Times, “Asia Takes Stock of New US Space Policy”, Asia Times, 7-16, [http://www.atimes.com/atimes/South\_Asia/LG16Df02.html](http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1616/1))

A new National Space Policy issued by United States President Barack Obama's administration in late June emphasized the important role of international cooperation in space and demonstrated the apparent willingness of the US to begin work on a space weapons treaty. [1]  As the three major space powers in Asia - China, India and Japan - assess the new policy, they must pay close attention not only to the details, but also to the harsh political winds that are buffeting Obama these days.  Some see China as the big winner in this instance, while others see India and Japan coming out on top.  "[The new US space policy] which lays out broad themes and goals, does not lend itself to such determination for a specific country," said Subrata Ghoshroy, a research associate at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Program in Science, Technology, and Society. However, he added, "countries like India and Japan are expected to benefit more".  From the start, however, Obama's overhaul of both the US space sector as a whole and the US National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) in particular has encountered stiff opposition in the US Congress. That opposition is likely to intensify as November's mid-term elections approach. In the US Senate, attempts are being made to toss aside Obama's domestic space sector agenda. [2]  Political infighting aside, it is not just US conservatives who do not want the US to embrace China in space.  "Many members of the Obama administration and a large majority of the members of Congress are opposed to cooperation with China in space. They want to deny China status as a member in good standing of the international community of space-faring nations," said Gregory Kulacki, senior analyst and China Project Manager for the Global Security Program at the Massachusetts-based Union of Concerned Scientists. "Many believe they have not earned that right. At the same time, however, they have not specified what China must do to earn it. Some tie cooperation in space to human rights. Others connect cooperation in space it to other troublesome issues in the bilateral relationship."

Even minimal space cooperation with China triggers strong Congressional opposition

Day 5 (Dwayne A., Program Officer – Space Studies Board of the National Research Council, “Mysterious Dragon: Myth and Reality of the Chinese Space Program”, The Space Review, 11-7, [http://www.thespacereview.com/article/ 492/1](http://www.thespacereview.com/article/492/1))

The bottom line for the speakers was that absent a dramatic policy change in either Washington or Beijing, international cooperation in space is not going to happen in the near future. Either Beijing will have to change its military, foreign policy, and human rights policies, or Washington will need an entirely new presidential administration and Congress. Several of the speakers—not known as critical of White House policy—suggested that the United States was missing an important opportunity to engage China. Fly a single taikonaut aboard a space shuttle to the ISS, one of them suggested, and instantly the United States is back in a clear leadership position regarding China. Another indicated that cooperating with China would give the United States access to Chinese rocket and space experts, and give the Chinese an incentive to “play nice” internationally. Cooperation could take place on several levels. The lowest would be data sharing and cooperation on robotic scientific missions. Higher level cooperation could be commercial efforts and human spaceflight. However, ever since the 1998 “Cox Report” from Congress, there has been strong opposition within Congress to even the most basic space cooperation with China.

Space projects with China cause a strong GOP backlash --- independently turns the case by collapsing support for long-term cooperation

Page 10 (Jeremy, China Correspondent – WSJ, “Orbital Paths of U.S., China Set to Diverge”, Wall Street Journal, 10-29, [http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702303891804575575904021690456.html](http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0411/53495.html))

The Obama administration's space policy, released earlier this year, went further than any previous administration in emphasizing international cooperation and Gen. Bolden has frequently spoken about its importance, with aides suggesting China could play a key role. But with Republicans expected to regain control of the House of Representatives in next month's mid-term elections—and China looming large as a campaign issue—experts now deem it unlikely that there will be real progress on joint manned missions in Mr. Obama's first term, and possibly for the next decade. "In the short term, I think there is little chance of such joint missions. I don't think Congress would accept it," said Peter Bond, consultant editor of the Jane's Space Systems & Industry directory. Dean Cheng, an expert on China's space program at the Heritage Foundation, said: "Any effort to push manned spaceflight cooperation without the necessary groundwork and high-level support is far more likely to lead to disappointment and frustration, retarding future cooperation." The controversy highlights the volatility of U.S.-China relations over the last year, with overlapping disputes on the value of China's currency, U.S.arms sales to Taiwan, Beijing's territorial claims and U.S.support for a Chinese dissident who won the Nobel Peace Prize. It also speaks to the longer-term anxiety in Washington—compounded since the 2008 financial crisis—about how China plans to use its rapidly expanding economic, military and technological power, and whether it could one day become more powerful than the U.S. "Ambivalence about human space cooperation with China reflects the mixed view of China's role in the world," said Scott Pace, director of the Space Policy Institute. "Any major cooperation with China will likely require a long period of building common understanding, transparency, and trust." China sent its first astronaut into space in 2003, launched its second unmanned lunar probe this month, and by 2025 plans to become the second country after the U.S. to land a man on the moon. The U.S., by contrast, canceled its manned lunar program in February and is due to ground its space shuttle fleet next year, relying entirely on Russia, at least through the first half of the decade, to take astronauts to the International Space Station. Yet opposition in the U.S. to space cooperation with China appears to be growing, even as the European Space Agency and other countries deepen their engagement with Beijing. ESA, for example, has helped China monitor its satellites, worked with it to explore the Earth's magnetic field, and advocated its participation in the ISS—currently run by the U.S., Russia, Canada, Japan, Brazil and ESA's 11 members. A Chinese astronaut is also participating in a joint exercise with Russia and ESA to simulate a 500-day flight to Mars and back. "Cooperation with Europe has been much better," said Huang Hai, a professor at the Beijing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics. "The biggest problem with the United States and China is that the two sides don't trust each other enough." He said some Chinese space experts had been refused visas to attend conferences in the U.S., and would often arrange to meet U.S. colleagues in Europe instead. U.S. antipathy stems in large part from the 1999 Cox Committee congressional report that alleged that China stole U.S. space technology, partly by launching U.S.commercial satellites, to help develop its nuclear missile program. Fears about China's intentions were exacerbated when it shot down one of its own weather satellites in 2007 to test its ballistic missile capability. President Obama tried to move past that when he met China's President Hu Jintao in Beijing in November last year and agreed that Gen. Bolden and his Chinese counterpart would exchange visits this year. A joint statement during Mr. Obama's visit included the line: "The United States and China look forward to expanding discussions on space science cooperation and starting a dialogue on human space flight and space exploration, based on the principles of transparency, reciprocity and mutual benefit." However, the letter ahead of Gen. Bolden's trip to China, from Republican lawmakers Frank Wolf of Virginia, John Culberson of Texas and Robert Aderholt of Alabama—all on the House Appropriations subcommittee responsible for the NASA budget—as well as Rep. Dana Rohrabacher of California, asked for his "personal assurance" that he wouldn't discuss cooperation on human space flights.

## Link: Constellation

Constellation Funding Causes Huge Congressional Battles

Morring 10 (June 14, Frank, “Space Policy Fight May Have No Winners This Year”, Lexis)

There’s no joy in the U.S. space industry this summer, as the Obama administration and Congress skirmish over the proposal to kill NASA’s Constellation Program and follow the space shuttle with a fleet of commercial «space taxis» to take astronauts to the International Space Station (ISS). Constellation contractors are losing a bitter game of legal hardball over congressional appropriations requirements that stipulate no Fiscal 2010 funds be spent to kill the program. But the so-called «merchant seven»—companies that have funding to pursue the commercial route—are nervous about the near-term prospects for their funding as well. After conceding that the $2.5 billion in the Fiscal 2011 budget request for its own Constellation termination costs is «oversubscribed,» NASA bigwigs have been warning contractors that they, too, «must abide by provisions of their contracts with respect to termination costs,» in the words of NASA Administrator Charles Bolden. In a letter to congressional leaders of both parties, Bolden argues that NASA cannot keep Constellation going because of restrictions in the Anti-Deficiency Act that prohibit agencies from spending money Congress has not appropriated. Claiming a $991-million shortfall in the overall $4.2-billion Fiscal 2010 Constellation appropriation, Bolden says NASA will focus Constellation spending on an ISS-lifeboat version of the Orion crew exploration vehicle, and the J-2X engine that would have powered the upper stage of its Ares I launcher. Otherwise, for Ares NASA «will provide no additional funding for the first-stage contract, descope remaining contracts, and reduce support contractor levels.» That is a huge hit for first-stage prime contractor ATK, and other Constellation contractors will not be spared either. Bolden says «most of these reductions will be implemented via reductions in workforce» in the weeks ahead, «beginning immediately» and totaling an estimated «30-60% of the current population, or 2,500-5,000, for the balance of the year.» But the merchant seven—Orbital Sciences and SpaceX, which hold milestone-driven multi-billion-dollar contracts to deliver cargo to the ISS, and the five companies awarded stimulus-package funding to develop commercial crew transport technology—also are feeling the crunch. Their funds depend to one degree or another on passage of a Fiscal 2011 NASA budget at least somewhat like the one President Barack Obama requested, and so far it looks like the best they will get is a continuing-funding resolution this fall. Beyond that, the view is even murkier. For Fiscal 2012 the White House wants most federal agencies, including NASA, to identify as potential budget cuts «programs and subprograms that have the lowest impact on your agency’s mission and constitute at least 5% of your agency’s discretionary budget.» That is sure to set off fireworks in the congressional appropriations panels, which created most of the pork barrel programs likely to be targeted. The lack of funding continuity makes it hard to attract private investment to commercial spaceflight and retain the workforce able to make it happen, contractors say.

Reviving Constellation Programs creates political firestorm *(Also in general new spending link wall)*

HANDBERG, 11 - Professor and Chair of the Department of Political Science at the University of Central Florida (Rodger, “Small ball or home runs: the changing ethos of US human spaceflight policy,” The Space Review, 1/17, http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1759/1)

The US space program remained focused, not on duplicating Apollo, but on achieving another difficult goal such as going to Mars, a logical extension truly of the Apollo effort. Twice, the presidents Bush provided the presidential rationale, if not support, for achieving great things. The Space Exploration Initiative (SEI) in 1989 and the Vision for Space Exploration (VSE) in 2004 were announced with great fanfare but neither survived the realities of congressional and presidential budgeting. The VSE appeared on paper more realistic about funding, but its choices were draconian: the ISS and space shuttle were both to be sacrificed on the altar of the new program. The earlier SEI died quickly, so hard choices were not required, while the VSE in the form of the Constellation Program lingers on although its effective demise appears certain. The Obama Administration prefers another approach while the new Congress is likely more hostile to big ticket discretionary spending. If the Tea Party faction in the Republican House caucus means what it says, the future for Constellation or any other similar program is a dim one. The reality is that the Apollo program, the SEI, and the VSE are examples in space terms of the home run approach. Such efforts confront the cruel but obvious reality that the human spaceflight program is considered by the public and most of Congress to be a “nice to have,” but not a necessity when compared to other programs or national priorities. Congressional support is narrow and constituency-driven (i.e. protect local jobs), which means most in Congress only support the space program in the abstract. Big ticket items or programs are not a priority for most, given other priorities. What happens is what can be loosely termed normal politics: a situation where human spaceflight remains a low priority on the national agenda. Funding for bold new initiatives is going to be hard to come by even when the economy recovers and deficits are under control. The home run approach has run its course at least for a time; now the small ball approach becomes your mantra.

Restoring Constellation funding will be a political loss – perceived as weakness and slap in face

Mahoney**,** served as a spaceflight instructor at the Johnson Space Center and is now a freelance writer,10 (March 29, Bob, “Prognosticating NASA’s future”, “The Space Review”, http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1594/1)

So what are the most obvious boundary scenarios here? “Worst” and “best” case (depending on your views) would be either complete cancellation as defined in the budget submission, or Congress balks and restores full funding to all Constellation components, perhaps even adding the billions supposedly needed to make it work. But those boundary scenarios obviously don’t help us much. For the former, the likelihood of Congress rolling over completely is slim, and for the latter, Constellation’s mounting budget and schedule troubles can’t be ignored, and such a move would be a slap in the face to the President. Members of Congress are bound to do something though because, well, that’s what Congress does: it’s part of their nature to either allocate funds or impose restrictions. (Sometimes, as we all know, the best thing to do is nothing, but persons elected to Congress always seem to forget this.)

Flip-flops kill the agenda - it’s the most destructive political label in America

Rainey, 8 (6/25/08 (James, Staff @ LA Times, "ON THE MEDIA: Candidates Show Lack of Leadership on Iraq," Daily Herald, <http://www.heraldextra.com/component/option,com_contentwire/task,view/id,61544/Itemid,53/>)

The Iraq experts I interviewed agreed that one of the most problematic barriers to a real debate is -- as author and journalist George Packer said -- a culture that has "made flip-flopper the most feared label in American politics." They could point to another politician, fact averse but stalwart, who took too long to adapt once it became clear Iraq was going sideways. "It seems in America you are stuck with the position you adopted, even when events change, in order to claim absolute consistency," Packer said. "That can't be good."

## Link: Earth Sciences

EARTH SCIENCE SAPS CAPITAL.

DINERMAN 11. [Taylor, journalist, “NASA’s continuing problems” The Space Review -- April 18]

NASA’s $5-billion science budget is almost certainly going to be cut. Many in Congress are suspicious of its earth science programs since not only do they seem to have little to do with the agency’s core space exploration mission, but the programs are so intertwined with the controversies and political battles over global warming that cutting them or putting them on “pause” would seem logical. At the very least many of the new earth observation satellites will be delayed while Congress examines the role of earth sciences at NASA.

EARTH SCIENCES WILL BE SPUN AS CLIMATE CHANGE -- SPARKS GOP BACKLASH

SMITH 10. [Marcia, editor, “What the Election Means for NASA” Space Policy Online Nov 3]

NASA's space science programs are very popular with Congress and the public, but earth sciences have been a political football for a long time. Many Republicans do not believe that climate change is human-induced and question why NASA needs to invest so much in earth science research. With the White House and Senate still in Democratic hands, and Senator Barbara Mikulski still in the Senate to champion Goddard Space Flight Center and its earth science research programs, the news is not entirely gloomy. Still, the President's requested increase for NASA's earth science program may encounter rough seas ahead instead of the smooth sailing it enjoyed this year.

Republicans hate climate research – believe it distracts from NASA’s purpose

Sheppard 2/11 (Kate, 2/11/11, Mother Jones, “Taking Climate Denial to New Extremes” [http://motherjones.com/blue-marble/2011/02/republican-climate-nasa-budget](http://www.azocleantech.com/article.aspx))

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, "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.

## Link: Helium 3

HELIUM 3 GUARANTEES A FIGHT IN CONGRESS. (Duplicated in the General Costs Capital Section

Whittington, 5-4-11 [Mark, Staff Writer, “Harrison Schmitt's Plan to Solve the Energy Problem by Mining the Moon,” http://news.yahoo.com/s/ac/20110504/us\_ac/8419965\_harrison\_schmitts\_plan\_to\_solve\_the\_energy\_problem\_by\_mining\_the\_moon]

Harrison Schmitt, Apollo moonwalker, geologist, and former U.S. Senator, spoke at the Williston Basin Petroleum Conference recently and presented his plan to solve the long-term energy needs of the world by mining the moon. The idea is to mine a substance that is almost nonexistent on the Earth, but extant on the moon called helium 3 (3HE), an isotope of the well known substance usually put in party balloons. Helium 3 has been deposited in lunar soil over billions of years by solar wind and exists in trace amounts waiting to be extracted. 100 kilograms of helium 3 could be obtained from processing a 2 kilometer square area of lunar soil down to the depth of three meters. That amount would run a 1,000 megawatt fusion reactor for a year. Schmitt says helium 3 is an ideal fuel for future fusion reactors because it leaves little or no radioactive residue, which obviates the need to decontaminate the reactor periodically. The downside is that a helium 3 fusion reaction has to take place at hotter temperatures than other fusion reactions using, for example, deuterium. Schmitt proposes that $5 billion be spent to build a test reactor that would burn helium 3 to create power. In the meantime a return to the moon would have as its main focus the extraction and shipping back to Earth helium 3 to fuel the reactor. A return to the moon was ruled out over a year ago by President Barack Obama when he canceled the Constellation space exploration program. However, there has recently been a resurgence in interest in sending astronauts back to the moon, especially in the Congress. Schmitt's scheme has the virtue of connecting the desire to go back to the Moon with solving the long term energy needs of planet Earth. While there are abundant fossil fuels, the supply is finite and in any case using oil and coal causes various forms of pollution. Solar and wind have thus far proven inadequate as a means of replacing fossil fuels. Helium 3 fueled hydrogen provides a potential of providing clean, virtually limitless energy for the foreseeable future. Of course, there are obstacles in the path of a helium 3 fusion future, both technical and political. Developing a reactor that will create more energy than it consumes to create a helium 3 fusion reaction will be daunting. Then there are the problems of developing of lunar mining techniques and a cost effective transportation infrastructure between Earth and the moon. The political problem is almost as acute. The Fusion Technology Institute is funded with private money, as the Energy Department thinks that space based helium 3 is a NASA problem and NASA thinks fusion energy is an Energy Department problem. It will take a leader of vision to sort out the turf battles and get Schmitt's plan rolling.

## Link: Launch Vehicles

SLV drains capital -- perceived as a poor use of money when budgets are tight

Angela Hill, “NASA’s Space Shuttle Program Ends This Month: Does Anybody Care?” San Jose Mercury News, 7-2-2011 (http://www.mercurynews.com/science/ci\_18399023)

The issue is money, said Maryann Tarantino, 55, of Clayton. Space exploration is too expensive in an era of foreclosures and widespread hunger. "It's not that I'm against exploring space. I guess it's important to keep up with Russia and China on that," said Tarantino, a legal secretary who works in Oakland. "But it's the wrong time for us to be doing it. The costs are too great when people are living in fear of losing their homes." Galactic wanderlust While scientists and NASA officials say the end of the shuttle program by no means signifies the end of the American space era, government funding for space ventures is indeed shrinking. With no shuttle, U.S. astronauts will still go to the space station, but they'll be hitching rides on Russian Soyuz craft for at least the next five years and eventually move to commercially built vehicles produced by private companies, such as California-based SpaceX. After that, the plan is for NASA to build a "heavy-lift launch vehicle" to take equipment and humans farther out into the solar system sometime after 2020. Although robotic technology will continue to explore far deeper into space for far less money than is feasible for man, human exploration has long been the dream. But such efforts require public passion and government support, and this gap in manned missions has some worried that Americans may not have the right stuff anymore. The shuttle "was the one good thing we had going for us as a country," said April Thompson, a San Francisco financial adviser who suggests that ending the program "has silenced the one truly altruistic venture the United States can say was their own. "The idea that we went to the moon and didn't find a Starbucks, so why should we bother going back is a sad, sad day for American culture in general," she added. "If we don't keep going, I think future generations will look at this generation and see an opportunity lost." Many, like Tim Soldati, 46, of Pleasanton, who grew up with "Star Trek" images of colonies on other planets, said he's "flabbergasted" that NASA is retiring the shuttle without having something right behind it. "And I can't believe more people aren't up in arms about it. Imagine if Facebook went down for an hour. The entire world would come to a halt." Been there, done that Many scientists and NASA officials say we can reignite the public passion for space, but what we need are more milestones. "That's what every space mission did in the '60s," said Ben Burress, a staff astronomer at the Chabot Space & Science Center in Oakland. "You had the first flight. First orbit. First spacewalk. First man on the moon. And everyone was entranced. But even though we're not doing that right now, I think people are as interested in space exploration as ever." Burress said he'd love to walk on Mars, but he's in the camp that believes researchers get far more from robotic information than human exploration: "Robots and space probes can go so much farther, with no human cost. Sending a person on a mission is a huge undertaking, but you can send robots to every planet in the solar system." Astrophysicist Neil deGrasse Tyson, director of the Hayden Planetarium in New York and host of "NOVA scienceNOW" on PBS, said we shouldn't underestimate the importance of the human element in space exploration. His upcoming book, "Space Chronicles: Facing the Final Frontier," addresses the early dreams of manned space flight versus the realities of today. "Going into space to advance a scientific frontier, by far the most efficient and cheapest way is with robots," Tyson said in a phone interview. "But manned missions can shape the zeitgeist of a nation like no other force. In the '60s and '70s it influenced architecture, literature, music, what people dreamed about. There were 'homes of tomorrow.' It captivated a culture. It influenced what people wanted to be when they grew up." Astronauts were heroes then, he said, setting new records every mission. That's something that hasn't happened in a long time. "If the shuttle boldly goes only where hundreds have gone before, nobody's interested," he said. "But I assert that if you have humans going to Mars, if you learned today that the U.S. was selecting astronauts to walk on its surface -- of course they'd be kids in middle school right now -- can you imagine what effect that would have on the country, on morale? Everyone would be following those future astronauts, what they ate, how they did in college. "That's inspiration. That's what the manned programs can do." NASA officials say the next steps for American space exploration depend on the national budget and political will. When President George W. Bush was in office, he outlined a plan to develop an Orion Spacecraft to return to the moon, develop a base there and eventually go on to Mars, said John Allmen, project manager for the space transportation system at NASA Ames Research Center in Mountain View. "The Obama administration re-evaluated the costs and felt we couldn't afford to do it at this time," Allmen said. "We're still going with the heavy-lift vehicle portion of the Orion project. It will be developed for payload and to transport humans when appropriate." But when? Tyson asks. "The worry many in the industry have is that, when you have a gap in missions and you're facing a budget crisis, then you just delay and delay the process in order to fund other things you find to be significant," Tyson said.

**Congress strongly opposed to increasing funding for SLV**

Satellite Today, “Boeing WGS Escapes Congressional Air Force Budget Chopping Block,” June 15, 2011 lexis

The U.S. House of Representatives is making alterations to the U.S. Air Force budget in a defense spending bill that is expected to reduce the budget for the GPS space and ground segments from $463.1 million to about $413 million. Congressional appropriators also are expected to slim the Air Force's $390.9 million request for its GPS OCX by about $50 million. GPS OCX is currently under development by Raytheon Intelligence and Information Systems. The Air Force launch vehicle budget is on the chopping block as well, and is expected to be cut by about $170 million. The sole beneficiary of the Air Force budget is [Boeing  Description: Click for Enhanced Coverage Linking Searches](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702303891804575575904021690456.html)Space and Intelligence Systems, which is building the Air Force's Wideband Global Satcom spacecraft -- a program set to receive an additional $335 million in the bill. The funds were authorized to purchase the ninth WGS satellite. Congress is making alterations to the U.S. Air Force's plans for GPS and its Evolutionary Acquisition for Space Efficiency (EASE) strategy after a June 13 U.S. House of Representatives' defense subcommittee report harshly criticized the Pentagon's budget management.

**SLV unpopular -- heavy lifting required to make it a budget priority**

Lee Bowman, “End of an Era, Shuttle’s Last Launch,” Scripps Howard News Service, 7-1-2011 (http://www.wptv.com/dpp/news/state/end-of-an-era,-shuttle%27s-last-launch-)

Why is the shuttle program ending now? The decision was a function of age, money and national policy. Each shuttle in the fleet was designed to fly for 100 missions or 10 years. None has flown even half the maximum number of trips, but the youngest orbiter is now more than 10 years old. There have been numerous overhauls and upgrades. Each launch costs about $1.2 billion. That expense, along with the knowledge that the space station would be built out by around 2010, were major factors in President George W. Bush’s 2004 decision to start phasing out the shuttles, followed by President Barack Obama’s moves to start the final countdown for them last year. Does this mean the end of human space flight by Americans? No. We’ve contracted with Russia to send American crews and supplies to the space station for the next few years, and those agreements could be extended. A Soyuz spacecraft just delivered a three-man American-Russian-Japanese crew to the station last month to join two Russians and one American already there. The latest NASA legislation approved by Congress keeps the U.S. a partner in the space station until 2020. However, there’s no solid timetable for an American-made launch system capable of carrying crews into orbit. Under Obama’s plan, a NASA program to develop its own shuttle replacement was shut down in favor of increased support to private firms working to develop new shuttles and cargo rockets capable of reaching “low” Earth orbit of 200 to 400 miles out. What about the plans for astronauts to visit an asteroid and Mars? By relying on private contractors to match shuttle-level performance, presumably at lower cost, NASA is supposed to put more focus on developing a heavy launch vehicle and crew capsule that would be able to reach an asteroid, the moon and eventually other planets. But just how much money will actually be devoted to this effort in upcoming budgets remains to be seen.

## Link: Mars Science Programs

Mars programs drain capital – political support declining

Enke, 9 (Brian, Denver Space Industry Examiner, 8/4, http://www.examiner.com/space-industry-in-denver/political-capital-running-low-for-nasa-s-mars-science-program)

Political capital running low for NASA's Mars science program? The keynote speaker on the third day of the twelfth annual Mars Society conference, veteran NASA-Ames planetary scientist and astrobiologist Dr. Chris McKay, revealed yet another challenge facing NASA. The once high-flying Mars science program within the Science Mission Directorate (SMD) suffers from a major identity crisis. Already reeling from a massive cost overrun to the 2011 Curiosity rover, the Mars science program has also lost much of its uniqueness within the astrobiology community. Follow the water – follow the life… Astrobiology has formed the heart and soul of the Mars science program for over a decade. The search for life on Mars dictated the goals for a string of missions since the Mars Global Surveyor orbiter in the mid-1990’s. Each robotic mission added to our understanding of the physical conditions on the Red Planet and its potential for harboring sub-surface life forms. While our knowledge of Mars has grown in leaps and bounds, our knowledge of the rest of the solar system has grown too. According to McKay, Mars is no longer unique in its potential as a habitat for non-terrestrial life forms. Europa, Titan, and Enceladus have now surpassed Mars as the most likely and accessible places in the solar system to continue the great search for life elsewhere in the universe. The upcoming decadal survey could demote the Mars science program to a shadow of its former glory. Due to its heavy price tag and lengthy development interval, the next flagship mission in the robotic Mars science program, a Mars Sample Return (MSR) mission planned for around 2020, must receive strong support from the science community if it ever hopes to leave the Earth.

## Link: Mars Missions

*(ALSO IN GENERAL LINKS SECTION)*

Mars missions drain capital – too costly

Stover, ‘4 (Dawn, Science editor of Popular Science, http://books.google.com/books?id=9jHqE2VeadkC&pg=PA62&lpg=PA62&dq=nasa+%22political+capital%22&source=bl&ots=OsBLoJVbYB&sig=GkoUeiiwkgT6dV-ABmF7w82oHzU&hl=en&ei=y24GTsTZDaPl0QHxpJW-Cw&sa=X&oi=book\_result&ct=result&resnum=1&ved=0CBkQ6AEwADgK#v=onepage&q=nasa%20%22political%20capital%22&f=false)

It's as though time has stood still on the Moon—and also in the human space exploration program. "In the past 30 years, no human being has set foot on another world or ventured farther up into space than 386 miles, roughly the distance from Washington, D.C, to Boston, Massachusetts," President George W. Bush said in announcing a major U.S. space initiative on January 14. Soon, though, he vowed, humans will head "into the cosmos"; his new space policy calls for sending astronauts back to the Moon by 2020. Exactly how they will get there remains to be seen, but many experts agree on one thing: Like those footprints on the Moon, the technology of human spaceflight has changed surprisingly little in 30 years. Improvements in materials, electronics and solar power have made spacecraft lighter, smarter and more energy efficient than in the Apollo days, but with few major advances in propulsion technology since the advent of chemical rocket engines powered by cryogenic liquid fuels, human space flight is not significantly faster or cheaper than it was in the 1970s. Space enthusiasts embraced the new policy ("Geez Louise hot f»««"»g damn!" was the first response to the Bush speech posted on one online forum). Until January 14, the only human spaceflight destination NASA had on its schedule was the International Space Station. "We haven't been exploring for years; we've been going in circles," says fohn M. Logsdon, director of the Space Policy Institute at George Washington University. "Sending people beyond Earth orbit is a big deal." 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 longer than three days. If astronauts are to spend weeks or months there, they'll have 10 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 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 S1 billion 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 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 in a policy that, according to an Associated Press poll, only half the American public supports. For those Americans, though, the new policy whetted a long-suppressed appetite for extending the frontiers of human settlement. With unmanned rovers sending back spectacular images of the Martian surface, the dream today is of a lunar outpost that would test the vehicles, power sources and life-support systems needed for a manned Mars mission. The question every space fan needs to ask is: What seeds did the president's January 14 speech plant, and can they ever grow into a Moon base that wilt help humans travel to Mars and beyond? Cont… PRESIDENT BUSH HAS PROPOSED SPENDING S12 BILLION on NASA's new exploration goals over the next five years, including $1 billion in new funding (the rest will be "reprogrammed" from the existing budget). After that, the NASA budget will increase only enough to keep up with inflation. By contrast, NASA spent about S150 billion in today's dollars on the decade-long Apollo program, according to space historian Howard McCurdy of American University. "Kennedy did not have a dollar figure in front of him when he made the decision," says McCurdy. In the year after Kennedy's announcement, the NASA budget doubled, and it doubled again the following year. This time around, though, the White House intends to keep a tight rein on spending. So, although President Bush has announced specific dates for the development of the CE V and the return to the Moon, it would not be surprising if those deadlines slipped. At a press conference only a few hours after the president's speech, NASA administrator O'Keefe was already telling reporters that the new policy was not about "specific destinations' or "dates certain." Making the financial outlook even worse. NASA is still saddled with the costly space station, whose completion will require at least 25 more space shuttle flights. Many who heard Bush's speech assumed that the funding for human space exploration would come from the phaseout of those two programs, which consume the lion's share of NASA's budget. But that's not the case, at least not for the next five years. Of the S12 billion that will be spent to achieve the new exploration goals, $1 billion will have to be cut from other parts of NASA's budget; the cuts will come mainly from science programs not directly related to human exploration. "[Tin- station] is a hole in space into which NASA is pouring money, and it's not even on the table for debate," gripes Apollo 9 astronaut Rusty Schweickart, who sent a letter to Bush and O'Keefe on |anuary 19 recommending the immediate termination of the shuttle and station programs. Other critics of the new space policy are concerned that the president plans to abandon the space shuttle too soon. With the shuttle scheduled for a 2010 retirement, and the CEV not expected to start flying until 2014, NASA faces a hiatus of at least four years in which it will have no vehicles traveling to space. "A big gap like that threatens the health and vitality of NASA.'says Dan Shapiro, legislative director to senator Bill Nelson of Florida. Some critics have even suggested that the Bush vision is a covert plan to euthanize NASA by phasing out its biggest programs, then shelving the Moon initiative. Even tf that's not the case, it's clear that the bulk of the funding required for a Moon program will be the responsibility of future administrations. Some question whether the president, who has never attended a shuttle launch, is any more serious about space exploration than his father was; in 1989, President Bush Sr. called for a manned mission to Mars, only to drop the idea after learning it would cost $400 billion or more.' I think the American public is justifiably apprehensive about starting another major space initiative for fear that they will learn later that it will require far more sacrifice, or taxpayer dollars, than originally discussed or estimated," said senator John McCain at a January 28 hearing. If the bad news is that a four year battle over spending priorities, vehicle designs and mission planning has just begun, the good news is that, for the first time in a long while, space policy is a matter for national debate rather than idle speculation. Key fodder for discussion is exactly what Americans will do on the Moon once we return. The mission can't simply be a repeat performance of Apollo. "That's not a great vision," says Robert Zubrin, president of the Mars Society. Unless activities on the Moon are focused on testing ideas and equipment for going to Mars (at a much safer distance from home), the Moon could end up a detour on the road to the Red Planet, as Carl Sagan once warned. "The idea of having a permanent base on the Moon could be a quagmire,\* says Louis rneaman, executive director ot the Planetary Society, a nonprofit space advocacy group co-founded by Sagan. "It could be the space station and worse, all over again." And while the United States is fixing its gaze on the Moon, the European Space Agency's much more detailed Aurora plan calls for a human landing on Mars in 2033. Still, Friedman and other space enthusiasts are hopeful that the new NASA policy will finally set the agency back on a path toward the heavens. Until a few months ago, when the White House began to hint that President Bush was planning a new space agenda, it looked like the next big NASA program would be the Orbital Space Plane—a new spacecraft that would simply ferry astronauts back and forth to the\* space station, which is even less than the current shuttle does. "That was the space program version of Groundhog Day' says Zubrin. "Now the vision is, We're pushing out."

*(ALSO IN GENERAL LINK SECTION)*

Mars mission drains political capital- lack of congressional support and cost concerns

Richard S. Conley, Associate Professor Department of Political Science University of Florida and Wendy Whitman Cobb PhD Candidate University of Florida, 6/19/2010, “The Perils of Presidential Leadership on Space Policy: The Politics of Congressional Budgeting for NASA, 1958-2008” pg. 10-11

Few presidents have been willing to put their “political capital” on the line for space policy—a “constituentless” policy area (Light 1999)—since the Apollo era. And the international and domestic political context has changed considerably since NASA’s inception. NASA’s raison d’être has become less clear following the end of the Cold War and with increased multinational cooperation on projects, such as the ISS, involving Russia and the European Union (Murray 1991), not to mention China’s emerging interest in space exploration. Still, two presidents—George H.W. Bush in 1989 and George W. Bush in 2004—attempted to articulate long-term visions for NASA. Their relative success was contingent not only on congressional action but also their successors’ commitment as party control of the White House changed. George H.W. Bush proposed the Space Exploration Initiative (SEI) in 1989, with the explicit goal of putting mankind on Mars. The large price tag inhibited congressional action in his inaugural year, and the SEI was not taken up by Congress until 1990 for FY 1991, and that year the president’s budget fell apart dramatically in Congress (Eastland 1992). In 2004 George W. Bush proposed the VSE, which called for phasing out the space shuttle program and emphasizing programs designed to use the moon as a launching pad for eventual exploration of Mars. Yet President Obama, following his 2008 election victory, signaled that such efforts are a low priority on his overall agenda and has attempted to scale back the Constellation project significantly. If presidential commitment to space exploration has been highly uneven in recent decades, NASA’s ability to influence presidential commitment to space policy has been further hampered by bureaucratic intransigence and a failure to alter its own agenda priorities as political control and priorities of the White House and Capitol Hill have alternated. As Klerkx (2005, 57) contends, “the pace of human spaceflight is whatever pace NASA says it should be,” regardless of congressional skepticism or presidents’ “vision” or lack thereof. NASA programs have been criticized for their path dependency—programs taking on a life of their own independent of congressional or presidential calls for change (Roberts 1990, 144; Bruggeman 2002). Path dependency obviously inhibits successful liaison with either Congress or the Office of Management and Budget.

## Link: Mars Mission – Public

(Also in general public popularity links)

Public hates the plan --- they’re strongly against mars exploration

Rasmussen 10 (Rasmussen Reports – National Polling, “59% Favor Cutting Back on Space Exploration”, 1-15, http://www.rasmussenreports.com/public\_content/lifestyle/general\_lifestyle/january\_2010/50\_favor\_cutting\_back\_on\_space\_exploration)

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

No Public interest in mars mission

Kaufman 8

(7/9/08, Marc, Washington Post, “US Finds It’s Getting Crowded out There”, Global Policy Forum, http://www.globalpolicy.org/component/content/article/152/25824.html)

At the same time, the enthusiasm for space ventures voiced by Europeans and Asians contrasts with America's lukewarm public response to the moon-Mars mission. In its assessment, Futron listed the most significant U.S. space weakness as "limited public interest in space activity." The cost of manned space exploration, which requires expensive measures to sustain and protect astronauts in the cold emptiness of space, is a particular target. "The manned space program served a purpose during the Apollo times, but it just doesn't anymore," says Robert Parks, a University of Maryland physics professor who writes about NASA and space. The reason: "Human beings haven't changed much in 160,000 years," he said, "but robots get better by the day."

## Link: Missile Defense

Missile defense unpopular – cost

Grego, 6/2/11 – Laura, staff scientist at the Union of Concerned Scientists (http://allthingsnuclear.org/post/6105337195/space-based-missile-defense-still-a-bad-idea)

While $8 million is small money in this context, as Rep. Sanchez rebutted, space-based interceptors are big money. This has been established repeatedly in studies by, for example, the American Physics Society and the Congressional Budget Office, both in 2004, which show that hundreds to thousands of orbiting interceptors would be needed to provide global coverage against one or two ballistic missiles. For the foreseeable future, each of these hundreds to thousands of orbiting interceptors would require a mass of many hundreds of kilograms, larger than an Iridium communications satellite at launch. A deployed system would be enormously expensive and challenge the U.S. launch capability. It is unlikely to ever be deployed, and in today’s constrained budgetary environment, it is exceedingly unlikely to even be considered seriously.

Missile defense unpopular – perceived as violating treaties

Denny 10. – Bart Denny is a retired U.S. Naval Officer with an Associate's Degree in Nuclear Technology, a Bachelor's Degree in Economics and Political Science, and a Master of Science in Space Studies. (4/29. [http://www.bartdenny.com/index.html](http://www.thespacereview.com/article/898/1))

The hurdles to placing a revived Brilliant Pebbles-like system in orbit are predominantly political, not technical, in nature. Originally, space-based missile defenses faced stiff opposition because of their prohibition by the Antiballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty of 1972. The U.S., of course, withdrew from the ABM Treaty in 2002, but there remains continued unfriendliness, in the U.S. and abroad, to deploying weapons in space. Some mistakenly claim that such weapons are a violation of the Outer Space Treaty of 1967, although that treaty actually prohibits placing weapons of mass destruction, in space, not weapons en bloc.

## Link: Moon Base

Congress hates Moon basing --- they’ll backlash

McCurdy 7 (Professor Howard E., Chair of the School of Public Affairs – American University, “Congress and America’s Future in Space: Pie in the Sky or National Imperative?”, Wilson Center Congress Project, 5-14, [http://www.wilsoncenter.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=topics.event\_summary&event\_id=201072&topic\_id=1412](http://www.atimes.com/atimes/South_Asia/LG16Df02.html?fuseaction=topics.event_summary&event_id=201072&topic_id=1412))

America must continue with its scientific exploration of outer space, though the costs of building a space station on the Moon as a launch pad for sending astronauts to Mars and beyond—-estimated by some at over $400 billion--may be too much for Congress and the public to swallow.  
That was the consensus of a panel of experts at the Congress Project Seminar on Congress and America’s Future in Space. Professor Howard E. McCurdy of American University traced the history of America’s space program while exploding “the myth of presidential leadership in space.” According to that myth, says McCurdy, all the President has to do is move his lips and say the words, and it will be done. But that ignores both the independence of Congress and the ways of the NASA bureaucracy. Congress sometimes says “no” and sometimes, “go slow.” While Congress did largely defer to the President during the 1960s when John F. Kennedy called for putting a man on the moon within the decade, that began to change with the next stages of our space program. When President George W. Bush announced in 2004 his “Vision for Space Exploration,” which included building a Moon station for manned flights to Mars, he was recycling an idea that’s been kicked around for the last 50 years, says McCurdy. In fact, in 1989 Bush’s father called for the exact same thing, calling it the “Space Exploration Initiative.” But it died a natural death in Congress.

No support for lunar development- overcomes general public support

Benaroya, 1- prof of Aerospace Engineering at Rutgers (Winter 2001, Haym, Cross Section, “Making Lunar Development Possible,” [http://gsnb.rutgers.edu/publications/cs\_2001.pdf](http://www.mydd.com/story/2009/3/3/191825/0428), mat)

Much of Benaroya’s recent work on lunar development focuses on a series of proposals he hopes will help to realize the goal of lunar colonization in the face of inadequate governmental funding for such a venture. While public interest in NASA remains high, there is very little public or political support for funding ambitious long-term projects involving manned lunar bases. He argues that such a project could be funded by private investment, provided that development was centered on intermediate, “self-profitable” steps. Such a plan would focus on “dual-use technologies” including smart structures (structures that are able to repair themselves), robotic systems, low-gravity production, instrumentation, and nanotechnology (the creation of extremely small machines). Companies funded to conduct this research could sell products developed using these technologies to become profitable, while the technology itself furthers progress toward lunar development. Benaroya suggests that the funding body, which he refers to as a lunar development corporation, could operate as a venture capital firm, investing in these companies to do research, and retaining the technology to further the long-term goal of lunar colonization. The possibility exists that a lunar colony, once established, could cater to space tourism. In fact, the Hilton Corporation has contracted architects to produce conceptual sketches of the interior of a lunar hotel.

## Link: Moon Mission

Moon missions trigger partisan battles --- and it’s a flip-flop and a loss for Obama

Statesman 10 (“NASA: Moon Not Among Returns on Investment”, 2-2, [http://www.statesman.com/opinion/nasa-moon-not-among-returns-on-investment-209597.html?printArticle=y](http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?printArticle=y))

Now, faced with daunting budget deficits that grow larger and larger, Obama wants Congress to put the brakes on future lunar missions, including Bush's vision of a lunar base from which Mars missions could begin. "We do not know where this journey will end, yet we know this: Human beings are headed into the cosmos," Bush told NASA employees in 2004, announcing the ambitious plan and declaring the moon the "home to abundant resources." Obama's new vision of NASA includes $18 billion for new technologies that eventually could take humans farther into space. The president wants NASA to concentrate on research and development, while the nation would look to commercial companies to handle "space taxi services" to the International Space Station. John M. Logsdon, former director of George Washington University's Space Policy Institute and one of the experts briefed by the White House, told The New York Times the Obama plan is "a somewhat risky proposition." But he also noted it's time for something new because "we've been kind of stuck using the same technologies we developed in the '50s and '60s." To that end, Obama is calling for an end to NASA's Constellation program that has been underway for four years to replace the space shuttles. And while the White House plan calls for a "bold new initiative," it offers no schedules or destinations. We eagerly await more details on Obama's vision for space exploration. In any form, it is an expensive undertaking. But we know from history that it can be an investment with an attractive rate of return. These are times that call for cautious spending of precious public funds. Is NASA a wise place to look for savings? Could be, but we trust that Congress will have a full-throated discussion of this before making the radical midcourse correction favored by Obama. With the NASA facility near Houston (thanks, LBJ), Texas obviously has a large stake in the space program. Texas lawmakers, led by Sens. John Cornyn and Kay Bailey Hutchison, already have pushed back against Obama's plan. Hutchison blasts the proposed cuts as "very short-sighted \u2026 especially considering how much has been poured into the space program in the past." We agree, but we will withhold final judgment until Congress delves further into the president's plan. Like most federal projects, NASA probably can stand some trimming. But we believe it continues to be involved in important research that can have benefits here on our little planet. The last thing we need is a partisan battle over NASA. Can we please shift politics to a back burner, just this one time, so we can have a forward-looking (beyond the next election) discussion abut this?

No political support for Moon exploration --- politicians don’t perceive its benefits

Thompson 11 (Loren, Chief Financial Officer – Lexington Institute, “Human Spaceflight”, April, <http://www.lexingtoninstitute.org/library/resources/documents/Defense/HumanSpaceflight-Mars.pdf>)

This all makes sense from a budgetary and scientific perspective. What’s missing is a grasp of the rationale required to sustain political support across multiple administrations. While exploration of the Moon’s far side or nearby asteroids may have major scientific benefits, those benefits are unlikely to be appreciated by politicians struggling to reconcile record deficits. NASA’s current research plans do not connect well with the policy agendas of either major political party, and the flexible path will not change that. To justify investments of hundreds of billions of dollars in human spaceflight over the next 20 years while entitlements are being pared and taxes are increasing, NASA must offer a justification for its efforts commensurate with the sacrifices required. Mars is the only objective of sufficient interest or importance that can fill that role. Thus, the framework of missions undertaken pursuant to the flexible-path approach must always be linked to the ultimate goal of putting human beings on the Martian surface, and the investments made must be justified mainly on that basis. The American public can be convinced to support **a** costly series of steps leading to a worthwhile objective, but trips to the Moon and near-Earth objects aren’t likely to generate sustained political support during a period of severe fiscal stress.

Moon mission drains capital – spending concerns swamp support

Holmes, 11 (David, 4/26/11, NY Daily News, “To the Moon! Congress proposes a bill that would establish a base on the Moon, could face Obama veto,” [http://articles.nydailynews.com/2011-04-26/news/29494409\_1\_moon-program-space-exploration-lunar-surface](http://www.nationaljournal.com/tech/as-nasa-prepares-to-retire-its-final-shuttle-agency-leaders-face-an-uncertain-future-20110602),)

Good news, spaceheads! If Congress has its way, we could be back on the moon as soon as 2022 -- for keeps. Four U.S. House members have sponsored a bill that would establish a long-term base on the moon. According to the proposal, this mission would promote "exploration, commerce, science and United States preeminence in space as a stepping stone for the future exploration of Mars and other destinations." The last manned moon landing was Apollo 17 in 1972. On that mission, astronauts Eugene Cernan, Ronald Evans and Harrison Schmitt spent three days on the lunar surface taking photographs and collecting samples. But don't strap on those moon shoes just yet. Last year, Obama called for an end to NASA's moon program, so even if the bill passes both the House and the Senate, it could still be vetoed by the President. In an April 15, 2010, speech on space exploration, Obama said, "Now, I understand that some believe that we should attempt a return to the surface of the moon first, as previously planned. But I just have to say pretty bluntly here: We've been there before." Meanwhile, John Timmer of the tech website Ars Technica is skeptical that the bill will even get to that point, considering the recent spending disagreements that nearly led to a government shutdown earlier this month. Timmer writes, "Given how contentious budget issues have been in the current Congress, **any attempt** to turn it into something concrete would probably make it a **nonstarter**."

Plan unpopular --- unfunded liabilities and lack of media interest

Schmidt, Chairman of the Interlune-Interarms Initiative Inc., 3 (11/6/3, Hon. Harrison H. Schmitt, SUBCOMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND SPACE OF THE SENATE COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE, [www.space4pece.net/moon/schmitt110603.doc](http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/opinon/2011/06/137_89716.html))

It is doubtful that the United States or any government will initiate or sustain a return of humans to the Moon absent a comparable set of circumstances as those facing the Congress and Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson in the late 1950s and throughout 1960s. Huge unfunded "entitlement" liabilities and a lack of sustained media and therefore public interest will prevent the long-term commitment of resources and attention that such an effort requires.

## Link: Nuclear Propulsion

Nuclear propulsion is unpopular --- tied up in broader social opposition to nuke power

Downey 4 (James, Lieutenant Colonel – United States Air Force, “Flying Reactors: The Political Feasibility of Nuclear Power in Space”, et al., April, [http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf&AD=ADA425874](http://thehill.com/blogs/on-the-money/1005-trade/168849-baucus-announces-grand-bargain-on-trade-deals?Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf&AD=ADA425874))

*Research Question:* What mechanism(s) would improve the political feasibility of a nuclear power program for United States space operations? For a period of more than 50 years the United States has been exploring the potential of nuclear power reactors for use in a variety of space based applications. From the earliest days there have been numerous challenges―some technical, many political―that have impeded progress in every program that has been considered. The issues surrounding space nuclear power (SNP) are complex and multifaceted. For the United States, the development of SNP lies at the intersection of program cost benefit and the social perception of risk. The actual decision to employ SNP is finally political, encompassing political, judgment will and acceptance of risk. But if the current climate surrounding all things nuclear remains manifest, the future for SNP looks politically challenging.

Debates about the plan will be polarized and controversial --- draining capital

Downey 4 (James, Lieutenant Colonel – United States Air Force, “Flying Reactors: The Political Feasibility of Nuclear Power in Space”, et al., April, [http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf&AD=ADA425874](http://articles.nydailynews.com/2011-04-26/news/29494409_1_moon-program-space-exploration-lunar-surface?Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf&AD=ADA425874))

So is SNP an environmental menace or a feasible enabling technology? The argument is polarized in the United States, the epicenter of the debate as the world’s most capable space faring and democratic nation. Valid arguments can be made either way. Each side of the debate has its active proponents, supported by allies and ad hoc coalitions of stakeholders. Yet between the interlocutors in the debate there is the vast, unaligned, and politically passive or inactive majority. The public is interested in space science but is also sensitive to the costs and risks. Politically aligned and activated, even a small part of that majority would pose pressure that policy-makers in the government could not ignore, and such pressure may determine the feasibility of SNP systems' going forward. Despite the polarization in the public debate about SNP, there is not doubt about the attractiveness of the technology to support space based missions. Space science and national security are both missions enabled by the next generation of satellites and space vehicles. Such vehicles may depend on onboard nuclear reactors to reliably generate large amounts of electricity for power and propulsion

Link outweighs the turn --- benefits aren’t properly sold to the public --- ensures polarization and broad opposition

Downey 4 (James, Lieutenant Colonel – United States Air Force, “Flying Reactors: The Political Feasibility of Nuclear Power in Space”, et al., April, [http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf&AD=ADA425874](http://www.space4peace.net/moon/schmitt110603.doc?Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf&AD=ADA425874))

The intent of this paper is to address the question, ‘What mechanism would improve the political feasibility of a nuclear power program for United States space operations?’ The authors’ inquires have highlighted the fact that the answer to the question is highly contextual and mainly a matter of political judgment. Unlike pure science, trans-scientific policy must include scientific data interpretation by inference and political value judgments. Transscience is the art of synthesizing political solutions that science informs but cannot solve. Empirical analysis is a necessary but insufficient tool for solving trans-scientific problems. That 9conclusion, and the fact that some stakeholders have not assimilated it, causes serious problems in engaging the public with respect to SNP. The result is the discomfort felt even in politically moderate circles. One side talks about empirical scientific facts (the proposing agencies) and historically has largely ignored the public face of the political debate. The other side counters with environmental and socially derived values (the public opposition), focusing on worst case scenarios and potentially disastrous outcomes. The potential value of SNP enabled programs is sacrificed in the name of ultimate safety. Both parties are talking past one another, and the ensuing polarized public debate is politically divisive. SNP remains politically problematic, and the conduct of space science remains overtly politicized.

## Link: Privatization

PRIVATIZATION UNPOPULAR – BACKLASH PROVES.

KLAMPER 10. [Amy, Editor and publisher, “Angst greets Obama space plan” Space News April 26]

Washington - U.S. President Barack Obama’s plan to scrap NASA’s Moon-bound Constellation program and turn to private companies for launching astronauts into space provoked a strong bipartisan rebuke from the Alabama, Florida and Texas congressional delegations several days before the president was slated to deliver his annual budget request to Congress. House and Senate lawmakers from the three states home to NASA’s lead human spaceflight centers unleashed a barrage of criticism in advance of the Feb. 1 release of Obama’s 2011 budget request, which an administration official said would increase NASA spending by $6 billion over the next five years, keep the international space station in service through at least 2020, cancel the agency’s 5-year-old Constellation program to build new rockets and spacecraft optimized for the Moon and fund a $6 billion effort to foster development of commercial systems for ferrying astronauts to the international space station.Sen. Bill Nelson (D-Fla.), chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee panel that oversees NASA, said in a Jan. 29 statement that if reports of the White House plan are accurate, “then the president’s green-eyeshade-wearing advisors are dead wrong.”Nelson, whose state is home to Kennedy Space Center, said he would “fight for NASA, and for the thousands of people who stand to lose their jobs.”Rep. Bill Posey (R-Fla.) called Obama’s plan “a giant leap backwards” and Rep. Suzanne Kosmas (D-Fla.) said it was “simply unacceptable” and vowed to “fight back” to preserve Kennedy contractor jobs that stand to be lost when shuttle flights end. Texas lawmakers were similarly disgruntled about the plan and what it might mean for NASA’s Johnson Space Center, which has been in charge of the Constellation program since its 2005 inception. Republican **Reps. Ralph** Hall**, Pete** Olson, and **Michael** McCaul and Democratic **Rep. Sheila Jackson** Lee all issued testy press releases in the wake of media reports about the president’s NASA plans.Sen. Mary Landrieu (D-La.) said she would try to shield work at NASA’s Michoud Assembly Facility in New Orleans from any job losses associated with the Constellation program’s cancellation. Michoud workers have been counting on Ares and Orion to make up for the loss of the space shuttle external tank work done there.Sen. Richard Shelby (Ala.), the ranking Republican on the Senate Appropriations **commerce, justice, science** subcommittee, said **canceling Constellation and** turning over **crew transportation** to the private sector threatens to make the astronauts launched on NASA’s final shuttle mission **in September** the last Americans sent into space from U.S. soil **until well after 2020**.“**China, India, and Russia will be putting humans in space while we wait on commercial hobbyists to actually back up their grand promises**,” **Shelby said** in a Jan. 29 statement to Space News, referring to companies banking on NASA to guarantee a market for the  space transportation systems they seek to develop. Shelby, **whose state is home to NASA’s Marshall Space Flight Center in Huntsville, where the Constellation program’s Ares 1 and Ares 5 rockets are currently in development,** dismissed the proposed $6 billion commercial crew initiative as  “a welfare program for amateur rocket companies with little or nothing to show for the taxpayer dollars they have already squandered.”Brett Alexander, president of the Commercial Spaceflight Federation here, said Obama’s proposed $6 billion investment would not only get astronauts back to launching on U.S. vehicles faster than Constellation, but would also “create more jobs per dollar” by leveraging private investment.Alexander said Constellation has failed to live up to the Vision for Space Exploration he helped craft as a White House policy analyst under former President George W. Bush.“I was a primary author of the Vision for Space Exploration, and I really wanted it to succeed. I am not happy that five years later it has to be retooled completely,”  Alexander said. “But they chose the most expensive architecture and they had cost and technical issues with it. The cost overruns are astonishing.”A White House panel appointed last year to review NASA’s human spaceflight plans said Constellation was well-managed and technically feasible but likely to cost more than the nation would be willing to spend. The panel suggested the White House consider canceling Ares 1 and foster development of commercial crew systems instead.John Logsdon, a space policy expert here familiar with Obama’s plan, said the emphasis on commercial crew does not mean that NASA will neglect development of the type of heavy-lift rocket it will need to conduct manned missions beyond low Earth orbit by the early 2020s. In the near term, he expects to see NASA invest in heavy-lift technology and do more to engage its international partners.“It’s a fairly sophisticated strategy, in saying let’s spend technology money for the next few years, let’s see what our partners might be willing to contribute, and then, let’s choose a design for the heavy-lift vehicle,” he said.

Privatization of space is politically controversial – economic interests drive intense political fights in the Senate

Simberg ’11, (Chair of the Competitive Space Task Force, former aerospace engineer -- Washington Examiner, “Space politics make strange bedfellows”, 6-8-11, http://washingtonexaminer.com/blogs/opinion-zone/2011/06/space-politics-makes-strange-bedfellows

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. Interestingly and ironically, it sets up a potential battle in the upper chamber over space policy, in which the Democratic senators from California are fighting for a competitive approach (in the interest, of course, of their own home state contractor), against a "conservative" Republican senator from Utah who insists on a wasteful, sole-source pork-based one in the interest of his state. Which all goes to show (as we've seen for the last year and a half) that space policy is truly non-partisan, and non-ideological, and it is driven primarily by rent seeking, not a desire to open up space to humanity. As long as space policy remains unimportant, it will continue to be subject to the petty politics of those whose states and districts benefit from the jobs created, even as wealth is destroyed. But the good news is that this may delay things sufficiently long that an expensive, unnecessary rocket never gets built at all.

## Link: R&D

Space R+D triggers political backlash and opposition --- Congress is committed to narrow, Moon-focused goals

Boyce 10 (Neil Greenfield, “Budget Analysis By Issue: Space Exploration”, NPR, 2-1, <http://www.npr.org/blogs/politicalj2011/02/10/02/budget_analysis_by_issue_space.html>)

The NASA budget for fiscal year 2011 would give the $18.7 billion space agency a substantial financial boost — an additional $6 billion over five years — while dramatically changing the direction of future human exploration. The budget would kill the[Constellation](http://www.statesman.com/opinion/nasa-moon-not-among-returns-on-investment-209597.html) program, a new system of rockets and space capsules that NASA has been pursuing to return astronauts to the moon by 2020. That program was to be the successor to the nearly 30-year-old space shuttle program, which is due to be retired after just five more flights. But the budget documents say Constellation was "over budget, behind schedule and lacking in innovation." Instead, the budget would fund NASA to contract with private industry to provide astronaut transportation to the international space station as soon as possible. The budget also provides funds to extend the life of the space station past its previously planned retirement date of 2016. Analysis: For several years NASA has been touting its planned return to the moon and the eventual creation of a permanent manned lunar outpost. In this new budget, that vision appears to be dead. Instead of repeating and building on many of the achievements of the Apollo era, the administration favors turning to the private sector to bring astronauts up to the International Space Station, while having NASA focus on research and development for future exploration technologies — like closed-loop life support systems and advanced in-space propulsion — to get astronauts out farther and faster into space. But this huge change will likely face opposition in Congress, which has shown strong support for the Constellation program and its moon-focused goals, and where there has already been concern about jobs being lost after the space shuttle program ends.

## Link: SETI

SETI is politically controversial – requires enormous effort to overcome Congressional budget concerns

Amir Alexander, The Planetary Society, 2011, “Space Topics: Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence,” http://planetary.org/explore/topics/seti/seti\_history\_12.html

Part 12: SETI goes to Washington From the begining, MOP faced a bumpy ride. As early as 1979 Senator William Proxmire awarded the program his infamous Golden Fleece Award," given to wasteful programs sponsored by the Federal government. In 1982 Proxmire actually managed to cut all federal funding for MOP through a legislative amendment, threatening to put an end to the entire effort. The threat was averted through the timely intervention of Carl Sagan, who met personally with the Senator and convinced him that SETI was a worthwhile pursuit. Sagan then introduced a petition in support of SETI signed by many of the world's leading scientists, including seven Nobel laureates. The publicity and prestige Sagan generated kept the NASA SETI program on track for another decade. On October 12, 1992, 500 years to the day after Columbus landed in the New World, the two NASA searches were finally launched. The Ames search began to scan its 800-1000 targeted stars from the 305-meter (1000-foot) radio telescope in Arecibo, Puerto Rico, the largest dish in the world. The JPL program began mapping the skies using the 34-meter dish at the Deep Space Communications Complex in Goldstone in the Mohave Desert. The searches were also given a new NASA designation - High Resolution Microwave Survey (HRMS). Both searches utilized the most advanced technology available. The targeted search would analyze the spectrum between 1 and 3 GHz looking for narrow band signals. To accomplish this, its Multi Channel Spectrum Analyzer would analyze a 20 MHz wide band at any given moment, parse it into 20 million 1 Hz channels, and look for signals at bandwidths of between 1 and 28 Hz. The JPL search was designed to map the entire sky at frequencies ranging from 1 GHz to 10 GHz. This enormous 9 GHz band would be analyzed by the Wide Band Spectrum Analyzer, designed to scan a bandwidth of 320 MHz simultaneously, and parse it out into sixteen million 20 Hz-wide channels. It would create a mosaic of 25,000 frames making up the entire night's sky. If we consider that 15 years earlier Big Ear was searching a mere 50 channels, we get a sense of the magnitude of the technological achievement involved. But less than one year after their launch, both searches were suddenly and irrevocably terminated, victims of a new wave of Congressional budget cuts. This time it was Senator Richard Bryan of Nevada who led the charge against governmental expenditures on SETI. "The Great Martian Chase," he said, "may finally come to an end. As of today millions have been spent and we have yet to bag a single little green fellow. Not a single Martian has said take me to your leader, and not a single flying saucer has applied for FAA approval." After an investment of around $60 million over 23 years, and less than one year of operation, NASA's SETI project was unexpectedly dead. Nevertheless, despite the crushing disappointment to SETI enthusiasts caused by the cancellation of the most ambitious search ever attempted, it can now be said that HRMS did not die in vain. The enormous resources available to NASA supported remarkable technological advances, which would have been very difficult to achieve without such backing. Furthermore, the equipment used in the Ames targeted search did not go to waste, but was passed on to the privately funded SETI Institute. The Institute then used to launch its own targeted search, the ongoing and aptly named "Project Phoenix." Although the NASA searches were incomplete and short-lived, they completely transformed the face of SETI. Compared to the relatively amateurish efforts of previous searches, SETI became a professional enterprise conducted by experts using the most advanced technologies available. The scope and sophistication of the searches has also been increased by an order of magnitude through NASA's involvement. And though NASA is no longer an active participant in SETI, the existing SETI programs all took shape under the influence of its impressive effort.

No political support for SETI funding

Lisa M. Krieger, San Jose Mercury News, 4-25-2011, “SETI Institute suspends search for aliens,” http://www.mercurynews.com/science/ci\_17926565?source=rss

If E.T. phones earth, he'll get a "disconnect" signal. Lacking the money to pay its operating expenses, Mountain View's SETI Institute has pulled the plug on the renowned Allen Telescope Array, a field of radio dishes — popularized in the Jodie Foster film "Contact" — that scans the skies for signals from extraterrestrial civilizations. In an April 22 letter to donors, SETI Institute CEO Tom Pierson explained that last week the array was put into "hibernation," safe but non-functioning, due to inadequate government support. The timing couldn't be worse, say SETI scientists. After millenniums of musings, this spring astronomers announced that 1,235 new possible planets had been observed by Kepler, a telescope on a space satellite. They predict that dozens of these planets will be Earth-sized — and some will be in the "habitable zone," where the temperatures are just right for liquid water, a prerequisite of life as we know it. "There is a huge irony," said SETI director Jill Tartar, "that a time when we discover so many planets to look at, we don't have the operating funds to listen."

Especially true in the current political climate

LA Times, 6-18-2011, “Disconnected,” http://articles.latimes.com/2011/jun/18/opinion/la-oe-cokinos-seti-20110618

Yet we're surprisingly unwilling to put our money where our imaginations want to roam. News that the Allen Telescope Array is "hibernating" -- a curio fusly biological term for shutting down 42 radio telescopes designed to listen for signs of life from other worlds -- raises questions about our true commitment to the search for extraterrestrial intelligence. The National Science Foundation recently slashed the University of California's budgets for the Allen array by 90%. This, along with state cuts, has left UC Berkeley, which operates the Hat Creek, Calif., array in the Cascade Mountains, and the private SETI Institute, which conducts searches, in the lurch. For now, the phone is off the hook -- as it was in 1994 when Sen. Richard Bryan (D-Nev.) derided NASA's "Martian chase" and successfully shut down its SETI -- "Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence" -- program. It would cost each U.S. taxpayer just 3 cents a year to fund the Allen array, according to SETI Institute Senior Astronomer Seth Shostak. But in this political environment, direct taxpayer support is unlikely, so the SETI Institute is trying to raise $5 million to reboot the array. Donors such as Microsoft's Paul Allen stepped up after NASA's project died; it's for him that the array is named. In fact, SETI's best hope may be the private sector. Privately financed astronomy is nothing new. In the 18th and 19th centuries -- the heyday of private observatory building -- such work was in part spurred by interest in alien life. It's an interest that, despite present budget tribulations, runs deep. As scholars Steven Dick and Michael Crowe have shown, we can trace the idea of an infinite universe full of other worlds to pre-Socratics like Democritus. This view was marginalized by more famous philosophers, such as Aristotle, and later, by a church fearful of anything that threatened the notion of a unique God-Earth relationship. But by the Victorian era, there were serious discussions not only about a lively universe -- which was widely assumed -- but about whether Christ might have to be endlessly reincarnated on a "plurality of worlds." That thorny issue eventually faded from view and new takes on the question of cosmic life emerged, such as whether there were canals on Mars. Arguably, the first organized SETI took place in the 1920s when astronomer David Todd persuaded the U.S. military to observe radio silence across North America while he and others listened to the Red Planet. More famously, pioneering radio astronomer Frank Drake turned a big dish in West Virginia toward the stars in 1960. SETI has continued, in fits and starts, ever since. Still, while the public imagines a universe of star cruisers and galactic cyberwebs, budget-cutting bureaucrats find even partial grants for SETI an easy target. Did you write your representative or senator when the SETI funding was slashed? I guess we prefer our aliens to announce themselves without effort on Netflix.

SETI funding is quick to get the axe in a budget cutting congress

Michael Woods, Post-Gazette National Bureau, 10-25-2003, “Alien hunt in space may score by 2025,” http://www.post-gazette.com/pg/03298/234442.stm

Earthlings also have tried to reach out to extraterrestrials. In 1974, the Arecibo Observatory in Puerto Rico, the largest radio telescope in the world, sent a digital message toward the M13 Global Cluster. It will arrive in about 25,000 years. The Pioneer 10 spacecraft launched in 1972 carried humanity's first message-in-a-bottle -- a plaque bearing an illustration of a man and a woman and a diagram identifying Earth's location in the galaxy. It is now 9 billion miles away. The search for extraterrestrials has been intermittent, however. In 1993, a budget-cutting U. S. Congress canceled NASA's SETI program. By the late 1990s, there had been barely two years of continuous observations for extraterrestrial messages.

## Link: Solar Powered Satellites

SPS requires tons of political capital

David 8 (Leonard, Research Associate – Secure World Foundation and Senior Space Writer – Space.com, “Space-Based Solar Power - Harvesting Energy from Space”, CleanTech, 5-15, [http://www.azocleantech.com/article.aspx? ArticleId=69](http://www.space.com/11411-nasa-2011-budget-cuts-constellation-funding.html?%20ArticleId=69))

*Space Based Solar Power: Science and Technology Challenges* Overall, pushing forward on SBSP "is a complex problem and one that lends itself to a wide variety of competing solutions," said John Mankins, President of Artemis Innovation Management Solutions, LLC, in Ashburn, Virginia. "There's a whole range of science and technology challenges to be pursued. New knowledge and new systems concepts are needed in order to enable space based solar power. But there does not appear, at least at present, that there are any fundamental physical barriers," Mankins explained. Peter Teets, Distinguished Chair of the Eisenhower Center for Space and Defense Studies, said that SBSP must be economically viable with those economics probably not there today. "But if we can find a way with continued technology development ... and smart moves in terms of development cycles to bring clean energy from space to the Earth, it's a home run kind of situation," he told attendees of the meeting. "It's a noble effort," Teets told Space News. There remain uncertainties in SBSP, including closure on a business case for the idea, he added. "I think the Air Force has a legitimate stake in starting it. But the scale of this project is going to be enormous. This could create a new agency ... who knows? It's going to take the President and a lot of political will to go forward with this," Teets said.

Zero Congressional support for SPS --- its too expensive and tied to unpopular military space programs

Day 8 (Dwayne A., Program Officer – Space Studies Board of the National Research Council, “Knights in Shining Armor”, The Space Review, 6-9, [http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1147/1](http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php))

If all this is true, why is the space activist community so excited about the NSSO study? That is not hard to understand. They all know that the economic case for space solar power is abysmal. The best estimates are that SSP will cost at least three times the cost per kilowatt hour of even relatively expensive nuclear power. But the military wants to dramatically lower the cost of delivering fuel to distant locations, which could possibly change the cost-benefit ratio. The military savior also theoretically solves some other problems for SSP advocates. One is the need for deep pockets to foot the immense development costs. The other is an institutional avatar—one of the persistent policy challenges for SSP has been the fact that responsibility for it supposedly “falls through the cracks” because neither NASA nor the Department of Energy wants responsibility. If the military takes on the SSP challenge, the mission will finally have a home. But there’s also another factor at work: naïveté. Space activists tend to have little understanding of military space, coupled with an idealistic impression of its management compared to NASA, whom many space activists have come to despise. For instance, they fail to realize that the military space program is currently in no better shape, and in many cases worse shape, than NASA. The majority of large military space acquisition programs [have experienced major problems](http://www.thespacereview.com/article/384/1?channel=space&id=news/milspace031008.xml&headline=GAO%20IDs%20Space%20Acquisitions%20Woes), in many cases cost growth in excess of 100%. Although NASA has a bad public record for cost overruns, the DoD’s less-public record is far worse, and military space has a bad reputation in Congress, which would never allow such a big, expensive new program to be started. Again, this is not to insult the fine work conducted by those who produced the NSSO space solar power study. They accomplished an impressive amount of work without any actual resources. But it is nonsensical for members of the space activist community to claim that “the military supports space solar power” based solely on a study that had no money, produced by an organization that has no clout.

High cost makes SPS politically impossible

Boswell 4 (David, Speaker – International Space Development Conference, “Whatever Happened to Solar Power Satellites?”, The Space Review, 8-30, <http://www.thespacereview.com/article/214/1>)

*High cost of launching*

Another barrier is that launching anything into space costs a lot of money. A substantial investment would be needed to get a solar power satellite into orbit; then the launch costs would make the electricity that was produced more expensive than other alternatives. In the long term, launch costs will need to come down before generating solar power in space makes economic sense. But is the expense of launching enough to explain why so little progress has been made? There were over 60 launches in 2003, so last year there was enough money spent to put something into orbit about every week on average. Funding was found to launch science satellites to study gravity waves and to explore other planets. There are also dozens of GPS satellites in orbit that help people find out where they are on the ground. Is there enough money available for these purposes, but not enough to launch even one solar power satellite that would help the world develop a new source of energy? In the 2004 budget the Department of Energy has over $260 million allocated for fusion research. Obviously the government has some interest in funding renewable energy research and they realize that private companies would not be able to fund the development of a sustainable fusion industry on their own. From this perspective, the barrier holding back solar power satellites is not purely financial, but rather the problem is that there is not enough political will to make the money available for further development.

Congress and the public hate SPS

Mahan 7 (Rob, Founder – Citizens for Space Based Solar Power, “SBSP FAQ”, [http://c-sbsp.org/sbsp-faq/](http://www.planetary.org/programs/projects/space_advocacy/20100615.html))

*What are the main hurdles to developing and deploying space-based solar power?* Let me start by saying that I believe there are three solutions to every complex problem. First, the technical solution – how are we going to solve the problem (often the easiest). Second, the financial solution – who is going to pay for / profit from the solution. And third, the political solution – who is going to organize the solution … and take credit for it. The technical solution for space-based solar power is exciting because no scientific breakthroughs are needed. It is essentially a complex engineering project. The technical solution will initially be dependent on developing low cost and reliable access to space, but later we could use resources mined from Moon and near Earth objects like asteroids. The financial solution will admittedly be very expensive at first, so there must be an early adopter, like the Defense Department, to provide a market and rewards for those willing to invest in space based solar power and the supporting technologies. Engineering and scientific advancements and the commercialization of supporting technologies will soon lead to ubiquitous and low cost access to space and more widespread use of wireless power transmision. Economies of scale will eventually make space-based solar power affordable, but probably never cheap again, like energy was fifty years ago. Eventual Moon based operations will reduce costs significantly, since it takes twenty-two times less energy to launch from Moon than from Earth’s gravity well and the use of lunar materials will allow heavier, more robust structures. The political solution will most likely be the biggest hurdle to the development of space-based solar power because so many areas have to be negotiated and agreed upon, not only within the United States, but with our allies around the world, too. Strong energy independence legislation is the first step that needs to be taken immediately. Treaties and agreements for the military and commercial use of space must be negotiated and put into place. Universal safety measures must be agreed upon and integrated into related legislation and treaties. Getting widespread voter (i.e. tax-payer) support to prompt Congress to take action may be the highest hurdle of all.

Congress won’t support – oil and coal lobbies

Mankins 8 (John C., Spring 2008, Ad Astra, “Space Based Solar Power” http://www.nss.org/adastra/AdAstra-SBSP-2008.pdf)

AD ASTRA: In light of the growing demand for dwindling hydrocarbons and the dangerous increases of greenhouse gases, do you think that the world is now primed to seriously consider space-based power systems? GLASER: No, because people can still get gas for their cars too easily. Those in the top levels of science and government know what is coming, but the average man on the street will not care unless it impacts his wallet. That is the biggest problem. The basic approach is unchanged from my initial concept. We could have built this system 30 years ago. The technology just keeps getting better. The design and implementation is a small problem Compared to the much larger obstacle of getting people to understand the potential benefits. Building such a system could provide cheap and limitless power for the entire planet, yet instead of trying to find a way to make it work, most people shrug it off as being too expensive or too difficult. Of course existing energy providers will tight, too. It only makes sense that coal and oil lobbies will continue to find plenty of reasons for our representatives in Congress to reject limitless energy from the sun

SPS drains Political Capital

Preble 06, Darel, Space Solar Power Institute, “Introduction to the motion to the National Space Society Board of Directors,” 12/15 NM

Changing our nation and our world’s baseload energy generation sources to introduce SSP is a **massive battle.** The current oil, coal, and gas energy providers, nuclear as well, are not eager to see their baseload investments face competition from SSP, which has zero fuel costs and zero emissions and a billion years of steady supply projected. This is why SSP has been unfunded since it was invented in 1968. Carter pushed through the SSP reference study in 1979-1980, but space transportation costs were far too high, and they were forced to plan to use astronauts to bolt it together. This is too dangerous for astronauts outside the protection of the Van Allen Radiation Belts. (The Space Station is inside the Van Allen Belts) People are also too expensive to use for SSP construction. Telerobotics, the real way to assemble SSP, did not exist in 1979. Now it is used in heart surgery every day worldwide and for a thousand other uses. (The fossil fuel industry has battled environmentalists every inch during our struggle to understand climate change effects. That is their right. Perhaps half the studies are wrong. But half are right.) Most crucially, space transportation costs have stayed too high because there is no market large enough to support a Reusable Launch Vehicle fleet. SSP IS just such a massive market. Robert Zubrin mentions this battle and perspective in “Entering Space”, page 51. He quit space transportation and decided to work on Mars, which has no possibility of commercialization this century. This is detailed in the Space Transportation chapter on the SSPW website also. You can’t make an omelet without breaking a few eggs.

## Link: Solar Sails

Solar sails require political capital to jump-start --- even with operational viability

Gilster 7 (Paul, Technology Columnist – News & Observer, “Reflections on Space Policy in Washington”, Centauri Dreams, 11-15, [http://www.centauri-dreams.org/?p=1580](http://www.aviationnow.com/aw/generic/story_generic.jsp?p=1580))

Ponder the solar sail itself as seen through the prism of NASA. Work at Marshall Space Flight Center has progressed to the point that the solar sail is close to or at the status of operational viability. In other words, it wouldn’t take much to launch and deploy an actual sail mission in terms of technology. But without the needed funding, such missions don’t happen, which is why space policy can be so difficult to sort out, and so frustrating. That’s one price you pay for democracy, and while I certainly would never want to live under any other form of government, it does account for the fact that our ventures into space sometimes seem to proceed by fits and starts rather than in a stable continuum.

Solar sails would cost political capital: Democratic process, public

Gilster 7**.** (Nov. 15 2007. Paul—author of *Centauri Dreams: Imagining and Planning Interstellar Exploration* and writer about technology for 20 years. “Reflections on Space Policy in Washington” http://www.centauri-dreams.org/?p=1580)

For many people (though probably not regular Centauri Dreams readers), solar sails are purely theoretical constructs, so I was glad to hear Matloff explaining the history of the concept, dating back to 1974, when the Mariner 10′s mission to Mercury used the radiation pressure from solar photons for attitude control. That ad hoc demonstration said all that needed to be said about the utility of the momentum imparted by photons, and later missions, like the Russian Znamya reflectors or the 1996 thin film antenna unfurled from the Space Shuttle, kept the concept in play (the Znamya missions, to be sure, had their share of problems). Louis Friedman, of course, had put huge amounts of time and effort into COSMOS-1, which would have been the first sail to go fully operational in space, but that 2005 launch failure was but a temporary setback. The Japanese had already demonstrated sail deployment in 2004 from a suborbital rocket — we’re learning how to do these things. Thinking back, too, to Dr. Friedman’s talk and the array of international missions now in the works, it’s striking that countries less concerned about democratic participation, like China, have in some ways an easier time at articulating a long-term space goal. Democracy is sprawling, messy, and it assumes the public’s support is a major factor in building space policy. Governments without elections to contend with set their own agendas. Ponder the solar sail itself as seen through the prism of NASA. Work at Marshall Space Flight Center has progressed to the point that the solar sail is close to or at the status of operational viability. In other words, it wouldn’t take much to launch and deploy an actual sail mission in terms of technology. But without the needed funding, such missions don’t happen, which is why space policy can be so difficult to sort out, and so frustrating. That’s one price you pay for democracy, and while I certainly would never want to live under any other form of government, it does account for the fact that our ventures into space sometimes seem to proceed by fits and starts rather than in a stable continuum.

## Link: Space Debris Cleanup

Space debris cleanup drains capital – high costs and no political support

David 11 - research associate with the Secure World Foundation, winner of the National Space Club Press Award

(Leonard, May 09, “Ugly Truth of Space Junk: Orbital Debris Problem to Triple by 2030”, http://www.space.com/11607-space-junk-rising-orbital-debris-levels-2030.html)

"The buildup of debris is not a naturally reversible process. If we are to clean up space, it will certainly be complex and very expensive. If we continue, as we have, to use these very popular orbits in near-Earth space, the density of debris and collision events will surely increase," Kaplan told SPACE.com. The good news is that no immediate action is necessary in terms of removing debris objects, Kaplan advised, as experts estimate that the situation will not go unstable anytime soon. "But, when it does, operational satellites will be destroyed at an alarming rate, and they cannot be replaced. We must prepare for this seemingly inevitable event," Kaplan said. While there are many options for debris removal that have been proposed, he feels that none are sensible. "Barring the discovery of a disruptive technology within the next decade or so, there will be no practical removal solution," Kaplan added. "We simply lack the technology to economically clean up space." [Lasers Could Zap Space Junk Clear From Satellites] For Kaplan, the issue of dealing with orbital debris will become dire. "The proliferation is irreversible. Any cleanup would be too expensive. Given this insight, it is unlikely spacefaring nations are going to do anything significant about cleaning up space," Kaplan said. "The fact is that we really can't do anything. We can't afford it. We don't have the technology. We don't have the cooperation. Nobody wants to pay for it. Space debris cleanup is a 'growth industry,' but there are no customers. In addition, it is **politically untenable**."

## Link: Unmanned Missions

Drains capital --- ignites funding fights and lacks political support

Lytle ’03

(Tamara,- Sentinel Bureau Chief [http://articles.orlandosentinel.com/2003-02-12/news/0302120124\_1\_spaceflight-unmanned-missions-astronauts/2](http://www.popularmechanics.com/science/space/nasa/nasa-senate-appropriations-constellation))

Unmanned Missions Still Face Funding Fight

Though Robotic Probes Don't Risk Lives, They Don't Excite The Public, Some Lawmakers Said. WASHINGTON -- Robotic space missions have long been overshadowed by NASA's focus on astronauts and may now have to compete for funding against a manned-flight program garnering public sympathy and support. The latest unmanned probe reporting in to NASA, the Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe, beamed back a wealth of data about the origin of the universe, the space agency said Tuesday. Much of the science being conducted on space shuttle Columbia before it disintegrated over Texas on Feb. 1 could have been done on an unmanned mission. That revives some of the debate about whether the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has weighted too much of its money and attention toward astronaut missions instead of the cheaper, less risky robotic probes. But President Bush and leaders in Congress have made it clear that, despite the success of probes such as MAP, manned spaceflight is a major part of the future of space exploration. Rep. Dave Weldon, R-Palm Bay, said the manned missions get children interested in space science and are important to the public. "If we say it's too risky, the psychological impact of what makes us different from the rest of the world as Americans could be huge," Weldon said. The Apollo moon landings helped prove American technological prowess during the Cold War, said Henry Hertzfeld, a senior research scientist at the Space Policy Institute at George Washington University. "One of the first things you have to deal with is the *politics of NASA,* which is organized around putting people in space," Hertzfeld said. "There has always been a tendency to favor the very expensive human spaceflight in NASA." Astronauts make missions more expensive because of the life-support systems and the extra safety measures, such as redundant systems in case something goes wrong. Probes can withstand harsh space conditions unfit for humans and can send data back without needing to return to Earth. Hertzfeld said some of the scientists and engineers involved in unmanned probes have been frustrated by the focus on manned spaceflight. If NASA doesn't get the money it needs to fix the problems in the manned-spaceflight program, "some of those [unmanned] programs could be jeopardized," Hertzfeld said.

support for unmanned missions is only rhetorical, any new funding drains capital

Harwood ’10

(William,- CBS News space analyst “Obama Envisions Manned Mars Mission for NASA”)

The 2004 vision outlined by Bush included plans to retire the aging space shuttle, return Americans to the moon and explore Mars through robotic and human missions. "I encourage you to ask whether there was a flaw in the vision that we did not realize at the time," Fisk told members of the House Science and Technology Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics. "The vision is about the future, extending our civilization into space, but there is little of immediate concern to the taxpayer." The congressional hearing, which focused specifically on NASA's space and Earth science programs, was the latest held to examine the proposed 2009 budget Bush has recommended for the agency. Committee chairman Mark Udall called NASA's science programs the "crown jewels" of the agency but expressed his longstanding concern over whether they have been adequately funded. "NASA's challenging new science initiatives are to be built on a budget that increases by only one percent through 2011 — and that assumes only inflationary increases at best in the years beyond that," said Udall, D-Colo. "There will be little new money. Instead, there will be a continuing need to transfer of funds across the science accounts to support each new initiative — an approach some might call 'robbing Peter to pay Paul.'" Rep. Tom Feeney, the panel's top Republican, said both the president and Congress often are eager to assign NASA new missions yet avoid *providing the money necessary to achieve them*. "The result of our actions is that NASA's resources are shrinking in real terms while the agency is charged with maintaining America's preeminence as a space faring nation," said Feeney, whose district includes north Brevard County. Steven Squyres, an astronomy professor at Cornell University, expressed specific concern about the agency's Mars exploration program, which includes the scheduled launch of several spacecraft over the next decade. "The budget doesn't appear to include enough funds to carry out the mission," he said, an observation he based on a study he and more than a dozen engineers and scientists conducted recently. "Most of the news in this budget is good for solar system exploration," Squyres said. "If you can fix the one serious problem — the cuts to the Mars program — you can make it a space science program that the nation will be proud of."

Funding battle overwhelms proponents

Gannett News Service ’08

(“Scientists: NASA programs lack adequate funding”)

"We are stunned that, in a time of economic crisis, this move will force as many as 30,000 irreplaceable engineers and managers out of the space industry," they wrote. "We see our human exploration program, one of the most inspirational tools to promote science, technology, engineering and math to our young people, being reduced to mediocrity." In the wake of the 2003 Columbia disaster, President Bush decided to complete the space station and retire the shuttle by 2010. At the same time, he directed NASA to begin development of new rockets, capsules and landers to carry astronauts back to the moon by the early 2020s. NASA came up with the Constellation program to implement those directives, spending some $9 billion over the past five years. But funding shortfalls resulted in a projected five-year gap between the end of shuttle operations and the debut of the Ares I rocket and Orion crew capsule. To bridge the gap, NASA is paying the Russians some $50 million a seat to launch U.S. and partner astronauts to the space station aboard Soyuz rockets. During the presidential campaign, Obama expressed support for Constellation but after the election, he set up a panel of outside experts to review NASA's plans and how much they might ultimately cost. The panel concluded NASA could not afford to implement Constellation, or any other reasonable exploration program, without an additional $3 billion or so per year, primarily to make up for earlier budget reductions. And that did not take into account the cost of operating the International Space Station beyond 2015. The group favored a shift to commercial launch services to carry astronauts to and from low-Earth orbit while NASA focused on development of a new heavy-lift rocket system that would enable eventual flights to the moon, nearby asteroids or even the moons of Mars. The Obama administration agreed with the idea of commercial launch services, but it did not explicitly embrace the "flexible path" approach to deep space exploration suggested by the panel, focusing instead on development of enabling technologies and somewhat vague long-range goals. The result, administration officials said, was an affordable, more sustainable space program. The new commitment to development of a heavy lifter may defuse at least some of the outside criticism. But the benefits of using a scaled-down version of Orion for space station crew escape are not as clear. Seats purchased on Russian Soyuz rockets include launch and landing and the capsules remain docked at the station throughout a crew's stay, available as emergency lifeboats if needed. Former NASA Administrator Mike Griffin, chief architect of the Constellation program and a signer of the open letter to the president, said in an email "the people who are offering this plan are flailing." Launching the capsules atop unmanned rockets would eliminate the need for complex abort systems, he said, but *even unmanned rockets are expensive*, the capsules would need an autonomous rendezvous and docking capability and they would have to be periodically replaced.

Status quo proves it’s unpopular

Loew ’11

(Justin,- “Space Missions, Present & Future” 3-31 [http://addins.waow.com/blogs/weather/tag/europa](http://c-sbsp.org/sbsp-faq/))

In some other unfortunate news, because of the poor economy, and the fact that the government is running trillion dollar deficits, budget cuts at NASA might put on hold a possible robotic mission to Jupiter’s moon Europa. A Mars astrobiology mission (searching for signs of life) has top priority so Europa will have to wait. As far as big expensive missions go, I suppose it makes sense to return to Mars a couple more times (the MSL and astrobiology mission) since NASA has had relatively good success with the red planet. Europa would be much more tricky. I blogged about some robotic testing in lake Mendota back in 2008. This research was conducted in preparation for a possible mission to Jupiter’s lively moon.

## Link: Weaponization

No support for the plan

Tannenwald, ‘3 – Nina, Associate Research Professor at Brown University's Watson Institute for International Studies (Yale Journal of International Law. April. <http://www.cissm.umd.edu/papers/files/tannenwald.pdf>)

Although SPACECOM and its supporters aggressively assert their views, advocates of weapons in space may be in the minority, even in the Pentagon. As many observers recognize, the interests of the United States in space are much broader than SPACECOM presents. U.S. testing and deployment of orbital weapons could make using space for other military and commercial purposes more difficult. Many in the military, especially those involved in crucial military support activities, are quietly aware of this, as are officials at NASA and the international space station, and their supporters in Congress. 26 Congressional support for antisatellite (ASAT) programs does not appear to be deep or widespread. Serious questions remain as to whether the threats to U.S. assets in space are really as great as SPACECOM argues, and whether, even if the threats were real, expensive and difficult space-based weapons would really be the most effective way to deal with them. In many cases, those wishing to hurt the United States will likely find it much easier, and more effective, to attack terrestrial targets. 27

Plan is super unpopular

Sheenan 7. – Mike, prof of IR @ university of Swansea (The International Politics of Space, page 121. Series: Space Power and Politics, ed. Everett C Dolman and John Sheldon, both @ School of Advanced Air and Space Studies, USAF Air. )

While there may be clear military rationales in favour of the weaponisation of space by the United States, it is a decision that would have considerable political implications. It is also true that to date there have always existed powerful cultural and political domestic obstacles in the United States to such a development. Even at the outset of the space age leading US politicians speculated on the idea of space as a force for peace rather than a theatre of war. House Majority Leader McCormack suggested in 1958 that the exploration of space had the potential to encourage a revived understanding ‘of the common links that bind the members of the human race together and the development of a strengthened sense of community of interest which quite transcends national boundaries’.84 President Kennedy similarly suggested that it was ‘an area in which the stale and sterile dogmas of the Cold War could be literally left a quarter of a million miles behind’.85 US National Space Policy states that the United States is committed to the exploration and use of outer space ‘by all nations for peaceful purposes and for the benefi t of all humanity’.86 US national space policy does allow for the use of space for the purpose of national defence and security, but nevertheless, the weaponisation of space would seem to run counter to a very long-standing national policy. Similarly, the US National Security Strategy declares that uninhibited access to space and use of space are essential to American security. Space policy objectives include protecting US space assets, ‘preventing the spread of weapons of mass destruction to space, and enhancing global partnerships with other space-faring nations across the spectrum of economic, political and security issues’.87 It is also notable that the US armed forces are aware of the need to respect the concept of space as a ‘global commons’, so that if ‘the United States impedes on the commons, establishing superiority for the duration of a confl ict, part of the exit strategy for that confl ict must be the return of space to a commons allowing all nations full access’.88 Current US military space doctrine is careful to emphasise the political implications of military operations in space and the need to be sensitive to legal issues. USDD 2-1.1, Counterspace Operations, insists that ‘in all cases, a judge advocate should be involved when considering specifi c counterspace operations to ensure compliance with domestic and international law and applicable rules of engagement’. 89

Weaponization causes Congressional backlash --- there’s broad, bipartisan opposition

Moltz 2 (James Clay, Research Professor and Associate Director – Center for Nonproliferation Studies at the Monterey Institute of International Studies, “Breaking the Deadlock on Space Arms Control”, Arms Control Today, April, [http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2002\_04/moltzapril02](http://www.lexingtoninstitute.org/library/resources/documents/Defense/HumanSpaceflight-Mars.pdf))

*Where Does Congress Stand?* The same Congress that boosted funding for missile defenses by 57 percent to $8.3 billion last year also cut significant chunks out of Bush proposals for space-based elements of national missile defense. Indeed, the final House-Senate conference committee eliminated $120 million from the president’s proposed $170 million appropriation for the Space-Based Laser. It also eliminated funds entirely for the Space Based Infrared System-low (SBIRS-low), a satellite-based early-warning system. These actions suggest that space weapons are vulnerable to congressional challenges. Also, the full impact of the change in the Senate’s leadership has not yet been felt. Key Democrats have come out in strong opposition to space weapons, including Senators Tom Daschle (SD), Joseph Biden (DE), and Carl Levin (MI). Except for the unprecedented budget unity brought on by the September 11 events, cuts would likely have been made in the missile defense budget for fiscal year 2002,[9](http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2002_04/moltzapril02" \l "notes) forcing even harder choices regarding space defenses. Such debates are beginning for fiscal year 2003. Conservative Democrat Robert Byrd (WV) warned on the Senate floor against “a headlong and fiscally spendthrift rush” to deploy space weapons, concluding, “That heavy foot on the accelerator is merely the stamp and roar of rhetoric.” In addition, a strong contingent within Congress still supports NASA and the International Space Station, which, despite problems, continues to resonate as a worthwhile endeavor with the American public. Introducing weapons into space is abhorrent to many Americans, raised to view space as the realm of the Apollo astronauts, the moon landing, and the shuttle missions. Even conservatives such as Representative Curt Weldon (R-PA) have emphasized the continued importance of manned space research to the nation’s economy and the development of spin-offs for furthering our technological base. Despite Weldon’s support for missile defense, he and other NASA supporters may modify their stances when they recognize that aggressive deployment of space weapons could jeopardize other U.S. space priorities. Tests of ASAT weapons, for example, could create debris that might threaten astronauts on the International Space Station. They might also cause costly litigation in which commercial providers seek restitution from the U.S. military for damage caused to their satellites. Foreign claims could create international incidents harmful to U.S. foreign and defense policies, as well as commercial interests. Ten to 20 years down the line, multiple states responding to U.S. weapons in orbit could create an unlimited test range in low-Earth orbit, to the great harm of U.S. space interests, including for military assets. It is not surprising, therefore, that risks associated with weaponizing low-Earth orbit do not sit well with many members of Congress, who want to see U.S. military, scientific, and commercial leadership in space protected. According to defense analyst Theresa Hitchens, U.S. satellite providers are already nervous about possible future U.S. government decisions to try to shut off foreign access to U.S. communications satellites in times of crisis and to shoot down U.S. and foreign satellites providing such access.[10](http://news.yahoo.com/s/ac/20110401/pl_ac/8187949_rep_bill_posey_argues_for_more_funding_for_nasa_space_exploration#notes) They fear that this may lead foreign customers to develop their own satellite industries to ensure the availability of spares, thus stimulating competition and cutting into existing U.S. market share. A liberal House Democrat introduced H.R. 2977 in fall 2001 and a revised bill (H.R. 3616) in January entitled the “Space Preservation Act of 2002.” This legislation would prohibit U.S. funds from being spent on space-based weapons, terminate all research associated with such systems, and instruct the president to participate in international negotiations toward completion of a treaty banning such weapons worldwide. Although the bill is unlikely to pass in the Republican-controlled House, it does set down a marker of opposition to current administration policies. More indicative of chances for creating a bipartisan consensus on limiting space weapons was a speech in late September 2001 by Senator Richard Lugar (R-IN), a highly respected Republican foreign policy beacon. In an address to the National Press Club, Lugar rejected the idea of moving forward with a multitiered national missile defense and instead called upon the Bush administration to reorient missile defense programs to focus on the existing, short-range missile threat and to redouble efforts to fight terrorism and provide for homeland security. He argued that longer-range missile defenses and space systems should be put off indefinitely, suggesting a significant difference of opinion with the Bush administration. Other concerned Republicans are echoing such thoughts in this spring’s congressional budget debates, particularly as politically risky deficit spending looms. Thus, although arms controllers may despair about current plans, there are good reasons to think that cooler heads can still prevail in the space weapons debate. Although missile defense of some sort may be inevitable, those who doubt the utility of space weapons represent a majority in Congress. This middle constituency is the one with whom the arms control community must open a dialogue. The problem today in trying to identify a defensible middle ground for space arms control is the lack of a formula to draw in these moderates, who do not want to be painted as “anti-missile defense.” Thus, a search to create new alternatives to the existing options and arguments must be undertaken.

Weaponization is politically controversial --- plan triggers partisan debates

McFaddin 98 (David W., Lieutenant Colonel – United States Air Force, “Can the Air Force Weaponize Space?”, Air War College Research Report, April, [http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/awc/98-173.pdf](http://www.ndu.edu/press/lib/pdf/spacepower/spacepower.pdf))

In dealing with Congress on space programs, it became apparent to me that not everyone agreed on interpretation of laws and treaties, not to mention national intent/policy. Concurrent with partisan political debates over the legality of putting weapons in space was the Air Force’s movement toward the Nation’s Air and Space Force to be followed by a transition to a Space and Air Force. With this Revolution in Military Affairs type of move into space control, today’s Air Force finds itself working to fulfil a vague National Space Policy by developing programs for, and methods of, space control. The dilemma encountered is one of being told to accomplish this without being given the required tools and permission to accomplish the task – for political reasons. Therefore, the Air Force finds itself trying to please two masters, the Administration and Congress, who have opposing viewpoints.

Space weaponization is broadly unpopular in Congress and with the military

Canada Newswire 6 (1-11, Lexis)

The Polaris Institute welcomes the inclusion of a commitment to "lead an international campaign at the United Nations to establish a treaty banning all weapons in space" in the Liberal election platform, leaked today. "This is a realistic and timely proposal, as international conditions are ripe for negotiations to ban all weapons in space, and Canada is well- positioned to provide leadership for such negotiations," said Steven Staples of the Polaris Institute. There has been, and will continue to be, resistance to the initiation of such negotiations from the Bush administration, requiring strong resolve from Canada. However, opposition to the weaponization of space in the U.S. is widespread in Congress, parts of the U.S. military, security policy establishment.

Plan causes a massive political backlash

Mitchell 1 (Gordon, Associate Professor and Director of Debate – University of Pittsburgh, et al., ISIS Briefing on Ballistic Missile Defense, July, [http://www.isisuk.demon.co.uk/0811/isis/uk/bmd/no6.html](http://www.popularmechanics.com/science/space/moon-mars/4212906?timestamp=1155773646&md5=nbdSk8IggXVhlJHMdBeJkw==&redirect=http://www.isisuk.demon.co.uk/0811/isis/uk/bmd/no6.html))

Since any US attempt to overtly seize military control of outer space would likely stir up massive political opposition both home and abroad, defence analyst James Oberg anticipates that 'the means by which the placement of space-based weapons will likely occur is under a second US space policy directive — that of ballistic missile defense… This could preempt any political umbrage from most of the world's influential nations while positioning the US as a guarantor of defense from a universally acclaimed threat'. 32 In this scenario, ABM Treaty breakout, conducted under the guise of missile defence, functions as a tripwire for unilateral US military domination of the heavens .

Bipartisan Congressional and public opposition to space militarization

**CISSM, 8** (Center for International and Security Studies @ Maryland, “ Large Majorities of Americans and Russians Oppose All Space Weapons,” Jan 23, <http://drum.lib.umd.edu/bitstream/1903/10631/3/CISSM_Space_Jan08_art.pdf>)

**Most Americans** and Russians agree that their governments should work together to prevent an arms race in space. Large majorities in both countries **favor unilateral restraint and a treaty that would keep space free of weapons.** A United States Air Force Defense Support System satellite used for infrared detection (Photo: USAF) Americans and Russians also support treaties that would prohibit countries from attacking or interfering with each others' satellites and from testing or deploying weapons designed to attack satellites. These are among the key findings of a WorldPublicOpinion.org poll of 1,247 Americans and 1,601 Russians developed in conjunction with the Center for International and Security Studies at the University of Maryland (CISSM). Knowledge Networks in the United States and the Levada Center in Russia conducted the interviews. Russia (67%) say that as long as no other country puts weapons into space, their own governments should also refrain from doing so. **Most** Russians (72%) and **Americans (80%)** also **favor a new treaty banning all weapons in space. Support for such a ban was strong among Americans even when they were presented counter arguments about the potential military advantages of deploying such systems. The US poll revealed strong bipartisan consensus on the issue. Majorities in both the Republican and Democratic parties believe the US government should refrain unilaterally from deploying space weapons.** There is also bipartisan backing for a treaty to ban these weapons, though support is higher among Democrats. Steven Kull, director of WorldPublicOpinion.org, noted that there was remarkable agreement within and between the two countries on the issue of space weapons. "**What is striking is the robust consensus among** Russians as well as Americans, and among **Republicans as well as Democrats that space should not be an arena for the major powers to compete for military advantage**," Kull said.

Empirically proven

Lambakis, 1 (Steven, Writer @ the Hoover Institution, “Space Weapons: Refuting the Critics,” Policy Review No 105, Feb 1, [http://www.hoover.org/publications/policy-review/article/6612](http://www.bartdenny.com/index.html), EMM)

**Clashes over the military use of space, usually a result of proposals to fund politically controversial weapons programs, have agitated and unsettled the country at various times throughout the space age**. But **though the world has changed, the intellectual and doctrinal foundations underlying the debate have not.**

Plan saps tons of PC - Congress opposes weaponization

Lambeth, 3 (Benjamin, PhD Political Science and Writer @ RAND, “Mastering the Ultimate High Ground: Next Steps in the Military Uses of Space,” Accessed on Spacedebate.org, [http://www.spacedebate.org/evidence/1415](https://mail.msu.edu/cgi-bin/webmail))

For the time being, **the idea of placing offensive weapons in space for use against terrestrial targets remains contrary to declared national policy, and there is no indication that the nation is anywhere near the threshold of deciding to weaponize space. Any truly serious steps toward acquiring a space force** application capability **will involve a momentous political decision that the nation's leadership has not yet shown itself ready to make**. As the Air Force's former deputy chief of staff for air and space operations, then Lieutenant General Robert Foglesong, noted, "if the policy decision is made to take our guns into space, that will be decided by our civilian leadership." Until that threshold is reached, **any talk of space weaponization will remain not only politically moot but needlessly provocative**, and military space activity will remain limited to enhancing terrestrial operations and controlling the ultimate high ground.

Plan drains Capital – Congress hates

Johnson, 7 – PhD and director of The Acronym Institute for Disarmament Diplomacy (Rebecca, the Acronym Institute [an Independent, not-for-profit research and advocacy organization working on disarmament, arms control, and security issues], “Space without Weapons.” October, http://www.acronym.org.uk/space/congo.htm)

To answer my first question: It appears quite clear from the documents and statements put out by the Bush administration during its first six years that an influential cadre has been pushing for the United States to design and deploy weapons for use in and from space. But despite the desire, **the weaponisation of space is far from being a***fait accompli***.** First, **Congress has proved less than persuaded of the need, particularly in view of high costs and technological hurdles**. (Add to this, their **concerns about the overstretch of the US budget with the war on Iraq, and in that context weaponising space is not a priority**.) Moreover, some **sceptics have voiced the conclusion that the weaponisation of space is only inevitable if the US itself drives a race to do so.**

No risk of political support – massive backlash as a result of the plan

Mueller, 6 (Karl, PhD and Political Scientist @ RAND, “Toward a U.S. Grand Strategy in Space,” March 10th, Washington Roundtable on Science and Public Policy, http://www.marshall.org/article.php?id=408, EMM)

The United States probably has – conceivably at least – the capability of doing that if we want. We are in a position where we could actually say, “Alright, space is so important to national security and global stability that it needs to be handled by someone responsible. Guess what – we’re it!” **So the United States develops space weapons first** and says, “Alright, nobody goes into space and does anything there without our permis-sion.” **This would obviously be quite a sensational political thing to do. It would be expensive monetarily and politically. The political investment would be very large and before you embark on a path that involves that as your desired end-state, you need to be sure you actually want to go there.** Another analogy here: it is like trying to corner the gold market. Buying so much gold that you corner the market would be very, very profitable. Buying a whole lot of gold and not cornering the market is just putting a lot of money into an investment with a very poor return. So you want to be pretty clear about whether you are going to be able to achieve the end-state you envision before you embark on a path that leads in that direction.

Space weapons unpopular with policymakers

Grego & Wright, 10(Laura Grego, Senior Scientist in the Global Security Program of the Union of Concerned Scientists, David Wright, Senior Scientist and co-director of the UCS Global Security Program, 2010, “Securing the Skies; Ten Steps the United States Should Take to Improve the Security and Sustainability of Space, http://www.ucsusa.org/assets/documents/nwgs/securing-the-skies-full-report-1.pdf)

**Stationing destructive weapons in space is without precedent. Despite research and development efforts over the years, no dedicated space weapons are known to have been deployed. This has been the case for various reasons, the main ones being that they are** costly, technically challenging to develop, and **unpopular with policy makers and the public.**

The plan is political unfeasible – aff authors agree

Dolman and Cooper, 11 (Everett, PhD and Professor of Comparative Military Studies @ US Air Force School of Advanced Air and Space Studies and Recipient of Central Intelligence’s Outstanding Intelligence Analyst Award, and Henry, Former Deputy for the Strategic and Space Systems, “Chapter 19: Increasing the Military Uses of Space,” Part of “Toward a Theory of Spacepower,” Edited by Charles Lutes and Peter Hays, National Defense University Press, [http://www.ndu.edu/press/lib/pdf/spacepower/spacepower.pdf](http://www.heraldextra.com/component/option,com_contentwire/task,view/id,61544/Itemid,53/))

Within about 15 years of Arnold's comments, Soviet ICBMs armed with nuclear warheads did indeed have the ability to threaten Washington, but over 40 years later, **America's ability to reliably defend itself from ICBMs remains minimal—due** not to technology limitations but **to long-standing policy and political constraints. To understand the passion of the current opposition to space weapons, one must look into the** fundamental issue of the **Cold War: nuclear weapons deployed at a scale to threaten the existence of all life on the planet. The specter of potential nuclear devastation was so horrendous that a neo-ideal of a world without war became a political imperative.** Longstanding realist preference for peace through strength was stymied by the invulnerability of ballistic missiles traveling at suborbital velocities. Thus, **America accepted a policy of assured and mutual destruction to deter its opponents in a horrible** (if effective) **balance of terror. This meant it became politically infeasible even to contemplate shooting down missiles aimed at America or its allies**— especially from machines in space that might prove so efficient as to force an opponent to strike while it could, before such a system became operational.

Even amid fears of space inferiority, weaponization is still politically explosive

Moltz, 7 (James, PhD and Associate Professor for Security Studies @ Naval Postgraduate School, “ Protecting Safe Access to Space: Lessons from the First 50 Years of Space Security,” Space Policy Vol 23, November, Accessed on Spacedebate.org, [http://www.spacedebate.org/evidence/3150](http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1147/1))

But **the combined impact of sharply elevated defense spending for** the wars in **Afghanistan and Iraq, a series of now-familiar technical problems in developing space-based missile defenses, and the unwillingness of most Democratic and many Republican members of Congress to move hastily into the weaponization of space** before understanding its likely costs and geopolitical implications, **led to the scaling back of many of these programs** by mid-2006. In November 2006, **the Democrats**' seizure of both houses of Congress in the mid-term elections **seemed to end any realistic prospects for near-term deployment of space weapons.** Or did it? **China's successful test of an ASAT weapon in** January **2007 shocked the US political establishment. Proponents of space defenses, like** Republican Senator Jon **Kyl, argued for near-term deployment of orbital ASAT weapons, seeing China's action as the start of a space arms race** that the USA could not afford to lose. **But his calls fell upon deaf ears even among most of his fellow Republican members of Congress, as other defense priorities dominated their attention and the new Democratic majority all but eliminated prospects of significant new funding**. Previous, rosy predictions of an era of unchallenged US "space dominance" now seemed hopelessly unattainable after just one Chinese test.

Drains Capital – Congressional and public backlash

Hitchens, 05 (Theresa Hitchens, Vice President of the Center for Defense Information, “U.S. Military Space Policy and Strategy”, Sept 14, 2005, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/meetdocs/2004\_2009/documents/dv/hitchens-05\_12\_01\_/hitchens-05\_12\_01\_en.pdf)

What I can also say is that even if the new presidential policy blesses the Pentagon’s space warfare strategy, it remains unclear whether Congress will be willing to fund it much beyond basic technology research. Space is an exceedingly expensive place. Tofully implement the capabilities necessary to fight “in, from and through” space, hundreds of billions would have to be dedicated to developing new weapons, launching thousands of new on-orbit assets, and maintaining those systems once they are deployed. With launch costs remaining at $22,000 per kilogram, and current satellites in LEO weighing up to 4,000 kilograms, the price tag rapidly becomes exorbitant – hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars. **Further, Congress is already expressing concerns about** **the costs of today’s Air Force space programs that have nothing to do with controversial** **ASAT or space-strike systems.** **Programs such as the Transformational Satellite System** **designed to replace current military communications satellites, and the Space Radar to** **replace aging U.S. early warning satellites, are years behind schedule and tens of millions** **of dollars over budget. Congressional reaction to Air Force budget requests for new** **space weapons programs** based on unproven and yet undeveloped technologies **may well** **not be all that favorable. In addition, space weapons remain controversial politically and** **the concept unpopular with broad U.S. public opinion** – and a unilateral move by the United States to weaponize space is likely to also face harsh international political resistance and possible backlash as other nations seek to compete with their own space weapons programs.

## Link: Weaponization – Flip Flop

Plan’s an enormous flipflop - Obama promised to eliminate all space weapons

Gilbert, 10 (Jo-Anne, Griffith Asia Institute @ Griffith University, “ A SPOON FULL OF SUGAR MAKES THE MEDICINE GO DOWN? AN ANALYSIS OF THE OBAMA ADMINISTRATION’S ‘NEW’ NATIONAL SPACE POLICY,” 8/9, [http://sustainablesecurity.org/article/spoon-full-sugar-makes-medicine-go-down-analysis-obama-administration%E2%80%99s-%E2%80%98new%E2%80%99-national-space](http://www.chron.com/disp/story.mpl/nation/6780240.html))

On 28 June 2010, US President Barack **Obama released a new**, and much anticipated **National Space Policy (NSP) document. In contrast to the bellicose** and unilateral **tone of** George W. **Bush’s** 2006 **policy, the 2010 document is replete with references to ‘international cooperation’ and ‘responsibility.’ When taken with Obama’s campaign promise to pursue a “world-wide ban” on space weapons(**1) **and overtures to the Conference on Disarmament that the US is prepared to negotiate international arms control agreements regarding space, those opposed to the weaponisation of space might have some cause for optimism that the US has stepped back from setting a dangerous precedent.**

Flip-flops destroy the agenda

Goddard, 9 (Taegan, Creator – Political Wire, (One of the Most Widely-Read and Influential Political Web Sites on the Internet), "Does Obama Practice a Different Kind of Politics?", CQ Politics, 3-19, http://innovation.cq.com/ liveonline/51/landing)  
#  Dan from Philadelphia: How quickly is Obama burning through his political capital? Will he have anything left to actually keep some of his promises? With potential shifts from his campaign stanceson the question of Gitmo, Iraq troop withdrawals and taxing employer healthcare benefits, it seems he is in for tough fights on all fronts.  
# Taegan Goddard: That's a great question. I think Obama spends some of his political capital every time he makes an exception to his principles -- such as hiring a lobbyist to a key position or overlooking an appointee not paying their taxes. **Policy reversals** such as the ones you note **burn through even more of this precious capital**.

## Link: Weather Satellites

WEATHER SATELLITES GET DRAGGED INTO THE CLIMATE DEBATE – SAPS CAPITAL.

BOYLE 11. [Rebecca, reporter, “As Congress fusesses over climate semantics, the US faces a weather satellite gap” Popular Science, May 23 -- http://www.popsci.com/technology/article/2011-05/satellite-funding-cuts-us-could-face-weather-satellite-gap]

As Congress Fusses Over Climate Semantics, the U.S. Faces a Weather Satellite Gap Weather monitoring is vital, but don't mention the C-word This year has seen some phenomenally bizarre weather, from deadly tornadoes ripping through the Midwest and South to historic snowmelt-related flooding on the Mississippi River. Most hurricane forecasters are saying it’s about to get worse — the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration projected Thursday that the Atlantic basin is likely to see 12 to 18 named storms this season. Amid all this, the country’s future weather prediction capabilities could be stymied by a battle in Washington. During the budget battle earlier this spring, Congress cut funding for a new polar-orbiting satellite, which is designed to monitor atmospheric temperatures and pressure, severe weather, fires and other manmade and natural disasters, and to provide continuous climate data. If it does not get built, the country faces a satellite gap, which could affect forecasters’ ability to predict the weather. The key word here is climate. “Weather is apolitical, but climate is unfortunately not,” Bill Sullivan, a director at Raytheon Intelligence and Information Systems and program manager for the new satellite, said in an interview. NOAA Administrator Jane Lubchenco said at a news conference Thursday that the agency’s satellite program is in limbo. This is at least the fourth time in the past few years that a climate-monitoring project has fallen victim to either terrible luck or bad politics. First the Orbiting Carbon Observatory failed to reach orbit, then NASA’s aerosol-monituring Glory mission also died during launch. Last month we told you about the Deep Space Climate Observatory, languishing in a box in Maryland. Now a satellite called JPSS is in danger of losing its funding. Here’s a bit of history: Until last year, NASA, NOAA and the Department of Defense were going to share a brand-new polar-orbiting satellite called the National Polar Orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite System (NPOESS). But after a few years of planning and design work, the government decided the military and civilian agencies didn’t play well together and divorced the project, giving the DOD its own satellite. The existing civilian project, called NPP for NPOESS Preparatory Project, will serve NASA and NOAA only, and is planned for launch in October. It just completed a thermal test. It is supposed to have a companion successor called the Joint Polar Satellite System, and NOAA requested $1.06 billion in this year’s budget to build it. Then the federal budget stalemate happened, and everything was funded at 2010 levels as Congress and the White House wrangled. “The message that was getting to Congress was that NOAA needed a billion dollars to do climate research,” said Sullivan, who is Raytheon’s program manager for the JPSS. As a result, the funding was not approved.

OIL AND GAS LOBBIES FIGHT SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH.

LA TIMES 11. [“NASA launch failure is a blow to climate science” March 7 -- http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/greenspace/2011/03/nasa-glory-satellite-climate-change-science.html]

The crash of a NASA rocket bearing a sophisticated observation satellite has dealt a major setback to scientific efforts aimed at understanding how humans are affecting Earth’s climate. A nine-story Taurus XL rocket carrying the agency’s Glory satellite was launched early Friday from Vandenburg Air Force base. But it crashed into the Pacific Ocean without reaching orbit, after the satellite’s protective casing failed to open. The satellite carried equipment to help scientists understand how the sun and particles of matter in the atmosphere called aerosols affect Earth’s climate. Scientists said the new instruments would have been able to distinguish more accurately than ever the difference between such natural particles as desert dust, and particles from human activities such as burning coal and using nitrate fertilizers. "The loss of the Glory satellite is a serious setback to our capacity to continue observations critical to understanding and predicting the earth's climate," said Greg Holland, director of the Earth System Laboratory of the National Center for Atmospheric Research, based in Boulder, Co. The failure of the $424-million mission comes at a time of heightened controversy over the accuracy of climate predictions, with the oil and coal industries attacking the integrity of scientific research and seeking to halt government efforts to limit the burning of fossil fuel.

Funding for weather satellites unpopular – JPSS proves

FOUST 11. [Jeff Bachelor's degree in geophysics Cal Tech, Ph.D. in planetary sciences from MIT Space Politics, “A “pretty bleak picture” for a weather satellite program,” 6/10/2011, http://www.spacepolitics.com/2011/06/10/a-pretty-bleak-picture-for-a-weather-satellite-program/]

If the data provided by polar-orbiting satellites is so crucial to weather forecasting, why is it so difficult to win funding to keep the JPSS satellites on schedule? Sullivan blamed the difficulties in getting a “ramp” of funding needed for development programs in general, and in the current fiscal environment in particular. “You end up with three years in a row where you have to provide a large slug of procurement dollars to keep the program moving on the pace you originally projected,” she said. “Washington doesn’t like budget ramps. Washington likes nice, easy increments.” Combine that with current pressures to reduce federal spending, she added, and “you have the perfect storm of misaligned fiscal biorhythms.” (One contributing factor she didn’t dwell upon was the predecessor of JPSS, the National Polar-orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite System (NPOESS), which suffered delays and cost overruns so severe that last year the administration effectively cancelled it, breaking it into separate civil and defense programs.) Sullivan said NOAA was working with the administration and Congress to try and secure sufficient funding for JPSS in future years’ budgets. “We’re working on a daily basis with OMB and the Congress to see what can be done to ameliorate this problem for the current year and set up for the years ahead in the next rounds of budgeting,” she said. She added that NOAA was also looking for potential commercial and international partnerships to address the potential data gap. “We’re working so very hard to do everything we can to assure the continuity of this program, these observations,” she said. “It will be a sad and terrible day to retreat decades back on that service capability.”

Weather monitoring satellites unpopular – GOP wants to cut funding

Conathan 11 (Michael Conathan , the Director of Ocean Policy at Center for American progress,

Science Progress of Center for American Progress, “House GOP Still Says Accurate Weather Forecasting and Hurricane Tracking are Luxuries America Can’t Afford”, 17 March 2011, < <http://www.scienceprogress.org/2011/03/house-gop-doubles-down-on-cuts-to-weather-hurricane-and-climate-tracking/>>)

Last month, CAP and Climate Progress reported on House Republicans’ shortsighted attempt to obliterate funding for new environmental monitoring satellites—the sole source of some data for weather and climate forecasters.On Tuesday, in its latest three-week extension of government spending, the GOP, apparently not content with the depth of its evisceration, upped the ante by voting to cut an additional $115 million from NOAA’s Acquisition account.As we wrote in February after the initial cuts passed the House: At least an 18-month gap in coverage will be unavoidable without adequate funding for new polar-orbiting satellites this year. More troubling, taking an acquisition program offline and then restarting the process at a later date would lead to cost increases of as much as three to five times the amount the government would have to spend for the same product today. So here’s the choice: Spend $700 million this year for continuous service or $2 billion to $3.5 billion at some point in the future for the same equipment and a guaranteed service interruption.The tragic events in Japan serve as the most recent reminder that betting against Mother Nature is a losing proposition, yet House Republicans seem intent on insisting they can protect Americans without adequate information. They know the hurricanes, tornadoes, and floods are coming. Apparently we simply can’t afford to know without.

# \*GENERAL INTERNALS

## OBAMA GETS CREDIT/BLAME

Obama is the Velcro president – all agency action links.

Nicholas and Hook 10. (Peter and Janet, Staff Writers – LA Times, “Obama the Velcro president”, LA Times, 7-30, http://articles.latimes.com/2010/jul/30/nation/la-na-velcro-presidency-20100730/3)

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 ensnared in 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. What's not sticking to Obama is a legislative track record that his recent predecessors might envy. Political dividends from passage of a healthcare 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% approve of Obama's job performance, compared with 47% 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 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% of the population rated unemployment and the economy as the nation's most important problem. By contrast, only 7% cited healthcare — 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% lower. Yet, Americans aren't apt to cheer when something bad doesn't materialize. Unemployment has been rising — from 7.7% when Obama took office, to 9.5%. Last month, more than 2 million homes in the U.S. were in various stages of foreclosure — up from 1.7 million when Obama was sworn in. "Folks just aren't in a mood to hand out gold stars when unemployment is hovering around 10%," said Paul Begala, a Democratic pundit. Insulating the president from bad news has proved impossible. Other White Houses have tried doing so with more success. Reagan's Cabinet officials often took the blame, shielding the boss. But the Obama administration is about one man. Obama is the White House's chief spokesman, policy pitchman, fundraiser and negotiator. No Cabinet secretary has emerged as an adequate surrogate. Treasury Secretary Timothy F. Geithner is seen as a tepid public speaker; Energy Secretary Steven Chu is prone to long, wonky digressions and has rarely gone before the cameras during an oil spill crisis that he is working to end. So, more falls to Obama, reinforcing the Velcro effect: Everything sticks to him. He has opined on virtually everything in the hundreds of public statements he has made: nuclear arms treaties, basketball star LeBron James' career plans; Chelsea Clinton's wedding. Few audiences are off-limits. On Wednesday, he taped a spot on ABC's "The View," drawing a rebuke from Democratic Pennsylvania Gov. Edward G. Rendell, who deemed the appearance unworthy of the presidency during tough times. "Stylistically he creates some of those problems," Eddie Mahe, a Republican political strategist, said in an interview. "His favorite pronoun is 'I.' When you position yourself as being all things to all people, the ultimate controller and decision maker with the capacity to fix anything, you set yourself up to be blamed when it doesn't get fixed or things happen." A new White House strategy is to forgo talk of big policy changes that are easy to ridicule. Instead, aides want to market policies as more digestible pieces. So, rather than tout the healthcare package as a whole, advisors will talk about smaller parts that may be more appealing and understandable — such as barring insurers from denying coverage based on preexisting conditions. But at this stage, it may be late in the game to downsize either the president or his agenda. Sen. Richard J. Durbin (D-Ill.) said: "The man came in promising change. He has a higher profile than some presidents because of his youth, his race and the way he came to the White House with the message he brought in. It's naive to believe he can step back and have some Cabinet secretary be the face of the oil spill. The buck stops with his office."

OBAMA WILL GET THE BLAME FOR ALL POLICIES PASSED – THE HILL IS TOO POLARIZED FOR ANY BLAME DEFLECTION.

Politico 9. [2-13-09 -- http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0209/18827.html]

The Washington climate, which led to a party-line vote on the stimulus, has big political implications: It means that Obama will have sole ownership -- whether that means credit or blame -- for all the massive changes in government he envisions over the coming year.

**PRESIDENTS ARE THE FOCAL POINT OF POLITICS – THEY GET THE CREDIT/BLAME.**

CNN Late Edition with Wolf Blitzer 4/28/02

Bruce Morton, Cnn Correspondent: Networks will often air whatever the president says, even if he's praising the Easter Bunny. Blitzer: Competing for face time on the cable news networks. Stay with us. Blitzer: Welcome back. Time now for Bruce Morton's essay on the struggle for balanced coverage on the cable networks. Morton: The Democrats have written the three cable news networks -- CNN, Fox and MSNBC -- complaining that the Bush administration gets much more coverage than elected Democrats. They cite CNN, which they say, from January 1 through March 21, aired 157 live events involving the Bush administration, and 7 involving elected Democrats. Fox and MS, they say, did much the same thing. The coverage gap is certainly real, for several reasons. First, since September 11, the U.S. has been at war in Afghanistan, so the president has been an active commander in chief. And covering the war, networks will often air whatever the president says, even if he's praising the Easter Bunny. Plus, the White House press secretary's briefing, the Pentagon's, maybe the State Department's. Why not? It's easy, it's cheap, the cameras are pooled, and in war time, the briefings may make major news. You never know. But there's a reason for the coverage gap that's older than Mr. Bush's administration. In war or peace, the president is a commanding figure -- one man to whose politics and character and, nowadays, sex life, endless attention is paid. Congress is 535 people. What it does is complicated, compromises on budget items done in private, and lacks the drama of the White House. There's a primetime TV show about a president. None about the Congress. If a small newspaper has one reporter in Washington, he'll cover two things, the local congressional delegation and, on big occasions, the White House. So the complaining Democrats have a point, but it's worth remembering that coverage of a president, while always intense, isn't always positive. You could ask the Clintons. 9 Presidents will always get more coverage than Congresses. They're sexier. But it won't always be coverage they like.

PRESIDENCY IS THE FOCAL POINT OF POLITICS – PRESIDENT GETS THE CREDIT OR THE BLAME, DESERVED OR NOT

**Rosati 4***. [Jerel A., University of South Carolina Government and International Studies professor THE POLITICS OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY, 2004, p. 80]*

*Given the popular image of presidential power,* presidents receive credit when things are perceived as going well and are blamed when things go badly. Unfortunately, American politics and the policy process are incredibly complex and beyond considerable presidential control. With so many complex issues and problems to address *– the debt problem, the economy, energy, welfare, education, the environment, foreign policy –* this is a very demanding time to be president*. As long as presidential promises and public expectations remain high, the president’s job becomes virtually an impossible task. Should success occur, given the lack of presidential power, it is probably not by the president’s own design. Nonetheless,* the president *– the person perceived to be the leader of the country –* will be rewarded in terms of public prestige, greater power, and reelection *(for him or his successor). However,* if the president is perceived as unsuccessful – a failure – this results not only in a weakened presidentbut one the public wants replaced, creating the opportunity to challenge an incumbent president or his heir as presidential nominee.

## OBAMA PUSH

Only Obama involvement gets plan passed

General Hamel et. al, 09– Michael A., Lt. General (retired), USAF (3/10/10, The Committee for US Space Leadership, “MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT: America’s Leadership in Space,” http://spacepolicyonline.com/pages/images/stories/Memo\_For\_the\_President\_March\_10\_20091.pdf)

Just as the mastery and use of the maritime and air domains helped define the course of world affairs and the histories of the 19th and 20th centuries, so too mastery of space will be a defining feature of the 21st century. Loss of our strategic advantage in space would have acute consequences, both symbolic and substantive, on U.S. standing in the world and erode capabilities crucial to the nation’s security and prosperity in the decades ahead. We know the formula for success in space. It takes the right skills, hard work, and effective management, starting at the top. Strong White House leadership is essential to putting the national space enterprise on an effective new course, which in turn will be highly supportive and synergistic with your broader agenda, priorities, and goals for the nation. Nearly fifty years ago, a new President challenged America to become the world leader in space, to send Americans to the moon and return them safely to Earth within a decade. America succeeded in achieving President Kennedy’s vision, and the nation has benefited beyond imagination from meeting that challenge. America is at a new crossroads, and we need our new President to inspire the nation with a space vision and government actions to assure our continued leadership in the 2s1t century.

Plan requires presidential involvement – means Obama gets the blame

Marcia Smith ’11 Smith is President of the Space and Technology Policy Group, LLC, which specializes in news, information and analysis of civil, military and commercial space programs and other technology areas. From March 2006-March 2009, Ms. Smith was Director of the Space Studies Board (SSB) at the National Research Council (NRC), “Last Man on Moon and Space Policy Expert Dismayed at State of U.S. Human Spaceflight Program” 5/25 http://spacepolicyonline.com/pages/index.php?option=com\_content&view=article&id=1591:last-man-on-moon-and-space-policy-expert-dismayed-at-state-of-us-human-spaceflight-program&catid=67:news&Itemid=27

Logsdon recounted the key points of his new book, John F. Kennedy and the Race to the Moon, emphasizing that JFK was not a space visionary, but a President coping with Cold War realities.   In his op-ed for the Orlando Sentinel today, Logsdon suggested that JFK could be a role model for President Obama in remaining closely involved in space program decisions.  "If President Obama hopes for a positive space legacy, he needs to emulate John Kennedy; without sustained presidential leadership, NASA will continue to lack the focus required for a space effort producing acknowledged international leadership and national pride in what the United States accomplishes," Logsdon wrote.

Executive Controls Space Policy – Obama Push Is Required

G. Ryan Faith ’10G. Ryan Faith is an independent technology consultant and Adjunct Fellow for Space Initiatives at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, (CSIS). “President Obama’s Vision for Space Exploration (part 2)” 4/26 [http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1616/1](http://www.thespacereview.com/article/41/1)

One thing that President Obama can learn from the fate of his predecessor’s plan for space exploration is that continued, periodic political support at the Presidential level is of great importance—or is perceived to be within the space community—because of the sentiment that the national space exploration program is a tool to be used by and within the prerogative of the executive. Should international cooperation play a greater role in American plans in the near future, engagement by the President and State Department on behalf of NASA will be quite valuable.

## CAPITAL KEY/A2: DICKINSON

Prefer our ev – its specific to PC and vote switching in context of skfta

Their ev is just a blog post, not peer reviewed and solely in the context of Supreme court nominations – Dickinson concludes neg

Dickinson, , 2009 (Matthew, professor of political science at Middlebury College. He taught previously at Harvard University, where he also received his Ph.D., working under the supervision of presidential scholar Richard Neustadt, We All Want a Revolution: Neustadt, New Institutionalism, and the Future of Presidency Research, Presidential Studies Quarterly 39 no4 736-70 D 2009)

Small wonder, then, that initial efforts to find evidence of presidential power centered on explaining legislative outcomes in Congress. Because scholars found it difficult to directly and systematically measure presidential influence or "skill," however, they often tried to estimate it indirectly, after first establishing a baseline model that explained these outcomes on other factors, including party strength in Congress, members of Congress's ideology, the president's electoral support and/or popular approval, and various control variables related to time in office and political and economic context. With the baseline established, one could then presumably see how much of the unexplained variance might be attributed to presidents, and whether individual presidents did better or worse than the model predicted. Despite differences in modeling assumptions and measurements, however, these studies came to remarkably similar conclusions: individual presidents did not seem to matter very much in explaining legislators' voting behavior or lawmaking outcomes (but see Lockerbie and Borrelli 1989, 97-106). As Richard Fleisher, Jon Bond, and B. Dan Wood summarized, "[S]tudies that compare presidential success to some baseline fail to find evidence that perceptions of skill have systematic effects" (2008, 197; see also Bond, Fleisher, and Krutz 1996, 127; Edwards 1989, 212). To some scholars, these results indicate that Neustadt's "president-centered" perspective is incorrect (Bond and Fleisher 1990, 221-23). In fact, the aggregate results reinforce Neustadt's recurring refrain that presidents are weak and that, when dealing with Congress, a president's power is "comparably limited" (Neustadt 1990, 184). The misinterpretation of the findings as they relate to PP stems in part from scholars' difficulty in defining and operationalizing presidential influence (Cameron 2000b; Dietz 2002, 105-6; Edwards 2000, 12; Shull and Shaw 1999). But it is also that case that scholars often misconstrue Neustadt's analytic perspective; his description of what presidents must do to influence policy making does not mean that he believes presidents are the dominant influence on that process. Neustadt writes from the president's perspective, but without adopting a president-centered explanation of power. Nonetheless, if Neustadt clearly recognizes that a president's influence in Congress is exercised mostly, as George Edwards (1989) puts it, "at the margins," his case studies in PP also suggest that, within this limited bound, presidents do strive to influence legislative outcomes. But how? Scholars often argue that a president's most direct means of influence is to directly lobby certain members of Congress, often through quid pro quo exchanges, at critical junctures during the lawmaking sequence. Spatial models of legislative voting suggest that these lobbying efforts are most effective when presidents target the median, veto, and filibuster "pivots" within Congress. This logic finds empirical support in vote-switching studies that indicate that presidents do direct lobbying efforts at these pivotal voters, and with positive legislative results. Keith Krehbiel analyzes successive votes by legislators in the context of a presidential veto and finds "modest support for the sometimes doubted stylized fact of presidential power as persuasion" (1998,153-54). Similarly, David Brady and Craig Volden look at vote switching by members of Congress in successive Congresses on nearly identical legislation and also conclude that presidents do influence the votes of at least some legislators (1998, 125-36). In his study of presidential lobbying on key votes on important domestic legislation during the 83rd (1953-54) through 108th (2003-04) Congresses, Matthew Beckman shows that in addition to these pivotal voters, presidents also lobby leaders in both congressional parties in order to control what legislative alternatives make it onto the congressional agenda (more on this later). These lobbying efforts are correlated with a greater likelihood that a president's legislative preferences will come to a vote (Beckmann 2008, n.d.). In one of the most concerted efforts to model how bargaining takes place at the individual level, Terry Sullivan examines presidential archives containing administrative headcounts to identify instances in which members of Congress switched positions during legislative debate, from initially opposing the president to supporting him in the final roll call (Sullivan 1988,1990,1991). Sullivan shows that in a bargaining game with incomplete information regarding the preferences of the president and members of Congress, there are a number of possible bargaining outcomes for a given distribution of legislative and presidential policy preferences. These outcomes depend in part on legislators' success in bartering their potential support for the president's policy for additional concessions from the president. In threatening to withhold support, however, members of Congress run the risk that the president will call their bluff and turn elsewhere for the necessary votes. By capitalizing on members' uncertainty regarding whether their support is necessary to form a winning coalition, Sullivan theorizes that presidents can reduce members of Congress's penchant for strategic bluffing and increase the likelihood of a legislative outcome closer to the president's preference. "Hence, the skill to bargain successfully becomes a foundation for presidential power even within the context of electorally determined opportunities," Sullivan concludes (1991, 1188). Most of these studies infer presidential influence, rather than measuring it directly (Bond, Fleisher, and Krutz 1996,128-29; see also Edwards 1991). Interestingly, however, although the vote "buying" approach is certainly consistent with Neustadt's bargaining model, none of his case studies in PP show presidents employing this tactic. The reason may be that Neustadt concentrates his analysis on the strategic level: "Strategically the question is not how he masters Congress in a peculiar instance, but what he does to boost his mastery in any instance" (Neustadt 1990, 4). For Neustadt, whether a president's lobbying efforts bear fruit in any particular circumstance depends in large part on the broader pattern created by a president's prior actions when dealing with members of Congress (and "Washingtonians" more generally). These previous interactions determine a president's professional reputation--the "residual impressions of [a president's] tenacity and skill" that accumulate in Washingtonians' minds, helping to "heighten or diminish" a president's bargaining advantages. "Reputation, of itself, does not persuade, but it can make persuasions easier, or harder, or impossible" (Neustadt 1990, 54).

Ideology doesn’t outweigh – presidential success dictates votes

Lebo, 2010 (Matthew J. Lebo, Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, Stony Brook University, and Andrew O'Geen, PhD Candidate, Department of Political Science, Stony Brook University, Journal of Politics, “The President’s Role in the Partisan Congressional Arena” forthcoming, google)

Keeping this centrality in mind, we use established theories of congressional parties to model the president’s role as an actor within the constraints of the partisan environment of Congress. We also find a role for the president's approval level, a variable of some controversy in the presidential success literature. Further, we are interested in both the causes and consequences of success. We develop a theory that views the president’s record as a key component of the party politics that are so important to both the passage of legislation and the electoral outcomes that follow. Specifically, theories of partisan politics in Congress argue that cross-pressured legislators will side with their parties in order to enhance the collective reputation of their party (Cox and McCubbins 1993, 2005), but no empirical research has answered the question: "of what are collective reputations made?" We demonstrate that it is the success of the president – not parties in Congress – that predicts rewards and punishments to parties in Congress. This allows us to neatly fit the president into existing theories of party competition in Congress while our analyses on presidential success enable us to fit existing theories of party politics into the literature on the presidency.

Studies prove issues spillover—the president is key.

Eshbaugh-Soha, M. (2008). Policy Priorities and Presidential Success in Congress. Conference Papers -- American Political Science Association, 1-26. Retrieved from Political Science Complete database.

Presidential-congressional relations are a central topic in the scientific study of politics. The literature is clear that a handful of variables strongly influence the likelihood of presidential success on legislation. Of these variables, party control of Congress is most important (Bond and Fleisher 1990), in that conditions of unified government increase, while conditions of divided government decrease presidential success, all else equal. The president’s approval ratings (Edwards 1989) and a favorable honeymoon (Dominguez 2005) period may also increase presidential success on legislation. In addition, presidential speeches that reference policies or roll-call votes tend to increase the president’s legislative success rate (Barrett 2004; Canes-Wrone 2001; Eshbaugh-Soha 2006). In their landmark examination of presidential success in Congress, Bond and Fleisher (1990, 230) identify yet another condition that may facilitate presidential success on legislation when they write that “the president’s greatest influence over policy comes from the agenda he pursues and the way it is packaged.” Moreover, the policies that the president prioritizes have “a major impact on the president’s relationship with Congress.” Taken together, these assertions strongly suggest that the policy content of the president’s legislative agenda—what policies the president prioritizes before Congress—should be a primary determinant of presidential success in Congress.

Capital determines agenda above all else

Light 99 – Senior Fellow at the Center for Public Service (Paul, the President’s Agenda, p. 34)

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.

Capital is key – it outweigh ideology, party support, or concessions

Light 99 – Senior Fellow at the Center for Public Service (Paul, the President’s Agenda, p. 24-25)

Call it push, pull, punch, juice, power, or clout – they all mean the same thing. The most basic and most important of all presidential resources is capital. Though the internal resources time, information, expertise, and energy all have an impact on the domestic agenda, the President is severely limited without capital. And capital is directly linked to the congressional parties. While there is little question that bargaining skills can affect both the composition and the success of the domestic agenda, without the necessary party support, no amount of expertise or charm can make a difference. Though bargaining is an important tool of presidential power, it does not take place in a neutral environment. Presidents bring certain advantages and disadvantages to the table.

## AT: POLITICAL CAPITAL KEY

CAPITAL NOT KEY TO THE AGENDA – LIMITED IMPACT.

SKOCPOL AND JACOBS 10. [Theda, Victor S. Thomas Professor of Government and Sociology at Harvard, former Director of the Center for American Political Studies, Lawrence, Walter F. and Joan Mondale Chair for Political Studies and Director of the Center for the Study of Politics and Governance in the Hubert H. Humphrey Institute and Department of Political Science at the University of Minnesota, “Hard Fought Legacy: Obama, congressional democrats, and the struggle for comprehensive health reform” Russell Sage Foundation -- October]

Although presidential power is widely credited with dictating public policy, the truth is that presidential influence over domestic law making is quite limited. Presidential speeches (as in the case of Obama‘s nationally televised September address to restart health reform) can influence the agenda of issues for DC insiders and all Americans. But Constitutional checks and balances prevent any president from having his way with Congress – and this situation was exacerbated in 2009 and 2010 by Republican obstructionist tactics. In practice, Obama and his aides were often little more than frustrated witnesses to Congressional maneuvers and delays.

POLITICAL CAPITAL IS IRRELEVANT -- EMPIRICALLY PROVEN.

Bond & Fleisher 96. [Jon R. and Richard, professor in Political Science - Texas A&M and Professor in Political Science. Fordham - 1996. "The President in Legislation”]

In sum, the evidence presented in this chapter provides little support for the theory that the president's perceived leadership, skills are associated with success on roll call votes in Congress. Presidents reputed as highly skilled do not win consistently more often than should be expected. Even the effects of the partisan balanced Congress, the president's popularity, and, the cycle of decreasing influence over the course of his term. Presidents reputed as unskilled do not win consistently less often relative to. More­over, skilled presidents do not win significantly more often than unskilled presidents on either important votes or close votes, in which skills have the greatest potential to affect the outcome. Because of the difficulty of establishing a definitive test of the skills theory, some may argue that it is premature to reject this explanation of presidential success based on the tests reported in this chapter. It might be argued that these findings by themselves do not deny that leadership skill is an important component of presidential-congressional relations. Failure to find systematic effects in general does not necessarily refute the anecdotes and case studies demonstrating the importance of skills.

PRESIDENTIAL CAPITAL ISN’T SIGNIFICANT – PARTY SUPPORT AND DIVISIONS ARE KEY

Bond & Fleisher 96. [Jon R. and Richard, professor in Political Science - Texas A&M and Professor in Political Science. Fordham - 1996. "The President in Legislation”]

Neustadt is correct that weak political parties in American politics do not bridge the gap created by the constitutional separation of powers. We would add: neither does skilled presidential leadership or popularity with the public. In fact, the forces that Neustadt stressed as the antidote for weak parties are even less successful in linking the president and Congress than are weak parties. Our findings indicate that members of Congress provide levels of support for the President that are generally consistent with their partisan and ideological predispositions. Because party and ideology are relatively stable, facing a Congress made up of more members predisposed to support the president does increase the likelihood of success on the floor. There is, however, considerable variation in the behavior of the party factions. As expected, cross-pressured members are typically divided, and when they unify, they unify against about as often as they unify for the president. Even members of the party bases who have reinforcing partisan and ideological predispositions frequently fail to unify for or against the president's position. Our analysis of party and committee leaders in Congress reveals that support from congressional leaders is associated with unity of the party factions. The party bases are likely to unify only if the party and committee leader of a party take the same position. But party and committee leaders within each party take opposing stands on a significant proportion of presidential roll calls. Because members of the party factions and their leaders frequently fail to unify around a party position, there is considerable uncertainty surrounding the outcome of presidential roll calls.

## WINNERS WIN

WINNERS WIN.

Singer 9 (Jonathan -- senior writer and editor for MyDD. Singer is perhaps best known for his various interviews with prominent politicians. His interviews have included John Kerry, Walter Mondale, Bob Dole, Michael Dukakis, and George McGovern, Barack Obama, John Edwards, and Tom Vilsack. He has also also interviewed dozens of senatorial, congressional and gubernatorial candidates all around the country. In his writing, Singer primarily covers all aspects of campaigns and elections, from polling and fundraising to opposition research and insider rumors. *He has been quoted or cited in this capacity* by Newsweek, The New York Times, USA Today, The Politico, and others. My Direct Democracy, 3-3-09, [http://www.mydd.com/story/2009/3/3/191825/0428](http://www.thespacereview.com/article/499/1))

From the latest NBC News-Wall Street Journal survey: Despite the country's struggling economy and vocal opposition to some of his policies, President Obama's favorability rating is at an all-time high. Two-thirds feel hopeful about his leadership and six in 10 approve of the job he's doing in the White House. "What is amazing here is how much political capital Obama has spent in the first six weeks," said Democratic pollster Peter D. Hart, who conducted this survey with Republican pollster Bill McInturff. "And against that, he stands at the end of this six weeks with as much or more capital in the bank." Peter Hart gets at a key point. Some believe that political capital is finite, that it can be used up. To an extent that's true. But it's important to note, too, that political capital can be regenerated -- and, specifically, that when a President expends a great deal of capital on a measure that was difficult to enact and then succeeds, he can build up more capital. Indeed, that appears to be what is happening with Barack Obama, who went to the mat to pass the stimulus package out of the gate, got it passed despite near-unanimous opposition of the Republicans on Capitol Hill, and is being rewarded by the American public as a result. Take a look at the numbers. President Obama now has a 68 percent favorable rating in the NBC-WSJ poll, his highest ever showing in the survey. Nearly half of those surveyed (47 percent) view him very positively. Obama's Democratic Party earns a respectable 49 percent favorable rating. The Republican Party, however, is in the toilet, with its worst ever showing in the history of the NBC-WSJ poll, 26 percent favorable. On the question of blame for the partisanship in Washington, 56 percent place the onus on the Bush administration and another 41 percent place it on Congressional Republicans. Yet just 24 percent blame Congressional Democrats, and a mere 11 percent blame the Obama administration. So at this point, with President Obama seemingly benefiting from his ambitious actions and the Republicans sinking further and further as a result of their knee-jerked opposition to that agenda, there appears to be no reason not to push forward on anything from universal healthcare to energy reform to ending the war in Iraq.

VICTORIES INCREASE CAPITAL.

**Lee 5** (Andrew, Claremont McKenna College, “Invest or Spend? Political Capital and Statements of Administration Policy in the First Term of the George W. Bush Presidency,” Georgia Political Science Association Conference Proceedings, http://a-s.clayton.edu/trachtenberg/2005%20Proceedings%20Lee.pdf)

To accrue political capital, the president may support a particular lawmaker’s legislation by issuing an SAP urging support, thereby giving that legislator more pull in the Congress and at home. The president may also receive capital from Congress by winning larger legislative majorities. For example, the president’s successful efforts at increasing Republican representation in the Senate and House would constitute an increase in political capital. The president may also receive political capital from increased job favorability numbers, following through with purported policy agendas, and defeating opposing party leaders (Lindberg 2004). Because political capital diminishes, a president can invest in policy and legislative victories to maintain or increase it. For example, President George W. Bush invests his political capital in tax cuts which he hopes will yield returns to the economy and his favorability numbers. By investing political capital, the president assumes a return on investment.

WINNERS WIN ON CONTROVERSIAL POLICIES.

**Ornstein 1** (Norman, American Enterprise Institute, “How is Bush Governing?” May 15, http://www.aei.org/events/filter.,eventID.281/transcript.asp)

The best plan is to pick two significant priorities, things that can move relatively quickly. And in an ideal world, one of them is going to be a little bit tough, where it's a battle, where you've got to fight, but then your victory is all the sweeter. The other matters but you can sweep through fairly quickly with a broad base of support and show that you're a winner and can accomplish something. Bush did just that, picking one, education, where there was a fairly strong chance. Something he campaigned on, people care about, and a pretty strong chance that he could get a bill through with 80, 85 percent support of both houses of Congress and both parties. And the other that he picked, and there were other choices, but he picked the tax cuts. What flows from that as well is, use every bit of political capital you have to achieve early victories that will both establish you as a winner, because the key to political power is not the formal power that you have. Your ability to coerce people to do what they otherwise would not do. Presidents don't have a lot of that formal power. It's as much psychological as it is real. If you're a winner and people think you're a winner, and that issues come up and they’re tough but somehow you're going to prevail, they will act in anticipation of that. Winners win. If it looks like you can't get things done, then you have a steeply higher hill to climb with what follows. And as you use your political capital, you have to recognize that for presidents, political capital is a perishable quality, that it evaporates if it isn't used. That's a lesson, by the way, George W. Bush learned firsthand from his father. That if you use it and you succeed, it's a gamble, to be sure, you'll get it back with a very healthy premium.

## WINNERS LOSE – A2 WINNERS WIN

WINNERS-LOSE FOR OBAMA

RYAN 9. [1-18 -- Selwyn Professor of Social Science at the Sir Arthur Lewis Institute of Social and Economic Studies, University of West Indies. Ph.D. in Political Science from Cornell, http://www.trinidadexpress.com/index.pl/article\_opinion?id=161426968]

Like many, I expect much from Obama, who for the time being, is my political beast of burden with whom every other politician in the world is unfavourably compared. As a political scientist, I however know that given the structure of American and world politics, it would be difficult for him to deliver half of what he has promised, let alone all of it. Reality will force him to make many "u" turns and detours which may well land him in quick sand. Obama will, however, begin his stint with a vast accumulation of political capital, perhaps more than that held by any other modern leader. Seventy-eight per cent of Americans polled believe that his inauguration is one of the most historic the country will witness. Political capital is, however, a lumpy and fast diminishing asset in today's world of instant communication, which once misspent, is rarely ever renewable. The world is full of political leaders like George Bush and Tony Blair who had visions, promised a lot, and probably meant well, but who did not know how to husband the political capital with which they were provided as they assumed office. They squandered it as quickly as they emptied the contents of the public vaults. Many will be watching to see how Obama manages his assets and liabilities register. Watching with hope would be the white young lady who waved a placard in Obama's face inscribed with the plaintive words, "I Trust You." Despite the general optimism about Obama's ability to deliver, many groups have already begun to complain about being betrayed. Gays, union leaders, and women have been loud in their complaints about being by-passed or overlooked. Some radical blacks have also complained about being disrespected. Where and when is Joshua going to lead them to the promised land, they ask? When is he going to pull the troops out of Iraq? Civil rights groups also expect Obama to dis-establish Guantanamo as soon as he takes office to signal the formal break with Dick Cheney and Bush. They also want him to discontinue the policy which allows intelligence analysts to spy on American citizens without official authorisation. In fact, Obama startled supporters when he signalled that he might do an about-turn and continue this particular policy. We note that Bush is signalling Obama that keeping America safe from terrorists should be his top priority item and that he, Bush, had no regrets about violating the constitutional rights of Americans if he had to do so to keep them safe. Cheney has also said that he would do it again if he had to. The safety of the republic is after all the highest law. Other groups-sub-prime home owners, workers in the automobile sector, and the poor and unemployed generally all expect Obama to work miracles on their behalf, which of course he cannot do. Given the problems of the economy which has not yet bottomed out, some promises have to be deferred beyond the first term. Groups, however, expect that the promise made to them during the campaign must be kept. Part of the problem is that almost every significant social or ethnic group believes that it was instrumental in Obama's victory. White women felt that they took Obama over the line, as did blacks generally, Jews, Hispanics, Asians, rich white men, gays, and young college kids, to mention a few of those whose inputs were readily recognisable. Obama also has a vast constituency in almost every country in the world, all of whom expect him to save the globe and the planet. Clearly, he is the proverbial "Black Knight on a White Horse." One of the "realities" that Obama has to face is that American politics is not a winner-take-all system. It is pluralistic vertically and horizontally, and getting anything done politically, even when the President and the Congress are controlled by the same party, requires groups to negotiate, bargain and engage in serious horse trading. No one takes orders from the President who can only use moral or political suasion and promises of future support for policies or projects. The system was in fact deliberately engineered to prevent overbearing majorities from conspiring to tyrannise minorities. The system is not only institutionally diverse and plural, but socially and geographically so. As James Madison put it in Federalist No 10, one of the foundation documents of republicanism in America, basic institutions check other basic institutions, classes and interests check other classes and interests, and regions do the same. All are grounded in their own power bases which they use to fend off challengers. The coalitions change from issue to issue, and there is no such thing as party discipline which translated, means you do what I the leader say you do. Although Obama is fully aware of the political limitations of the office which he holds, he is fully aware of the vast stock of political capital which he currently has in the bank and he evidently plans to enlarge it by drawing from the stock held by other groups, dead and alive. He is clearly drawing heavily from the caparisoned cloaks of Lincoln and Roosevelt. Obama seems to believe that by playing the all-inclusive, multipartisan, non-ideological card, he can get most of his programmes through the Congress without having to spend capital by using vetoes, threats of veto, or appeals to his 15 million strong constituency in cyberspace (the latent "Obama Party").

Link outweighs the link turn on timeframe

Silber 07 [PhD Political Science & Communication – focus on the Rhetoric of Presidential Policy-Making – Prof of Poli Sci – Samford, [Marissa, WHAT MAKES A PRESIDENT QUACK?, Prepared for delivery at the 2007 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, August 30th-September 2nd, 2007, UNDERSTANDING LAME DUCK STATUS THROUGH THE EYES OF THE MEDIA AND POLITICIANS]

Important to the discussion of political capital is whether or not it can be replenished over a term. If a President expends political capital on his agenda, can it be replaced? Light suggests that “capital declines over time – public approval consistently falls: midterm losses occur” (31). Capital can be rebuilt, but only to a limited extent. The decline of capital makes it difficult to access information, recruit more expertise and maintain energy. If a lame duck President can be defined by a loss of political capital, this paper helps determine if such capital can be replenished or if a lame duck can accomplish little. Before determining this, a definition of a lame duck President must be developed.

WINNERS WIN NOT TRUE FOR OBAMA.

GALSTON 10. [William, Senior Fellow, Governance Studies, Brookings, “President Barack Obama’s First Two Years: Policy Accomplishments, Political Difficulties” Brookings Institute -- Nov 4]

Second, the administration believed that success would breed success—that the momentum from one legislative victory would spill over into the next. The reverse was closer to the truth: with each difficult vote, it became harder to persuade Democrats from swing districts and states to cast the next one. In the event, House members who feared that they would pay a heavy price if they supported cap-and-trade legislation turned out to have a better grasp of political fundamentals than did administration strategists.

WINNERS DON’T WIN ON CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES – THE HILL IS TOO POLARIZED.

MANN 10. [Thomas, Senior Fellow, Governance Studies, “American Politics on the Eve of the Midterm Elections” Brookings Institute -- November]

That perception of failure has been magnified by the highly contentious process by which Obama’s initiatives have been adopted in Congress. America has in recent years developed a highly polarised party system, with striking ideological differences between the parties and unusual unity within each. But these parliamentary-like parties operate in a governmental system in which majorities are unable readily to put their programmes in place. Republicans adopted a strategy of consistent, unified, and aggressive opposition to every major component of the President’s agenda, eschewing negotiation, bargaining and compromise, even on matters of great national import. The Senate filibuster has been the indispensable weapon in killing, weakening, slowing, or discrediting all major legislation proposed by the Democratic majority.

WINNERS LOSE FOR OBAMA – LOSES THE SPIN GAME.

BAKER 10. [Peter, foreign policy reporter, author of Kremlin Rising: Vladimir Putin and Russian Counter-Revolution, “Education of a President” New York Times]

But it is possible to win the inside game and lose the outside game. In their darkest moments, White House aides wonder aloud whether it is even possible for a modern president to succeed, no matter how many bills he signs. Everything seems to conspire against the idea: an implacable opposition with little if any real interest in collaboration, a news media saturated with triviality and conflict, a culture that demands solutions yesterday, a societal cynicism that holds leadership in low regard. Some White House aides who were ready to carve a new spot on Mount Rushmore for their boss two years ago privately concede now that he cannot be another Abraham Lincoln after all. In this environment, they have increasingly concluded, it may be that every modern president is going to be, at best, average. “We’re all a lot more cynical now,” one aide told me. The easy answer is to blame the Republicans, and White House aides do that with exuberance. But they are also looking at their own misjudgments, the hubris that led them to think they really could defy the laws of politics. “It’s not that we believed our own press or press releases, but there was definitely a sense at the beginning that we could really change Washington,” another White House official told me. “ ‘Arrogance’ isn’t the right word, but we were overconfident.” The biggest miscalculation in the minds of most Obama advisers was the assumption that he could bridge a polarized capital and forge genuinely bipartisan coalitions. While Republican leaders resolved to stand against Obama, his early efforts to woo the opposition also struck many as halfhearted. “If anybody thought the Republicans were just going to roll over, we were just terribly mistaken,” former Senator Tom Daschle, a mentor and an outside adviser to Obama, told me. “I’m not sure anybody really thought that, but I think we kind of hoped the Republicans would go away. And obviously they didn’t do that.” Senator Dick Durbin, the No. 2 Democrat in the upper chamber and Obama’s ally from Illinois, said the Republicans were to blame for the absence of bipartisanship. “I think his fate was sealed,” Durbin said. “Once the Republicans decided they would close ranks to defeat him, that just made it extremely difficult and dragged it out for a longer period of time. The American people have a limited attention span. Once you convince them there’s a problem, they want a solution.” Gov. Ed Rendell of Pennsylvania, though, is among the Democrats who grade Obama harshly for not being more nimble in the face of opposition. “B-plus, A-minus on substantive accomplishments,” he told me, “and a D-plus or C-minus on communication.” The health care legislation is “an incredible achievement” and the stimulus program was “absolutely, unqualifiedly, enormously successful,” in Rendell’s judgment, yet Obama allowed them to be tarnished by critics. “They lost the communications battle on both major initiatives, and they lost it early,” said Rendell, an ardent Hillary Clinton backer who later became an Obama supporter. “We didn’t use the president in either stimulus or health care until we had lost the spin battle.”

STATISTICALLY -- WINS DON’T INFLUENCE FUTURE LEGISLATION.

Bond & Fleisher 96 [Jon R. and Richard. professor in Political Science - Texas A&M and Professor in Political Science. Fordham "The President in Legislation" p.223]

Presidency-centered variables, however, provide an even weaker explanation of presidential success. We found little support for the thesis that the weakness of legislative parties increases the importance of presidential skill or popularity for determining presidential success on roll call votes. Our analysis reveals that presidents reputed to be highly skilled do not win consistently more often than should be expected given the conditions they faced. Similarly, presidents reputed to be unskilled do not win significantly less often than expected. The analysis of presidential popularity reveals that the president's standing in the polls has only a marginal impact on the probability of success or failure.

## LOSERS LOSE

LOSERS LOSE – CLINTON PROVES.

**Galston and Kamarck 8** (William Galston and Elaine Kamarck, Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institution and Lecturer in Public Policy at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard, “Change You Can Believe In Needs a Government You Can Trust: A Third Way Report,” November, http://www.thirdway.org/data/product/file/176/Third\_Way\_-\_Trust\_in\_Government\_Report.pdf)

On day one of the Reagan presidency, the hostages came home from Iran. This success, though arguably not of President Reagan’s making, enhanced one of his central narratives—the importance of strength and resolve—and helped set the stage for the passage of his historic tax cut. By contrast, President Bill Clinton's opening days were marred by failed appointments to key positions, controversies over executive decisions, and a poorly conceived economic stimulus plan that lingered for months before succumbing. These early stumbles took the luster off the new administration, reinforced a negative impression of chaos and inexperience, and lowered the president’s approval rating, all of which complicated the task of enacting key proposals.

MORE EVIDENCE – PERCEPTION OF WINNING OR LOSING IS KEY.

**Ornstein 1** (Norman, American Enterprise Institute, September 10, Lexis)

The compromise accomplished two ends. First, it changed the agenda base of the issue. Patients' rights went from an issue where the only viable proposal was from Democrats (with GOP co-sponsors), which the President vowed to veto - to one where both Democrats and Bush are for patients' rights and merely differ on the details. Two, it gave the President a victory on the House floor when all the pundits predicted defeat - a major momentum builder. 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.

LOSERS LOSE -- CONGRESS ABANDONS SUPPORT.

LIGHT  99 *[Paul C., Senior Fellow at the Center for Public Service The President’s Agenda:  Domestic Policy Choice from Kennedy to Clinton, 3rd Edition p. 29]*

How does reputation affect presidential capital? According to Neustadt, professional reputation is a “cardinal factor in the President’s own power to persuade”: What me in government consider their relationships with him it does them little good to scan the Constitution or remind themselves that Presidents process potential vantage points in excess of enumerated powers. Their problem never is what abstract Presidents might do in theory but what an actual incumbent will try in fact. They must anticipate, as best they can, his ability and will to make use of the bargaining advantages he has. Out of what others think of him emerge his opportunities for influence with them. If he would maximize his prospects for effectiveness, he must concern himself with what they think. For Neustadt, the “greatest danger to President’s potential influence with [Congress] is not the show of incapacity he makes today but its apparent kinship to what happened yesterday, last month, last year. For if his failures seem to form a pattern, the consequence is bound to be a loss of faith in his effectiveness ‘next time.’”

## AT: LOSERS LOSE

Losers don’t necessarily lose- can still get big agenda items after a loss

Weisberg 5. (Jacob Weisberg, Editor, “Bush's First Defeat: The president has lost on Social Security. How will he handle it?” Slate, March 31, 2005, [http://www.slate.com/id/2115141/](http://blog.al.com/breaking/2011/06/nasa_supporters_find_no_white.html))

This means that Bush is about to suffer—and is actually in the midst of suffering—his first major political defeat. After passing all his most important first-term domestic priorities (a tax cut, an education-reform bill, domestic security legislation, another tax cut), Bush faces a second term that is beginning with a gigantic rebuke: A Congress solidly controlled by his own party is repudiating his top goal. It's precisely what happened to Bill Clinton, when Congress rejected his health-care reform proposal in 1993. As the Clinton example shows, such a setback doesn't doom an administration. But how Bush handles the defeat is likely to be a decisive factor in determining whether he accomplishes any of the other big-ticket items on his agenda.

## POPULARITY KEY -- OBAMA

POPULARITY KEY TO OBAMA’S AGENDA – KEY TO GARNER SWING VOTES.

**Silver 8** (Nate, Political Analyst published in the Guardian, the New Republic and CNN, and cited by the New York Times, “Who Are the Swing Senators?” December 4, http://www.fivethirtyeight.com/2008/12/who-are-swing-senators.html)

In practice, there will be a group of four or five senators in each party who line up just to either side of the 60-seat threshold and will find that they're suddenly very much in demand. If Obama's approval ratings are strong, he should have little trouble whipping the couple of Republican votes he needs into shape, and should clear 60 comfortably on key issues. But, if Obama proves to be unpopular, there remain enough conservative, red-state Democratic senators to deny him a simple majority on key issues, much less 60 votes.

POPULARITY KEY – KEY TO DEMOCRATIC VOTES IN CONGRESS.

**Friedman 8** (George, Founder of Stratfor, “Obama: First Moves,” November 24, http://www.stratfor.com/weekly/20081124\_obama\_first\_moves)

[Presidents are not as powerful as they are often imagined to be](http://www.wilsoncenter.org/index.cfm). Apart from institutional constraints, presidents must constantly deal with public opinion. Congress is watching the polls, as all of the representatives and a third of the senators will be running for re-election in two years. No matter how many Democrats are in Congress, their first loyalty is to their own careers, and collapsing public opinion polls for a Democratic president can destroy them. Knowing this, they have a strong incentive to oppose an unpopular president — even one from their own party — or they might be replaced with others who will oppose him. If Obama wants to be powerful, he must keep Congress on his side, and that means he must keep his numbers up. He is undoubtedly getting the honeymoon bounce now. He needs to hold that.

POPULARITY KEY TO OBAMA AGENDA.

Nather 8. [11/9 -- David, CQ Staff Writer, CQ Today Online News, 2008 http://www.cqpolitics.com/wmspage.cfm?docID=news-000002984617&parm1=5&cpage=2)

There is one wild card that could increase Obama’s odds of getting his agenda through Congress: the possibility that he will continue the technologically savvy mass mobilization techniques of his campaign, this time using them to lobby Congress to pass his most ambitious initiatives. As a former community organizer, Obama transferred the lessons from those days into his campaign, using blast e-mails, text messages and other techniques to mobilize supporters at key moments.

POPULARITY KEY.

**McLaughlin and McLaughlin 7** (Curtis P., Professor Emeritus at the Kenan-Flager Business School and School of Public Health at the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, and Craig D., Executive Director of the Washington State Board of Health, *Health Policy Analysis,* p.244, Available via Google books)

A president’s ability to push a measure through Congress depends in large part on his or her *political capital.* For presidents, political capital primarily comes down to two things—their popularity and their party’s strength in Congress. For a recently elected president, popularity can be judged by the electoral margin of victory. For a president well into her or his term, popularity can be assessed by opinion polls. George W. Bush, for example, took office after losing the popular vote. He had no claim to a mandate, and his approval rating was an unremarkable 57 percent in February 2001, according to a Gallup poll. Even though his party was only one vote shy of a majority in the Senate and held a clear majority in the House, he enjoyed little success with Congress in the early days. His political capital increased after the attacks of September 11, 2001, because his approval rating as a wartime president hit an astounding 90%. Public approval tanked as dissatisfaction with the war in Iraq grew. After the 2006 election, he was a lame duck facing Democratic majorities in Congress—his political capital was negligible. The 1965 passage of Medicaid and Medicare has been attributed to Lyndon Johnson’s phenomenal political capital. He clearly had a mandate, as he was elected with more than 61% of the popular vote, a feat unsurpassed since. The first Gallup poll of his term showed an 80% approval rating. He was a Democrat, and his party had a two-thirds majority in both houses. This gave him authority to push the agenda that had gotten him elected and a Congress unified enough, despite a North/South split in the Democratic party, to tackle even the most divisive issues.

## AT: POPULARITY KEY

Popularity not key to agenda.

**Detroit News 5** (January 23, Lexis)

Presidents don't have mandates. They have agendas. If a president has enough votes in Congress to get that agenda passed, and can do so without hurting his party's chances in the next election, it doesn't matter if he won the election by two percentage points or 20. He's going to do what he wants to do, and nothing's going to stop him.

EMPIRICALLY NOT KEY TO POLITICAL CAPITAL.

Norquist 2 (Grover, The American Enterprise, September 1, Lexis)

President Bush's approval rating has remained above 70 percent forten months. Far from being an asset, these approval ratings are a liability that **has hurt his agenda**. Immediately after the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, Democrats feared and Republicans hoped that Mr. Bush's approval ratings--which jumped from 57 percent to 90 percent--would create political capital that would help Bush advance his legislative agenda and elect more Republicans. Both Republican hopes and Democratic fears went unfulfilled. On November 6, only 55 days after September 11, the GOP lost control of the governors' mansions in Virginia and New Jersey. President Bush made no progress on legislative priorities such as reforming Mexican immigration and giving Americans the option of investing part of their Social Security taxes. A dozen Congressional leadership staff members have told me that the President's high approval ratings have not helped him pass any important bills.

PUBLIC POPULARITY IS NOT KEY TO THE AGENDA.

**LIGHT 99.** [Paul, Paulette Goddard Professor of Public Service, New York University; Founding Director, Brookings Center for Public Service; Senior Adviser, National Commission on the Public Service; Senior Adviser, Brookings Presidential Appointee Initiative The President’s Agenda: Domestic Policy Choice from Kennedy to Clinton, p. 27]

. Public approval can be used to sway congressional votes, but with only limited success. "Everyone has a poll," one aide noted. "You can find any number of groups which can present a poll to support a given proposal. Depending upon how you word the questions and how you select the sample, you can get a positive result. Congress is fairly suspicious of polls as a bargaining tool, and public approval ratings are too general to be of much good." Public opinion is important over the term; it affects both midterm losses and the President's chances for re-election. Yet, public opinion is not easily converted into direct influence in the domestic policy process. Most often it is an indirect factor in the congressional struggle. Presidents cannot afford to ignore public opinion, but in the closed world of Washington politics, the party comes into play virtually every day of the term. Party support thereby becomes the central component of the President's capital.

POPULARITY DOESN’T AFFECT AGENDA – BUSH AND CLINTON PROVE.

Light 99 (Paul, The President’s Agenda: Domestic Policy Choice from Kennedy to Clinton, p. 280)

Although party seats remain the gold standard of a President's political capital, the Bush/Clinton years suggest that public approval may be increasingly irrelevant to agenda influence. Twenty years ago, the trends in public approval seemed mostly immutable. Presidents started their terms at the peak of their approval and slid steadily downward. But for an occasional bump due to a foreign policy crisis, approval seemed to be governed by a coalition­of-minorities phenomenon. Each decision angered some small number of pres­idential enthusiasts, slowly eroding approval in each successive poll. Having held for every President since 1960, the trend changed direction under both Bush and Clinton. Bush had the roughest ride. His ap­proval ratings started out at barely 50 percent, rose steadily for the next two years to the 70 percent range, fell twenty points in the wake of the 1990 mid­term elections, rose again to unprecedented heights after the Gulf War, and fell again by nearly fifty points as the economy slowed prior to the 1992 election. His approval was so volatile that it is not clear how he could have harnessed it as a source of legislative advantage, nor is it clear how such instability could have helped the President convince Congress of either the inevitability of his success or the rightness of his cause. Clinton's ratings followed a more orderly course, but again in the opposite direction from previous Presidents. Having won the Presidency by a plurality of just 43 percent, his approval started out in the mid 50 percent range, fell by roughly twenty points, then began a slow but steady saw-tooth rise back into the mid 50 percent range by 1996. His approval continued upward through 1997 and early 1998, rising even despite allegations regarding his relationship with White House intern Monica Lewinsky. By February 1998, Clinton's approval stood at 71 percent, a gain of nine points over a single month. According to a panel survey by The Pew Research Center for the People & The Press, one fifth of the President's new supporters were drawn to his side by his State of the Union address and another sixth by his ability to do his job despite the sex scandal. Among all respondents, roughly half said they did not like the President personally, but 70 percent liked his policies (Pew Research Center, 1998a, p. 1).

## BIPART KEY – OBAMA

BIPART KEY TO AGENDA.

JACOBY 11-4-10. [Tamar, President, ImmigrationWorks USA, “Immigration reform is still doable” CNN]

In a lopsided Congress, where one party has a supermajority or close, there's little or no incentive to compromise -- you can pass almost anything you want without making nice, so why make concessions to get a deal? This will no longer be true in the 112th Congress: Little if anything is going to pass without compromise. Neither party will have much to show for itself if it does not find ways to work across the aisle. And just saying "no" to the other side's proposals is likely to wear thin very quickly with the independent voters who decided this election and the last one and will surely be the prize in 2012.

BIPART KEY TO AGENDA.

COLLINSON 11-15-10. [Stephen, AFP writer, “Obama lands back in changed Washington” AFP]

President Barack Obama landed in a politically-changed Washington after 10 days abroad and called on newly empowered Republicans to drop their strategy of 'No' to work with him. Obama returned from Asia to reverberating aftershocks of mid-term elections which dealt Democrats a crushing defeat and handed Republicans the House of Representatives -- and the means to halt his reform program. Flying into Washington on Air Force One on Sunday, after a trip that circled the globe, Obama reflected on the meaning of the election defeat two weeks ago, and promised to do more to honor his previous vows to reach across the aisle. He said that early in his term, an "obsessive" focus on anti-crisis policies had led him to neglect the need to reach across political divides and to get out into the heartland to explain to Americans what he was doing.

BIPART IS KEY TO OBAMA’S AGENDA.

GALSTON 10. [William, Senior Fellow, Governance Studies, Brookings, “President Barack Obama’s First Two Years: Policy Accomplishments, Political Difficulties” Brookings Institute -- Nov 4]

The outcome of the November 2010 election has fundamentally changed the political dynamic for at least the next two years. It will no longer be possible for President Obama to advance his agenda with support from only his own party. Instead, he will be forced either to negotiate with an emboldened Republican House majority or endure two years of confrontation and gridlock. (As Newt Gingrich discovered in 1995, the same logic applies in reverse: it is no easier to run divided government from Capitol Hill than from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.) Choosing the path of negotiation over confrontation would require a change of substance as well as tone. The president would have to give the federal budget deficit and national debt a far more central place in his policy agenda. Here the obstacles to agreement across party lines are formidable, although the findings of his bipartisan fiscal commission, due out in December, may assist him in making a shift to a more fiscally conservative position. It helps that the co-chairs of the commission, Democrat Erskine Bowles and Republican Alan Simpson, are determined to break the current gridlock, in which conservatives refuse to consider raising taxes while those on the left stoutly resist cuts in social programs.

BIPART KEY TO AGENDA – SPILLS OVER

**Zelizer 9** (Julian, Prof Public Affairs @ Princeton, CNN, 1/13)

Obama will have to define himself in relation to his predecessor, but in this case by demonstrating clearly to the public what he will do differently, rather than the same, as President Bush. And, finally, the new president will need to find legislation that attracts some support from the opposition to diminish the power of polarization on Capitol Hill and establish the groundwork for future compromise.

BIPART KEY TO OBAMA AGENDA.

**News and Observer 8**. [11/7, Lexis]

Such a move toward bipartisanship may be challenged by those who think the Bush partisans have some payback coming. But if Obama can rise above that instinct, he will have taken some important initial steps in bringing a much-divided country together, and in easing the way for his ambitious agenda to clear the Congress. If the people are ready, and they have signaled resoundingly that they are, then Republican and Democratic leaders need to be ready as well.

## PARTISANSHIP SPILLS OVER

PARTISANSHIP SPILLS OVER ON SECURITY POLICY SPECIFICALLY.

COHEN 1. [WILLIAM, counselor @ CSIS and former Secretary of Defense, Washington Quarterly -- Spring -- lexis]

Finally, a more bipartisan approach to the formulation of national security policy specifically can only occur with a less partisan approach to political discourse generally. Social and political observers alike have chronicled an absence of civility in the public sphere and increasing hostility in the political sphere. Debate too often gives us a way to diatribe, and practical problem-solving to rhetorical finger-pointing. At times – such as the Desert Fox strikes – the enmity has become so intense that some openly question the motivations of the leaders on the opposite side of the aisle. At other times – such as during the national debate on the CTBT – incendiary rhetoric is used to inflame core constituencies, gain political advantage, or to humiliate or embarrass one’s opponents. Such scorched earth tactics may be chauvinistically satisfying, but they only diminish the trust and respect among policymakers that is essential to responsible and reason compromise.

## CONCESSIONS KEY – GENERIC

CONCESSIONS KEY POST MIDTERM.

SEIB 11-16-10. [Gerald, Washington Bureau chief, “White House Renovation Calls for a Bridge Builder” Wall Street Journal]

As the White House fills some important vacancies in coming days, it might want to include this new job: bridge builder. In his tenuous post-election condition, President Barack Obama finds himself on a political island, no longer linked to the comfortable Democratic majorities in Congress that served as his lifeline for two years. To exit from that island, he needs to build bridges to three groups: Republican leaders in both houses of Congress, moderate Democrats in the congressional rank and file, and the business community. Such bridges don't simply materialize. They have to be built, and the White House could use a respected figure from the outside to help.

CONCESSIONS TO REPUBLICANS KEY TO THE AGENDA.

**Nicholas 8** (Peter, Tribune Washington Bureau, published in the Baltimore Sun, December 18, Lexis)

But Republicans in the Senate, even with their ranks diminished, still possess leverage to tailor a package that fits certain specifications. They want public hearings on the stimulus, even if it thwarts Democratic ambitions to present the bill to Obama for his signature when he is sworn into office Jan. 20. And they insist the bill be scrubbed of projects that, in their view, are aimed more at appeasing interest groups than creating jobs. When the new Congress convenes on Jan. 6, Senate Democrats will still lack the 60-vote majority needed to stave off Republican delaying tactics - a reality that gives Republicans some confidence that they can win concessions.

CONCESSIONS ARE KEY TO THE AGENDA -- BREAKS GRIDLOCK.

BRADY AND VOLDEN 6. [David W. Brady, professor of political science and business, and Senior Fellow and Deputy Director of the Hoover Institute at Stanford University and Craig Volden, assistant professor of political science at the Ohio State University “Revolving Gridlock : Politics and Policy from Jimmy Carter to George W. Bush,” Pg 35]

More often, however, gridlock is maintained through members from divorce districts who are very responsive to the electorate and thus at odds with their fellow legislators. In these cases, gridlock can be overcome only through legislative compromise, and only when status quo policies are outside the gridlock region. When a policy advocate suggests a change so major that supermajorities are difficult to achieve, the change will be stopped by a filibuster or veto. To build the needed coalition for cloture or a vet override, compromises will need to be struck, often taking one of two forms. First, the policy itself could be watered down. This was the main way that President Clinton overcame Republican filibusters in 1993 on issues like the job stimulus package, voter registration, and family and medical leave. A smaller change was more acceptable to moderate Senators. A second possible compromise with these pivotal members needed to build a supermajority involves concessions not on the ideological position of the bill at hand, but on other issues. Often these include distributive budgetary items, like roads, bridges, research labs, and targeted tax cuts. Riders attached to budget bills add these benefits needed to smooth out compromises on earlier bills. Quite clearly, to the extent that budget concessions are needed to build coalitions on all sorts of issues, gridlock is more likely when congress is confronting deficits than when it is ignoring them or facing surpluses.

CONCESSIONS ARE KEY TO THE AGENDA -- COMPARATIVELY THE BEST FORM OF POLITICAL WRANGLING.

PIKA & MALTESE 4. [Joseph A., Professor of Political Science & International Relations at U of Delaware & John Anthony, Prof of Political Science at University of Georgia, The Politics of the Presidency, p. 199-200]

On their relations with Congress, presidents follow certain modes or patterns of behavior: bargaining, arm-twisting, and confrontation. Bargaining is the pre­dominant mode, and occasionally the president bargains directly with members whose support is deemed essential to a bill's passage. In May 1981, for example, the Reagan administration agreed to revive a costly program to support the price of sugar in exchange for the votes of four Democratic representatives from Louisiana (where sugar is a key crop) on a comprehensive budget reduction bill. 78 Presidents usually try to avoid such explicit bargains because they have limited resources for trading, and the desire among members for these resources is keen. Moreover, Congress is so large and its Power so decentralized that presid­ents cannot bargain extensively over most bills. In some instances, the presi­dent may be unable or unwilling to bargain. Fortunately, rather than a quid pro quo exchange of favors for votes, much presidential-congressional bargaining is implicit, generalized trading in which tacit exchanges of support and favors occur. If bargaining does not result in the approval of their proposals, presidents may resort to stronger methods, such as arm-twisting, which involves intense, even extraordinary, pressure and threats. In one sense, it is an intensified extension of bargaining, but it entails something more - a direct threat of punishment if the member's opposition continues. Among modern presidents, Johnson was perhaps the most frequent practitioner of arm-twisting. When gentler effort failed, or when a once-supportive member opposed him on an important issue, Johnson resorted to tactics such as deliberate embarrassment, threats, and reprisals. In contrast, Eisenhower was most reluctant to pressure Congress. Arm twisting is understandably an unpopular tactic and, if used often, creates resent­ment and hostility. Still, judicious demonstration that sustained opposition or desertion by normal supporters will exact costs strengthens a president's bargaining position

GOP VOTES KEY TO AGENDA – CONCESSIONS KEY

BAKER 10. [Peter, foreign policy reporter, author of Kremlin Rising: Vladimir Putin and Russian Counter-Revolution, “In Republican Victories, Tide Turns Starkly” New York Times]

“The president is somebody who knows he’s not going to have his way on these things, that he needs Republicans and he has the ability to reach out to them,” said Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood, the most prominent Republican in the administration.

2012 RE-ELECTION WORRIES MEAN DEMOCRATS HAVE TO COMPROMISE WITH THE GOP.

LEXOLOGY 10. [Arent Fox LLP, “2010 midterm election analysis” November 3 -- http://www.lexology.com/library/detail.aspx?g=174db255-8105-4745-b611-16fed1acc4d5]

Coloring the legislative agenda will be the fact that the President looks weaker than he did two years ago and many Democratic senators who are on the ballot in 2012 will be far less likely to toe the party line blindly. The Democrats will have 23 seats to defend in two years, compared to only 10 Republican seats. Already, Sen. Ben Nelson, D-Neb., has voted with Republicans on a number of important votes, and one could expect that swing-state senators up for re-election may push Reid behind the scenes to compromise more with the Republicans. Also making Sen. Reid’s job tougher, but possibly easing it for Minority Leader McConnell, there are several Republicans (Orrin Hatch of Utah, Olympia Snowe of Maine, Scott Brown of Massachusetts, Bob Corker of Tennessee) who at times have strayed from their party and could face primary challenges of the kind that knocked off Utah Senator Bob Bennett in this cycle and expected GOP Senate nominee Rep. Mike Castle in Delaware, and who, as a result, may stay more in the Republican camp on key votes.

## CONCESSIONS FAIL: GENERIC

CONCESSIONS FAIL – OBAMA IS INEPT.

PONNURU 11-16. [10 -- Ramesh, senior editor @ National Review, “National Review: Eleven reasons 2010 is not a rerun” NPR]

Seventh, Obama isn't Clinton. The former president started his political career in a relatively conservative state. During his governorship, Arkansas gave its electoral votes to Republican presidential candidates three times. Clinton also ran the Democratic Leadership Council, which sought to pull the party rightward. Obama has had much less experience of appealing to conservative and moderate voters. He did it in the general election of 2008 only under exceptional circumstances and with a very short record. It's not clear that he is interested in "triangulating" against congressional Democrats and Republicans, much less that he is capable of it. Keep in mind that at this point in his presidency Clinton had already relied on Republican votes to win a high-profile fight over trade. Obama has done nothing similar.

NO SHIFT TO THE CENTER –GOP WILL REJECT IT.

BAKER 10. [Peter, foreign policy reporter, author of Kremlin Rising: Vladimir Putin and Russian Counter-Revolution, “In Republican Victories, Tide Turns Starkly” New York Times]

Strategists on both sides said the lessons of the past offered only limited utility. As politically toxic as the atmosphere in Washington was in the 1990s, the two sides appear even more polarized today. The Republicans may be more beholden to a Tea Party movement that abhors deal cutting, while Mr. Obama has not shown the same sort of centrist sensibilities that Mr. Clinton did and presides in a time of higher unemployment and deficits. “I know President Clinton. President Clinton was an acquaintance of mine. Obama is no President Clinton,” said former Representative Dick Armey of Texas, who as House Republican leader squared off against Mr. Clinton at the time and today is a prime Tea Party promoter. “Personally, I think he’s already lost his re-election.” That remains to be determined, but he can expect a rough two years. If nothing else, both Mr. Clinton and Mr. Bush saw what can happen when the other side gets subpoena power. Legitimate oversight and political fishing expeditions can both take their toll. “Even when carefully managed, these investigations can be distracting to senior White House officials,” said W. Neil Eggleston, who was a White House lawyer under Mr. Clinton and later represented an aide to Mr. Bush during a Congressional inquiry. Still, Mr. Obama wields the veto pen, and his Democratic allies in the Senate will provide a firewall against Republican initiatives. The possibility of gridlock looms. And in the White House, there is hope that Republicans descend into fratricide between establishment and Tea Party insurgents, while Mr. Obama presents himself as above it all. Former Representative Tom Davis, Republican of Virginia, said it was hard to see Mr. Obama finding common cause with Mr. Boehner or Mr. McConnell, the Republican leaders. “Obama’s denigrated Boehner and McConnell by name — not very presidential,” Mr. Davis said. Moreover, both sides will have to answer to partisans on the left and the right with little interest in compromise. “There’s going to be a lot of posturing to the base,” Mr. Davis said. “I think it’s going to be ugly, **at least at first.”**

## CONCESSIONS FAIL: ANGERS THE LEFT

CONCESSIONS FAIL – ANGERS THE LEFT.

FRIEL 10. [Brian, CQ Staff, “Divided Senate complicates Dem Agenda” CQ Today -- November 4 -- http://www.congress.org/news/2010/11/04/divided\_senate\_complicates\_dem\_agenda]

While many Democratic senators may feel pressure from their right, Obama may feel pressure from his left. Henry Olsen, a political analyst at the conservative American Enterprise Institute, noted that both presidents who have faced serious primary challenges when seeking a second term in recent years — Jimmy Carter and George H.W. Bush — were defeated in the general election. Olsen warned that Obama could risk such a challenge from the left if he strikes deals with Republicans the way President Bill Clinton did in 1996. “Triangulation is not going to be on the agenda,” Olsen said.

CONCESSIONS FAIL – ALIENATES THE LEFT.

PONNURU 11-16-10 -- Ramesh, senior editor @ National Review, “National Review: Eleven reasons 2010 is not a rerun” NPR]

Eighth, Obama has to deal with a larger, angrier, and more implacable Left than Clinton did. The Left was chastened after three Republican presidential terms when Clinton took office. When Clinton signed welfare reform in 1996, a few of his appointees resigned but there was no revolt. Obama cannot be so sure that MoveOn.org, MSNBC, etc., will stay in his corner if he triangulates. His freedom of action is more circumscribed.

## CONCESSIONS FAILS: GOP SAYS NO

CONCESSIONS TO THE GOP FAILS – PISSES OFF THE LEFT AND THE GOP WONT’ LISTEN.

LIASSON 11-12-10. [Mara, national political correspondent for NPR, “Democrats split on way forward after losses” NPR]

Going forward, one of the flash points for Democrats is how far to go to accommodate the new Republican majority in the House and the expanded Republican minority in the Senate. Green thinks reaching out won't help. "Democrats could take a lesson from what Republicans are doing right now, which is being dogged in what they believe," he says. "They're not talking about compromise. They're saying, 'We're going to fight for what we just campaigned on.' What we've seen the last week or so is a president consistently talking about compromise, consistently talking about consensus, and never laying out any blueprint by which he would actually be willing to fight the Republicans."

ATTEMPTS TO TRIANGULATE FAIL – UNCOOPERATIVE GOP.

GANDLEMAN 11-14-10. [Joe, editor-in-chief in Politics, “Is the democratic party really out for the count?” Moderate Voice]

But Obama’s problem will be that the party’s progressive wing will be clamoring for him to be a progressive Democrat while to rebrand himself as a different kind of Democrat he’s going to have to triangulate (which will create howls of protest from the Democratic left and could even spark a primary challenge) and show that he is working with some key GOPers (at a time when most in the GOP see that noncooperation with Obama reaps political dividends and also can be a way of avoiding a primary challenge from Tea Party movement members).

CONCESSIONS FAIL – GOP SAYS NO.

COLLINSON 10. [Stephen, AFP writer, “Sun sets on Obama’s era of grand reforms” AFP -- October 25]

Should Obama chose cooperation, it is uncertain whether his Republican foes will have the inclination -- or the political capacity -- to help. An influx of ideological conservatives from the Tea Party movement may push the party's leadership further to the right, narrowing room for compromise. And with a looming general election, Republicans have little incentive to bolster a Democratic president. Republican Senate leader Mitch McConnell signaled that Republicans may be flexible, but only strictly in their own interests.

MOVING TO THE CENTER FAILS – TOO POLARIZED.

SARGENT 10. [Greg, Washington Post journalist, editor of Election Central, Talking Points Memo’s politics and elections website, “How will Obama react to GOP gains?” Washington Post]

What's striking about this is how dated, and even quaint, it sounds. As Ronald Brownstein has noted, a conspicuous move to the ideological center isn't really something we should expect from Obama after the election, even in the event of major GOP gains, because such a gesture wouldn't really be relevant to our politics today, which are even more polarized now than in Clinton's time.

## AT: BIPART/CONCESSIONS KEY

CONCESSIONS FAIL – CAUSE REPUBLICANS TO UNDERMINE OBAMA AGENDA.

**Parry 8** (Robert, former writer for the Associated Press and Newsweek who broke the Iran-Contra stories in the 1980s, Baltimore Chronicle, November 11, http://baltimorechronicle.com/2008/111108Parry.shtml)

Barack Obama seeks a new era of bipartisanship, but he should take heed of what happened to the last Democrat in the White House – Bill Clinton – in 1993 when he sought to appease Republicans by shelving pending investigations into Reagan-Bush-I-era wrongdoing and hoped for some reciprocity. Instead the Republicans pocketed the Democratic concessions and pressed ahead with possibly the most partisan assault ever directed against a sitting President. The war on Clinton included attacks on his past life in Arkansas, on his wife Hillary, on personnel decisions at the White House, and on key members of his administration. The Republicans also took the offensive against Clinton’s reformist agenda, denying him even one GOP vote for his first budget and then sabotaging Hillary Clinton’s plan for universal health insurance.

MODERATE GOP NOT KEY – DEMOCRATIC UNITY IS CRUCIAL.

**Walter 8** (Amy, Staff Writer, National Journal, November 18, http://www.nationaljournal.com/njonline/ol\_20081117\_2769.php)

But what does "working across the aisle" really mean? In the Senate, retirements and election losses have substantially reduced the number of Republican moderates. **Olympia Snowe**, **Susan Collins**, **George Voinovich**, **Arlen Specter** and, of course, McCain are the only obvious potential allies Obama will have on the GOP side. Of the 19 Republicans up in 2010, just six -- including Voinovich and Specter -- sit in states Obama won. If Obama is counting on McCain to help broaden that coalition, it's worth asking why. After all, this is a guy who campaigned heavily on his "maverick-ness" and ranted against the corrupting influence of Washington insiders. Team player he was not. Even so, he, like Obama, ended the campaign with high approval ratings and has more political capital than your typical defeated nominee. Obama's potential GOP allies in the House may be an even smaller bunch. There are only five Republicans who sit in districts that **John Kerry** won four years ago: **Mike Castle** (Del.-At Large), **Mark Kirk** (Ill.-10), **Jim Gerlach** (Pa.-06), **Charlie Dent** (Pa.-15) and **Dave Reichert** (Wash.-08). (Note: We are using 2004 stats since we won't have presidential vote by congressional district data for some time). Given Obama's strong showing in places like Neb.-02 (where GOP Rep. **Lee Terry** sits) and New Jersey (home to freshman Rep. **Leonard Lance** in N.J.-07), this list of Republicans sitting in putatively Democratic seats will grow -- but probably not by much. For all the talk of bipartisanship, the reality is that there just aren't that many Republicans left to work with. Herding them may not be Obama's biggest problem. Now, about corralling expectant Democrats ...

BIPART FAILS—STRONG PARTISAN LINE KEY TO WIN SUPPORT

KUTTNER 8. [Robert, political commentator and author of "Obama's Challenge: America's Economic Crisis and the Power of a Transformative Presidency." December 15, http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2008/12/the\_post\_postpartisan\_presiden.html]

Here is an easy prediction: When President Obama reaches that hand of bipartisanship across the aisle, he will find that the Republicans bite it. Of course, it is smart politics to pick off Republicans for a progressive agenda wherever possible. Splitting the Republicans is much better than splitting the difference. By January, when Congress takes up the emergency stimulus bill, unemployment will be heading toward double digits, and state and local governments will be slashing public services. In that emergency climate, Obama may well get some Republicans to cross over and vote for a Democratic plan. But that strategy is not being bipartisan. It is being an astute partisan. And there will be many other times when Obama will need to rally all of his Democrats to enact progressive legislation over the strenuous objection of most Republicans. This economic emergency and its political opportunity is no time to compromise for the sake of hollow unity. If Obama can win over a few Republicans for a progressive program, great. If he put can Republicans in the position of haplessly opposing popular and urgently needed legislation, so much the better. By the end of his first year, either Obama will have put the economy on the path to recovery based on a progressive program that represents a radical ideological shift; if he achieves that, he will have done it with precious little Republican support. Alternatively, much of his program will have been blocked by Republican filibusters enabled by a few conservative Democratic allies.

## A2: BIPART KEY – BIPART IMPOSSIBLE

ZERO CHANCE FOR BIPARTISANSHIP – FEWER MODERATES AND RE-ELECTION WORRIES.

KNOLL 10. [Benjamin, Assistant Prof of Govt’ @ Centre College, researcher focused on public opinion and voting behavior of the American public, “Prospects for “bipartisanship” in the 112th Congress” Novemver 7 -- http://informationknoll.wordpress.com/2010/11/07/prospects-for-bipartisanship-in-the-112th-congress/]

It would be nice if the results of last Tuesday’s election prompted our political leaders to seek common ground, put aside their differences, and do what’s best for the future of the country. But it’s not going to happen. Why? For several reasons, including these two: 1. There are fewer moderate members of Congress now. Most of the Democrats who were swept out of office last week were moderate Democrats from conservative districts. Ideologically speaking, the “average” Democrat in the House is now much more liberal than the “average” Democrat in the last Congress. And because of the election of a number of Tea Party Republicans, the “average” Republican is now going to be much more conservative. The two parties in Congress will now be even more ideologically polarized, if such a thing were possible. 2. It’s election season. Again. But not for 2010; for 2012. Yep, the 2012 presidential campaign began last Wednesday morning. Politically speaking, Republicans have very little incentive to provide President Obama with any sort of legislative victory, as it would only aid his reelection chances in 2012. Thus, they will be even less likely to want to “compromise” than they were before last week’s election, making the prospects for “bipartisan” accomplishments on any substantive piece of legislation very, very unlikely.

DECLINING MODERATE NUMBERS MEAN ATTEMPTS AT BIPART FAIL.

BARRON 11-4-10. [John, Inside American presenter on ABC NewsRadio, research associate @ US Studies Centre @ U of Sydney, “The Doughnut Election” ABC -- http://www.abc.net.au/news/stories/2010/11/04/3056619.htm?site=thedrum]

Already president Obama is being urged to "shift to the political centre" - to do as Bill Clinton did after he suffered massive losses in the 1994 mid-terms and abandon more divisive agenda items like health care and gays serving openly in the military. But even some Clinton insiders, like former labor secretary Robert Reich, say the political centre just doesn't exist - shift to the centre and you'll find you are all alone. American politics is more like a doughnut. And this is clearly a problem for any attempts at bipartisanship. When the democrats enjoyed a 60-40 Senate majority, there was no need to compromise. Which was just as well because there were only one or two moderate Republicans who might have ever considered a compromise. Usually when a chamber like the Senate swings back to closer to 50-50 that means you'll get more moderates in swinging electorates prepared to cut a deal and cross the floor. But not this time. Tea Party-backed freshmen Republican senators like Rand Paul from Kentucky and Marco Rubio in Florida immediately become the least likely to join with the Democrats. And Democrats like Evan Bayh of Indiana who frequently voted with the Republicans saw the writing on the wall and quit politics this year in disgust, while liberals capable of bipartisandship like Russ Feingold of Wisconsin got creamed.

NO BIPART – GOP OBSTRUCTIONISM.

SKOCPOL AND JACOBS 10. [Theda, Victor S. Thomas Professor of Government and Sociology at Harvard, former Director of the Center for American Political Studies, Lawrence, Walter F. and Joan Mondale Chair for Political Studies and Director of the Center for the Study of Politics and Governance in the Hubert H. Humphrey Institute and Department of Political Science at the University of Minnesota, “Reaching for a New Deal: Ambitious governance, economic meltdown and polarized politics in Obama’s first two years” Russell Sage Foundation -- October]

The immediate prospect for Congressional Republicans to work with Obama and Democrats to solve major national problems is poor to nonexistent, following Tea Party 59 primary victories against longtime conservative incumbents such as Utah’s Bob Bennett and party-endorsed candidates such as Delaware’s Mike Castle. Those two had occasionally collaborated across the aisle, and the clear message is ―cross-party cooperation is a political death sentence.‖ In case the risk has not already been made crystal clear, GOP legislators face continuing scrutiny from grass-roots extremists who hate Obama. Some pundits blame Obama for such polarization and deadlock, but the logic is puzzling, given the severity of the problems the President has had to tackle and his repeated efforts to find compromises with Republicans. It is hard to see anything more at work in the recent intense polarization than strategic choices by Obama’s opponents and the media dynamics and institutional advantages for obstruction we have discussed above – all of these interacting with the profound social demoralization caused by a deep and prolonged economic downturn.

## DEM UNITY KEY

DEM UNITY KEY IN POST ELECTION CONGRESS.

STICKINGS 11-15-10. [Michael, assistant editor in Politics, “For Democrats, Unity and Continuity in the House” Moderate Voice]

Why is continuity important? Because the Democrats need to move forward in large part by defending their impressive record (health-care reform, Wall Street reform, the stimulus, the bailouts, etc.), not by making a show of throwing out those who helped guide the party to those successes. What, after all, would fresh new leadership signify? That the party was going in a different direction, that it was abandoning what it had done, all that it had accomplished, and that the midterms really were a rejection of the Democrats and their agenda. Changing the leadership, including forcing Pelosi out, would have been an admission of failure and an act of cowardice, an expression of fear and weakness, essentially a self-vote of non-confidence. Because, as I and many others keep saying, the result of the midterms, particularly in the House, was not an expression of popular support for the Republicans and their agenda (which is extremist and obstructionist). It was, rather, a reflection of deep public discontent rooted in the still lousy economy, with anger and frustration directed at incumbents, at the party in power. Certainly, the Democrats failed to make a convincing case for themselves, and, given the swing, failed to hang on to seats in heavily conservative districts that they won in ‘06 and ‘08, but that’s hardly Pelosi’s fault, or hardly hers alone. And while the Democrats, both in the House and elsewhere, do have some bitter lessons to learn, there is no need to overreact and certainly no need for a purge. Republicans will likely remain united on Capitol Hill, but there are already signs of fracturing as the party gets ever more extreme and as the Tea Party acquires ever more power within the GOP. (It’s one thing to be thoroughly obstructionist, as establishment types like Mitch McConnell want, and to end up with gridlock, quite another to turn the House into a hyper-investigative inquisition. And, of course, there will no doubt be a good deal of internal conflict as the 2012 primary season draws closer and the likely candidates jockey for position. All the more reason for Democrats to be as united as possible and to defend what they’ve done and what they stand for with conviction and purpose. There is certainly diversity in the Democratic House leadership, and it’s not clear how they’ll all get along, and there are quite a few Democrats who think Pelosi should have stepped down, but there is good reason to believe that, with Pelosi at the helm and her team settled in place, the party will be effective in opposition, working constructively and productively with Obama and Senate Democrats to get things done for the American people.

Democratic unity key to the agenda.

Gerstein 8 (Dan, political communications consultant and commentator based in New York, founder and president of Gotham Ghostwriter, formerly served as communications director to Sen. Joe Lieberman, Forbes, December 3, http://www.forbes.com/opinions/2008/12/02/obama-defense-appointments-oped-cx\_dg\_1203gerstein.html)

Here, we can anticipate one of the trickiest tests of Obama's presidency. While he tries to govern from the pragmatic center on national security, he must manage the high expectations and inevitable disappointments of his strongest supporters. His liberal activist base may be relatively small, but its members can be extremely distracting and often destructive. Witness [the successful campaign the left-wing blogosphere waged](http://crooksandliars.com/john-amato/liberal-blogs-victorious-defeating-john) to derail the nomination of John Brennan, who had been considered the leading candidate for Obama's CIA director. That squabble took place off-stage and was totally overshadowed by Clinton's appointment. But Obama won't have that luxury once he's in office. The commentariat will be closely watching and inflating every intra-party fight, the most potent catnip for pundits. At a minimum, these spats could suck up precious time and political capital as Obama works to defuse them. At worst, they could inflame the latent divisions in Congress and sidetrack key elements of Obama's agenda.

BASE UNITY IS THE KEY STARTING POINT FOR ENSURING AGENDA PASSAGE

Bond & Fleisher 96. (Jon R. and Richard professor in Political Science - Texas A&M and Professor in Political Science. Fordham - 1996. "The President in Legislation" p.120)

For majority presidents, unity in the party base is a key ingredient of success. When a majority president's base is unified, the chances of victory approach certainty. If the base is split, the probability of victory drops considerably. And the base is frequently split. In parliamentary systems, partisan control of the legislature virtually assures victories; in the United States, having more members in Congress who are predisposed to support the president is an advantage, but one insufficient to guarantee victories.

## AT: DEM UNITY INEVITABLE/PC KEY DEM UNITY

OBAMA LEADERSHIP IS KEY TO ROUNDING UP DEMOCRATIC VOTES.

SKOCPOL AND JACOBS 10. [Theda, Victor S. Thomas Professor of Government and Sociology at Harvard, former Director of the Center for American Political Studies, Lawrence, Walter F. and Joan Mondale Chair for Political Studies and Director of the Center for the Study of Politics and Governance in the Hubert H. Humphrey Institute and Department of Political Science at the University of Minnesota, “Reaching for a New Deal: Ambitious governance, economic meltdown and polarized politics in Obama’s first two years” Russell Sage Foundation -- October]

Of necessity, Obama’s White House has repeatedly caucused with Democratic House Speaker Nancy Pelosi and Democratic Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, looking for ways to coordinate agendas and move key bills through the many hurdles that mark today’s legislative process, especially in the Senate. Even though the watching public might not understand why Democrats spend so much time negotiating among themselves, or why the President can’t just tell Congress to ―get it done,‖ the early Obama administration understandably devoted much effort to prodding and cajoling Congress in consultation with key Congressional Democrats. This happened not merely because Obama is a former Senator and thinks in legislative terms, and not only because his former Chief of Staff, Rahm Emanuel, is a seasoned wheeler-dealer from the House of Representatives (Bai 2010). More than that, Obama and his White House aides new that the 111th Congress is probably their only chance to further big legislative reforms. To take advantage of Congressional Democratic majorities that are sure to shrink, they have had to work week by week, month by month with the Congressional leaders to assemble fragile and shifting coalitions. Congressional sausage-making involving the President has been confusing and dispiriting for the public to watch, but the alternative would have been for an ambitious President Obama not to try for big legislative reforms. How can a leader who wants to use government to make America stronger not make such attempts?

RE-ELECTION WORRIES AND AN UNPOPULAR PRESIDENT MEAN OBAMA CAN’T COUNT ON DEM VOTES.

FRIEL 10. [Brian, CQ Staff, “Divided Senate complicates Dem Agenda” CQ Today -- November 4 -- http://www.congress.org/news/2010/11/04/divided\_senate\_complicates\_dem\_agenda]

Reid could have a tough time holding his caucus together next year in support of Obama’s agenda. With the president’s fading popularity no doubt contributing to several Democratic senators’ defeat, caucus members facing the voters in 2012 — particularly those in states where Obama’s public approval ratings are low — could be under intense pressure to buck the White House. In the 2012 election cycle, Democrats will be defending twice as many Senate seats as Republicans. The GOP has 10 seats to protect, while the Democrats have 23. Most Democrats up for re-election in two years hail from states Obama won in 2008, but swing-state senators from Ohio, Missouri and Virginia, and those from states such as Montana and Nebraska that tend to vote Republican in presidential elections, may be difficult to keep in line.

## MODERATE DEMS KEY

MODERATE DEMS KEY TO AGENDA – THEY GET MODERATE GOP TO MOVE TO THE CENTER.

SEIB 11-16-10. [Gerald, Washington Bureau chief, “White House Renovation Calls for a Bridge Builder” Wall Street Journal]

Second, consider rank-and-file moderates in Congress from the president's own party. The corps of these lawmakers was ravaged by this months' election, so their numbers are down. Yet their importance actually may go up in months ahead. These Democratic moderates, particularly in the Senate, worked over the last two years to nudge legislation from the left toward the political center, in ways that annoyed the White House. But now they have the ability in the new Congress to nudge legislation from the Republican right toward the center, this time in ways that can benefit the White House.

MODERATE DEMS ARE A KEY SWING VOTING BLOC.

RAASCH 10. [Chuck, Gannett National Writer, “Noem, Herseth Sandlin embody ’10 trends” Gannett News Service -- October 28 -- lexis]

If Kristi Noem is elected to Congress by fellow South Dakotans on Tuesday, she would be a member of what may be the largest freshman class in the House of Representatives since 1992. If Rep. Stephanie Herseth Sandlin, D-S.D., is re-elected, she would be a member of what is almost certain to be a diminished pack of centrist "Blue Dog" Democrats in the House. Those that survive could be a key swing bloc between President Barack Obama's party and Republicans, particularly if the GOP ends up with only a narrow majority in the House.

## AT: DEMS KEY

If Obama angers the left, it only boosts capital

Weigant 8 (Chris Weigant is a political commentator. He has been a regular contributor to Arianna Huffington’s The Huffington Post since June of 2006, “How Will Obama Enrage The Left?” Huffington Post 12/3/08 [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/chris-weigant/how-will-](http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2002_04/moltzapril02)obama-enrage-the\_b\_148246.html)

I hate to rain on anyone's parade, but Obama is guaranteed to disappoint. The right wing won't be terribly disappointed, of course, since they'll have plenty to complain about for the next four-to-eight years. The only disappointing thing to them will be that Obama will not turn out to be the boogeyman they created in an effort to scare the heck out of voters. This means Obama won't be as effective a Republican fundraising tool, since he won't be doing all those things that terrify Republican donors. The left wing, however, is going to get disappointed with a short sharp shock, soon after Obama enters office. Because newly-inaugurated President Obama is going to pick one issue and swiftly smack the left in the face, by refusing to do what they want him to do. This will be a calculated move, and will likely pay off enormous political dividends for Obama over the life of his presidency. Call it his "Sister Souljah moment," if you will. By appearing to "stand up" to the left wing, Obama will be seen as charting his own course as a strong and independent leader, beholden to no special interest group of radical progressives. That's how the news media will portray it, at any rate. His approval ratings will likely rise after he does so, since it will serve to calm fears from suburban Republicans and Independents that Obama is going to make too many radical changes too fast. But it's going to absolutely enrage the left. You can bet the farm on that one. Taking the long view, however, I believe it will actually help Obama get more progressive laws passed. It's kind of doublethink, but bear with me. If Obama starts off his presidency showing strength and independence from the left, it will mean a lot more people out there are going to give him the benefit of the doubt over time. They didn't believe the cries of "Socialist!" in the election, and they're going to get more comfortable with Obama as a result. It will then be up to Congress to challenge him by passing laws even more sweeping than Obama asked for. Which Obama will (perhaps with a show of reluctance) then sign. Meaning more progressive legislation actually gets passed in the end. If Obama removes his "lightning rod" target for the right wing early on, over the long run he'll be able to get better laws passed, with more support from the public than they would normally have. I could be monstrously wrong about all of this, to be sure. But from watching his campaign, and listening to what he actually said, the portrait of Obama I am left with is one of cautiousness and pragmatism, and not of some sort of progressive icon. Exhibit A in my thinking is the FISA bill he voted for. Exhibit B would have to be the numerous times he reluctantly moved left, without actually fully supporting a populist or liberal agenda. Exhibit C is his intervention with how the Senate treated Joe Lieberman. And that's without even examining his cabinet choices. All of these things point to a very centrist course for an Obama administration, with lots of compromises with political foes. A good test case will be how President Obama handles the torture question. Will he convene a commission to investigate? Will he offer blanket immunity (or even -- gasp! -- pardons) to get honest answers about what went on? Or will he sweep the whole thing under the rug and "look to the future and not the past," while urging everyone to move on? The torture question is merely the tip of the iceberg (the best bad example, as it were) in how Obama is going to handle Bush's legacy. What Bush policies is Obama going to immediately rectify? What Bush actions will he reverse, even if it takes months? We've never really gotten clear and consistent answers as to how Obama is going to handle the Bush mess, which leaves me wondering what he will actually do when he gets the chance. But it could be almost any issue, it doesn't just have to be how to deal with Bush's legacy. Barack Obama will likely not make the mistake Bill Clinton did when he entered office with the "gays in the military" issue. Clinton wanted to do what was right, the military balked, and we wound up with "Don't ask, don't tell," which has been a complete disaster. But the lesson here is that Clinton started off by picking a fight with his opponents -- with a bold move that he knew they would hate. I think Obama is going to do the opposite. I think he's going to come out with some bold move that he knows the left is absolutely going to abhor. [Feel free to offer your own thoughts in the comments as to what exactly this is going to turn out to be, or even if you think I'm barking up the wrong tree entirely.] Because I simply cannot get rid of the feeling that, sometime next January or February, President Obama is going to make a point of picking a fight with some of his own most fervent supporters. They will then denounce him for his outrageous action, and go ballistic in an entirely predictable fashion. And (this is the part I'm least sure about, I have to admit) Obama will emerge from the fray even stronger politically than ever, with more "political capital" to spend on getting the rest of his agenda done. In other words, although it will require more of a "big picture" or "long view of history" type of viewpoint, I don't think it'll be as bad as it will first seem when it happens.

NO IMPACT TO ANGERING THE DEMOCRATS – THEY WON’T TURN ON OBAMA.

**Chicago Tribune 8**. [11/7, Lexis]

Michael O'Hanlon, a national security expert at the Brookings Institution in Washington, said that Obama has enough political capital to free him from "pleasing the left" of the Democratic Party as he presses forward with his strategy for Iraq and Afghanistan. "Obama to the left is what Ronald Reagan was to the right," O'Hanlon said. "He can do no wrong. If you're ending the war anyway, and it is a question if you're doing it in 1 1/2 , 2 1/2 or 3 1/2 years. ... He's already moving things in the direction they want him to."

## AT: MODERATES DEMS KEY

NOPE THEY ALL LOST – REMAINING DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS WILL BE UNIFIED AND PROGRESSIVE.

KRIEGER 11-12-10. [Hilary Leila, Washington correspondent, “Analysis: The partisans are coming to Congress” Jerusalem Post]

But some Democrats have found a silver lining to their otherwise unwelcome results, particularly those Democrats on the farther left side of the spectrum. For them, though the party lost its majority in the House of Representatives and with it its committee chairmen, there was some small comfort in the result that most of those kicked out were moderates. Many were the so-called “blue dog Democrats” from traditionally Republican districts who rode the Democratic waves of 2006 and 2008 into office but were the most vulnerable when even Independents turned red this year. “In vivid contrast,” as liberal blogger Deborah White wrote, “no Black Caucus members, and very few Progressive or Latino Caucus members, lost their House reelection bids. As a result, House Democrats in the 112th Congress will be more progressive and more supportive of the Democratic Party and Nancy Pelosi’s agenda than any House of Representatives in recent memory.”

THERE’S NOT ENOUGH LEFT TO MATTER – ELECTION RESULTS.

THOMMA 11-5-10. [Steven, White House correspondent, “Extremes rule both parties, as centrists lose their seats” McClatchy Newspapers]

The center may be falling out of American politics. About two dozen moderate to conservative Democrats in the House of Representatives were defeated this week, leaving a more liberal party in Washington. Also, several moderate to liberal Republicans were turned out through the year, ousted by primary challenges from more conservative candidates and leaving a more conservative party behind. The result is a more polarized Congress. That could complicate efforts to solve some of the country's biggest problems, such as government deficits and debt, especially as outsized voices on talk radio, cable TV and in the blogosphere pressure the parties not to compromise. All this risks driving politics farther from the American people, many of whom still stand squarely in the middle of the political road. "Bit by bit, the center in American politics is getting weaker," said William Galston, a top policy adviser in the Clinton White House and a scholar at the Brookings Institution. In the Democratic Party, this week's elections drove out about half of the conservative Democrats in the House, mostly from the South. Among the losers: Rep. Gene Taylor of Mississippi, who voted against the Democratic health care law, opposed "cap and trade" energy legislation and voted for Sen. John McCain, R-Ariz., for president in 2008 against his own party's nominee, Barack Obama. The remaining Democratic lawmakers, particularly in the House, will be more liberal, and under great pressure from such outside groups as labor unions not to make any compromises that would cut federal spending, particularly for pay or benefits for government employees.

## MODERATES KEY -- GENERIC

Moderates key to the agenda.

**Silver 8** (Nate, Political Analyst published in the Guardian, the New Republic and CNN, and cited by the New York Times, “Who Are the Swing Senators?” December 4, http://www.fivethirtyeight.com/2008/12/who-are-swing-senators.html)

With Jim Martin's loss in Georgia, we now know that the Democrats will not achieve a 60-seat senatorial caucus once the 111th Congress convenes next month. In practice, however, the line between 59 (or 58) votes and 60 was never so bright as it seemed. Moderate Republicans are an endangered species these days, but there are still a few of them left, as well as several other quasi-moderates who either get along with Obama or are under some form of electoral pressure in their home states. Conversely, there are more than a couple of Democrats in the chamber whose votes Obama can't take for granted. In practice, there will be a group of four or five senators in each party who line up just to either side of the 60-seat threshold and will find that they're suddenly very much in demand. If Obama's approval ratings are strong, he should have little trouble whipping the couple of Republican votes he needs into shape, and should clear 60 comfortably on key issues. But, if Obama proves to be unpopular, there remain enough conservative, red-state Democratic senators to deny him a simple majority on key issues, much less 60 votes.

MODERATES KEY -- SWAY THE VOTE.

Bangor Daily News 6. [Lauren Smith, “Moderates Still Wield Power in Congress” , 11-30-06, http://www.bu.edu/washjocenter/newswire\_pg/fall2006/conn/Moderates.htm]

Despite the ouster of many moderate Republicans in the midterm elections, politicians and political experts still expect moderates to play a pivotal role in the upcoming Congress. “Nearly 45 percent of Americans describe themselves as moderates and I think that speaks volumes about what the people want, what Maine people want: an independent voice building a political center,” said Sen. Olympia Snowe (R-Maine), who won reelection with almost 75 percent of the vote. The Democrats will enjoy a 31-seat majority in the House come January. In the Senate, Democrats will have a slim two-seat majority in combination with the two independents who have said they will be caucusing with the Democrats. “Because of the Senate rules, it takes 60 votes to get any major bill passed,” said Sen. Susan Collins (R-Maine). “That means the moderates on both sides of the aisle will be the ones who determine whether or not legislation is approved.” The slight majority in the Senate could put Republican moderates in a powerful position. “The few moderate Republicans that exist in the Senate are in an influential position,” said Richard Powell, political science professor at the University of Maine, Orono. “They still control the swing vote in such a narrowly divided Senate.” Because of the rules in the House which allow the majority party to control the flow of legislation, Republicans in the House will have less influence, said Powell. But the Blue Dog Coalition, a group of moderate and conservative House Democrats, of which Rep. Michael Michaud (D-Maine) is a member, hopes to reach over to the Republican side of the aisle on at least some issues, said Eric Wortman, the coalition’s spokesman. “I think you will see a rise in bipartisanship. The leadership of the House has made that clear,” Wortman said. The recent election brought a number of new Blue Dog Democrats to the House but took a particularly hard toll on the already endangered New England Republican. Rep. Chris Shays is not only the last Connecticut Republican in the House, he’s the only Republican left in the chamber from New England. The state’s other two GOP representatives, Nancy Johnson and Rob Simmons, viewed as moderates on most issues, lost to Democratic challengers. “This is just the latest in a long line of elections in which the number of moderate Republicans has been declining in both the House and the Senate,” Powell said. “The trend has been underway for quite some time now.” New Hampshire’s two Republican House members, Charles Bass and Jeb Bradley also were defeated by Democratic challengers. In Rhode Island, moderate Republican Sen. Lincoln Chaffee was ousted from his position. In Massachusetts, a Democratic governor was elected for the first time in 16 years, putting the statehouse in line with the state’s entire congressional delegation. “It is not healthy for Republicans to have such a small presence in an entire region of the country,” Shays said. “Competition makes everyone perform better. It would be better for the Republicans, the Democrats and the country to have two strong parties in New England.” Shays said he would be happy to travel in New England to help rebuild the moderate wing of the party in the Northeast. “Moderates in both parties have an important role of reaching across the aisle to get things done,” Shays said. “Most Americans are not red or blue, they are purple.”

## MODERATE GOP KEY

MODERATE REPUBLICANS KEY.

MAXWELL 10. [Zerlina, former Obama campaign staffer, political commentator, “5 things Obama should do after the midterm elections” -- http://theloop21.com/politics/5-things-obama-should-do-after-the-midterm-elections]

The following is a list of 5 action items that President Obama should do in order to be successful under a new and more conservative Congress. 1. Meet with key Republicans in the U.S. Senate immediately after the midterm elections. While it is true that there will be fewer “moderate” Republicans left in the Congress after the midterms, there will still be a handful. They are the same ones whose names were dropped during the healthcare and financial reform debates, Olympia Snowe (R-ME), Susan Collins (R-ME), and Scott Brown (R-MA). These three at the very least should be on the President’s list of “reasonable” Senators who will hopefully not filibuster every single piece of legislation. Senator Snowe who is up for re-election in 2012 actually has an incentive to work with the President and he is in a strong position to negotiate with her. It is important to point out that the political calculus after the midterms changes slightly for the Republicans in Congress. Whereas between 2008 and 2010 they had nothing at all to lose by going against the President’s agenda and everything to gain by frustrating his efforts to bring about promised “change,” they have to appear as though they are doing something other than saying “no.” Otherwise they risk losing not only seats in Congress in 2012, but President Obama has a perfect scapegoat to blame for any lack of progress during his 2012 reelection campaign.

MODERATE REPUBLICANS KEY TO OBAMA’S AGENDA.

WHITTELL 10. [Giles, Washington, DC bureau chief for the London Times, “Barack Obama’s agenda shifts to humility, consensus” The Australian -- October 30]

Translation: he knows that even if Democrats manage to hang on to the Senate and the house, their majorities will shrink to insignificance and their ability to force through ambitious legislation will disappear. Whether Mr Obama likes it or not, the time for serious compromise is near and the outlines of a legislative bargain with moderate Republicans are on the table.

Moderate Republicans key to the agenda.

**Guardian 8** (December 4, Lexis)

The Chambliss victory means the Democrats have 58 of the 100 Senate seats. A majority of 60 would have allowed them to override Republican delaying tactics such as filibusters that could wreck Obama's ambitious legislative programme. Instead, the Democrats will have to court Republicans to see their bills through. Chambliss' push to become a bulwark against Obama earned him the nickname "Mr 41" - the number of Republican senators needed to thwart a 60-seat Democrat majority - from the national Republican chairman, Mike Duncan. "Republicans still know how to win an election," Duncan declared yesterday at a victory party in Georgia. The final Senate contest, in Minnesota, is being recounted and hangs in the balance, with Republican incumbent Norm Coleman clinging to a lead of about 300 votes as of yesterday. Still, the Georgia defeat makes that outcome less important as Obama's allies in Congress now look to build alliances with moderate Republicans on their healthcare, energy, and jobs plans.

MODERATE GOP ARE KEY TO THE AGENDA.

CHADDOCK 9. [Gail Russell Chaddock, Staff writer of The Christian Science Monitor, February 9, 2009 edition http://features.csmonitor.com/economyrebuild/2009/02/09/gop-centrists-give-obama-a-majority-%E2%80%93-barely/]

There are moments, even in highly polarized political times, when the center holds – and counts. This week’s Senate vote on a massive economic recovery plan is one such moment. Three Republican centrists – the remnant of a once-robust moderate wing of their party – are poised to give Democrats the last few votes they need to pass President Obama’s $800 billion-plus stimulus plan in the Senate. With a handful of GOP colleagues, they are the likely “swing votes” that could make or break legislation in the Congress for the first years of the Obama administration. It’s a bare working majority. But if the relationship develops, it allows the president to go forward largely without regard to majority conservative views in the GOP caucus. Democrats shy of votes Even with a majority of 58 in the Senate (with one recount pending), Democrats are shy of the 60 votes needed to move major legislation. That’s why Republican moderates like Sens. Susan Collins and Olympia Snowe of Maine and Arlen Specter of Pennsylvania are so crucial to the new president’s agenda.

## AT: THERE ARE NO MODERATE GOP

REPUBLICAN MIDTERM WINS CAME IN BLUE DISTRICTS – CONSIDERABLE MODERATE GOP CONTINGENT.

SHOR 10. [Boris, PhD, Assistant Professor, Harris School @ UChicago, political scientist, “Say Hello to the Future Fightin’ Republican Liberals and Moderates of the House Class of 2010” October 27 -- http://bshor.wordpress.com/2010/10/27/say-hello-to-the-future-fightin-republican-liberals-and-moderates-of-the-house-class-of-2010/]

Republicans, in this wave election that recalls 1994, look set to win not just swing districts, but also those districts that have been traditionally Democratic, or those with strong or longtime Democratic incumbents. Naturally, just as in 2008, this has led to overclaiming by jubilant conservatives and distraught liberals–though the adjectives were then reversed–that this portends a realignment in American politics. What do Republican inroads in traditionally Democratic areas portend for how these potential new Representatives will vote come January 2011? For a little guidance, think back to two Republicans who won special elections in deeply blue constituencies in the 111th Congress: Scott Brown in Massachusetts, and Charles Djou in Hawaii’s 1st District. I’ve already written a bit about Scott Brown. My prediction after his election but before his arrival in Washington was that Brown, based on his voting record in the Massachusetts state legislature, would prove to be one of the most liberal Republicans in the US Senate, for which I was vilified a bit online. Now that we have nearly a year’s worth of votes behind us, I feel pretty good about that prediction. My estimate of Brown’s ideology—using our NPAT common space data–is that he is the third most liberal Republican in the Senate, just behind Olympia Snowe and Susan Collins of Maine. Charles Djou won a unique special election in the normally very Democratic HI-1 district, when two Democrats split the majority of votes in the district due to the lack of a primary election by law. One measure, among many, of the partisan leanings of a district is its Cook Partisan Voting Index or PVI score. HI-1, which is Barack Obama’s home district and encompasses Honolulu, is D+11. I hadn’t yet written about Djou–to my regret—though he had previously served in the Hawaii State Assembly (District 47). While there, he compiled a conservative-for-Hawaii voting record; I estimate him in the top 10 percent of legislators for conservatism in the state. He was even right of center of his own party. Of course, the punch line is just like that for Dede Scozzafava in New York. A conservative Republican in Hawaii just ain’t that conservative when you look across the country. It’s just that Hawaii Republicans are quite liberal. Based purely on Djou’s voting record in the Assembly, I would have predicted him to be more liberal than Lincoln Chaffee (RI) or Jim Jeffords (VT), the first of whom endorsed a Democrat for president, and the second of whom gave majority control of the Senate to Democrats by leaving the Republican party. In fact, he turned out to be slightly more conservative than I had expected, but not by much. He’s about as conservative as Scott Brown is–that is, not very–by the standards of congressional Republicans. In fact, the only Republican representative evincing a more liberal voting record than Djou is Anh “Joseph” Cao, of Louisiana’s 2nd District. Cao won his New Orleans district after the indictment of his predecessor. Yet even his sole Republican vote in favor of the Democratic health care reform legislation doesn’t appear to be enough to save him, as polling and other data indicate a very high likelihood of a Cao loss. In short, Republican moderates in Congress are often associated with two factors: 1) a liberal voting record earlier in their career, and 2) a liberal district. Of course, both are related, in the sense that ambitious moderates choose liberal districts to run in, and liberal districts weed out conservative candidates. Still, district opinion and legislator ideology are not always mirror images, for reasons I will describe in a later post. Despite this, Republican liberals and moderates often find themselves in difficult electoral contests, as Democratic conservatives and moderates are discovering anew in 2010. Given how competitive Republicans are in 2010, even in otherwise unfriendly territory, we should then expect a crop of moderates to emerge in the 112th Congress that will vote on the left side of the party.

## AT: MODERATE GOP KEY

REACHING OUT TO MODERATE GOP FAILS – THERE’S NONE LEFT.

BARRON 11-4-10. [John, Inside American presenter on ABC NewsRadio, research associate @ US Studies Centre @ U of Sydney, “The Doughnut Election” ABC -- http://www.abc.net.au/news/stories/2010/11/04/3056619.htm?site=thedrum]

Already president Obama is being urged to "shift to the political centre" - to do as Bill Clinton did after he suffered massive losses in the 1994 mid-terms and abandon more divisive agenda items like health care and gays serving openly in the military. But even some Clinton insiders, like former labor secretary Robert Reich, say the political centre just doesn't exist - shift to the centre and you'll find you are all alone. American politics is more like a doughnut. And this is clearly a problem for any attempts at bipartisanship. When the democrats enjoyed a 60-40 Senate majority, there was no need to compromise. Which was just as well because there were only one or two moderate Republicans who might have ever considered a compromise. Usually when a chamber like the Senate swings back to closer to 50-50 that means you'll get more moderates in swinging electorates prepared to cut a deal and cross the floor. But not this time. Tea Party-backed freshmen Republican senators like Rand Paul from Kentucky and Marco Rubio in Florida immediately become the least likely to join with the Democrats. And Democrats like Evan Bayh of Indiana who frequently voted with the Republicans saw the writing on the wall and quit politics this year in disgust, while liberals capable of bipartisandship like Russ Feingold of Wisconsin got creamed.

MODERATES CAN’T COMPROMISE – RE-ELECTION.

FRIEL 10. [Brian, CQ Staff, “Divided Senate complicates Dem Agenda” CQ Today -- November 4 -- http://www.congress.org/news/2010/11/04/divided\_senate\_complicates\_dem\_agenda]

GOP primary voters made it clear this year that they were looking for conservative bona fides in their Senate candidates. Such demands ultimately cost Pennsylvania’s Arlen Specter and Utah’s Robert F. Bennett their seats and helped deny nomination to several candidates initially favored by Senate Republican leaders, including Florida Gov. Charlie Crist and Rep. Michael N. Castle of Delaware. Republican senators who could face challenges from the right in 2012 include Olympia J. Snowe of Maine, Orrin G. Hatch of Utah, Scott P. Brown of Massachusetts and Bob Corker of Tennessee. That pressure could make compromise with Democrats impossible.

THERE AREN’T ENOUGH OF THEM LEFT TO MATTER – ELECTION RESULTS.

THOMMA 11-5-10. [Steven, White House correspondent, “Extremes rule both parties, as centrists lose their seats” McClatchy Newspapers]

The center may be falling out of American politics. About two dozen moderate to conservative Democrats in the House of Representatives were defeated this week, leaving a more liberal party in Washington. Also, several moderate to liberal Republicans were turned out through the year, ousted by primary challenges from more conservative candidates and leaving a more conservative party behind. The result is a more polarized Congress. That could complicate efforts to solve some of the country's biggest problems, such as government deficits and debt, especially as outsized voices on talk radio, cable TV and in the blogosphere pressure the parties not to compromise. All this risks driving politics farther from the American people, many of whom still stand squarely in the middle of the political road. "Bit by bit, the center in American politics is getting weaker," said William Galston, a top policy adviser in the Clinton White House and a scholar at the Brookings Institution. In the Democratic Party, this week's elections drove out about half of the conservative Democrats in the House, mostly from the South. Among the losers: Rep. Gene Taylor of Mississippi, who voted against the Democratic health care law, opposed "cap and trade" energy legislation and voted for Sen. John McCain, R-Ariz., for president in 2008 against his own party's nominee, Barack Obama. The remaining Democratic lawmakers, particularly in the House, will be more liberal, and under great pressure from such outside groups as labor unions not to make any compromises that would cut federal spending, particularly for pay or benefits for government employees. In the Republican Party, dozens of tea party conservatives won seats in the House. They're likely to pressure GOP leaders to make deep cuts in government spending, and to oppose any compromise with President Obama. Tea party candidates defeated moderate rivals in Senate primaries through the year. Among the moderate GOP victims: Rep. Michael Castle of Delaware, Gov. Charlie Crist of Florida, Secretary of State Trey Grayson of Kentucky and Sen. Robert Bennett of Utah. The ultimate example: Sen. Arlen Specter of Pennsylvania, whose political fate this year evoked the old line from Texas Democrat Jim Hightower, who sneered, "There's nothing in the middle of the road but yellow stripes and dead armadillos." A moderate to liberal Republican for most of his career, Specter was often right in the middle of Senate deal-making that bridged the two parties.

## FLIP FLOP KILLS AGENDA

Flip-flops are politically devastating

The Dallas Morning News, 1 (4/16/2001 (lexis))

A high number of flip-flops can bleed a president dry, they added, especially one who campaigned for a "responsibility era" in contrast to the scandal-ridden Clinton era. "His stock-in-trade more than anything else is, 'This is a guy who keeps his commitments, even when it's painful ,' " said Norman Ornstein, a resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute. Democrats said the coal companies applied pressure to Bush, forcing a decision they say ignores the threat of global warming. In mocking Bush's prior campaign pledge, many cited the chemical formula for carbon dioxide, CO2. "The president and his team have really made a 180-degree turn on their position here, suggesting now that CO2 is somehow A-OK," said Sen. Joe Lieberman, D-Conn., who ran against Bush as the Democratic candidate for vice president. Sen. Hillary Rodham Clinton, D-N.Y., wife of Bush's predecessor, called it "a promise made and a promise broken." "In less than eight weeks in office, President Bush has gone from CO2 to 'see you later,' " Hillary Clinton said. During a campaign speech in Saginaw, Mich., on Sept. 29, Bush outlined a clean air strategy targeting four pollutants. "With the help of Congress, environmental groups and industry, we will require all power plants to meet clean air standards in order to reduce emissions of sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxide, mercury, and carbon dioxide within a reasonable period of time," Bush said. And since his inauguration, Bush's Environmental Protection Agency chief, Christie Whitman, has publicly backed the carbon dioxide restrictions. But late Tuesday, he sent a letter to Republican senators saying he was still committed to new emission standards on the first three items. "I do not believe, however, that the government should impose on power plants mandatory emissions reductions for carbon dioxide, which is not a 'pollutant' under the Clean Air Act," Bush wrote. Critics said broken promises are especially troublesome for Bush, who promised a more straightforward approach than his predecessor. During an Oct. 26 speech titled "Responsible Leadership," Bush told supporters in Pittsburgh that "in a responsibility era, government should trust the people." "And in a responsibility era, people should also be able to trust their government," Bush said. Ornstein said it may be hard for Bush to make those kind of comments in the future. "Now his opponents are going to jump up and say, 'Oh yeah?' " Ornstein said. "This is going to be used against him." White House aides said they believe most voters will understand the circumstances behind the decision. They cited a recent Energy Department study saying that capping carbon dioxide emissions would escalate the shift from coal to natural gas for electricity generation, thus boosting prices. "It's better to protect the consumer and avoid worsening the energy crisis," White House spokesman Ari Fleischer said. If Bush has any doubt how much damage a broken promise can do, he needs only to ask his father , President George Bush, who hurt himself by reversing his nationally televised "read my lips, no new taxes" pledge. The younger Bush's carbon dioxide pledge came in an energy policy speech, and most of the attention at the time was devoted to his proposal to drill for oil in an Alaska wildlife refuge. Thomas E. Patterson, a professor of government and the press at the Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government, said the damage done to Bush depends on what happens in the future. He likened broken campaign promises to "razor cuts." "If you only have a few of them, they really can get lost in everything else that's going on," Patterson said. " It's the accumulation of these razor cuts that starts the real bleeding."

Flip-flops kill the agenda - it’s the most destructive political label in America

Rainey, 8 (6/25/08 (James, Staff @ LA Times, "ON THE MEDIA: Candidates Show Lack of Leadership on Iraq," Daily Herald, [http://www.heraldextra.com/component/option,com\_contentwire/task,view/id,61544/Itemid,53/](http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc))

The Iraq experts I interviewed agreed that one of the most problematic barriers to a real debate is -- as author and journalist George Packer said -- a culture that has "made flip-flopper the most feared label in American politics." They could point to another politician, fact averse but stalwart, who took too long to adapt once it became clear Iraq was going sideways. "It seems in America you are stuck with the position you adopted, even when events change, in order to claim absolute consistency," Packer said. "That can't be good."

FLIP FLOPS KILL THE AGENDA.

**Fitts 96** (Michael A., University of Pennsylvania Law Review, January, Lexis)

Centralized and visible power, however, becomes a double-edged sword, once one explores the different ways in which unitariness and visibility can undermine an institution's informal influence, especially its ability to mediate conflict and appear competent. In this context, the visibility and centralization of the presidency can have mixed effects. As a single visible actor in an increasingly complex world, the unitary president can be prone to an overassessment of responsibility and error. He also may be exposed to a normative standard of personal assessment that may conflict with his institutional duties. At the same time, the modern president often does not have at his disposal those bureaucratic institutions that can help mediate or deflect many conflicts. Unlike members of Congress or the agencies, he often must be clear about the tradeoffs he makes. Furthermore, a president who will be held personally accountable for government policy cannot pursue or hold inconsistent positions and values over a long period of time without suffering political repercussions. In short, the centralization and individualization of the presidency can be a source of its power, as its chief proponents and critics accurately have suggested, as well as its political illegitimacy and ultimate weakness.

## AT: FLIP FLOP KILLS AGENDA

A WELL-CALCULATED FLIP FLOP PROJECTS STRENGTH -- NOT POLITICAL SUICIDE.

Harris 8. [John, Politico.com editor-in-chief Bryant Park Project, NPR, “Politicians: Flip-Flopping Or Changing Their Minds?”, [http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=92510153](http://motherjones.com/blue-marble/2011/02/republican-climate-nasa-budget?storyId=92510153)]

Can politicians change positions without being accused of the now familiar criticism that they are flip-flopping?

Take, for example, Barack Obama's trip to Iraq. When he announced at the beginning of the month that he would be making his second visit to the war-torn country, he said that he would be making a "thorough assessment" of the situation while he was there, adding, "I'm sure I'll have more information and continue to refine my policy." That immediately opened him up to questions about whether he would alter his position that, as president, he would take the United States out of Iraq within 16 months of his election.John Harris, editor-in-chief of Politico.com, says it is possible for politicians to change their stands without being perceived as flip-floppers, but he says it depends on the issue, the political climate, and the agility of the politician. Obama is walking a line, he says, and if he is going to change his position, "it will tell us about how skillful a politician he really is." McCain has what is perhaps the flip side of the flip-flop question on Iraq. Harris says that McCain, long identified as a strong supporter of the war, "knows that he's sort of exposed on this issue." Harris says McCain won't try to alter his position substantially. Instead, he says, McCain will highlight his support of the war head-on: "Rather than trying to talk his way out of the issue or downplay the issue, he's going to say, 'Look, let's have an argument about Iraq and who's been right over this past year about the surge."On the issue of the war in Iraq, says Harris, he thinks most Americans have already made up their minds, deciding that the war was a mistake in the first place. These voters, says Harris, don't look at whether the war is going well for the U.S. on any particular month. "At least, that's what Barack Obama will hope," Harris says. Harris believes that the American public will allow politicians to change their positions, but only under the correct circumstances. "On the one hand," he says, "we don't want politicians who look just nakedly expedient, totally transparent — they're flip-floppers." He says that there are many times when the electorate will admire politicians who change their positions: "They're flexible, they're shrewd, they're willing to stand up to the extremists in their own party, and they're willing to fight for maneuvering room.""I believe that with the exception of the most ideologically committed partisans, most voters are not that worked up about flip-flops," says Harris. "They know that situations change, politicians change their mind. What they are looking for is strength, and the key is projecting strength.""Strength can be consistency," says Harris. "It can also be judgment."

FLIP FLOPS DON’T HURT OBAMA.

Walsh 9 [Kenneth, Chief White House correspondent -- U.S. News & World Report “Obama Said To Have Rebuffed Liberal Activists In Series Of "Flip-Flops.” 6/1 lexis]

US News Weekly's Kenneth T. Walsh (5/29) writes, "President Obama has been shifting gears, and reversing some of his policies, at a remarkable rate. But so far, he hasn't paid much of a political price for it, a testament to his popularity and the willingness of Americans to give him a chance to get results. The list of his fluctuations is lengthy: He once promised Planned Parenthood that his first act as president would be to sign an abortion-rights bill into law. Now he says it is 'not my highest legislative priority.' He pledged to gay activists that he would repeal the military's 'don't ask, don't tell' policy. ... Instead, he has delayed any action to change the system." Walsh adds that Obama has adopted many of the Bush administrations antiterrorism policies and "plans to leave tens of thousands of troops behind to train Iraqis, protect U.S. interests, and root out al Qaeda insurgents. Many antiwar Democrats backed Obama in key primaries and caucuses last year because they believed he would end the war as soon as possible. Some of them are disappointed; others are angry. Overall, however, Obama has been praised for his flexibility, not condemned for his flip-flops."

Political flip-flops are common – key to adapt to changing political climates.

**VAN HORN 1**. [Carl, affiliated with the John J Heldrich Center for Workforce Development @ Rutgers, Politics and Public Policy, 3rd ed, p 181-182]

It is not uncommon for chief executives to contradict one of their publicly stated positions rather than to pursue policies that displease important voting blocs. For much of his public career, George Bush supported a woman’s right to choose an abortion, but he shifted positions 180 degrees in order to fit comfortably on the Republican ticket in 1980. By 1988, when he sought the presidency on his own, Bush had become an ardent advocate of restrictions on abortion. Reagan often changed his mind at politically opportune moments, making adept adjustments in his positions on Social Security, farm subsidies, public works programs, and import restrictions. For much of his public career, Clinton supported policies aligned with liberal ideologies. He shifted his position somewhat in order to garner enough mainstream support to defeat Bush in the 1992 presidential elections. By 1995 it was often difficult to tell the difference between his policy proposals and those of the Republican Congress. Ironically, political leaders sometimes have to follow changes in the political wind in order to stay in charge.

## FOCUS KEY

OBAMA’S AGENDA IS FINITE – FOCUS IS KEY – PLAN DERAILS THE AGENDA.

CSMonitor 9. [March 12 – lexis]

The Obama administration itself has not hidden the fact that it sees a limited window to enact its agenda, almost like a game of "beat the clock." As long as Obama's job approval ratings are comfortably high - currently in the 60s in major polls - he has the political capital to address the pent-up demand for change that is inevitable when the opposition party takes over from an unpopular previous administration. But, there's only so much a White House and Congress can accomplish, given the deliberative nature of the process, and even members of Obama's own party are raising warning flags about the magnitude of the new president's agenda.

PRESIDENTIAL FOCUS IS KEY TO GETTING THE AGENDA – PLAN IS A SURPRISE DERAILING THE AGENDA

GOMES 8. [11-10 Jim, columnist, “A climate plan in peril?” Boston Globe -- http://www.boston.com/lifestyle/green/articles/2008/11/10/a\_climate\_plan\_in\_peril/]

A budget out of balance and a populace more worried about the economic present than our atmospheric future does not bode well for global warming emerging as a top-tier issue in the early days of the new administration. An agenda crowded with critical items - an economy in recession, wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, the continuing mortgage meltdown, healthcare - awaits our newly elected leaders. There are only so many priorities that an administration and Congress can focus on, and they will need to make choices on how to use their initial honeymoon period and their finite supply of political capital.

PRESIDENTIAL FOCUS KEY AGENDA – PLAN TRADES OFF.

ANDRES 00. [Gary, president for legislative affairs in the Bush Administration, Presidential Studies Quarterly, September -- lexis]

The constraint of "time" is another trade-off the White House mustmanage. Members of Congress regularly criticize the White House for only being able to focus on one single issue at a time, a trait common to the White House legislative office that routinely works this way during major legislative battles, focusing its attention to winning a key vote on the House or Senate floor, and disposing of it before moving on to another project. Congress, with its diverse committee system and decentralized power structure, processes a variety of issues simultaneously. A typical legislative day might find two or three keyissues on the floor, leadership meetings about the agenda for the following week, and a half a dozen critical markups in committees. Given all the issues Congress can present to the president and the limited number of hours in a day or week, it is critical how the White House prioritizes. The White House must decide which issues to get involved with and which to ignore or delegate to others within the administration. The resolution of these choices and the trade-offs ultimatelyshape the White House-congressional agenda.

Focus key to passing the president’s agenda.

**EDWARDS AND BARRETT 00**. [George & Andrew, distinguished professor of political science @ A&M, assistant lecturer/PhD Candidate in political science @ A&M, Polarized Politics: Congress and the President in a Partisan Era, ed Bond and Fleisher p 110]

In addition, the White House wants to ensure that its proposals compete favorably with other proposals on the agenda. If presidents cannot focus Congress’s attention on their priority programs, the programs will get lost in the complex and overloaded legislative process. Moreover, presidents and their staff have the time and energy to lobby effectively for only a few bills at a time, and the president’s political capital is inevitably limited. As a result, presidents wish to focus on advancing their own initiatives rather than opposing or modifying the proposals of others. Thus, the White House not only wants its initiatives to be on the congressional agenda but also prefers to have fewer congressional initiatives with which it must deal.

## AT: FOCUS

Delayed Focus Key to Effective Use of Capital

**Newstex, 6/23/09** (lexis)

For now, the White House should have as little to do as possible with the various legislative products. Let the committees absorb the blows of the bad weeks. Let the early coalitions present themselves. Let the Republicans show their strategy in the mark-up sessions. Let the CBO score all the different options. Let the legislature familiarize itself with different revenue options. Wait. Wait and wait and wait. Wait until Congress has pushed this as far upfield as it's able.  
Then open up the White House. Then have Obama on TV. Then have Rahm on the phone with legislators. Then take Olympia Snowe for a ride on Marine One. The White House can exert explosive force on a piece of legislation, but it can only do so effectively for a short period of time. That was the mistake Clinton White House made in 1994. By the time their legislation was near reality, administration officials were so deeply involved that they couldn't add external momentum. It is not a mistake that Rahm Emmanuel, who watched it all happen firsthand, means to repeat.

Focus Link Not True For Obama

**Herald Times, 4/29/09** (Lexis)

I don't think any of us were quite prepared for the sheer energy this new president demonstrated in his first 100 days. The number of press conferences, policy speeches, cross-country and international travels on top of new initiatives to bolster financial markets has been mind-boggling. Obama said he would close down Guantanamo Bay, and the process is under way. He said he would extend health care to children, and he has signed into law a program that will provide more than 11 million children with health care. He said he would assess the situation in Iraq and provide a plan to bring our troops home safely. He said he would reverse many of George W. Bush's executive orders on stem-cell research and did that, too. One astute political observer recently told me that Obama reminds her of an octopus with eight arms, all doing different things, but each done with agile efficiency.

FOCUS LINK IS WRONG – PRESIDENTS ALWAYS DO A TON ESPECIALLY OBAMA.

MANN 10. [Thomas, Senior Fellow, Governance Studies, “American Politics on the Eve of the Midterm Elections” Brookings Institute -- November]

Those who argue that Obama should have focused exclusively on the economy and jobs during his first two years, pushing health reform, climate change and other centerpieces of his campaign agenda into the future, are blind to the realities of governing. Multiple problems and issues crowd a presidential agenda. They cannot simply be set aside. The window for health reform, which he considered an essential element in dealing with the long-term revenue imbalance, would be open early and briefly at best. Obama wisely concluded it was "now or never" and won a seemingly impossible legislative victory.

## AT: LOBBY LINK TURNS

NO RISK OF TURNS -- LOBBY IMPACT IS OVERRATED – LAUNDRY LIST.

INSIGHT ON THE NEWS 3**. [Sept 15 --lexis]**

Do we really have the best Congress money can buy? Maybe not. Paul Burstein, a sociology professor at the University of Washington, looked into the matter and concludes that "Contrary to popular belief and typical media portrayals, big campaign contributions and lobbying do not necessarily win the political influence that determines votes in the U.S. Congress." Writing in the summer 2003 edition of Contexts, the magazine of the American Sociological Association, Burstein says his research indicates votes are more often than not dictated by public opinion, ideology and party affiliation. "The power of interest groups to get legislators to change their votes in the face of personal ideology and party commitments is real but very limited," Burstein maintains. And just why does it appear otherwise? The author says that part of the misconception is due to media focus on the egregious actions of a few, and part is due to the individual perception that if government is not doing things "my way," then obviously it is a tool of special interests. Burstein says his study merely is one of many showing that money and special interests have little influence on the shaping of policy. This influence is limited by several factors, he says. For one thing, politicalaction-committee campaign contributions are not large compared with campaign costs, so their clout in that regard is limited. For another, "there are so many lobbyists that most cannot gain access to members of Congress, much less influence them." And lastly, "the number of members actually influenced by contributions and lobbying is often too small to determine the outcome of key votes." Burstein analyzed key votes from 2002 in reaching his conclusions. Most followed party affiliation. The major influence on voting, he concludes, is public opinion.

# \*SKFTA SPECIFIC INTERNALS

## PC KEY

POLITICAL CAPITAL KEY TO SKFTA PASSAGE.

GREEN 10. [11/1 -- Michael, senior advisor @ the Center for Strategic and International Studies, “Echoes of the past haunt G-20” -- http://joongangdaily.joins.com/article/view.asp?aid=2927756]

Fortunately, President Obama has backed his trade negotiators by declaring his desire to see the Korea-U.S. Free Trade Agreement approved by the end of this year, but that is the easy part. Its passage will require him to exhibit leadership by side-stepping some of his own in the Democratic caucus and working with (probably) a majority Republican House. This will take a lot of political capital. The fact that the White House still talks about “exports” rather than “trade” leaves some worrisome questions about how much the administration really understands and is committed to this goal.

PC KEY – WILL PASS

Palmer 5-5 (Doug, Staff Writer, “Boehner says Obama push needed to pass trade deals,” Reuters, 2011, http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/05/05/us-usa-trade-boehner-idUSTRE74453V20110505)

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.

## GOP KEY

GOP VOTES KEY TO SKFTA PASSAGE.

BRODER 10. [david, op-ed columnist, “What the GOP can do for Obama” Washington Post -- Aug 1]

For instance, it is clear that if Obama seeks Senate approval of the stalled free-trade agreement with South Korea -- a step that would shore up his Asian foreign policy and end the impasse on trade -- he will need a higher percentage of votes from Republicans than he is likely to get from Democrats.

GOP SUPPORT NOT INEVITABLE – AVOIDING PARTISAN ISSUES KEY TO ENSURE COOPERATION.

KAROL 10. [David, assistant professor of government at American University, “After the election: Can Obama find common ground with the GOP on trade?” The Hill -- 10/28]

Beyond these differences however, the chief obstacle to cooperation between the administration and GOP legislators on trade is pervasive mistrust flowing from polarization, which aggravates politicians’ temptation to posture for short-term partisan advantage. While President Clinton worked with Republicans to liberalize trade via NAFTA and PNTR, partisan mistrust impeded cooperation in the 1990s as well. Then Speaker Gingrich and most GOP legislators did back Clinton’s 1997 request for fast track authority. Yet Clinton’s fast track bid failed in part because dozens of Republicans were reluctant to give him a win of any sort. The following year Gingrich brought up the bill when he knew the votes weren’t there simply to drive a wedge between Democrats and the business community. So cooperation between Obama and Congressional Republicans on trade policy is hardly assured. Yet in an era in which the partisan divide looms large it is one area where at least common ground is visible.

# \*IMPACTS

## 2NC IMPACT WALL

1NC PRITCHARD SAYS RELATIONS SOLVE MULTIPLE SCENARIOS OF CONFLICT – EACH CAUSES EXTINCTION

1 - KOREA

Africa News -99 (AFRICA NEWS, December 25, 1999, p. online)

Lusaka - If there is one place today where the much-dreaded Third World War could easily erupt and probably reduce earth to a huge smouldering cinder it is the Korean Peninsula in Far East Asia. Ever since the end of the savage three-year Korean war in the early 1950s, military tension between the hard-line communist north and the American backed South Korea has remained dangerously high. In fact the Koreas are technically still at war. A foreign visitor to either Pyongyong in the North or Seoul in South Korea will quickly notice that the divided country is always on maximum alert for any eventuality. North Korea or the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) has never forgiven the US for coming to the aid of South Korea during the Korean war. She still regards the US as an occupation force in South Korea and wholly to blame for the non-reunification of the country. North Korean media constantly churns out a tirade of attacks on "imperialist" America and its "running dog" South Korea. The DPRK is one of the most secretive countries in the world where a visitor is given the impression that the people's hatred for the US is absolute while the love for their government is total. Whether this is really so, it is extremely difficult to conclude. In the DPRK, a visitor is never given a chance to speak to ordinary Koreans about the politics of their country. No visitor moves around alone without government escort. The American government argues that its presence in South Korea was because of the constant danger of an invasion from the north. America has vast economic interests in South Korea. She points out that the north has dug numerous tunnels along the demilitarised zone as part of the invasion plans. She also accuses the north of violating South Korean territorial waters. Early this year, a small North Korean submarine was caught in South Korean waters after getting entangled in fishing nets. Both the Americans and South Koreans claim the submarine was on a military spying mission. However, the intension of the alleged intrusion will probably never be known because the craft's crew were all found with fatal gunshot wounds to their heads in what has been described as suicide pact to hide the truth of the mission. The US mistrust of the north's intentions is so deep that it is no secret that today Washington has the largest concentration of soldiers and weaponry of all descriptions in south Korea than anywhere else in the World, apart from America itself. Some of the armada that was deployed in the recent bombing of Iraq and in Operation Desert Storm against the same country following its invasion of Kuwait was from the fleet permanently stationed on the Korean Peninsula. It is true too that at the moment the North/South Korean border is the most fortified in the world. The border line is littered with anti-tank and anti-personnel landmines, surface-to-surface and surface-to-air missiles and is constantly patrolled by warplanes from both sides. It is common knowledge that America also keeps an eye on any military movement or buildup in the north through spy satellites. The DPRK is said to have an estimated one million soldiers and a huge arsenal of various weapons. Although the DPRK regards herself as a developing country, she can however be classified as a super-power in terms of military might. The DPRK is capable of producing medium and long-range missiles. Last year, for example, she test-fired a medium range missile over Japan, an action that greatly shook and alarmed the US, Japan and South Korea. The DPRK says the projectile was a satellite. There have also been fears that she was planning to test another ballistic missile capable of reaching North America. Naturally, the world is anxious that military tension on the Korean Peninsula must be defused to avoid an apocalypse on earth. It is therefore significant that the American government announced a few days ago that it was moving towards normalising relations with North Korea.

2 - PROLIF

**Utgoff 2** (Victor A., Deputy Director of the Strategy, Forces, and Resources Division of the Institute for Defense Analysis, Survival Vol 44 No 2 Proliferation, Missile Defence and American Ambitions, p. 87-90)

In sum, widespread proliferation is likely to lead to an occasional shoot-out with nuclear weapons, and that such shoot-outs will have a substantial probability of escalating to the maximum destruction possible with the weapons at hand. Unless nuclear proliferation is stopped, we are headed toward a world that will mirror the American Wild West of the late 1800s. With most, if not all, nations wearing nuclear 'six-shooters' on their hips, the world may even be a more polite place than it is today, but every once in a while we will all gather on a hill to bury the bodies of dead cities or even whole nations.

3 - ECON

Mead 9. [2/4, Walter Russell, Henry A. Kissinger Senior Fellow in U.S. Foreign Policy at the Council on Foreign Relations, Only Makes You Stronger: Why the recession bolstered America, The New Republic]

None of which means that we can just sit back and enjoy the recession. History may suggest that financial crises actually help capitalist great powers maintain their leads--but it has other, less reassuring messages as well. If financial crises have been a normal part of life during the 300-year rise of the liberal capitalist system under the Anglophone powers, so has war. The wars of the League of Augsburg and the Spanish Succession; the Seven Years War; the American Revolution; the Napoleonic Wars; the two World Wars; the cold war: The list of wars is almost as long as the list of financial crises. **Bad economic times** can **breed wars**. Europe was a pretty peaceful place in 1928, but the Depression poisoned German public opinion and helped bring Adolf Hitler to power. If the current crisis turns into a depression, what rough beasts might start slouching toward Moscow, Karachi, Beijing, or New Delhi to be born? The United States may not, yet, decline, but, if we can't get the world economy back on track, we may still have to fight.

4 - AFGHANISTAN

MORGAN 7. [Stephen J. former member of the British Labour Party Executive Committee, political writer including books such as The Mind of a Terrorist Fundamentalist – the Cult of Al Qaeda -- “Better Another Taliban Afghanistan, than a Taliban NUCLEAR Pakistan” March 4 -- http://ezinearticles.com/?Better-Another-Taliban-Afghanistan,-than-a-Taliban-NUCLEAR-Pakistan?&id=475808]

However events may prove him sorely wrong. Indeed, his policy could completely backfire upon him. As the war intensifies, he has no guarantees that the current autonomy may yet burgeon into a separatist movement. Appetite comes with eating, as they say. Moreover, should the Taliban fail to re-conquer al of Afghanistan, as looks likely, but captures at least half of the country, then a Taliban Pashtun caliphate could be established which would act as a magnet to separatist Pashtuns in Pakistan. Then, the likely break up of Afghanistan along ethnic lines, could, indeed, lead the way to the break up of Pakistan, as well. **Strong centrifugal forces have always bedevilled the stability and unity of Pakistan**, and, in the context of the new world situation, the country could be faced with civil wars and popular fundamentalist uprisings, probably including a military-fundamentalist coup d’état. **Fundamentalism is deeply rooted** in Pakistan society. The fact that in the year following 9/11, the most popular name given to male children born that year was “Osama” (not a Pakistani name) is a small indication of the mood. Given the weakening base of the traditional, secular opposition parties, conditions would be ripe for a coup d’état **by the fundamentalist wing of the Army** and ISI, leaning on the radicalised masses to take power. Some form of radical, military Islamic regime, where legal powers would shift to Islamic courts and forms of shira law would be likely. Although, even then, this might not take place outside of a protracted crisis of upheaval and civil war conditions, mixing fundamentalist movements with nationalist uprisings and sectarian violence between the Sunni and minority Shia populations. The nightmare that is now Iraq would take on gothic proportions across the continent. The prophesy of an arc of civil war over Lebanon, Palestine and Iraq would spread to south Asia, **stretching from Pakistan to Palestine, through Afghanistan into Iraq and up to the Mediterranean coast**. Undoubtedly, this would also spill over into India both with regards to the Muslim community and Kashmir. Border clashes, terrorist attacks, sectarian pogroms and insurgency would break out. A new war, and possibly nuclear war, **between Pakistan and India** could not be ruled out. Atomic Al Qaeda **Should Pakistan break down** completely, **a Taliban-style government with strong Al Qaeda influence is a real possibility**. Such deep chaos would, of course, **open a “Pandora's box**” for the region and the world. With the possibility of unstable clerical and military fundamentalist elements being in control of the **Pakistan** nuclear arsenal, **not only** their use **against India, but Israel** becomes a possibility, as well as the acquisition of nuclear **and other deadly** weapons secrets by Al Qaeda. Invading Pakistan would not be an option for America. Therefore a nuclear war **would now again become a real strategic possibility. This would** bring a shift in the tectonic plates of global relations. It could usher in a new Cold War with China and Russia pitted against the US.

## IMPACT: AGRICULTURE

SKFTA IS KEY TO THE US AGRICULTURE INDUSTRY

ASIA PULSE 7. [7/9 – “U.S. AGRICULTURE GROUPS TELL CONGRESS TO APPROVE FTA WITH KOREA”, lexis]

U.S. food and agriculture groups were getting actively involved in supporting a free trade agreement (FTA) with South Korea, telling their Congress that not approving the deal would be "devastating" to American farmers and ranchers. In a joint letter dated July 2, the 34 groups expressed the need to the legislature for the bilateral trade pact, commonly referred to as KORUS FTA. The deal gives the United States a chance to eliminate restrictions in one of the most highly protected agricultural markets in the world, the letter said. "We cannot afford to fumble it away," it said. "This is a significant achievement - one which will provide large dividends to America's farmers, ranchers and agribusiness for decades to come." South Korea and the U.S. signed the FTA on June 30, starting what many predict will be a long process to have it ratified by their respective legislatures. Proponents are believed to outnumber opponents in South Korea, but large-scale protests still continue. In the U.S., Democratic leaders who control the Congress issued a statement just a day before the FTA signing that said they cannot accept the deal as negotiated. Last week's letter to the Congress is seen as the start of lobbying in support of the FTA in the U.S. "What we have seen and heard so far in Washington were the voices of concern and opposition without really having people on the other side of the argument speaking as loudly. "Once the lobbying gets under way you will probably hear different things," a long-time observer who keeps close tabs on the developments said. In advisory committee reports released in May, the agriculture sector expressed overall satisfaction with the agreement but highly criticized the exclusion of rice from the deal, as well as yet-to-be-settled full reopening of South Korea's market to U.S. beef. The July 2 letter reiterated the concern on the beef issue but said the groups recognize South Korea's pledge to work toward restoration of beef trade with the U.S. The groups said they were worried because the U.S. agricultural market share in South Korea, although still the largest among exporters, has been steadily declining since the mid-1990s, dropping from 45 per cent in 1996 to less than an estimated 20 per cent last year. The KORUS FTA would reverse that trend, they said. The benefits would be heavily in U.S. favor, since American farmers, ranchers and agribusiness face "virtually no new competition" as a result of the FTA, they argued. "Failure by the Congress to approve the FTA would be devastating to U.S. farmers and ranchers," they said in the letter. "Canada and the European Union are negotiating free trade deals with Korea. If those deals are implemented in the face of congressional inaction on the KORUS FTA, the consequences for American agriculture would be catastrophic," they said.

BLIPS IN FOD PRICES KILL BILLIONS.

TAMPA TRIBUNE 96.

On a global scale, food supplies - measured by stockpiles of grain - are not abundant. In 1995, world production failed to meet demand for the third consecutive year, said Per Pinstrup-Andersen, director of the International Food Policy Research Institute in Washington, D.C. As a result, grain stockpiles fell from an average of 17 percent of annual consumption in 1994-1995 to 13 percent at the end of the 1995-1996 season, he said. That's troubling, Pinstrup-Andersen noted, since 13 percent is well below the 17 percent the United Nations considers essential to provide a margin of safety in world food security. During the food crisis of the early 1970s, world grain stocks were at 15 percent. "Even if they are merely blips, higher international prices can hurt poor countries that import a significant portion of their food," he said. "Rising prices can also quickly put food out of reach of the 1.1 billion people in the developing world who live on a dollar a day or less." He also said many people in low-income countries already spend more than half of their income on food.

## IMPACT: ECON

SKFTA KEY TO THE ECONOMY, ALLIANCE, AND ENGAGING EAST ASIA.

WEBB ET AL 10. [Jim, East Asia and Pacific Affairs Subcommittee Chairman, Senatory Kerry, Senator Lieberman, Senator Lincoln and Senator Begich, “Key Democratic Senators Support Obama Administration's Decision To Move Forward On U.S.-Korea Trade” Congressional Documents and Publications -- July 20 -- lexis]

"President Obama has made clear he wants to work with our ally South Korea to resolve legitimate concerns and smooth the way for passage of the trade agreement. This is an important step in meeting the President's goal of doubling American exports over the next five years to create good American jobs," said Senator Kerry, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. "South Korea is one of our closest allies, and swift movement on KORUS will help underscore both our relationship and our commitment to security and prosperity in East Asia. When Seoul hosts the G-20 meeting this November, I am optimistic that the United States will be able to point to substantial progress on KORUS as an example of America's reengagement with the region." "The passage of this agreement will send a strong signal to our ally, the Republic of Korea, and the rest of the region that the United States will follow through on its commitments and intends to remain deeply engaged in East Asia," said Senator Webb, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on East Asia and Pacific Affairs. "The United States, the Republic of Korea, and all of East Asia stand to benefit from the implementation of this agreement. I support the President's decision to resolve the concerns of a few key industries by November, and I will do my part in the Senate to ensure that it is approved." "As Chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, creating jobs and putting our economy back on the right track is my top priority. Opening more markets for agricultural producers will help Arkansas farmers, ranchers and rural communities who have felt the devastating effects of the current economic climate. I am very pleased that the President made a public commitment at the G-20 meeting to resolve outstanding issues with respect to the Korea Free Trade Agreement, and bring it to Congress for approval by the end of this year. Once it is passed by Congress, the implementation of this FTA will represent a major step toward reaching the goal of doubling U.S. exports within five years," said Senator Lincoln, Chairman of the U.S. Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry. This trade agreement will create jobs for Americans here at home, strengthen our economy, and bolster our alliance with South Korea," Senator Lieberman, Chairman of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee said. "When the President submits this critical initiative to Congress, there will be a strong coalition of Democrats who are ready and eager to fight for its passage."

NUCLEAR WAR.

Mead 9. [2/4, Walter Russell, Henry A. Kissinger Senior Fellow in U.S. Foreign Policy at the Council on Foreign Relations, Only Makes You Stronger: Why the recession bolstered America, The New Republic]

None of which means that we can just sit back and enjoy the recession. History may suggest that financial crises actually help capitalist great powers maintain their leads--but it has other, less reassuring messages as well. If financial crises have been a normal part of life during the 300-year rise of the liberal capitalist system under the Anglophone powers, so has war. The wars of the League of Augsburg and the Spanish Succession; the Seven Years War; the American Revolution; the Napoleonic Wars; the two World Wars; the cold war: The list of wars is almost as long as the list of financial crises. **Bad economic times** can **breed wars**. Europe was a pretty peaceful place in 1928, but the Depression poisoned German public opinion and helped bring Adolf Hitler to power. If the current crisis turns into a depression, what rough beasts might start slouching toward Moscow, Karachi, Beijing, or New Delhi to be born? The United States may not, yet, decline, but, if we can't get the world economy back on track, we may still have to fight.

## EXT: SKFTA KEY TO ECON

SKFTA KEY TO SMALL BUSINESS – KEY TO ECON

Graves, 7/1/11 (Sam, US Rep, Congressional Documents and Publications)

There has been recent progress on three pending trade agreements with Panama, Colombia and South Korea -- but time is of the essence. The slow progress certainly does not help our small businesses, which are already facing uncertainty because of skyrocketing energy costs, excessive federal regulations and possible tax increases. We owe it to small businesses to open new markets and lower trade barriers so they can compete with their foreign counterparts and increase their exports. More exports means more revenue and job creation. In fact, $1 billion in U.S. exports creates 6,000 jobs, according to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. In addition, the independent U.S. International Trade Commission estimates passing the trade agreements will increase U.S. exports by $13 billion and create 75,000 jobs -- all without one dime of new government spending. Phil Wise, the owner of Wise Family Farm in Harris, Mo., gave sobering testimony on the necessity of passing the trade agreements at a recent House Small Business Committee hearing. "While we sit on our hands," Wise said, "other pork-exporting countries are moving forward with FTAs of their own with Colombia, Panama and South Korea.... [Iowa State University economist] Dr. Dermot Hayes calculates that we will be out of the Korea and Colombia markets in 10 years if the U.S. fails to implement its agreements." The key to America's long-term economic recovery is held by flourishing small businesses -- our nation's most robust job creators. Small firms create more than half the nonfarm private gross domestic product and employ more than half the U.S. workforce. In fact, 64 percent of net new jobs over the past 15 years were created by small businesses. But we have to provide the market opportunities and resources for small businesses to compete -- so they can grow and hire more workers. With 95 percent of the purchasing market outside the U.S., small businesses and farmers understand the opportunities and benefits of exporting. Like large U.S. companies, small businesses face a variety of trade barriers that limit their ability to compete -- including higher tariffs, technical standards and foreign customs regulations. Most small firms, however, do not have the resources and capital to navigate complex trade barriers. As a result, many simply do not export. This is why passing all three trade agreements is critical. They remove both tariff and nontariff barriers, protect intellectual property and streamline the trade process. More than 20,000 U.S. companies export to South Korea alone -- and more than 18,500 are small businesses. The South Korea FTA will increase total U.S. exports by $10 billion, according to ITC estimates, including $2.8 billion from small- and medium-sized U.S. companies. Passing the trade agreement with Colombia would also increase opportunities and level the playing field for small businesses. Most Colombian exports already enter the U.S. duty free, while U.S. exports face tariffs as high as 35 percent. Lowering the barriers would generate an estimated $2.5 billion per year to the U.S. GDP and increase exports by more than $1 billion. "My customers [in Colombia] have been paying 20 percent tariffs on hundreds of thousands of dollars on my imported products, and this has reduced the range of items that they could purchase from me," said Roy Paulson, president of Paulson Manufacturing in California. In addition, more than 7,200 small businesses now export to Panama. Passage of the FTA with Panama would allow more than 88 percent of U.S. exports to enter duty free and increase U.S. exports by a whopping 145 percent. The benefits of these three job-creating agreements for small businesses and our economy are too big to move this slowly. It's time for America to get in the game. The longer we wait, the longer small businesses will be at a disadvantage, which means waiting longer for a full economic recovery.

SKFTA KEY TO ECON – BOOSTS EXPORTS.

DAILY NEWS 12-20. [“Trade deal would be a boon for Washington” -- http://tdn.com/news/opinion/article\_2bb8bfbc-0c25-11e0-8128-001cc4c002e0.html]

Let's hope Hufbauer is right about this agreement's prospects. The trade pact is a very good deal for the United States. Sen. Maria Cantwell, D-Wash., has cited estimates that say U.S. exports to South Korea could increase by $10 billion to $12 billion a year under the agreement. Washington exporters would benefit significantly from its ratification. Cantwell noted earlier this year that, "South Korea is Washington's fifth largest export market, making the U.S.-South Korean Free Trade Agreement crucial to future job and economic growth. Passage of the FTA would have enormous benefits for Washington, by making many U.S. food products duty-free, including wheat, cherries, wine and potatoes." Trade fuels the economy, both state and national, in both good times and bad. Trade, in fact, has been one of a very few bright spots in this recession-battered economy. Writing for The Wall Street Journal, Edward F. Gerwin Jr., senior fellow for trade and global economic policy at Third Way, reported that, in 2009, U.S. free trade agreements with 17 countries "accounted for 40 percent of U.S. goods exports and 31 percent of our goods imports." According to Gerwin, "One reason for the success of FTAs in promoting U.S. exports is that we often have more to gain because other countries must usually eliminate higher trade barriers than the United States. This certainly is true of Korea."

## IMPACT: HEG

SKFTA KEY TO INFLUENCE IN ASIA – KEY TO HEG.

KOREA TIMES 10. [2/1/ -- " US Loses Clout on Korean Economy ", http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/biz/2010/02/123\_60075.html]

But its influence in what is now Asia's fourth-largest economy has been diminishing rapidly over the last 10 years, with Korea expanding trade relations with China, Russia and other emerging economies. Analysts here say that the U.S. could lose more of its economic clout in Korea if the administration of President Barack Obama and the U.S. Congress continue to delay the ratification of the Korea-U.S. free trade agreement (FTA). They say the European Union and China, which compete with the U.S. for global hegemony, will establish closer economic ties with Korea if the U.S. heads toward protectionism and places greater priority on domestic populism than trade. According to the Korea Customs Services (KCS) Monday, Korea's trade dependence on the U.S. stood at 9.7 percent in 2009, down from 24.4 percent in 1991. Korea shipped about 10.36 percent of its total outbound shipments to the world's largest economy, down from 25.8 percent over the same period, while taking 9 percent of its total imports from the U.S., down from 23.18 percent. On the other hand, Korea's trade dependence on China has increased at an explosive pace since the two countries began diplomatic relations in 1992. South Korea's exchange of agricultural and industrial goods with the world's fastest-growing economy reached 20.5 percent last year, up from 2.9 percent in 1991. Korea exported 23.9 percent of its outbound shipments to the neighboring country in 2009, up from 1.4 percent, with 16.8 percent of its imports coming from China, up from 4.2 percent. The U.S. has become less important to Korea economically over the years, with the latter increasingly relying on China, the European Union and other economies for growth. "Korea is the sixth-largest trading partner of the U.S. and a key Asian economy strategically located in Northeast Asia. American policymakers and businesses should be alert over their diminishing economic influence over Korea," LG Economic Research Institute managing director Oh Moon-suk said. Oh said if the U.S. continues to remain reluctant to sign the free trade pact with Korea, the Asian nation will continue to move closer toward China and the European Union, adding the EU will likely sign a free trade accord with Korea before the U.S. does.

GLOBAL NUCLEAR WAR.

KHALILZAD 95. [ZALMAY, Zalmay, Rand Corporation, The Washington Quarterly]

Under the third option, the United States would seek to retain global leadership and to preclude the rise of a global rival or a return to multipolarity for the indefinite future. On balance, this is the best long-term guiding principle and vision. Such a vision is desirable not as an end in itself, but because a world in which the United States exercises leadership would have tremendous advantages. First, the global environment would be more open and more receptive to American values -- democracy, free markets, and the rule of law. Second, such a world would have a better chance of dealing cooperatively with the world's major problems, such as nuclear proliferation, threats of regional hegemony by renegade states, and low-level conflicts. Finally, U.S. leadership would help preclude the rise of another hostile global rival, enabling the United States and the world to avoid another global cold or hot war and all the attendant dangers, including a global nuclear exchange. U.S. leadership would therefore be more conducive to global stability than a bipolar or a multipolar balance of power system.

## IMPACT: LAUNDRY LIST

SKFTA KEY TO THE ECONOMY LEADERSHIP AND STABILITY ON THE PENINSULA.

KLECKNER 10. [Dean, Chairman @ Truth About Trade & Technology, "Seoul Food: Approve the Trade Agreement with Korea Now," 7/10 -- http://www.agweb.com/Blogs/BlogPost.aspx?src=TheTruth&PID=14d43756-5af3-46f7-9a05-cdfc6c14be43]

It’s so much better when our two countries can stand united, as they appeared to do at the G-20 summit in Toronto. As President **Obama** left the meetings, he **promised to make an aggressive push to finish the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement**, which has languished for three years. The main reason to support the pact is economic: By boosting exports to South Korea, the deal will create jobs here at home. Yet there’s more at stake as well. The sinking of a South Korean naval vessel earlier this year has put the Korean peninsula on war footing. An international commission recently determined that a North Korean torpedo killed 46 South Korean sailors aboard the Cheonan. This is a time for the United States to stand up for its longtime ally. The best way we can do this--and **also** take a concrete step that will have a real **rather than symbolic** impact--is for Congress to pass the U.S.-Korea FTA. The Bush administration concluded the deal with South Korean leaders in 2007. Congress promptly ignored an obligation to hold an up-or-down vote. In doing so, lawmakers ignored their own legislative rules. They also broke a promise to trade diplomats who had negotiated the deal with the expectation that Washington at least would give them a hearing. This is no way to treat a friend. When it comes to delays and denials, members of Congress are specialists. Yet even by D.C. standards, this trade deal with an important ally has been neglected for too long. Trade has the power to promote peace. That’s why I’ve always supported small steps to bring the two Koreas together through exchanges such as the partnership at the Kaesong industrial complex north of the DMZ. The regime in Pyongyang may be one of the world’s most oppressive, but **I’ve always believed that** economic integration is preferable to economic isolation. Now the limited trade ties between the two nations are severed. In the face of this crisis, the **U.S.-Korea** FTA makes more sense than ever before from a national-security perspective. Fortunately, it also makes sense from an economic perspective. **The deal would fuel exports and create thousands of jobs for Americans**. One estimate says that new trade activity would boost our GDP by $12 billion. Farmers and ranchers certainly would see gains. We already sell about $2 billion in food to South Korea. Under the agreement, the tariffs on half of these products would vanish immediately. Continuing to ignore the trade agreement is a bad idea. As much as the South Koreans would like to buy more American-made goods and services, they have not forgotten the rest of the world while Washington dawdles. Seoul recently completed a set of trade talks with the European Union and it’s making rapid progress on a pact with Australia. There is talk of a Northeast Asia free-trade zone that would provide China and Japan with new advantages in selling to South Korean consumers. If these competitors start to take market share from U.S. companies **and workers,** it will be a direct result of Washington’s refusal to take trade seriously. And once we lose it, it's hard to get it back! "The U.S. runs the risk of losing the Korean market within a decade if we can't get a free-trade agreement ratified," said Jong-hyun Choi, Minister for Economic Affairs for the South Korean Embassy, who met with global pork producers in Iowa last week, according to the Des Moines Register. Many Democrats have resisted new trade measures, but not all of them. In fact, the U.S.-Korea agreement attracts strong levels of bipartisan support. Democratic senator John **Kerry** of Massachusetts **and** Republican senator Dick **Lugar** of Indiana--the two top members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee--recently **urged Obama to press for the pact. They noted its economic benefits and also said** its approval “would be considered a significant show of solidarity with a close and reliable ally.”

ECON CAUSES NUCLEAR WAR.

Mead 9. [2/4, Walter Russell, Henry A. Kissinger Senior Fellow in U.S. Foreign Policy at the Council on Foreign Relations, Only Makes You Stronger: Why the recession bolstered America, The New Republic]

None of which means that we can just sit back and enjoy the recession. History may suggest that financial crises actually help capitalist great powers maintain their leads--but it has other, less reassuring messages as well. If financial crises have been a normal part of life during the 300-year rise of the liberal capitalist system under the Anglophone powers, so has war. The wars of the League of Augsburg and the Spanish Succession; the Seven Years War; the American Revolution; the Napoleonic Wars; the two World Wars; the cold war: The list of wars is almost as long as the list of financial crises. **Bad economic times** can **breed wars**. Europe was a pretty peaceful place in 1928, but the Depression poisoned German public opinion and helped bring Adolf Hitler to power. If the current crisis turns into a depression, what rough beasts might start slouching toward Moscow, Karachi, Beijing, or New Delhi to be born? The United States may not, yet, decline, but, if we can't get the world economy back on track, we may still have to fight.

HEG PREVENTS GLOBAL NUCLEAR WAR.

KHALILZAD 95. [ZALMAY, Zalmay, Rand Corporation, The Washington Quarterly]

Under the third option, the United States would seek to retain global leadership and to preclude the rise of a global rival or a return to multipolarity for the indefinite future. On balance, this is the best long-term guiding principle and vision. Such a vision is desirable not as an end in itself, but because a world in which the United States exercises leadership would have tremendous advantages. First, the global environment would be more open and more receptive to American values -- democracy, free markets, and the rule of law. Second, such a world would have a better chance of dealing cooperatively with the world's major problems, such as nuclear proliferation, threats of regional hegemony by renegade states, and low-level conflicts. Finally, U.S. leadership would help preclude the rise of another hostile global rival, enabling the United States and the world to avoid another global cold or hot war and all the attendant dangers, including a global nuclear exchange. U.S. leadership would therefore be more conducive to global stability than a bipolar or a multipolar balance of power system.

Korean war causes extinction.

Africa News -99 (AFRICA NEWS, December 25, 1999, p. online)

Lusaka - If there is one place today where the much-dreaded Third World War could easily erupt and probably reduce earth to a huge smouldering cinder it is the Korean Peninsula in Far East Asia. Ever since the end of the savage three-year Korean war in the early 1950s, military tension between the hard-line communist north and the American backed South Korea has remained dangerously high. In fact the Koreas are technically still at war. A foreign visitor to either Pyongyong in the North or Seoul in South Korea will quickly notice that the divided country is always on maximum alert for any eventuality. North Korea or the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) has never forgiven the US for coming to the aid of South Korea during the Korean war. She still regards the US as an occupation force in South Korea and wholly to blame for the non-reunification of the country. North Korean media constantly churns out a tirade of attacks on "imperialist" America and its "running dog" South Korea. The DPRK is one of the most secretive countries in the world where a visitor is given the impression that the people's hatred for the US is absolute while the love for their government is total. Whether this is really so, it is extremely difficult to conclude. In the DPRK, a visitor is never given a chance to speak to ordinary Koreans about the politics of their country. No visitor moves around alone without government escort. The American government argues that its presence in South Korea was because of the constant danger of an invasion from the north. America has vast economic interests in South Korea. She points out that the north has dug numerous tunnels along the demilitarised zone as part of the invasion plans. She also accuses the north of violating South Korean territorial waters. Early this year, a small North Korean submarine was caught in South Korean waters after getting entangled in fishing nets. Both the Americans and South Koreans claim the submarine was on a military spying mission. However, the intension of the alleged intrusion will probably never be known because the craft's crew were all found with fatal gunshot wounds to their heads in what has been described as suicide pact to hide the truth of the mission. The US mistrust of the north's intentions is so deep that it is no secret that today Washington has the largest concentration of soldiers and weaponry of all descriptions in south Korea than anywhere else in the World, apart from America itself. Some of the armada that was deployed in the recent bombing of Iraq and in Operation Desert Storm against the same country following its invasion of Kuwait was from the fleet permanently stationed on the Korean Peninsula. It is true too that at the moment the North/South Korean border is the most fortified in the world. The border line is littered with anti-tank and anti-personnel landmines, surface-to-surface and surface-to-air missiles and is constantly patrolled by warplanes from both sides. It is common knowledge that America also keeps an eye on any military movement or buildup in the north through spy satellites. The DPRK is said to have an estimated one million soldiers and a huge arsenal of various weapons. Although the DPRK regards herself as a developing country, she can however be classified as a super-power in terms of military might. The DPRK is capable of producing medium and long-range missiles. Last year, for example, she test-fired a medium range missile over Japan, an action that greatly shook and alarmed the US, Japan and South Korea. The DPRK says the projectile was a satellite. There have also been fears that she was planning to test another ballistic missile capable of reaching North America. Naturally, the world is anxious that military tension on the Korean Peninsula must be defused to avoid an apocalypse on earth. It is therefore significant that the American government announced a few days ago that it was moving towards normalising relations with North Korea.

## IMPACT: SK ECON

FTA KEY TO THE SOUTH KOREAN ECONOMY

Cutler 6. (Wendy, Assistant U.S. Trade Rep, “United States-South Korean Free Trade Agreement: A Win-Win Proposition, 3-7, http://seoul.usembassy.gov/rok20060307.html)

Korea is also expected to benefit substantially from this agreement. Reading through just some of the flurry of news reports, op-ed pieces, government statements, and Korean economic analysis, the major gains to Korea appear to fall into four main areas. First, an FTA with the United States is predicted to produce significant economic benefits for the Korean economy, increasing Korea’s real GDP by as much as 2%, establishing a foundation for Korea to achieve per capita income to as high as $30,000, boosting exports to the United States by 15%, and creating 100,000 new jobs. Second, Korean consumers should also benefit immensely, enjoying lower prices for daily commodities and special purchases. An FTA will contribute to Korea’s goal to become an advanced service economy by contributing to economic reform and deregulation in essential services sectors. In addition, the tariff reductions that will come as part of the agreement will benefit key Korean export products.

SOUTH KOREAN ECONOMIC DECLINE CAUSES PROLIF AND WAR.

Richardson 6 (Corey, a Washington-based analyst who covered East Asian security issues as a presidential management fellow with the US Department of Defense, and is a co-founder of The Korea Liberator. “South Korea must choose sides” Asia Times, www.atimes.com/atimes/Korea/HI09Dg02.html)

A Korea faced with an economic dilemma of such magnitude would find maintaining its conventional military forces at current levels impossible. At the same time, it would feel more vulnerable than ever, even with US security assurances. For a nation paranoid about the possibility of outside influence or military intervention, strapped for cash, and obsessed about its position in the international hierarchy, the obvious route might be to either incorporate North Korean nuclear devices (if they actually exist), or build their own, something South Korean technicians could easily accomplish. North Korea, after all, has set the example for economically challenged nations looking for the ultimate in deterrence. One might argue that clear and firm US security guarantees for a reunified Korea would be able to dissuade any government from choosing the nuclear option. If making decisions based purely on logic the answer would be probably yes. Unfortunately, the recent Korean leadership has established a record of being motivated more by emotional and nationalistic factors than logical or realistic ones. Antics over Dokdo and the Yasukuni Shrine and alienating the US serve as examples. But the continuation of the "Sunshine Policy" tops those. Instead of admitting they've been sold a dead horse, the Roh administration continued riding the rotting and bloated beast known as the Sunshine Policy, until all that are left today are a pile of bones, a bit of dried skin, and a few tufts of dirty hair. Roh, however, is still in the saddle, if not as firmly after North Korea's recent missile tests. Japan must then consider its options in countering an openly nuclear, reunified Korea without USFK. Already building momentum to change its constitution to clarify its military, it's not inconceivable that Japan would ultimately consider going nuclear to deter Korea. As in South Korea, there is no technological barrier preventing Japan from building nuclear weapons. While the details of the race and escalation of tensions can vary in any number of ways and are not inevitable, that an arms race would occur is probable. Only the perception of threat and vulnerability need be present for this to occur. East Asia could become a nuclear powder keg ready to explode over something as childish as the Dokdo/Takeshima dispute between Korea and Japan, a Diaoyu/Senkakus dispute between China and Japan, or the Koguryo dispute between Korea and China.

IT GOES NUCLEAR.

Landay 00 (Jonathan S., National Security and Intelligence Correspondent, Knight Ridder/Tribune News Service, 3-10, Lexis)

Few if any experts think China and Taiwan, North Korea and South Korea, or India and Pakistan are spoiling to fight. But even a minor miscalculation by any of them could destabilize Asia, jolt the global economy and even start a nuclear war. India, Pakistan and China all have nuclear weapons, and North Korea may have a few, too. Asia lacks the kinds of organizations, negotiations and diplomatic relationships that helped keep an uneasy peace for five decades in Cold War Europe. “Nowhere else on Earth are the stakes as high and relationships so fragile,” said Bates Gill, director of northeast Asian policy studies at the Brookings Institution, a Washington think tank. “We see the convergence of great power interest overlaid with lingering confrontations with no institutionalized security mechanism in place. There are elements for potential disaster.” In an effort to cool the region’s tempers, President Clinton, Defense Secretary William S. Cohen and National Security Adviser Samuel R. Berger all will hopscotch Asia’s capitals this month. For America, the stakes could hardly be higher. There are 100,000 U.S. troops in Asia committed to defending Taiwan, Japan and South Korea, and the United States would instantly become embroiled if Beijing moved against Taiwan or North Korea attacked South Korea. While Washington has no defense commitments to either India or Pakistan, a conflict between the two could end the global taboo against using nuclear weapons and demolish the already shaky international nonproliferation regime. In addition, globalization has made a stable Asia, with its massive markets, cheap labor, exports and resources, indispensable to the U.S. economy. Numerous U.S. firms and millions of American jobs depend on trade with Asia that totaled $600 billion last year, according to the Commerce Department.

## IMPACT: TRADE WARS

SOUTH KOREAN FTA IS KEY TO PREVENT GLOBAL TRADE WARS

Sang-Keun 6. [Byun, senior columnist of the Joongang Ilbo, “Work for a win-win agreement,” JoongAng Ilbo, Korea, http://www.bilaterals.org/article.php3?id\_article=3746]

When the world is making strenuous efforts to realize multilateral trade liberalization centered on the World Trade Organization, the competition over bilateral and regional "mating" seems to be contradictory. Free trade agreements have two aspects. They are steppingstones to liberalization in the sense that countries with identical or complementary goals first enter free trade agreements then ultimately realize global trade liberalization by broadening their scope. On the other hand, "free trade pacts between countries concerned" can be exclusive to others in the short and mid-term periods. The WTO system is seeing a rough going due to the resistance of anti-globalization and anti-liberalization forces. If the WTO system ends in failure, bilateral and regional agreements will become the minimum safety net to avoid trade wars. Therefore, unless a country is closely knitted into a web of free trade agreements, it is bound to be a loner. Although the world’s 11th-largest trading power, Korea is a latecomer in making such agreements. In this regard, an agreement between Korea and the United States is not a matter of choice but one of necessity, and the sooner the better. Some strongly argue that trade agreements should be made with China and Japan first but, despite six previous negotiations, an agreement with Japan is at a deadlock, and China has yet to meet the qualifications to join the World Trade Organization. The United States is our second-largest export market, behind China, and Korea is the seventh-largest trading partner of the United States. For this reason, an agreement between Korea and the United States is drawing attention worldwide as the biggest event in 15 years, since the North American Free Trade Agreement was reached.

EXTINCTION

Copley News Service 99 (December 1, L/N)

For decades, many children in America and other countries went to bed fearing annihilation by nuclear war. The specter of nuclear winter freezing the life out of planet Earth seemed very real. Activists protesting the World Trade Organization's meeting in Seattle apparently have forgotten that threat. The truth is that nations join together in groups like the WTO not just to further their own prosperity, but also to forestall conflict with other nations. In a way, our planet has traded in the threat of a worldwide nuclear war for the benefit of cooperative global economics. Some Seattle protesters clearly fancy themselves to be in the mold of nuclear disarmament or anti-Vietnam War protesters of decades past. But they're not. They're special-interest activists, whether the cause is environmental, labor or paranoia about global government. Actually, most of the demonstrators in Seattle are very much unlike yesterday's peace activists, such as Beatle John Lennon or philosopher Bertrand Russell, the father of the nuclear disarmament movement, both of whom urged people and nations to work together rather than strive against each other. These and other war protesters would probably approve of 135 WTO nations sitting down peacefully to discuss economic issues that in the past might have been settled by bullets and bombs. As long as nations are trading peacefully, and their economies are built on exports to other countries, they have a major disincentive to wage war. That's why bringing China, a budding superpower, into the WTO is so important. As exports to the United States and the rest of the world feed Chinese prosperity, and that prosperity increases demand for the goods we produce, the threat of hostility diminishes. Many anti-trade protesters in Seattle claim that only multinational corporations benefit from global trade, and that it's the everyday wage earners who get hurt. That's just plain wrong. First of all, it's not the military-industrial complex benefiting. It's U.S. companies that make high-tech goods. And those companies provide a growing number of jobs for Americans. In San Diego, many people have good jobs at Qualcomm, Solar Turbines and other companies for whom overseas markets are essential. In Seattle, many of the 100,000 people who work at Boeing would lose their livelihoods without world trade. Foreign trade today accounts for 30 percent of our gross domestic product. That's a lot of jobs for everyday workers. Growing global prosperity has helped counter the specter of nuclear winter.

# --- RELATIONS IMPACTS ---

## IMPACT: SK RELATIONS

SKFTA KEY TO THE ALLIANCE.

KOREA TIMES 10. [“KORUS FTA crucial in resolving alliance challenges” July 30 -- lexis]

The environment for foreign businesses in South Korea has improved remarkably over the last decade, to meet global standards, and the ratification of the Korea-U.S. Free Trade Agreement (KORUS FTA) will be crucial in resolving future challenges in the business climate and the Korea-U.S. alliance, the outgoing CEO of Boeing Korea said. In an interview with The Korea Times on July 28 at his office in central Seoul, William C. Oberlin, 66, expressed 'mixed emotions' about ending 23 years of living in Korea as an American business man. Oberlin worked with the U.S. aerospace giant Boeing for 25 years and has been president of Boeing Korea since 2002. He also served as chairman of the American Chamber of Commerce (AMCHAM) in Korea between 2003 and 2004, and again between 2007 and 2008. 'Somebody pointed out you have a lot of friends in Korea. I said yes, and you know, I have more friends in Korea than probably I do in the United States. So that's the sad part,' Oberlin said. 'The more exciting part is you go through phases of your life. I'm moving into another phase of my life, so it's exciting.' Oberlin has personally witnessed Korea's brisk economic, political, cultural and social transformation throughout the decades. In particular, the business climate for foreign corporations in Korea has improved dramatically, he recounted. 'Looking back on those days of 10 to 15 years ago, the challenges were many, and they were much, much more difficult to overcome than we look at today,' he said. 'Ask anybody who was here 10 or 15 years, and they will tell you that Korea is a far different place and a far better place to do business than it was before.' The Asian financial crisis in the late 1990s was the turning point for the Korean business environment to rapidly evolve and respond to the challenges, he noted. 'You can point to the exact time when there was a reversal in the business climate in Korea, and that was the Asian financial crisis, what we called the IMF crisis,' Oberlin went on to say. 'Before, Korea was rather restrictive and prohibitive in many of the business sectors that were trying to do business in Korea. After or during the IMF crisis, Korea realized that they had to change, and Korea changed quickly.' To attract foreign direct investment, Korea put an emphasis on improving the business climate for foreign companies in Korea, and that effort also helped the business environment for domestic firms, he said. There were policy changes for foreign enterprise and a relaxation of regulatory controls. 'We used to be briefing incoming American diplomats that this is the worst place to do business in all of Asia, but within 10 years, we're briefing them now this is the best place to do business in Asia,' said Oberlin. 'There are still challenges from an American point of view and the challenges are wrapped up in the KORUS FTA.' If the U.S. and Korean governments pass the trade deal, which has been put on hold since 2007, the challenges could be resolved, and they can take a big step forward to build a strategic alliance that covers the aspects of politics, society, culture and the economy beyond the traditional security domain.

SKFTA IS THE LYNCHPIN TO US-SOUTH KOREAN RELATIONS.

SHERIDAN 8. [Greg, foreign editor, “Obama’s Asia focus faces early scrutiny” The Australian -- Nov 20 -- lexis]

However, his speeches in his trips to the US have tended to concentrate on US policy towards China. Rudd needs to make an Australian input into US policy towards the northeast Asian triangle of China, Japan and the Korean peninsula. The first order of business for an Obama administration in relation to Korea is how it deals with the US-South Korea free trade agreement. During the presidential primaries, Obama irresponsibly opposed this FTA. This was a naked bid for votes from blue-collar car industry workers in Michigan and, to some extent, Ohio. Although the FTA has been finalised, neither the South Koreans nor the Americans have yet ratified it. However, in South Korea this would be nearly a formality. In the US, the Democratic congressional leadership has been opposed to it on grounds of pure protectionism. Both sides nonetheless understand the political realities in the US mean there may need to be some further side statement regarding the car trade, which would supplement the FTA without requiring its total redesign. The FTA is one of the technically best and most comprehensive the US has negotiated. If, in the light of all the strength and history of this bilateral relationship, the US were to walk away from the FTA, it would have serious consequences for the US-South Korea relationship. In short, the US needs the FTA for the Korea relationship and to maintain its influence within South Korean society. This is critically important in itself, given the size of the South Korean economy. But it is also important in the long run in helping South Korea avoid a fate it clearly does not want, namely falling into China's strategic orbit.

FTA KEY TO U.S.-SOUTH KOREAN ALLIANCE

Asia Pulse 7. (2-15, Lexis)

Stakes are high. Two-way trade between South Korea, the world's 11th largest economy, and the U.S. reached US$74 billion in 2006. Some studies show that if a deal is adopted, it would increase the total trade by 20 percent. South Korean officials also emphasized the negotiations are politically important amid some signs of friction with the U.S., notably because of the North Korean nuclear crisis that broke out in late 2002. "If the FTA is signed, it will be the most important event in South Korea-U.S. relations since the signing of the mutual military alliance in 1953," said Park Yoon-shik, a professor at George Washington University.

## RELATIONS GOOD: ASIA STABILITY

US-SOUTH KOREA RELATIONS KEY TO ASIAN STABILITY.

Klingner 8. [Bruce, the Senior Research Fellow for Northeast Asia at The Heritage Foundation's Asian Studies Center. October 9 “Forging a New Era in the U.S.—Japan Alliance” Heritage -- http://www.heritage.org/Research/AsiaandthePacific/bg2196.cfm]

The U.S. has critical national interests in Asia and must remain fully and energetically engaged in the region. Washington must employ all of the instru­ments of national power—diplomatic, informa­tional, military, and economic—to attain its strategic objectives. The U.S. cannot do it alone; it relies on its indispensable allies Japan and South Korea to achieve mutually beneficial goals. The U.S. must convince these two allies that the U.S.–South Korea and U.S.–Japan alliances are not a zero-sum equation. Both are critically important to achieving U.S. strategic objectives. Washington should make clear we stand shoulder to shoulder with both allies since we share common values. Strong trilateral cooperation between Washing­ton, Tokyo, and Seoul is critically important. Peri­odic political or societal flare-ups that strain relations between Japan and South Korea must not be allowed to detract from steady long-term progress in strengthening the military partnership among the three countries. While the U.S.–Japanese security alliance is in a far better position to address the 21st century threat environment than it was five years ago, much work remains.

ASIAN INSTABILITY GOES NUCLEAR.

Jonathan S. Landay, National Security and Intelligence Correspondent, -2K [“Top Administration Officials Warn Stakes for U.S. Are High in Asian Conflicts”, Knight Ridder/Tribune News Service, March 10, p. Lexis]

Few if any experts think China and Taiwan, North Korea and South Korea, or India and Pakistan are spoiling to fight. But even a minor miscalculation by any of them could destabilize Asia, jolt the global economy and even start a nuclear war. India, Pakistan and China all have nuclear weapons, and North Korea may have a few, too. Asia lacks the kinds of organizations, negotiations and diplomatic relationships that helped keep an uneasy peace for five decades in Cold War Europe. “Nowhere else on Earth are the stakes as high and relationships so fragile,” said Bates Gill, director of northeast Asian policy studies at the Brookings Institution, a Washington think tank. “We see the convergence of great power interest overlaid with lingering confrontations with no institutionalized security mechanism in place. There are elements for potential disaster.” In an effort to cool the region’s tempers, President Clinton, Defense Secretary William S. Cohen and National Security Adviser Samuel R. Berger all will hopscotch Asia’s capitals this month. For America, the stakes could hardly be higher. There are 100,000 U.S. troops in Asia committed to defending Taiwan, Japan and South Korea, and the United States would instantly become embroiled if Beijing moved against Taiwan or North Korea attacked South Korea. While Washington has no defense commitments to either India or Pakistan, a conflict between the two could end the global taboo against using nuclear weapons and demolish the already shaky international nonproliferation regime. In addition, globalization has made a stable Asia \_ with its massive markets, cheap labor, exports and resources \_ indispensable to the U.S. economy. Numerous U.S. firms and millions of American jobs depend on trade with Asia that totaled $600 billion last year, according to the Commerce Department.

## RELATIONS GOOD: CHINESE AGGRESSION

STRONG ALLIANCE IS KEY TO CHECK CHINESE REGIONAL HEGEMONY

HYUG-BAEG 8. [Im, professor at the department of political science and diplomacy at Korea University, “How Korea Could Become a Regional Power in Northeast Asia: Building a Northeast Asian Triad,” U.S.-Korea Institute Working Paper Series-- October -- http://uskoreainstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2008/10/USKI-WP4.pdf]

There are many conditions present to indicate the need for a renewal of, as well as a redefinition of the U.S.-ROK alliance. For starters, the power paradigm in East Asia is gradually shifting away from the old “hub and spokes” system of the Cold War era, to a new, more flexible and agile system of bilateral alliance-building between the U.S. and individual East Asian countries. Within this new system, the nature of U.S. relations with South Korea is directly related to and affected by the nature of U.S. relations with China and Japan. For instance, in a scenario where the U.S. were to perceive a rising threat from China that would effectively challenge U.S. hegemony, it is likely that the U.S. would respond by strengthening its bilateral ties to East Asian littoral states, such as Japan, the Philippines, and South Korea, in order to counter and contain that threat. (Lampton, 2004) In such a case, where the national interest of China and the U.S. conflict with each other, South Korea’s best option would be to strengthen its ties to the U.S. and limit the expansion of Chinese influence over the Korean peninsula. Beyond its traditional role of deterring North Korean aggression, a strong, redefined U.S.-ROK alliance could give South Korea important leverage against China’s rising global economic and political influence.5

CHINESE AGGRESSION ENSURES US-SINO WAR.

MEARSHEIMER 5. [John, “Better to be Godzilla than Bambi” Foreign Policy -- Jan 1 -- lexis]

China cannot rise peacefully, and if it continues its dramatic economic growth over the next few decades, the United States and China are likely to engage in an intense security competition with considerable potential for war. Most of China's neighbors, including India, Japan, Singapore, South Korea, Russia, and Vietnam, will likely join with the United States to contain China's power. To predict the future in Asia, one needs a theory that explains how rising powers are likely to act and how other states will react to them. My theory of international politics says that the mightiest states attempt to establish hegemony in their own region while making sure that no rival great power dominates another region. The ultimate goal of every great power is to maximize its share of world power and eventually dominate the system. The international system has several defining characteristics. Themain actors are states that operate in anarchy--which simply means that there is no higher authority above them. All great powers have some offensive military capability, which means that they can hurt eachother. Finally, no state can know the future intentions of other states with certainty. The best way to survive in such a system is to beas powerful as possible, relative to potential rivals. The mightier a state is, the less likely it is that another state will attack it. The great powers do not merely strive to be the strongest great power, although that is a welcome outcome. Their ultimate aim is to be the hegemon--the only great power in the system. But it is almost impossible for any state to achieve global hegemony in the modern world,because it is too hard to project and sustain power around the globe. Even the United States is a regional but not a global hegemon. The best outcome that a state can hope for is to dominate its own backyard. States that gain regional hegemony have a further aim: to prevent other geographical areas from being dominated by other great powers. Regional hegemons, in other words, do not want peer competitors. Instead, they want to keep other regions divided among several great powers so that these states will compete with each other. In 1991, shortly after the Cold War ended, the first Bush administration boldly stated that the United States was now the most powerful state in the world and planned to remain so. That same message appeared in the famous National Security Strategy issued by the second Bush administration in September 2002. This document's stance on preemptive war generated harsh criticism, but hardly a word of protest greeted the assertion that the United States should check rising powers and maintain its commanding position in the global balance of power. China is likely to try to dominate Asia the way the United States dominates the Western Hemisphere. Specifically, China will strive to maximize the power gap between itself and its neighbors, especially Japan and Russia, and to ensure that no state in Asia can threaten it.It is unlikely that China will go on a rampage and conquer other Asian countries. Instead, China will want to dictate the boundaries of acceptable behavior to neighboring countries, much the way the United States does in the Americas. An increasingly powerful China is also likely to try to push the United States out of Asia, much the way the United States pushed the European great powers out of the Western Hemisphere. Not incidentally, gaining regional hegemony is probably the only way that China will get back Taiwan.

EXTINCTION.

Straits Times -2K (Straits Times, June, 25, 2000, No one gains in war over Taiwan] (PDNSS2115)

THE DOOMSDAY SCENARIO -THE high-intensity scenario postulates a cross-strait war escalating into a full-scale war between the US and China. If Washington were to conclude that splitting China would better serve its national interests, then a full-scale war becomes unavoidable. Conflict on such a scale would embroil other countries far and near and -horror of horrors -raise the possibilityof a nuclear war. Beijing has already told the US and Japan privately that it considers any country providing bases and logistics support to any US forces attacking China as belligerent parties open to its retaliation. In the region, this means South Korea, Japan, the Philippines and, to a lesser extent, Singapore. If China were to retaliate, east Asia will be set on fire. And the conflagration may not end there as opportunistic powers elsewhere may try to overturn the existing world order. With the US distracted, Russia may seek to redefine Europe's political landscape. The balance of power in the Middle East may be similarly upset by the likes of Iraq. In south Asia, hostilities between India and Pakistan, each armed with its own nuclear arsenal, could enter a new and dangerous phase: Will a full-scale Sino-US war lead to a nuclear war? According to General Matthew Ridgeway, commander of the US Eighth Army which fought against the Chinese in the Korean War, the US had at the time thought of using nuclear weapons against China to save the US from military defeat. In his book The Korean War, a personal account of the military and political aspects of the conflict and its implications on future US foreign policy, Gen Ridgeway said that US was confronted with two choices in Korea -truce or a broadened war, which could have led to the use of nuclear weapons. If the US had to resort to nuclear weaponry to defeat China long before the latter acquired a similar capability, there is little hope of winning a war against China 50 years later, short of using nuclear weapons. The US estimates that China possesses about 20 nuclear warheads that can destroy major American cities. Beijing also seems prepared to go for the nuclear option. A Chinese military officer disclosed recently that Beijing was considering a review of its "non first use" principle regarding nuclear weapons. Major-General Pan Zhangqiang, president of the military-funded Institute for Strategic Studies, told a gathering at the Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars in Washington that although the government still abided by that principle, there were strong pressures from the military to drop it. He said military leaders considered the use of nuclear weapons mandatory if the country risked dismemberment as a result of foreign intervention. Gen Ridgeway said that should that come to pass, we would see the destruction of civilization. There would be no victors in such a war. While the prospect of a nuclear Annaggedon **over Taiwan** might seem inconceivable, it cannot be ruled out entirely, for China puts sovereignty above everything else.

## RELATIONS GOOD: DISEASE

ALLIANCE SOLVES PANDEMICS – COORDINATION AGAINST DEADLY FLU STRAINS

SNYDER 9. [Scott, director of the Center for U.S.-Korea Policy and senior associate of Washington programs in the International Relations Program of the Asia Foundation, April, “Pursuing a Comprehensive Vision for the U.S.–South Korea Alliance.” CSIS -- April]

An emerging challenge illustrated by the spread of SARS in 2004 is the need to coordinate in response to the spread of pandemic diseases. In many ways, the SARS epidemic was a wake-up call that served to raise awareness among publics and governments of the need to promote functional cooperation in this area. The promotion of a coordinated political response that explicitly includes coordination on threats to nontraditional security issues such as the spread of pandemic diseases not only provides an opportunity to encourage new forms of coordinated early warning and response capacity—for instance, through the promotion of new and closer relationships between the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and South Korean counterpart agencies—but also can serve to promote technical exchange and capacity building to enhance the capability of both nations to respond. Some of this work has already been initiated through global and regional coordination efforts under the auspices of the United Nations, the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation forum (APEC), and respective national emergency management and health administration authorities including the KCDC (Korean Centers for Disease Control and Prevention). As an industrialized nation with an advanced health research sector, South Korean scientists are well-placed to take leading roles in coordination, detection, and prevention efforts in connection with the H5N1 virus and mutated strains of bird flu. Many of these strains are originating in Southeast Asia, but the migratory path of some species of these birds puts South Korea on the front line as a population that could be affected by such mutations.32 In addition, given KOICA’s level of commitment and activity in Southeast Asia, the agency might consider focusing some of its ODA and technical cooperation toward the building of capacity to respond to such pandem- ics—for instance, by providing anti-virals and test kits, supporting distribution planning, develop- ing relevant human resources, and enhancing surveillance systems. The alliance provides an existing infrastructure and opportunity to promote technical cooperation among military specialists on the broader security implications of fighting against pandemic diseases and opportunities for coordinated action in response to such a threat. For instance, pro- motion of best practices in response to any outbreak of infectious disease and capacity to respond to such a threat, information sharing, and joint research on causes of and responses to pandemic diseases may provide both governments with early warning regarding new types of threats and a resulting enhanced capacity to protect publics in both countries from harm.33

EPIDEMICS CAUSE EXTINCTION.

**South China Morning Post 96** (1-4 Avi, quoting Dr. Ben-Abraham, called "one of the 100 greatest minds in history" by Mensa "Leading the way to a cure for AIDS," P. Lexis)

Two decades of intensive study and research in the field of virology have convinced him of one thing: in place of natural and man-made disasters or nuclear warfare, humanity could face extinction because of a single virus, deadlier than HIV. "An airborne virus is a lively, complex and dangerous organism," he said. "It can come from a rare animal or from anywhere and can mutate constantly. If there is no cure, it affects one person and then there is a chain reaction and it is unstoppable. It is a tragedy waiting to happen." That may sound like a far-fetched plot for a Hollywood film, but Dr Ben -Abraham said history has already proven his theory. Fifteen years ago, few could have predicted the impact of AIDS on the world. Ebola has had sporadic outbreaks over the past 20 years and the only way the deadly virus - which turns internal organs into liquid - could be contained was because it was killed before it had a chance to spread. Imagine, he says, if it was closer to home: an outbreak of that scale in London, New York or Hong Kong. It could happen anytime in the next 20 years - theoretically, it could happen tomorrow.

## RELATIONS GOOD: HEG

SKFTA KEY TO US LEADERSHIP – boosts US credibility and prevents Chinese regional heg.

BHATIA 7. [7/26 -- Karan K., Deputy US Trade Rep, Speech to Global Business Dialogue/Korea Economic Institute, US Fed News, lexis]

Second, KORUS's importance - beyond simply its bilateral economic benefits - is beginning to be appreciated. In foreign policy circles, KORUS's significance to U.S.-Korea relations and to the U.S.'s strategic interests in North Asia are starting to grow. To quote my colleague, Assistant Secretary of State and former Ambassador to Korea Chris Hill: "the impact of this FTA will go far beyond bilateral commercial benefits. The KORUS FTA is a powerful symbol of the U.S.-South Korea partnership, augmenting our longstanding bilateral security alliance and the robust ties between the South Korean and American people. It will create a new dynamic, reflecting both the growing sophistication of our relationship, and the Republic of Korea's (ROK) increasingly positive global role. It will strengthen our relations with one of our most important and reliable allies, serving as a pillar for the alliance in the 21st century as the mutual defense treaty did during the last half century. And it will decisively anchor the U.S. presence in the most dynamic and rapidly-growing economic region on the globe." Chris' view is not an isolated one. Foreign policy thinkers in the United States and abroad are, I think, increasingly unified in their view that approval of the FTA would strengthen the critically important U.S.-Korea alliance at a critically important time. Third, I think the broader economic significance of KORUS to U.S. trade position in the region is increasingly recognized. KORUS is a genuinely historic undertaking - a cementing of ties between two of the world's most significant industrial economies and a bellwether of the United States' economic role in East Asia. In remarks that I gave earlier this week about KORUS, I noted that the United States' relative position in the region is being challenged. Of 34 Asian countries surveyed for which we have data, U.S. market share has decreased in 27 since 1990. If this troubling development is to be addressed, the United States has got to be actively engaged in the region, breaking down barriers to U.S. exports. We've got to be competing actively with our other major trading partners, all of whom are working day-in, day-out to enhance their own competitive position in the region. We've got to show our Asian trading partners that we're committed to the region, and that we're prepared to support those that are willing to make tough reforms. If unable to effectuate a strong and comprehensive FTA that so clearly benefits the United States, U.S. credibility in Asia will be seriously compromised, as trading partners will be left to question our commitment to vital relationships in the region. Fearing U.S. disengagement from the region, Korea and other emerging-market economies of the region will approach more willing trading partners and establish preferential agreements with them. Rather than being at the forefront of trade in the region, shaping developments, the United States will run the risk of lagging further and further behind. On the other hand, approval of the KORUS FTA promises substantial benefits for years to come, as other Asian countries will look to follow Korea's lead, in building a stronger relationship with the United States and reforming its own economy. U.S. credibility in the region will grow, and with it, our economic position.

GLOBAL NUCLEAR WAR.

KHALILZAD 95. [ZALMAY, Zalmay, Rand Corporation, The Washington Quarterly]

Under the third option, the United States would seek to retain global leadership and to preclude the rise of a global rival or a return to multipolarity for the indefinite future. On balance, this is the best long-term guiding principle and vision. Such a vision is desirable not as an end in itself, but because a world in which the United States exercises leadership would have tremendous advantages. First, the global environment would be more open and more receptive to American values -- democracy, free markets, and the rule of law. Second, such a world would have a better chance of dealing cooperatively with the world's major problems, such as nuclear proliferation, threats of regional hegemony by renegade states, and low-level conflicts. Finally, U.S. leadership would help preclude the rise of another hostile global rival, enabling the United States and the world to avoid another global cold or hot war and all the attendant dangers, including a global nuclear exchange. U.S. leadership would therefore be more conducive to global stability than a bipolar or a multipolar balance of power system.

## RELATIONS GOOD: MID EAST PROLIF

ALLIANCE SOLVES REGIONAL AND MIDDLE EAST PROLIF

SCHRIVER AND KATO 9. [Randy,Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Kazuyo, adjunct fellow with the CSIS International Security Program, Center for a New American Security, “The U.S.-ROK Alliance: Regional Challenges for An evolving Alliance.” Going global: the future of the U.S.-South Korea alliance P. 53-54 http://www.cnas.org/files/documents/publications/CampbellPatel\_Going%20Global\_February09\_0.pdf]

With regard to proliferation, although the bulk of U.S.-ROK collaboration is — for obvious reasons — directed at peninsular concerns, it is worth noting South Korea’s recent cooperation in law enforcement efforts against criminal networks that span the region, as evidenced by Busan authorities’ recent seizure of high-quality counterfeit bills smuggled by ethnic Korean Chinese citizens. 21 More explicit integration of these efforts into existing counterterrorism cooperation should be a priority of the incoming U.S. administration. Nor are the security dimensions of the U.S.-ROK alliance limited to the Asia-Pacific region. South Korea has deployed about 660 troops in Iraq for reconstruction and has sent six experts to join the Regional Reconstruction Team in Iraq since February 2007. The United States also has expecta tions for South Korea to play an even bigger role in international affairs and assist in reconstruction efforts in the Middle East.

PROLIF CAUSES EXTINCTION.

**Utgoff 2** (Victor A., Deputy Director of the Strategy, Forces, and Resources Division of the Institute for Defense Analysis, Survival Vol 44 No 2 Proliferation, Missile Defence and American Ambitions, p. 87-90)

In sum, widespread proliferation is likely to lead to an occasional shoot-out with nuclear weapons, and that such shoot-outs will have a substantial probability of escalating to the maximum destruction possible with the weapons at hand. Unless nuclear proliferation is stopped, we are headed toward a world that will mirror the American Wild West of the late 1800s. With most, if not all, nations wearing nuclear 'six-shooters' on their hips, the world may even be a more polite place than it is today, but every once in a while we will all gather on a hill to bury the bodies of dead cities or even whole nations.

## RELATIONS GOOD: NK AGGRESSION

STRONG ALLIANCE KEY TO PREVENT NORTH KOREAN PROLIF.

PRITCHARD ET AL 9. [Jack, President, Korea Economic Institute, John Tilelli, Chairman and CEO, Cypress Int’l, and Scott Snyder, Adjunct Senior Fellow for Korea Studies, “A New Chapter for U.S.-South Korea alliance” Council on Foreign Relations -- June 16 http://www.cfr.org/publication/19635/new\_chapter\_for\_ussouth\_korea\_alliance.html]

While all eyes have been trained on North Korea's belligerent and aggressive actions in recent weeks, it is important to note that the U.S.-South Korea alliance has emerged as a linchpin in the Obama administration's efforts to successfully manage an overcrowded global agenda, and a pivotal tool for safeguarding U.S. long-term interests in Asia. When South Korea's President Lee Myung-bak meets with President Barack Obama at the White House Tuesday, the two leaders must effectively address three main areas: policy coordination to address North Korea's nuclear threat, the development of a global security agenda that extends beyond the peninsula, and collaboration to address the global financial crisis as South Korea takes a lead on the G-20 process. By conducting a second nuclear test in May, followed by a number of missile launches, North Korea has forced its way onto the Obama administration's agenda. First and foremost, effective U.S.-South Korea alliance coordination is critical to managing both the global effects of North Korea's nuclear threat on the nonproliferation regime and the regional security challenges posed by potential regime actions that lead to further crisis in the region. North Korea's internal focus on its leadership succession, and the apparent naming of North Korean leader Kim Jong-il's little-known and inexperienced youngest son as his successor, make the task of responding to North Korea's aggressive and destabilizing actions all the more challenging. Both deterrence and negotiation must be pursued on the basis of close consultations. Presidents Obama and Lee must also develop coordinated contingency plans in the event of internal instability in North Korea. Through effective U.S.-South Korea alliance coordination, it should be possible to forge a combined strategy capable of managing the nuclear, proliferation, and regional security dimensions of North Korea's threat. A coordinated position would also strengthen the administration's hand in its efforts to persuade China to put pressure on North Korea. Both countries also face hostage crises involving citizens detained in North Korea. The recent conviction of two U.S. journalists heightens the stakes for the United States, although the administration has tried to decouple their plight from Pyongyang's missile tests. Second, Presidents Obama and Lee should set the stage for a reinvigorated vision of a broader role for the U.S.-South Korea alliance as an important component of a broader U.S. strategy toward East Asia. A critical aspect of this vision is a mutual commitment to jointly address sources of global and functional instability beyond the peninsula. Lee Myung-bak has offered a vision of a global Korea that features an expanded commitment to peacekeeping and development assistance that is in greater proportion to South Korea's economic clout as the world's 13th largest economy. As the third-largest contributor of troops to Iraq, South Korea has also demonstrated its capacity to make valuable contributions to post-conflict stabilization. The U.S.-South Korea alliance can serve as a platform by which South Korea can make such contributions in many other areas, including Afghanistan. South Korea has already made commitments to send engineers and medical personnel to Afghanistan. It is poised now to expand its contributions, in line with its broadening scope of interest in contributing to global stability and its economic prowess. Third, South Korea is an essential partner in addressing the global financial crisis. Its emphasis on fighting protectionism and promotion of stimuli at the April G-20 leaders meeting in London illustrate how closely its priorities are aligned with those of the United States. A U.S. Federal Reserve Bank line of credit to South Korea last fall played a critical role in stabilizing the South Korean's currency and forestalled a possible repeat of South Korea's difficulties in the Asian financial crisis of a decade ago. The Obama and Lee administrations have the opportunity to send a powerful signal opposing protectionism by winning legislative support in both countries for the Korea-U.S. Free Trade Agreement negotiated by their predecessors. With the necessary revisions to meet new political conditions, Mr. Lee and Mr. Obama should urge their respective legislatures to consider early ratification of the trade pact. This would both support more effective coordination on the global financial crisis and underscore its value as a precedent that sets high standards for trade agreements in Asia, in contrast to the proliferation of Asian trade agreements that do little to promote a more open Asian trade and investment environment. U.S.-South Korean coordination to manage North Korea's challenge to nonproliferation norms, the global financial crisis, and the transition in Afghanistan will underscore the practical value of alliance contributions to meet mutual interests in global security and prosperity. For this reason, Presidents Obama and Lee have a compelling interest in establishing a firm foundation for unlocking the potential of alliance cooperation in the service of our shared interests.

Korean war causes extinction.

Africa News -99 (AFRICA NEWS, December 25, 1999, p. online)

Lusaka - If there is one place today where the much-dreaded Third World War could easily erupt and probably reduce earth to a huge smouldering cinder it is the Korean Peninsula in Far East Asia. Ever since the end of the savage three-year Korean war in the early 1950s, military tension between the hard-line communist north and the American backed South Korea has remained dangerously high. In fact the Koreas are technically still at war. A foreign visitor to either Pyongyong in the North or Seoul in South Korea will quickly notice that the divided country is always on maximum alert for any eventuality. North Korea or the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) has never forgiven the US for coming to the aid of South Korea during the Korean war. She still regards the US as an occupation force in South Korea and wholly to blame for the non-reunification of the country. North Korean media constantly churns out a tirade of attacks on "imperialist" America and its "running dog" South Korea. The DPRK is one of the most secretive countries in the world where a visitor is given the impression that the people's hatred for the US is absolute while the love for their government is total. Whether this is really so, it is extremely difficult to conclude. In the DPRK, a visitor is never given a chance to speak to ordinary Koreans about the politics of their country. No visitor moves around alone without government escort. The American government argues that its presence in South Korea was because of the constant danger of an invasion from the north. America has vast economic interests in South Korea. She points out that the north has dug numerous tunnels along the demilitarised zone as part of the invasion plans. She also accuses the north of violating South Korean territorial waters. Early this year, a small North Korean submarine was caught in South Korean waters after getting entangled in fishing nets. Both the Americans and South Koreans claim the submarine was on a military spying mission. However, the intension of the alleged intrusion will probably never be known because the craft's crew were all found with fatal gunshot wounds to their heads in what has been described as suicide pact to hide the truth of the mission. The US mistrust of the north's intentions is so deep that it is no secret that today Washington has the largest concentration of soldiers and weaponry of all descriptions in south Korea than anywhere else in the World, apart from America itself. Some of the armada that was deployed in the recent bombing of Iraq and in Operation Desert Storm against the same country following its invasion of Kuwait was from the fleet permanently stationed on the Korean Peninsula. It is true too that at the moment the North/South Korean border is the most fortified in the world. The border line is littered with anti-tank and anti-personnel landmines, surface-to-surface and surface-to-air missiles and is constantly patrolled by warplanes from both sides. It is common knowledge that America also keeps an eye on any military movement or buildup in the north through spy satellites. The DPRK is said to have an estimated one million soldiers and a huge arsenal of various weapons. Although the DPRK regards herself as a developing country, she can however be classified as a super-power in terms of military might. The DPRK is capable of producing medium and long-range missiles. Last year, for example, she test-fired a medium range missile over Japan, an action that greatly shook and alarmed the US, Japan and South Korea. The DPRK says the projectile was a satellite. There have also been fears that she was planning to test another ballistic missile capable of reaching North America. Naturally, the world is anxious that military tension on the Korean Peninsula must be defused to avoid an apocalypse on earth. It is therefore significant that the American government announced a few days ago that it was moving towards normalising relations with North Korea.

## RELATIONS GOOD: PROLIF

ALLIANCE SOLVES KOREAN PROLIFERATION

Mack 96. (Andrew, Prof IR – Australian National University, “Proliferation inNortheast Asia,” Occasional Paper No. 28 July http://www.stimson.org/wmd/pdf/mack.pdf)

Only a tiny minority of South Koreans is prepared to argue publicly that the South should withdraw from the NPT and acquire nuclear weapons—not least because acquisition would place relations with the United States in crisis and put ROK access to US nuclear technology at risk. The United States “nuclear umbrella,” some analysts argue, has negated the South Korean need for a bomb. Indeed, in 1974 President Park claimed that the South was capable of making nuclear weapons, “but would refrain from doing so as long as the US nuclear umbrella remained over Korea.”87 Seoul in the past has used American concern about its potential to go nuclear as a lever to maintain US conventional military support. The United States, on the other hand, has threatened to break its alliance with Seoul if the South acquires the bomb.

GLOBAL NUCLEAR WAR

Cirincione 00. (Joseph, Dir – Non-Proliferation Project, CEIP, Foreign Policy, 3-22, Lexis)

The blocks would fall quickest and hardest in Asia, where proliferation pressures are already building more quickly than anywhere else in the world. If a nuclear breakout takes place in Asia, then the international arms control agreements that have been painstakingly negotiated over the past 40 years will crumble. Moreover, the United States could find itself embroiled in its fourth war on the Asian continent in six decades--a costly rebuke to those who seek the safety of Fortress America by hiding behind national missile defenses. Consider what is already happening: North Korea continues to play guessing games with its nuclear and missile programs; South Korea wants its own missiles to match Pyongyang's; India and Pakistan shoot across borders while running a slow-motion nuclear arms race; China modernizes its nuclear arsenal amid tensions with Taiwan and the United States; Japan's vice defense minister is forced to resign after extolling the benefits of nuclear weapons; and Russia--whose Far East nuclear deployments alone make it the largest Asian nuclear power--struggles to maintain territorial coherence. Five of these states have nuclear weapons; the others are capable of constructing them. Like neutrons firing from a split atom, one nation's actions can trigger reactions throughout the region, which in turn, stimulate additional actions. These nations form an interlocking Asian nuclear reaction chain that vibrates dangerously with each new development. If the frequency and intensity of this reaction cycle increase, critical decisions taken by any one of these governments could cascade into the second great wave of nuclear-weapon proliferation, bringing regional and global economic and political instability and, perhaps, the first combat use of a nuclear weapon since 1945.

## RELATIONS GOOD: SINO-JAPAN WAR

STRONG ALLIANCE KEY TO PREVENT SINO-JAPAN WAR.

Cha 3 (Victor, Professor and Director of Asian Studies – Georgetown University, “America’s Alliances in Asia: The Coming “Identity Crisis” with the Republic of Korea?” – Recalibrating the U.S.-Republic of Korea Alliance, Ed. Boose, Hwang, Morgan, and Scobell, May, http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/display.cfm?pubid=53)

With regard to the future resiliency of the U.S.-Korea alliance, the key question is whether the alliance can survive the end of the North Korean threat. The stated policy of both Washington and Seoul is that the alliance and U.S. military presence will continue in the postunification era.9 However, political pronouncements about this and the groundwork to achieve it are two separate matters. Resiliency will require adjustments in both the rationale and components of the alliance. Foremost is a reorientation of the alliance’s overall purpose toward the promotion of broader regional stability.10 The primary rationale would no longer be deterring the North Korean threat, but would entail three different but related objectives. One purpose of the alliance would be to prevent dangerous power vacuums from forming on the peninsula. As the experience of the late 19th and early 20th centuries showed, whenever Korea has been unified, such vacuums have been an invitation for major power competition and war. Second, the U.S.-Korea alliance would remain an important political symbol of U.S. forward engagement as a Pacific power, which, in turn, would be key to ameliorating security dilemmas between China and Japan. As has already become clear in the post-Cold War period, Tokyo supports the U.S. presence as a check against China’s rise in the region; and Beijing implicitly supports the continuing U.S. presence as it views Japan’s future intentions with suspicion. Moreover, this amelioration effect would be weaker without the U.S.-Korea alliance. In other words, cutting the U.S. presence in a post-unified Korea but keeping a token presence in Japan is not likely to achieve the same effect, as Japan would remain uncertain of the U.S. commitment (given events in Korea), and China would have heightened suspicions due to Japanese selfhelp security behavior. A third purpose of the alliance would be to reassure a reunified Korea of its security, thereby preempting rash turns to self-help behavior that might be destabilizing in the region (e.g., nuclearization, ballistic missile development). The flip side of this same coin would be for a continued U.S.-Korea alliance to play a “binding” role on a reunified Korea that, replete with resurgent nationalism, might otherwise engage in arms buildups and provocative behavior toward Japan.

GOES NUCLEAR AND COLLAPSES THE GLOBAL ECONOMY

Samuels 99 (Richard, Professor of International Relations – MIT, The U.S.-Japan Alliance: Past, Present, and Future, p. 6-7)

The same forces that lead China and Japan into an adversarial relationship in the first place might well push them to the brink of war. From a U.S. perspective, this would be disastrous, for several reasons: -War between two of America’s largest trading partners would be devastating to the U.S. economy -U.S. involvement would be difficult to avoid in a war between a former ally and a former enemy -War between a nuclear power and a threshold nuclear power would push the envelope in new and disconcerting ways -War between the two would be (another) humanitarian disaster -Nuclearization in Japan would press both Koreas to do the same, and perhaps pressure other Asian nations to follow suite. Even if China and Japan did not go to war, a Cold War between the two great powers could impose high costs on the region, and indeed the globe, if the last simmering conflict between two giants on the world scene has taught us anything. At a minimum, the remarkable (and hard-earned) domestic politics stability in Japan would further unravel, creating even greater uncertainties for its foreign policy and its evolving role as provider of global public goods.

## RELATIONS GOOD: US-SINO

US/South Korean relations are key to regional stability, checking US/China war, and preserving heg in Asia

Kim 3 (Seung-Hwan Kim, Professor of International Affairs – Myongji University, “Anti-Americanism in Korea,” Washington Quarterly, Winter, http://www.thewashingtonquarterly.com/03winter/docs/03winter\_kim.pdf)

The future of the U.S.-Korean alliance is too important for Washington and Seoul to overlook this current trend of rising anti-Americanism and the potential rise of anti-Koreanism, as they directly threaten the special U.S.- ROK symbiotic relationship. The alliance with the United States is critical for South Korea to preserve stability on the peninsula and in the region. In addition, Korean instability that could arise in the absence of a U.S. security commitment would complicate Korean efforts to sustain current and expected levels of foreign investments throughout the country, thus threatening continued economic progress. Regional stability is also critical for South Korea because it conducts more than two-thirds of its trade in the Asia-Pacific region, with the volume of current South Korean trade through Asian naval transport routes exceeding 40 percent of its total trade. Even after unification, South Korea’s alliance with the United States will continue to be important to protect the peninsula from once again becoming the political, if not the military, battleground where the major Asian powers have historically sought regional hegemony. The alliance with South Korea is also critical for the United States to maintain its leadership position in the Asia-Pacific region. The partnership helps prevent the eruption of hostilities on the Korean peninsula, which could otherwise draw China into a reenactment of the Korean War. It helps preserve a stable balance of power in the region by hedging against the rise of an aggressive regional power and regional rivalries, and it helps protect U.S. economic interests. More than one-third of total U.S. trade is conducted with the Asia-Pacific region, and millions of U.S. jobs would be at stake if continued regional growth and development were jeopardized.

EXTINCTION.

Straits Times 00 (6-25, Lexis)

THE DOOMSDAY SCENARIO THE high-intensity scenario postulates a cross-strait war escalating into a full-scale war between the US and China. If Washington were to conclude that splitting China would better serve its national interests, then a full-scale war becomes unavoidable. Conflict on such a scale would embroil other countries far and near and -- horror of horrors -- raise the possibility of a nuclear war. Beijing has already told the US and Japan privately that it considers any country providing bases and logistics support to any US forces attacking China as belligerent parties open to its retaliation. In the region, this means South Korea, Japan, the Philippines and, to a lesser extent, Singapore. If China were to retaliate, east Asia will be set on fire. And the conflagration may not end there as opportunistic powers elsewhere may try to overturn the existing world order. With the US distracted, Russia may seek to redefine Europe's political landscape. The balance of power in the Middle East may be similarly upset by the likes of Iraq. In south Asia, hostilities between India and Pakistan, each armed with its own nuclear arsenal, could enter a new and dangerous phase. Will a full-scale Sino-US war lead to a nuclear war? According to General Matthew Ridgeway, commander of the US Eighth Army which fought against the Chinese in the Korean War, the US had at the time thought of using nuclear weapons against China to save the US from military defeat. In his book The Korean War, a personal account of the military and political aspects of the conflict and its implications on future US foreign policy, Gen Ridgeway said that US was confronted with two choices in Korea -- truce or a broadened war, which could have led to the use of nuclear weapons. If the US had to resort to nuclear weaponry to defeat China long before the latter acquired a similar capability, there is little hope of winning a war against China 50 years later, short of using nuclear weapons. The US estimates that China possesses about 20 nuclear warheads that can destroy major American cities. Beijing also seems prepared to go for the nuclear option. A Chinese military officer disclosed recently that Beijing was considering a review of its "non first use" principle regarding nuclear weapons. Major-General Pan Zhangqiang, president of the military-funded Institute for Strategic Studies, told a gathering at the Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars in Washington that although the government still abided by that principle, there were strong pressures from the military to drop it. He said military leaders considered the use of nuclear weapons mandatory if the country risked dismemberment as a result of foreign intervention. Gen Ridgeway said that should that come to pass, we would see the destruction of civilisation. There would be no victors in such a war. While the prospect of a nuclear Armaggedon over Taiwan might seem inconceivable, it cannot be ruled out entirely, for China puts sovereignty above everything else.

# --- AT AFF ARG’S ---

## AT: SK RELATIONS RESILIENT

SKFTA IS THE LYNCHPIN – FAILURE PUSHES SOUTH KOREA INTO CHINA’S SPHERE.

SHERIDAN 8. [Greg, foreign editor, “Obama’s Asia focus faces early scrutiny” The Australian -- Nov 20 -- lexis]

However, his speeches in his trips to the US have tended to concentrate on US policy towards China. Rudd needs to make an Australian input into US policy towards the northeast Asian triangle of China, Japan and the Korean peninsula. The first order of business for an Obama administration in relation to Korea is how it deals with the US-South Korea free trade agreement. During the presidential primaries, Obama irresponsibly opposed this FTA. This was a naked bid for votes from blue-collar car industry workers in Michigan and, to some extent, Ohio. Although the FTA has been finalised, neither the South Koreans nor the Americans have yet ratified it. However, in South Korea this would be nearly a formality. In the US, the Democratic congressional leadership has been opposed to it on grounds of pure protectionism. Both sides nonetheless understand the political realities in the US mean there may need to be some further side statement regarding the car trade, which would supplement the FTA without requiring its total redesign. The FTA is one of the technically best and most comprehensive the US has negotiated. If, in the light of all the strength and history of this bilateral relationship, the US were to walk away from the FTA, it would have serious consequences for the US-South Korea relationship. In short, the US needs the FTA for the Korea relationship and to maintain its influence within South Korean society. This is critically important in itself, given the size of the South Korean economy. But it is also important in the long run in helping South Korea avoid a fate it clearly does not want, namely falling into China's strategic orbit.

RELATIONS ARE ONLY RESILIENT IN THE WORLD OF STRONG TRADE RELATIONS – SKFTA KEY.

Winder 7. [Joseph AB, Fmr President - Korea Economic Institute of America, Nautilus Institute Policy Forum, 1-9, http://www.nautilus.org/fora/security/07002Winder.html]

A successful negotiation of the KORUS FTA and its subsequent ratification by the U.S. Congress and the Korean National Assembly would be a concrete manifestation of the health of the overall relationship. It would demonstrate to the Korean people the determination of the United States to remain a strong, reliable partner for Korea and ease doubts about the long-term U.S. commitment to the relationship. Compromise language on products produced in the Kaesong Industrial Zone would show Koreans that the United States is not trying to block peaceful change on the peninsula. Since the KORUS FTA would be the first U.S. bilateral FTA with a Northeast Asian country, it would boost Korea's standing in the region and ease fears in both Korea and China that the United States is relying solely on Japan to anchor its presence in the Northeast Asia. Such a demonstration of the U.S. commitment to Korea and the value it attaches to the U.S.-Korea relationship should provide Koreans with a sense of pride and self-confidence that would ameliorate their feelings of unequal status in the relationship and permit the evolution of the U.S.-Korea alliance on the basis of hard-headed assessment of mutual interests. Korea's need for a good security relationship with a powerful, far away friend with no territorial designs on the country has not disappeared.

## AT: SK CAN’T PROLIF

MOST RECENT DEFENSE REPORTS DISPROVE

Jung 10 (3/18 -- Sung-Ki, “S. Korea, Japan Can Build Nuclear Weapons Quickly”, Korea Times, 2010, http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/nation/2010/03/113\_62636.html)

South Korea, like Japan, has the technology to build a nuclear arsenal quickly if it decides to do so, a U.S. defense report said Thursday. "Several friends or allies of the United States, such as Japan and South Korea, are highly advanced technological states and could quickly build nuclear devices if they chose to do so," said the Joint Operating Environment (JOE) 2010, released on Feb. 18, by the U.S. Joint Forces Command. The biennial report forecasts possible threats and opportunities for the U.S. military. The 2008 report categorized South Korea, Taiwan and Japan as three "threshold nuclear states" that have the capability to develop nuclear weapons rapidly, should their political leaders decide to do so.

-- Technological capacity for prolif exists

Bandow 9 (Doug, Senior Fellow – Cato Institute and Robert A. Taft Fellow – American Conservative Defense Alliance, “A New Approach to Counter Nuclear Proliferation on the Korean Peninsula”, International Journal of Korean Studies, XIII(1), Spring / Summer, http://www.icks.org/publication/pdf/2009-SPRING-SUMMER/4.pdf)

Seoul possesses 19 nuclear plants and has the industrial, technological, and scientific assets necessary for a program. Peter Hayes of the University of Sydney has observed: "There is little doubt, however, that South Korea now has a near-nuclear option."41

-- This ensures prolif would be rapid

Hersman and Peters 6 (Rebecca KC, Senior Research Professor in the Center for the Study of Weapons of Mass. Destruction – National Defense University, and Robert, “Nuclear U-Turns: Learning from South Korean and Taiwanese Rollback”, Nonproliferation Review, 13(3), November, http://cns.miis.edu/npr/pdfs/133hersman.pdf)

Many U.S. analysts believe that this industry, combined with South Korea’s sizable number of highly trained engineers and scientists, gives the South a robust capability to produce nuclear weapons. Therefore, should Seoul reconsider its nuclear weapons future, it could probably restart a program fairly quickly. Additionally, some segments of the South Korean government and population believe that an independent nuclear capability would provide more autonomy on the world stage and greater advantage when dealing with the United States. These groups support those who view a South Korean nuclear arsenal as being the best way to guarantee security in the emerging strategic landscape.

## AT: JAPAN RELATIONS IMPACT TURN

US-Japan relations resilient – joint interests.

Nye -08 (Joseph Nye, Korea Times, May 12, 2008, Future of Japan-US Alliance, Lexis)

The greatest danger is that an escalating fear of enmity in the three countries becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy. In that sense, **the** **U.S.-Japan alliance rests on deeply rooted joint interests.** There is a new dimension to the alliance, however, and to the relationship with China. This year, China surpassed the U.S. as the world's largest emitter of greenhouse gases. China argues, correctly, that it is still behind the U.S. and Japan in per capita emissions, but this does not reduce the costs imposed on the world (including Japan and the U.S.). A cooperative program that helps China to burn its coal more cleanly is in the interests of all three countries. In general, transnational threats such as climate change or pandemics can cause damage on a scale equivalent to military conflict. (In 1918, avian flu killed more people than died in World War I). Responding to such threats requires cooperation, soft power, and non-military instruments, and this is an area in which **Japan is a much more equal and important ally**. If anything, **the new and growing dimension of transnational threats**, when added to traditional security concerns, **makes the future of the Japan-U.S. alliance look more promising than ever.**

RELATIONS RESILIENT – NEG CARDS ARE MEDIA HYPE.

Takashi Yokota, Associate Editor at Newsweek Japan, Special Correspondent at Newsweek International, 1-22-2010, “A Pacific Squall,” http://www.newsweek.com/2010/01/21/a-pacific-squall.html, accessed 7-16-2010

In the run-up to the 50th anniversary of the security alliance between Tokyo and Washington last week, the conventional wisdom was that the U.S.-Japan relationship was in a downward spiral. Since taking power in September, Japan's Prime Minister **Yukio Hatoyama has insisted on revising a 2006 military realignment agreement that would relocate a controversial Marine air base on Okinawa** known as Futenma from a densely populated residential area to an offshore site of another base on the island. That prompted fear in Washington that the entire deal would unravel and undermine its military realignment plans. Pundits speculated the alliance was adrift, particularly as U.S. officials seemed miffed about their new partners in Tokyo. Yet the relationship between the U.S. and Japan is not nearly as bad as it seems**. Yes, there is disagreement on one issue. But the fate of a small air base on Okinawa is not the only thing that matters.** On North Korea, cooperation between Japan and the U.S. is better than ever. A key part of the Obama administration's North Korea policy is to restrengthen its cooperation with Tokyo, after the Bush administration hastily pursued a nuclear deal with Pyongyang in 2008 at the expense of Japan's dearest issue: the North's 1970s abductions of Japanese citizens, who have yet to be accounted for. Despite Pyongyang's attempts to lure the U.S. into talks, Washington is treading cautiously so that the North will be unable to drive a wedge between the U.S. and its allies, as it has done before. Moreover, there is little, if any, difference between Tokyo and Washington on global issues like nuclear nonproliferation, climate change, and terrorism. In November, Hatoyama and Obama agreed to cooperate closely on nonproliferation efforts and clean-energy development. Despite Japan's decision to withdraw its refueling ships from the Indian Ocean, it has pledged $5 billion in aid to Afghanistan, a commitment Washington welcomed. Both sides also agree on the fundamentals of the security alliance. **Despite the squabbling over the Futenma base, Tokyo and Washington agree on the importance of having American troops in Japan. They also agree that the burden on Okinawa—which hosts 75 percent of U.S. military bases in the nation—must be mitigated**. For all the ranting by the Hatoyama administration's coalition partners—namely the Social Democrats—key cabinet members have no intentions of weakening the alliance. As Katsuya Okada said in one of his first news conferences as foreign minister, he wants to address the Okinawa problem to make the bilateral relationship sustainable "for the next 30, 50 years." So why the gloom and doom? Obviously it's tempting to make headlines out of a rare spat between steadfast allies**. In particular,** the Japanese media establishment perpetuated the angst, as it is accustomed to viewing the relationship as a cozy friendship between pro-American conservatives in Tokyo and so-called Japan hands in the U.S. Truth be told, the commotion was more about inexperienced governments than fundamental differences. Having won a historic election in August, an elated Hatoyama government got carried away by its promise to carve out a "more equal" partnership with the U.S. and insisted on the Futenma issue in a way that made it look like it was taking the relationship for granted. Washington overreacted by allowing the frustrations of the Pentagon to dominate its posture. "**Both capitals have lost sight of the fact that the bilateral relationship is not about housekeeping issues like the length and shape of a runway in Okinawa," says Evans Revere, an Asia expert formerly at the State Department**. Now officials on both sides of the Pacific are refocusing their attention on the big issue: how the countries can meet the challenges in a changing regional-security environment. At their meeting in Honolulu earlier this month, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said Washington is "respectful" of Tokyo's decision-making process, and Okada made it clear that Tokyo is not ruling out the current agreement—which Washington wants implemented—he just wants to explore the options. Hatoyama later said Japan should be "thankful" for the security alliance with the U.S. Next month both capitals will start talks to "deepen" that alliance. As for Futenma, expect more headlines from the Japanese press, as Hatoyama tries to craft a palatable compromise plan by May. But don't believe any hype about a crisis.

# \*AFF ANSWERS

## No SKFTA

Won’t pass – committee and gop objections to TAA

Bewley, 7/4/11 (Elizabeth, Washington Bureau, The Tennessean)

After the White House signaled last week that passage was near, Republicans on the Senate Finance Committee blocked the agreements Thursday, dimming chances they'll win congressional approval before lawmakers adjourn in August. Republicans largely support the agreements, which were negotiated under the Bush administration, but object to provisions that would fund a retraining program for workers who lose jobs because of increased imports.

Wont Pass – Partisanship and TAA

Washington Post, 7/3

Actually, no. The trade pacts remain stalled, with Congress's August recess looming. As far as we can see, the only work they're creating is for political scientists who study polarization and legislative dysfunction. The latest kerfuffle revolves around the White House-backed effort by Senate Finance Committee Chairman Max Baucus (D-Mont.) to tie about $900 million in aid over the next three years for trade-displaced workers to the South Korea deal, by far the largest and economically most important of the three. This prompted a walkout from the hearing by Republicans, who protested that the administration was using free trade as a vehicle for more spending. What's really going on? Basically, each party is playing some last-minute hardball on behalf of its respective ideological bases. On the Democratic side, labor unions have been unable to prevent Mr. Obama's belated conversion to the cause of the free-trade agreements. Trade adjustment assistance (TAA) money is the consolation prize labor demands - and the White House is determined to let the unions have it. On the Republican side, the anti-spending Club for Growth and affiliated back-benchers in Congress see TAA as yet another failed, expensive bureaucracy and want to kill it. GOP leaders on the Hill are committed to giving them at least a chance to vote "no" on TAA. The White House says that tying TAA to the South Korea deal helps guarantee that both the trade deal and TAA make it past Republican opposition. Perhaps, but it's a risky gambit: What happens if Republicans refuse to vote for free-trade-plus-TAA? We could end up with nothing.

GOP will block inclusion of TAA – Dems won’t pass FTA without it

Inside US Trade, 7/1/11

And then there's this rush job to jam them through the committee," he said.Hatch said he had asked Senate Finance Committee Chairman Max Baucus (D-MT) to delay the mock markup until after the July 4 recess. When that failed, he said he asked Baucus to hold the mock markup on the morning of June 30, presumably in order to give the committee more time to consider the 97 amendments that were tabled. But that request was also denied, he said.Hatch said he did not blame Baucus because the process was being driven by the White House, but added that Baucus should have stood up to the White House.Hatch and his colleagues also said they objected to holding the mock markup due to the inclusion of a TAA deal in the implementing bill for the Korea FTA, which they said was a bid to appease the administration's union allies. Hatch called on the TAA to be considered on its own merits, but said he did not know whether it would pass Congress on its own. Prior to the press conference, all Senate Finance Republicans Committee, including long-time TAA supporter Olympia Snowe (R-ME), voiced their opposition to including the program in the implementing bill for the Korea-U.S. free trade agreement in a letter to President Obama.One lobbyist said the fact that Snowe signed the letter shows how strongly united Republicans are in fighting against a provision which congressional Democrats need as political cover to be able to vote for the FTAs.In their letter, the Finance Republicans argued that including TAA in the Korea implementing bill is beyond the scope of the fast-track law, which stipulates that provisions in implementing bills for trade agreements must be "necessary or appropriate." A fast-track law gives the president the authority to negotiate trade agreements that receive an up or down vote in Congress without amendments provided that the deals meet its negotiating objectives and other conditions.During the press conference, Hatch said he expects the House to separate the TAA extension from the Korea FTA implementing bill and vote on the two measures separately. Sources have said that would not jeopardize the Korea FTA's fast-track status if the bills were rejoined before being sent to the Senate as long as what is received from the House is identical to the implementing package sent to the Senate by the administration (see separate story).Meanwhile, Kyl and Enzi stressed that TAA should be considered in the context of the renewal of the fast-track law, also known as trade promotion authority (TPA). McConnell also favors the TAA-TPA link. In addition, the senators said they rejected an extension of the TAA program as expanded under the 2009 stimulus bill due to its high costs at a time policymakers should be trying to rein in government spending.Roberts noted that he did not support the Democrats' move to include TAA extension in the Korea FTA implementing bill despite having received calls from constituents urging him to allow the FTAs to move forward.Business groups prior to the scheduled mock markup had urged Finance Committee members to allow quick approval of the three FTA implementing bills by not passing any amendments.Under the mock markup process, any approved amendments by the Finance Committee would not be binding. The administration could choose to include or ignore the recommended changes when it submits the implementing bills in final, unamendable form to Congress for up or down votes.

Prez won’t submit SKFTA without TAA – it’s a dealbreaker

Inside US Trade, 7/1

Three senior administration officials this week warned that continued Republican opposition to passing a reauthorization of the Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) program along with three pending free trade agreements could lead President Obama to refrain from seeking congressional approval of the FTAs.The White House has opted to back the inclusion of TAA renewal in the draft implementing bill of the Korea-U.S. FTA (KORUS), a strategy opposed by House Speaker John Boehner (R-OH) and Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-KY).The officials also conceded that they have no agreement with House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Dave Camp (R-MI) on how to proceed with the FTA, since he has deferred to the House leadership on the issue.One of the officials emphasized that it is the prerogative of the president to decide when to introduce the FTAs to Congress and thereby begin the fast-track process for their vote. "I cannot imagine that we would do that unless we have not only the three FTAs, but the Trade Adjustment Assistance, " he said.Another of the officials said the administration is making clear it will put forward proposals to pass all three FTAs as well as the TAA. "We feel that there should be and will be strong support for passage" of the FTAs and TAA together, he said.The officials repeatedly expressed their belief that they will ultimately prevail in their efforts to ensure renewal of TAA along with the passage of the three FTAs.

## No SKFTA – Korea

### Won’t pass in South Korea- the Democratic Party will block unless there are renegotiations

Korea Times 6/27 [“Crippled KORUS FTA” 6/27/2011; [http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/opinon/2011/06/137\_89716.html](javascript:void%200)]

The ratification of the Korea-U.S. Free Trade Agreement (FTA) at the National Assembly has found itself in uncharted waters as the leader of the opposition demanded its renegotiation. In a rare meeting Monday with President Lee Myung-bak, Sohn Hak-kyu, chairman of the largest opposition Democratic Party, made it clear that his party would boycott the ratification. He said the ratification will be possible only when the deal becomes at least equitable to Seoul and Washington and not disadvantageous to Korea through a renegotiation. He was apparently referring to a revision of the original contract, allowing more favorable access of American cars to Korea. He rebuffed President Lee’s bipartisan support for the ratification.

### Won’t pass on either side- its hasn’t even been introduced in South Korea and Job Training blocks it in the US

**Arirang 6/23** [“Ratification Process of KORUS FTA May Take Longer in Seoul” JUN 23, 2011; Arirang News; <http://www.arirang.co.kr/News/News_View.asp?nseq=117376&code=Ne2&category=2> ]

Korean Foreign Minister Kim Sung-hwan has admitted that it may take Seoul longer than Washington to ratify the Korea-US free trade agreement.

The minister, who is currently in New York, told reporters on Wednesday local time, that the FTA has made no progress as it has not even been introduced to the Foreign Affairs, Trade and Unification Committee at the National Assembly.

Kim said that officials in Korea may be holding up the deal to approve it at the same time as Washington.

However, not much headway has been made in Washington either, as the officials there are divided over the renewal of a job training program designed to help US workers.

### It won’t get ratified in Korea

Korea Times 6/29/11 (“EU free trade pact sparks debate on KORUS FTA”, http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/nation/2011/06/116\_89863.html)

“To be honest, the problems both in the National Assembly here and the U.S. Congress are far more political than economic,” he noted. In Korea, the main opposition Democratic Party (DP) teamed up with three other minor parties to stop the ratification of the KORUS FTA which is pending at the National Assembly Foreign Affairs Committee. These opposition parties demanded that negotiators of the two countries need to sit down again to fix what they called “hazardous clauses” that will negatively affect the job security of farmers and service sector workers. This week, President Lee Myung-bak had a two-hour meeting with DP leader Sohn Hak-kyu, which highlighted the deep divide between the two sides.

## LINK SHIELD

AFF IS SPUN AS PART OF THE 10 YEAR SURVEY – THAT SHIELDS THE LINK.

CARROLL 11. [Rebecca, Nextgov.com -- provides coverage and commentary on the management of information technology in the federal government, “As Nasa prepares to retire its final shuttle, agency leaders face an uncertain future” National Journal June 2 -- lexis]

Launius argues that 10-year surveys can help scientists make their case to politicians. "They serve as a rallying point for the community engaged in this stuff to make sure that they don't twist in the wind when there's a new Congress or panel in the White House." The astronomy division of NASA's science directorate has been using the surveys for nearly 50 years to prioritize popular and successful projects, such as the Hubble Space Telescope, the Chandra X-ray Observatory and the Spitzer Space Telescope. Other science divisions began using them more recently. The planetary science survey that went on tour this spring, for instance, was the second such report.

## Link Turns - General

Space policies popular despite fiscal pressures

Raju and Bresnahan, 11 (4/20/11, Manu Raju and John Bresnahan, Politico, “Shooting for the moon amid cuts,” [http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0411/53495.html](http://www.hoover.org/publications/policy-review/article/6612))

For all the rhetoric about cutting government spending, NASA’s space mission **remains sacred** in Congress. A handful of powerful lawmakers are so eager to see an American on the moon — or even Mars — that they effectively mandated NASA to spend “not less than” $3 billion for a new rocket project and space capsule in the 2011 budget bill signed by the president last week. NASA has repeatedly raised concerns about the timeframe for building a smaller rocket — but the new law expresses Congress’s will for the space agency to make a massive “heavy-lift” rocket that can haul 130 metric tons, like the ones from the days of the Apollo. Congressional approval of the plan — all while $38 billion is being cut elsewhere in the federal government — reflects not only the **power of key lawmakers from NASA-friendly states, but the enduring influence of major contractors** like Lockheed Martin and Boeing in those states.

Congress supports space policies – Parochial and national security concerns

Raju and Bresnahan, 11 (4/20/11, Manu Raju and John Bresnahan, Politico, “Shooting for the moon amid cuts,” [http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0411/53495.html](http://www.centauri-dreams.org/), JMP)

While some praise Congress for pushing the United States to remain a world leader in space science, critics say the national space program is effectively run by lawmakers protecting jobs in their home states. “Manned spaceflight is prohibitively expensive, especially considering our budgetary woes,” said Steve Ellis, vice president of Taxpayers for Common Sense, a budget watchdog group. “At one point, the administration was trying to lead NASA out of that, but congressional politics protecting parochial interests have forced the agency to waste money in the recent short-term continuing resolutions and are forcing a specific approach down NASA’s throat in the yearlong spending bill.” The latest $3 billion will likely be awarded to the same major companies that had contracts under the Bush-era Constellation program, most notably Boeing, Lockheed Martin and Alliant Techsystems — firms with extensive operations in Alabama, Maryland, Texas and Utah. As a whole, NASA is facing its own budget crunch, with its $18.5 billion budget recently trimmed by about $275 million. A top space expert, Scott Pace of The George Washington University, testified last month that NASA spent at least $21 billion over the past two decades for various programs, including manned space flight, that were later canceled. But Congress has no desire to let the agency slow down its work to return to the moon and beyond, even if that potentially could take decades to accomplish. Lawmakers from those states say their push is not parochial — that it’s rooted in the national interest to ensure the U.S. remains the base for an industry that supports thousands of highly skilled jobs. Moreover, they say it makes sense to give money to contractors with proven track records in this technical field, especially ones who have already begun work on the next generation of rockets. “Dismissing [the 130-ton rocket], or the capsule work, as constituent concerns misses the point that these are unique, national capabilities necessary to remain a leader in space exploration,” said Rep. Robert Aderholt (R-Ala.). “The Chinese are building a 130-ton rocket to go to the moon. We are dependent on the Russians for access to the International Space Station. The greatest nation on Earth, the one who stunned the world and inspired a generation by sending a man to walk on the moon, cannot afford to be eclipsed by Russia or China.”

Strong congressional support for space policies

Powell, 9 (12/21/09, Stewart M., Houston Chronicle, “ Moon mission gets help in Congress; Lawmakers insert wording into bill signed by Obama to get leverage over funds for manned spaceflights,” [http://www.chron.com/disp/story.mpl/nation/6780240.html](http://thewayoutspace.blogspot.com/2011/05/scrap-nasa.html), JMP)

WASHINGTON — Fearful that the White House might scale back manned space exploration, a bipartisan group of lawmakers slipped a provision into a massive government spending package last week that would force President Barack Obama to seek congressional approval for any changes to the ambitious Bush-era, back-to-the-moon program. The little-noticed legislative maneuver could yield massive payoffs for the Houston area, which has tens of thousands of jobs tied to manned space exploration. The congressional action hands NASA supporters additional leverage in their behind-the-scenes campaign to persuade Obama to budget an extra $3 billion a year to finance the return of astronauts to the moon by 2020 rather than revamping — and cutting — the manned space effort. “Congress' commitment to our nation's human spaceflight program is unwavering with respect to the path we have already charted,” says Rep. Pete Olson, R-Sugar Land, whose congressional district includes Johnson Space Center. “The debate should not be if we are moving forward, but how we are going to pay for it.”

NASA policies don’t require political capital- bipartisan support ensures popularity

SpacePolitics.com, 5/25/2011, “Congressional support for NASA’s MPCV decision”, http://www.spacepolitics.com/category/congress/page/2/

The “key decision” that NASA announced Tuesday regarding the agency’s space exploration plans was not too surprising, and perhaps a bit underwhelming: NASA is transitioning its existing work on the Orion spacecraft to the Multi-Purpose Crew Vehicle (MPCV). In the NASA statement and media teleconference later that day, NASA indicated there would be effectively no major modifications to Orion to become MPCV, but offered little in the way of specifics on the cost of the MPCV or when it would be ready to begin flights. The MPCV was included in the NASA authorization act last year with a specific requirement to “continue to advance development of the human safety features, designs, and systems in the Orion project.” There was, then, an expectation that NASA would do what it announced yesterday, and transition its existing Orion contract to the MPCV; there was also some frustration in Congress that NASA was taking a long time to make that decision. Now, though, that NASA has done just that, members of Congress are expressing their support for that move, while pressing NASA to also make a decision soon on the Space Launch System (SLS) heavy-lifter. “This is a good thing,” Sen. Bill Nelson (D-FL) said in a statement. The decision “shows real progress towards the goal of exploring deep space” and also helps Florida, he added, since hundreds will be employed at the Kennedy Space Center to process the MPCV for launch. The release also notes that NASA administrator Charles Bolden called Nelson personally to inform him of the decision. In that call, Bolden told the senator that soon “NASA will be making further decisions with regard to the ‘transportation architecture’ of a big deep space rocket.” Sen. Kay Bailey Hutchison (R-TX) also supported the decision. “After more than a year of uncertainty and delay, NASA has come to the same conclusion that it reached years ago — Orion is the vehicle that will advance our human exploration in space,” she said in a statement (not yet posted online.) She reminded NASA, though, that it “must continue to follow law” and announce plans for the SLS. “NASA needs to follow this important step by quickly finalizing and announcing the heavy lift launch vehicle configuration so that work can accelerate and the requirements of the law can be met.” “This was the only fiscally and technologically prudent decision that NASA could make,” Rep. Pete Olson (R-TX) said in a statement. “With this decision NASA can continue to build on current projects and investments rather than further delay with unnecessary procurements.” NASA’s decision means that Lockheed Martin’s contract to work on Orion/MPCV will continue, and that’s a relief for people in Colorado, where much of that work is taking place. In a joint statement, Sen. Mark Udall (D-CO) and Michael Bennet (D-CO) and Rep. Ed Perlmutter (D-CO) noted the decision protects over 1,000 aerospace jobs, and nearly 4,000 total jobs, in the state, which to them appeared to be just as important as the MPCV’s role in future human space exploration. “With the Space Shuttle Endeavor’s [sic] final launch, Orion represents the next frontier in human space exploration and has the potential to stir the imagination of a new generation of young scientists while giving our economy a much needed boost,” Bennet said.

Plan is popular – congress demands increased funding for space

**Rash ’10** (Wayne, 6/30/10, eWeek, “NASA Space Flight Funding Plan Stymies Congress, Obama Administration” http://www.eweek.com/c/a/IT-Infrastructure/NASA-Space-Flight-Funding-Plan-Embroils-Congress-Obama-Administration-503112/)

The White House's plans for NASA's manned space program have been encountering strong objections from both Democrats and Republicans. Members of Congress have repeatedly said the White House and Congress need to find a way to pay for continued space exploration by NASA. The current plans would effectively gut NASA's manned space program, eliminate planned manned-rated heavy-lift boosters and only direct long-term funding for manned space flight to private industry. In addition, the administration has delayed any decision on government-funded heavy-lift booster development programs for at least five years. In the meantime, NASA's current space shuttle fleet would be retired and any travel to the International Space Station would be either outsourced to startup space launch companies or to the Russian space program, or would simply be eliminated. The opposition in Congress has been partly driven by high-profile testimony from experts and astronauts, including Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin, the first two humans to land on the moon. In addition, members of Congress, especially in the economically hard-hit Gulf states, fear that the elimination of an effective manned space program by NASA would be a serious blow to their economies, already reeling from the BP oil leak that is throwing thousands of people out of work and shutting down a wide range of businesses along the coast.

Funding for space exploration popular with House republicans and democrats

Mark Whittington, 4/1/2011, “Rep. Bill Posey Argues for More Funding for NASA Space Exploration”, http://news.yahoo.com/s/ac/20110401/pl\_ac/8187949\_rep\_bill\_posey\_argues\_for\_more\_funding\_for\_nasa\_space\_exploration

In a recent hearing before the House Budget Committee in preparation for a 2012 budget, Rep. Bill Posey, Republican of Florida, made the case for more funding for NASA's human space flight programs. Most of the arguments Posey used were familiar. They included the need not to fall behind Russia and China in space exploration, technological spin-offs, and the need to maintain an aerospace work force. The main thrust of Posey's arguments were directed against President Barack Obama's space policy, which the congressman suggested had left NASA with no clear mission as well as the White House's continuing opposition to funding space exploration. This, more than the other arguments, is likely to have some resonance for House members, Republicans as well as Democrats.

## IMPACT D: US-SK RELATIONS (General)

US SOUTH KOREA RELATIONS ARE RESILIENT – ONE ISSUE CAN’T WRECK IT.

TARGETED NEWS SERVICE 9. [“From allies, past and present” Sept 14 -- lexis]

In a conversation in front of a capacity crowd at the forum, the two diplomats reflected on the historical strength of the alliance and what issues might put it at risk. Both agreed it would take a lot to shake a political relationship that dates back to the 19th century, and one that was forged in steel by the Korean War. It is an alliance "less brittle and far more resilient than it ever has been," said Stephens. Han, who in 1984 earned a Harvard Ph.D. in economics, called the U.S.-South Korea alliance the foundation of his nation's "economic growth, prosperity, and security." It remains so firm and mutual today, he added, that it could be an international model of cooperation -- "the exemplar alliance relationship of the future." Moderating the public conversation between ambassadors was Graham Allison, a terrorism scholar who has studied the threat posed by a nuclear-armed North Korea. He is Douglas Dillon Professor of Government at Harvard Kennedy School (HKS) and director of the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs. Skeptical and probing, Allison prompted the two diplomats to imagine a near future in which the traditional alliance enjoyed by the United States and South Korea goes sour. In sum, he asked, what could go wrong and what issues need attending to? Neither of the ambassadors budged much. In fact, said Han, "there is a very, very fundamental notion that U.S.-Korea relations cannot be swayed by one or two events." It is and has been an alliance, he said, that has never been "underestimated or disregarded. It was always central." But it is true, Han added, that the two nations share a set of 21st century problems -- global issues that include terrorism, piracy, climate change, and the challenges of development and trade. U.S.-South Korea relations are resilient and strong, said Stephens, but three areas deserve a measure of vigilance: economic crisis, North Korea, and the continued presence of 26,000 American military personnel on Korean soil. "We need to be good neighbors, good friends" on the issue of that presence, she said.

EMPIRICALLY DENIED – SKFTA HAS BEEN STALLED IN THE SENATE SINCE 2007 – RELATIONS HAVEN’T COLLAPSE.

ALT CAUS --- ANTI-AMERICANISM, POLICY DIFFERENCES.

Bandow 3 (Doug, Senior Fellow – Cato Institute and Robert A. Taft Fellow – American Conservative Defense Alliance, “Ending the Anachronistic Korean Commitment”, Parameters, 33, Summer, http://www.carlisle.army.mil/USAWC/PARAMETERS/03summer/bandow%20.pdf)

The United States established a permanent troop presence in the Korean peninsula with the onset of the Korean War. But changing perceptions of the threat posed by the North, combined with increasing national self-confidence in South Korea, are challenging bilateral relations. South Korean frustrations are not new, but they have gained greater force than ever before. Explains Kim Sung-han of the Institute for Foreign Affairs and National Security, “Anti-Americanism is getting intense. It used to be widespread and not so deep. Now it’s getting widespread and deep.”9 Although polls show that a majority of South Koreans still supports the US troop presence, a majority also pronounces its dislike of America. Some Americans hope that the sentiments will recede and everything will go back to normal. However, the generation grateful for American aid in the Korean War is passing from the scene. Younger people associate the United States more with US support for various military regimes and the indignities (and tragedies) of a foreign troop presence. Policy differences between Seoul and Washington also will likely worsen as the nuclear crisis proceeds. In late January, President Kim Dae-jung offered veiled criticism of the United States: “Sometimes we need to talk to the other party, even if we dislike the other party.”10 At the same time, Washington was pushing the issue toward the UN Security Council, which, in Seoul’s view, would short-circuit the diplomatic process. Shortly thereafter the Bush Administration pointedly observed that military action remained an option, generating a near hysterical response from Seoul. Indeed, Roh Moo-hyun, who once called for the withdrawal of US forces, ran on an explicit peace platform that sharply diverged from US policy: “We have to choose between war and peace,” he told one rally.11 He owes his narrow election victory to rising popular antagonism against the United States and particularly the presence of American troops. Of course, he later tried to moderate his position and called for strengthening the alliance. Yet he complained that “so far, all changes in the size of US troop strength here have been determined by the United States based on its strategic consideration, without South Korea’s consent.”12 Moreover, proposed “reforms” of the relationship—adjusting the Status of Forces Agreement, moving America’s Yongsan base out of Seoul, withdrawing a small unit or two, changing the joint command (which envisions an American general commanding Korean troops in war)—are mere Band-Aids. President Roh has called for a more “equal” relationship and promised not to “kowtow” to Washington. 13 But the relationship between the two countries will never be equal so long as South Korea is dependent on Washington for its defense. The United States cannot be expected to risk war on another nation’s terms.

## RELAT’S D: AT – CHINESE AGGRESSION

ALLIANCE DOESN’T BALANCE CHINA

Kang 9 (David, Associate Professor of Government – Dartmouth College, “Between Balancing and Bandwagoning: South Korea's Response to China”, Journal of East Asian Studies, 1-1, Lexis)

Yet South Korea has drawn closer to China over the past two decades, not farther away. Furthermore, South Korea has had increasing friction with Japan, a capitalist democracy that shares an alliance with the United States. Indeed, South Korea appears more worried about potential Japanese militarization than it is worried about actual Chinese militarization. Although the US-ROK alliance remains strong, the key point for this article is that the alliance is not a balancing alliance against China, and the recent adjustments in the alliance were neither aimed at nor the result of China. In sum, there is little evidence that South Korea will attempt to balance China, and even less evidence that South Korea fears China.

WON’T STOP CHINA’S RISE

Kang 9 (David, Associate Professor of Government – Dartmouth College, “Between Balancing and Bandwagoning: South Korea's Response to China”, Journal of East Asian Studies, 1-1, Lexis)

However, the US-ROK alliance is directed more fundamentally to the North and to other contingencies, and the alliance is not a balancing exercise against China. Furthermore, there appears little evidence that the alliance has changed to accommodate rising Chinese power, and agreements on out-of-area operations do not appear to relate to China. The military aspect of the alliance has undergone fairly major changes in the past few years; but this was driven by US out-of-area needs (particularly the "war on terror") and South Korean domestic considerations, not China. The two allies signed a base-restructuring agreement that includes the return of over sixty US camps to the South Koreans, as well as the relocation of the US Army headquarters from downtown Seoul to the countryside. By 2012, wartime operational control will return to South Korea, and the United States is reducing its South Korean deployments from 37,000 to 25,000 troops (US Department of Defense 2000). US power on the peninsula is thus actually decreasing,    and as a result, it has been noted that "the U.S. will emphasize the ROK's primary leading role in defending itself. Physically, the U.S. seems not to have sufficient augmentation forces, especially ground troops" (Choi and Park 2007, 18).

## RELAT’S D: AT -- SK ECON

US NOT KEY TRADING PARTNER – CHINA IS.

GAULIER 7. [Guillaume, PhD on economic integration and real convergences, research associate with the CEPII “China’s Integration in East Asia: Production Sharing, FDI & High-Tech Trade,” http://www.economieinternationale.fr/anglaisgraph/workpap/pdf/2005/wp05-09.pdf]

Since 1980, China’s economy has grown at the rate of 9% a year and its foreign trade has expanded at the pace of almost 15% a year. Its share in world trade rose from less than 1% to about 5% in 20023. The emergence of China as a great economic and trade power is bringing far reaching changes in the world economy and in international economic relations. China’s now holds large world market shares in traditional industries (accounting for about one third of world exports in leather and shoes, one fifth in clothing), but is also rapidly enlarging its shares in electrical and electronic exports, the fastest growing segments of world trade. In 2002 China recorded one fifth of world exports of consumer electronics and of domestic appliance. For East Asian countries, China has become a major partner, their first partner in the region. In 2003, for Japan, China was the second export market, behind the US, and its first supplier. For South- Korea, China was the first export market and its second supplier behind the US. In 2003 and 2004, the accelerated increase of China’s import demand (+40% and 37% respectively) has been the engine of economic growth in East Asia. The aim of the paper is to help understand how China has achieved such outstanding trade performance and to bring to the fore the factors underlying China’s competitiveness in world markets. It shows China’s involvement in the international segmentation of production processes and its integration in Asian production networks are at the core of its rapid trade expansion.

## IMPACT D: AT -- ECON IMPACT

South Korea isn’t key to the U.S. economy

Carpenter and Bandow 4 (Ted Galen, Vice President for Defense and Foreign Policy Studies – Cato Institute, and Doug, Senior Fellow – Cato Institute, The Korean Conundrum: America's Troubled Relations with North and South Korea, p. 126)

America's cultural and economic ties with South Korea are valuable, but not critical. For instance, two-way trade in 2003 exceeded $60 billion (it peaked at almost $67 billion in 2000), real money but small change for Amer­ica's $10 trillion economy.26 Moreover, notes Stephen W. Bosworth, dean of the Fletcher School at Tufts University, "The relative weights of the United States and South Korea in the increasingly global economic interests of the other are shrinking in relative terms."27

No impact – even in the worst-case scenario

Bandow 92 (Doug, Senior Fellow – Cato Institute, The U.S.-South Korean Alliance, p. 4)

The belief that the Republic of Korea (ROK) is vital to America's security is more a product of obsolete Cold War assumptions combined with an emotional commitment resulting from the sacri­fice of American blood and treasure during the Korean War than it is a rational assessment of current U.S. security interests or re­quirements. Neither South Korea's economic nor strategic impor­tance to the United States is sufficient to justify the costs and risks entailed by Washington's security commitment, especially the con­tinued presence of U.S. forces on the peninsula. True, the ROK is a significant trading partner; U.S.–South Ko­rean trade came to nearly $32 billion in 1988.5 Disruption of that commerce would be costly and unpleasant, but even a worst-case scenario involving the total loss of trade with South Korea would hardly devastate America's $5.5 trillion-a-year economy.

SKFTA IS IRRELEVANT -- NO CHANCE OF COMPLETE TRADE DISRUPTION

Bandow 96 (Doug, Senior Fellow – Cato Institute and Robert A. Taft Fellow – American Conservative Defense Alliance, Tripwire: Korea and U.S. Foreign Policy in a Changed World, p. 57)

Although economic ties are among the strongest aspects of the existing relationship between America and the ROK, Washington's security promise provides the United States with no tangible eco­nomic advantages. After all, U.S.-South Korean trade is valuable but not critical, accounting for about 3 percent of America's total trade and only a bit more than one-half a percent of its gross domestic product. Bilateral trade would be affected by the removal of U.S. troops only if the ROK was overrun, an exceedingly unlikely pros­pect for a nation so much more advanced than its adversary.

## SKFTA BAD: ECON

SKFTA TANKS THE U.S. ECONOMY – EXPLODES TRADE DEFICIT AND UNEMPLOYMENT – prefer our ev -- studies saying it helps the economy are inaccurate.

SCOTT 10. [Robert, “Free Trade Agreement with Korea will cost US jobs” Economic Policy Institute -- July 1 -- http://www.epi.org/economic\_snapshots/entry/free\_trade\_agreement\_with\_korea\_will\_cost\_u.s.\_jobs/]

The Obama administration has announced that it intends to finalize a new free trade agreement with South Korea (KORUS FTA) in time for the next G-20 summit in November. Although the U.S. International Trade Commission (USITC) projects this will have a small positive impact on the U.S. trade balance, and “minimal or negligible “ impact on U.S. employment, history shows that such trade deals lead to rapidly growing trade deficits and job loss in the United States. The Charts below compare USITC’s estimates of the impact of the forthcoming free trade agreement with Korea to EPI’s own calculation. Unlike USITC’s forecast of a small positive impact, EPI’s research shows it will increase the U.S. trade deficit with Korea by about $16.7 billion, and displace about 159,000 American jobs within the first seven years after it takes effect. The USITC has a history of vastly underestimating the negative impacts that free trade agreements have on the U.S. economy. In 1999, it estimated that China’s entry into the World Trade Organization would increase the U.S. trade deficit with China by only $1.0 billion, and have no significant impact on U.S. employment. In fact, the U.S. trade deficit with China increased by $185 billion between 2001 (when China entered the WTO) and 2008, and 2.4 million U.S. jobs have been displaced or lost. The U.S. trade deficit with Mexico also rose rapidly after the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) took effect in 1994. With U.S. unemployment close to 10%, and an employment gap of nearly 11 million jobs, it would be foolish and self destructive for the United States to implement a free trade agreement with Korea that leads to further job loss.

THE IMPACT IS GLOBAL NUCLEAR WAR.

Mead -09 (Walter Russell Mead, Henry A. Kissinger senior fellow for U.S. foreign policy at the Council on Foreign Relations. The New Republic, “Only Makes You Stronger,” February 4 2009. http://www.tnr.com/politics/story.html?id=571cbbb9-2887-4d81-8542-92e83915f5f8&p=2 AD 6/30/09)

So far, such half-hearted experiments not only have failed to work; they have left the societies that have tried them in a progressively worse position, farther behind the front-runners as time goes by. Argentina has lost ground to Chile; Russian development has fallen farther behind that of the Baltic states and Central Europe. Frequently, the crisis has weakened the power of the merchants, industrialists, financiers, and professionals who want to develop a liberal capitalist society integrated into the world. Crisis can also strengthen the hand of religious extremists, populist radicals, or authoritarian traditionalists who are determined to resist liberal capitalist society for a variety of reasons. Meanwhile, the companies and banks based in these societies are often less established and more vulnerable to the consequences of a financial crisis than more established firms in wealthier societies. As a result, developing countries and countries where capitalism has relatively recent and shallow roots tend to suffer greater economic and political damage when crisis strikes--as, inevitably, it does. And, consequently, financial crises often reinforce rather than challenge the global distribution of power and wealth. This may be happening yet again. None of which means that we can just sit back and enjoy the recession. History may suggest that financial crises actually help capitalist great powers maintain their leads--but it has other, less reassuring messages as well. If financial crises have been a normal part of life during the 300-year rise of the liberal capitalist system under the Anglophone powers, so has war. The wars of the League of Augsburg and the Spanish Succession; the Seven Years War; the American Revolution; the Napoleonic Wars; the two World Wars; the cold war: The list of wars is almost as long as the list of financial crises. Bad economic times can breed wars. Europe was a pretty peaceful place in 1928, but the Depression poisoned German public opinion and helped bring Adolf Hitler to power. If the current crisis turns into a depression, what rough beasts might start slouching toward Moscow, Karachi, Beijing, or New Delhi to be born? The United States may not, yet, decline, but, if we can't get the world economy back on track, we may still have to fight.

## EXT: KILLS ECON

SKFTA COLLAPSES THE TEXTILE SECTOR – PHASE OUT TARIFFS KILL U.S. COMPETITIVENESS.

MORRISSEY 10. [James A., Washington correspondent, “Administration moving on South Korea free trade pact” Textile World -- Aug 10 -- http://www.textileworld.com/Articles/2010/August/Administration\_Moving.html]

A letter to Kirk signed by five textile associations and the labor organization representing textile and apparel workers claims that the textile chapter in the agreement will result in "a massive one-way flow of South Korean textiles, apparel and home furnishings" and will result in extensive job losses. The organizations zero in on three areas of the KORUS that they say need to be renegotiated - the tariff phase-out schedule, the rules of origin and Customs enforcement. The organizations say the proposed tariff phase-out schedule is unacceptable, charging that the current agreement "exposes sensitive portions of the textile industry to immediate phase-outs with South Korea, which is simply a recipe for rapid job losses and plant closings in the United States." The letter also charges that the tariff treatments as currently written are non-reciprocal and benefit South Korean producers. The organizations say U.S. textile and apparel tariffs are relatively high and will require a gradual phase-out. The organizations call for major changes in the rules of origin. They point out that sewing thread, narrow fabrics and pocketing fabrics - all in plentiful supply in the United States - are not covered by the rules of origin. They say allowing these components to be sourced in non-participating countries is a departure from previous agreements. The organizations contend that the Customs enforcement model is "deeply flawed." They note that South Korean textile manufacturers have made major investments in Chinese production and that South Korea has "a long history as a transshipment route for Chinese textile and apparel products." This history, they say, calls for rewrite of the customs enforcement provisions in the agreement. In addition, the organizations say that KORUS will give goods from South Korea duty-free access into the United States while U.S. exports will be subject to a 10-percent value-added tax. The letter was signed by the American Manufacturing Trade Action Coalition, the National Council of Textile Organizations, the National Textile Association, the U.S. Industrial Fabrics Institute, the American Fiber Manufacturers Association and the Service Employees International Union. Members of the Congressional Textile Caucus also expressed their concerns about KORUS. A letter to Kirk on behalf of the caucus, signed by the co-chairmen, Rep. John Spratt, D-S.C., and Rep. Howard Coble, R-N.C., stated the existing agreement places domestic manufacturers at "a distinct disadvantage by allowing a massive flow of **highly technical industrial** textiles from Korea with few opportunities for reciprocal export of U.S. products." The caucus letter cited the same concerns as the textile organizations outlined with respect to the tariff cut schedule, customs enforcement and the rules of origin, and said: "While we recognize that the current free trade agreement framework was negotiated by the previous administration, we want to voice our strenuous objections to the tariff phase-out schedule. Since the purpose of this agreement is to provide fair and equitable treatment to all parties, the United States simply cannot accept an agreement that places U.S. manufacturers and workers at such a blatant disadvantage."

## SKFTA BAD: JAPAN RELATIONS

SKFTA kills US-Japan relations- perceived as hostile

NIKKEI WEEKLY 7. [9/18 – “Trade relations quiet after storm”, lexis]

There are, however, many policy-makers in both Japan and the U.S. who feel that something is lacking in the currently quiet economic relations between the two countries. A senior official of the U.S. State Department stationed in Japan recently confessed feeling nostalgia for the days when the two countries were at loggerheads. I too share the same feeling. The good news - although not necessarily for everyone - is that two recent events could shake things up. One is the free trade agreement reached between the U.S. and South Korea in April; and the other the global stock sell-offs in August triggered by fears about rising defaults on subprime mortgages in the U.S. Striking a groundbreaking trade deal right under Japan's nose, Bush and South Korean President Roh Moo-hyun agreed to an almost total elimination of tariffs on trade between the two countries. It is still unclear whether the bilateral FTA will actually be put into effect, but if it is, the impact on Japanese exports to the U.S. could be huge. Japanese policy-makers have to seriously think about why the U.S. has agreed on an FTA with South Korea before starting any negotiations on such a pact with Japan.

US-JAPAN RELATIONS KEY TO DETER AGGRESSION IN ASIA.

MOCHIZUKI 96. [Michael, Senior Fellow, Foreign Policy Studies, Brookings, September 1996, Japan Quarterly p. 21]

In the context of East Asia, how closely Japan is in step with the United States will be an important factor in the calculations of potential aggressors. Any sign that these two powers are at odds during a crisis might tempt the provocative state to escalate tensions. This will increase the possibility of miscalculation and war. In other words, the odds of a peaceful resolution of crises will be greater when the United States and Japan stand together.

The impact is nuclear war

HALPERIN 00. [Morton H., Director of Policy Planning at State Department, The Nuclear Dimension of the US-Japan Alliance, http://www.nautilus.org/archives/library/security/papers/Halperin-US-Japan.pdf accessed 8/05]

Another major objective of U.S. nuclear forces is to deter nuclear attacks on U.S. allies, especially Germany and Japan. In Europe, this issue has generally arisen in the context of the Soviet use of nuclear threats against Germany in a crisis or the initiation of nuclear weapons by the Soviet Union against NATO forces in the field during a conventional war in Europe. In Asia, it is discussed under the rubric of the U.S. nuclear umbrella over Japan and is generally understood to be designed to prevent Russia or China (or more recently the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, or DPRK) from coercing Japan by threatening the use of nuclear weapons.

## US-JAPAN RELATS: NORTH KOREA

US-JAPAN RELATIONS DETER KOREAN AGGRESSION.

Okamoto 2 president of Okamoto Associates, Inc. Special adviser to the cabinet and chairman of the Japanese prime minister's Task Force on Foreign Relations (Yukio, “Japan and the United States: The Essential Alliance”, The Washington Quarterly 25.2 (2002) 59-72)

Despite its years of famine; its evaporating industrial and energy infrastructure; and its choking, inhumane society, the DPRK government still refuses to retreat to its place on the ash heap of history. Despite the poverty of the people, the North Korean military maintains an arsenal of thousands of rocket launchers and pieces of artillery--some of which are possibly loaded with chemical and biological warheads--awaiting the signal to wipe Seoul off the map. The DPRK's immense stock of weapons includes large numbers of No-dong **missiles capable of** striking Japan's western coastal regions and probably longer-range missiles capable of hitting every major Japanese city. The United States has two combat aircraft wings in the ROK, in Osan and Kunsan. In addition, some 30,000 U.S. Army troops are stationed near Seoul. Most military experts admit that the army troops serve a largely symbolic function; if an actual war were to erupt, a massive North Korean artillery bombardment could pin down both the U.S. Eighth Army and the ROK armed forces at the incipient stage. The firepower the USFJ can bring to bear upon the Korean Peninsula within a matter of hours makes the U.S.-Japan alliance the Damoclean sword hanging over the DPRK. The DPRK leaders are masters of deception and manipulation, but they know that launching a military strike against the ROK will expose them to a strong and final counterstrike from U.S. forces in Japan

NORTH KOREAN AGGRESSION CAUSES EXTINCTION

CHOL 2 (Kim Myong, Executive Director of the Center for Korean-American Peace, Tokyo, and former editor of People's Korea, “Agreed Framework is Brain Dead; Shotgun Wedding Is the Only Option to Defuse Crisis,” October 24, http://www.nautilus.org/fora/security/0212A\_Chol.html)

The second choice is for the Americans to initiate military action to knock out the nuclear facilities in North Korea. Without precise knowledge of the location of those target facilities, the American policy planners face the real risk of North Korea launching a full-scale war against South Korea, Japan and the U.S. The North Korean retaliation will most likely leave South Korea and Japan totally devastated with the Metropolitan U.S. being consumed in nuclear conflagration. Looking down on the demolished American homeland, American policy planners aboard a special Boeing jets will have good cause to claim, "We are winners, although our homeland is in ashes. We are safely alive on this jet." The third and last option is to agree to a shotgun wedding with the North Koreans. It means entering into package solution negotiations with the North Koreans, offering to sign a peace treaty to terminate the relations of hostility, establish full diplomatic relations between the two enemy states, withdraw the American forces from South Korea, remove North Korea from the list of axis of evil states and terrorist-sponsoring states, and give North Korea most favored nation treatment.

The first two options should be sobering nightmare scenarios for a wise Bush and his policy planners. If they should opt for either of the scenarios, that would be their decision, which the North Koreans are in no position to take issue with. The Americans would realize too late that the North Korean mean what they say. The North Koreans will use all their resources in their arsenal to fight a full-scale nuclear exchange with the Americans in the last war of [hu]mankind**.** A nuclear-armed North Korea would be most destabilizing in the region and the rest of the world in the eyes of the Americans. They would end up finding themselves reduced to a second-class nuclear power. [this card has been gender modified]

## US-JAPAN RELATIONS: SOUTH CHINA SEAS

RELATIONS KEY TO DETERRING CHINESE AGGRESSION IN THE SOUTH CHINA SEA.

Okamoto 02 (president of Okamoto Associates, Inc. Special adviser to the cabinet and chairman of the Japanese prime minister's Task Force on Foreign Relations (Yukio, “Japan and the United States: The Essential Alliance”, The Washington Quarterly 25.2 (2002) 59-72)

**In the 1980s,** Japan pledged to develop a defense capacity to protect the Asia-Pacific sea lanes extending 1,000 nautical miles outward from Japan. Around the same time, Japan accepted a special mission to develop an incomparable antisubmarine warfare capability. The choice of the latter mission was a result of a quirk of geography: Japan had effective control of the three straits--the Tsushima, Tsugaru, and Soya (La Pérouse)--that the Soviet Pacific Fleet's submarines had to use in order to pass between the Pacific and their home ports in Vladivostok and Nakhodka. One of the outcomes of these two programs is that Japan now has a considerable store of expertise and equipment applicable to surveillance and interdiction of targets in the mid-ocean and coastal areas. By many measures, the MSDF is now the world's second-most powerful maritime force, counting [End Page 69] among its assets an aerial armada of 100 P-3C Orion patrol aircraft. With the deterioration of Russia's submarine and surface fleets, the MSDF could shift its focus from the Japan Sea to the East China Sea and the western Pacific. Japanese MSDF vessels and U.S. Navy vessels can work in tandem to assure that these areas remain empty of threats to free commerce and travel. The Japan-U.S. alliance also probably serves as a deterrent against any one nation seizing control of the Spratly Islands and, by extension, the sea lanes and resources of the South China Sea. Formally, the area is outside the Far East region that the United States and Japan agree is covered by Article 6 of the security treaty. For the countries vying for control of the sea, however, the proximity of two of the world's great maritime forces must at least urge them to use caution as they pursue their competition.

GOES NUCLEAR

Nikkei Weekly ’95 (7-3, Lexis)

Mahathir sees Asia developing in three possible ways in future. In his worst-case scenario, Asian countries would go to war against each other, possibly over disputes such as their conflicting claims on the Spratly Islands. China might then declare war on the U.S., leading to full-scale**, even** nuclear, war.

## US-JAPAN RELATIONS: TERRORISM

RELATIONS KEY TO PREVENT TERRORIST WMD ACQUISITION.

Isozaki and Szechenyi 06, Visiting Fellow, Office of the Japan Chair, CSIS and assistant director of the Japan Chair at CSIS (Komei, Nicholas, “New Roles and Missions: Transforming the U.S.-Japan Alliance” Report of the Cochairs, CSIS Japan Chair Study Group, July 12)

The United States launched the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI) in 2003 in response to the mounting threat of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD). **Japan has demonstrated its commitment to counterproliferation by joining PSI as an original core member and has participated in more than 15 various exercises and meetings**, having also hosted 1 international exercise in 2004. Japan traditionally considered counterproliferation efforts a matter for domestic law enforcement, but as **the shipment of WMD has been identified as a useful tool for rogue regimes or terrorists to acquire such weapons and related technologies, maritime interdiction by naval forces has become the centerpiece of alliance contributions in this area. The United States and Japan could lead regional partners in norm-setting to ensure effective cooperation in the future.**

EXTINCTION.

Sid-Ahmed, 2004 (Mohamed, Managing Editor for Al-Ahali, “Extinction!” August 26-September 1, Issue no. 705, http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2004/705/op5.htm)

A nuclear attack by terrorists will be much more critical than Hiroshima and Nagazaki, even if -- and this is far from certain -- the weapons used are less harmful than those used then, Japan, at the time, with no knowledge of nuclear technology, had no choice but to capitulate. Today, the technology is a secret for nobody. So far, except for the two bombs dropped on Japan, nuclear weapons have been used only to threaten. Now we are at a stage where they can be detonated. This completely changes the rules of the game. We have reached a point where anticipatory measures can determine the course of events. Allegations of a terrorist connection can be used to justify anticipatory measures, including the invasion of a sovereign state like Iraq. As it turned out, these allegations, as well as the allegation that Saddam was harbouring WMD, proved to be unfounded. What would be the consequences of a nuclear attack by terrorists? Even if it fails, it would further exacerbate the negative features of the new and frightening world in which we are now living. Societies would close in on themselves, police measures would be stepped up at the expense of human rights, tensions between civilisations and religions would rise and ethnic conflicts would proliferate. It would also speed up the arms race and develop the awareness that a different type of world order is imperative if humankind is to survive. But the still more critical scenario is if the attack succeeds. This could lead to a third world war, from which no one will emerge victorious. Unlike a conventional war which ends when one side triumphs over another, this war will be without winners and losers. When nuclear pollution infects the whole planet, we will all be losers.

## A2: TAA KEY ECON

TAA Has Zero Economic Benefits – Newest Studies Prove

Chapman, 7/3/11 (Steve, Chicago Tribune, columnist and editorial writer for the Chicago Tribune. His twice-a-week column on national and international affairs, distributed by Creators Syndicate, appears in some 50 papers across the country. Chapman has been a member of the Tribune editorial board since 1981. He came to the Tribune from The New Republic magazine, where he was an associate editor. He has contributed articles to several national magazines, including Slate, The American Spectator, The Weekly Standard, Reason, and National Review. He has appeared on numerous TV and radio news programs, include The CBS Evening News, NBC Nightly News, The NewsHour with Jim Lehrer, and National Public Radio’s Fresh Air, Talk of the Nation and On Point. Born in Brady, Texas in 1954, Chapman grew up in Midland and Austin. He attended Harvard University, where he was on the staff of The Harvard Crimson, and graduated with honors in 1976. He has been a fellow at the American Academy in Berlin and the Hoover Institution at Stanford University, and has served on the Visiting Committee of the University of Chicago Law School.

They think it amounts to largely wasting billions of dollars. They see no reason to hold free trade hostage to this boondoggle. And they're right. The argument for the program is that trade has many beneficiaries and a small number of victims, who ought to be compensated for their trouble. Most of us get richer from buying and selling in the international marketplace, and this program takes some of that extra wealth and spreads it around to the unlucky few who are worse off. But the logic has never stood up well to inspection. If a steelworker in Pennsylvania loses his job because of competition from Texas, he is just as unemployed as one whose competition comes from Brazil. Yet the latter gets special help and the former gets none. Capitalism is a dynamic system producing ceaseless change. Lots of people have been laid off because of big forces beyond their control -- from the financial crisis to the housing bust to the price of fuel. They get considerable help in the form of unemployment insurance (which has been extended to up to 99 weeks for the current troubles). Why are those affected by trade entitled to additional consideration? The answer is political, not economic. To get lawmakers distrustful of global commerce to go along with trade agreements, presidents had to give them this program as compensation. But as compensation, it falls lamentably short. The purpose is to assure that jobless workers find well-paid new employment. In reality, it's no big favor to the recipients. The surprise is that for all the money spent ($1.3 billion this year), the program's impact is undetectable. In a new study published in the journal Contemporary Economic Policy, American University economists Kara Reynolds and John Palatucci found "no statistical evidence that the TAA program improves the average employment outcome of beneficiaries over a comparison group." It makes zero difference.