### **HSR Links – Elections**

#### California voters hate the plan Cohen 7/16 (Bonner R. Cohen, Reporter for the Heartlander, July 16, 2012, <http://news.heartland.org/newspaper-article/2012/07/16/californians-regret-approving-high-speed-rail>)

Four years after approving a $9 billion high-speed rail proposal, Californians strongly oppose high-speed rail and would vote against it if given another chance, a University of Southern California/Los Angeles Times poll reports.¶ Only 33 Percent Support¶ In the 2008 elections, Californians approved borrowing $9 billion for high-speed rail by a vote of 53 percent to 47 percent. Four years later, however, costs are soaring far beyond initial projections, promised transit times are becoming longer and longer, and ridership estimates are proving overly optimistic.¶ Opponents of high-speed rail now outnumber supporters by nearly two to one. According to the USC/Los Angeles Times June 2 poll, 59 percent of Californians now oppose high-speed rail, and only 33 percent support it.¶ “California voters have clearly reconsidered their support for high-speed rail,” Dan Schnur, director of the USC/Los Angeles Times Poll and director of the USC Unruh Institute of Politics, said in a USC press release. “They want the chance to vote again—and they want to vote no.”¶ “The growing budget deficit is making Californians hesitant about spending so much money on a project like this one when they’re seeing cuts to public education and law enforcement. But they also seem to be wary as to whether state government can run a big speed rail system effectively,” Schnur added.¶ Voters Get Another ChanceThe poll bodes well for proponents of a November 2012 ballot initiative to halt the sale of state bonds to finance high-speed rail.

#### California controls the election for Obama – fundraising Parnes 6/6 (Amie Parnes, 6/6/12. Reporter for the Hill, <http://thehill.com/homenews/campaign/231107-obama-in-california-gold-rush>)

President Obama’s campaign is increasingly focusing its fundraising efforts on California, where Obama on Wednesday will make his third trip in a month to attend five fundraisers.¶ Silicon Valley and Hollywood are Obama’s hottest spots to raise money, and the spigots have opened wider since Obama last month went public with his personal endorsement of gay marriage, which went over particularly well with California donors.¶ The president’s trip on Wednesday will be his 16th visit to California since entering office.¶ ¶ To be sure, the Golden State has always been a major cash machine for Democratic candidates — and even some Republicans. Sixteen of Obama’s top bundlers — including DreamWorks Animation CEO Jeffrey Katzenberg — hail from California. But the state’s importance to the president has increased as Wall Street has cooled to Obama because of his attacks on Mitt Romney’s private-equity background at Bain Capital.¶ “California has always been the go-to, but it’s becoming that way more than ever this cycle,” said Chris Lehane, a Democratic consultant based in the Golden State.¶ While Obama might be losing support among investment bankers and hedge fund managers, he’s tapping into the munificence of Silicon Valley, where business has continued to prosper under his presidency, Lehane said.

#### HSR percieved as a failure – voters hate it Freemark, 12

Yonah Freemark ,reporter,Yale graduate , 1/25, http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2012/01/25/on-infrastructure-hopes-for-progress-this-year-look-glum/)

In the context of the presidential race, Mr. Obama’s decision not to continue his previously strong advocacy of more and more transportation funding suggests that the campaign sees the issue as politically irrelevant. If the Administration made an effort last year to convince Americans of the importance of improving infrastructure, there seems to have been fewer positive results in terms of popular perceptions than hoped for. Perhaps the rebuffs from Republican governors on high-speed rail took their toll; perhaps the few recovery projects that entered construction were not visible enough (or at least their federal funding was not obvious enough); perhaps the truth of the matter is that people truly care more about issues like unemployment and health care than they do for public transit and roads.

### HSR Links – Agenda

Republicans hate high speed rail

Bradley, 7/11 [2012, William, Huff Post Politics “A Ticket to Ride: High-Speed Rail Moves Forward on a Historic (and Bumpy) Track in California” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/william-bradley/a-ticket-to-ride-highspee\_b\_1666733.html]

Last Friday's narrow passage of legislation authorizing the beginning of construction of the first high-speed rail system in America was a dramatic moment many years in the making. And while it was undertaken entirely by Democrats at the end, some famous Republican politicians made it happen along the way. In fact, it would never have happened without them. Which makes the current version of the once Grand Old Party and its knee-jerk opposition to the project all the more ironic. It's Governor Jerry Brown who gets the credit -- and takes the heat from conservatives, sizable elements of the media, and the old energy economy interests whose die-hard opposition naturally underlies the opposition -- for pushing the project over the political goal line. But had former Governor Pete Wilson (ironically, a longtime Brown bete noire) not gotten the ball rolling in 1996 with the creation of the California High-Speed Rail Authority, it might not have happened. And had Brown's far more friendly predecessor, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, not supported the empowering initiative and pushed for ever more funding even as the economy sank into the great global recession, promoting high-speed rail through the very end of his term in January 2011, it would not have happened at all. Brown joined U.S. Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood Monday at the Port of Oakland to announce a $15 million grant to expand its rail yard and especially to discuss the legislature's decision to begin construction of the high-speed rail project. The plan is to begin construction in the winter, now that the release of funding -- a combination of already approved state bond funds and federal grants -- has been approved for that purpose. LaHood hailed the decision as a landmark in U.S. transportation policy. Brown, who loves the story, cited the example of Abraham Lincoln building the transcontinental railroad during the Civil War to make light of objections raised against the new project. (More about that later.) Right-wing opponents of transit and advocates of the old energy economy have succeeded in blocking the Obama administration's plans to begin high-speed rail elsewhere in America. Only California, with first Schwarzenegger and then Brown in staunch and steely support for the past few years of a shaky economy, remained. Would America join most of the rest of the advanced industrial world in developing high-speed rail? Or would it stay stuck in the old energy economy model? After taking office a year and a half ago, Brown retooled the state's troubled high-speed rail agency and had its business plan overhauled, then pushed it through the state legislature. Brown's big victory on Friday afternoon came when the state Senate voted to authorize the beginning of construction of California's long-awaited and controversial high-speed rail system. The vote was 21 to 16. The bill passed the Assembly on Thursday by a vote of 51 to 27. All Republicans in both houses were opposed, though some didn't show or vote in the Senate. Four Democrats voted no. Three of them were always opponents of this project, though some in the state press corps don't seem to have understood that, with a couple tweeting their surprise about Silicon Valley Democrat Joe Simitian's no vote. He's only been attacking the project for years now, perhaps with an eye to NIMBY voters as he runs for county supervisor. Two of the other Democratic no votes joined to make up a trio of constant critics for the past several years. The fourth, however, state Senator Fran Pavley, was on some level a surprise, as she is a staunch environmentalist and liberal who authored and co-authored the state's two landmark laws on greenhouse gas emissions. The first being the tailpipe emissions bill signed into law in 2002 by then Governor Gray Davis. The second, of course, being the overall climate change act, AB 32, signed into law in 2006 by Schwarzenegger. But Pavley is running this year in a new district which is much more conservative. She is likely to win it, but didn't need to set up a line of attack on the bullet train. I believe that, had her vote been absolutely needed, she would have voted yes. As it was, the needed 21 votes were secured Friday after major lobbying efforts by Brown, state Senate President Pro Tem Darrell Steinberg, whom many had doubted but who clearly came through in the clutch, House Democratic Leader Nancy Pelosi, organized labor, and various business leaders, among others. The opponents of high-speed rail, dominated by the Republican Party, deliberately conflate the facts about the funding for this project as part of their agenda to further wreak havoc on the state budget and block Brown's November revenue initiative. The funds in question do not come from California's general fund, aside from some interest payments down the line which are minor. They come instead from proceeds of already approved bonds backed by Schwarzenegger and many others in 2008 and from federal funds, which Schwarzenegger played the lead role in securing, especially from some states whose conservative Republican governors spurned funding in 2009 and 2010. But the anti-bullet train PR, aided by reporting that in some cases deliberately distorts and in others glides over the facts, was much more effective than the pro-side, which made only a minimal effort. Distortion and poor reporting led to a false meme, based on a Field Poll, that getting high-speed rail going would kill Brown's initiative. About a fifth of supporters said that passage would make them less likely to vote yes. And a fifth, naturally unreported, said that passage would make them more likely to vote yes. The poll -- the release of which was geared directly to the legislative vote -- did not present voters with the facts about where the money comes from, either. Ironically, the people who were pushing this meme -- concern trolling all the way -- are opponents not only of high-speed rail, but of raising taxes on the rich. They include LA Times columnist George Skelton, who has devoted several columns to his opposition to raising taxes on the rich as well as the bullet train itself, and Sacramento Bee columnist Dan Walters, who has been attacking Brown for about 40 years now. Skelton likes to praise Brown's liberal father, but Walters built his career attacking Brown, during his first governorship, and Democratic liberals, for the far right Sacramento Union, which was owned by Eastern billionaire Richard Mellon Scaife, one of the principal funders of far right think tank and media efforts around the country. The paper was also owned at one point by an agent of the apartheid government of South Africa. The ostensibly liberal Bee hired Walters as part of its effort to kill the Union, which finally closed in 1994. There has been a very sophisticated and persistent PR campaign against high-speed rail in California, because this is where the hope can be snuffed out in America. And the anti-side's PR has definitely gotten the best of things. But the pro-bullet train's side has notably lacked a powerful and persistent communications operation of its own. There are many statements and articles attacking the project that could be readily pushed back. But no one has been doing it on anything like a regular basis. As a result, high-speed rail opponents have largely enjoyed free rein with their PR and attendant media coverage. Opposition hinges on the silly notion that right-wing control of Congress, a key funding source, is assured in perpetuity. And on conflation of funding sources. Aside from some interest payments, which amount to budget dust, none of the authorized project will be financed out of the state's general fund. The start-up phase will be financed by federal grants and already authorized bonds. Because Brown and other proponents have pointed to real history in discussing this project and likening its opponents to the naysayers who attended similar great ventures, a beat reporter and would-be pundit described the debate as "History vs. Math." Better to describe it as history vs. pottery shards realism. Because the "math" is a myth that depends on the most fragmentary understanding of politics. The project, which is very long-range, a couple of decades, actually, until ultimate fruition, is only short of federal funds if one assumes that right-wing Republicans will control the House of Representatives in perpetuity.

Republicans oppose rail funding

AP, 7/9 [Washington Post, 2012, “Even with state approval, $68B California high-speed rail plan still a long way from reality” http://www.washingtonpost.com/business/even-with-state-approval-68b-california-high-speed-rail-plan-still-a-long-way-from-reality/2012/07/09/gJQAOsJyYW\_story.html]

SACRAMENTO, Calif. — California lawmakers may have given their OK to what could be the nation’s first high-speed rail line, but the project is still a long way from leaving the station. The bullet train has prominent supporters such as President Barack Obama and Gov. Jerry Brown, but backers must still overcome a number of challenges, including environmental concerns, clashes with local leaders over land use, a $68 billion overall price tag with no funding guarantees and an increasingly disenchanted public. Supporters applauded Friday when the state Legislature narrowly approved $4.5 billion in state funding for rail improvements and to begin construction of the initial segment of high-speed track in the agricultural Central Valley. The move enabled the state to tap $3.2 billion in federal bond money. Critics, however, are redoubling their efforts to derail the project that could eventually link Los Angeles and San Francisco with trains traveling up to 220 mph. Among those gearing up for a fight are the farmers whose land is in the path of the massive infrastructure project. The Madera and Merced county farm bureaus, along with other parties, have filed a lawsuit to halt the project on grounds that the state has not done enough environmental vetting. The plaintiffs say the train would render 1,500 acres of fertile land unfarmable and disrupt 500 agricultural businesses. “We are going to protect our property,” said Frank Oliveira, a farmer who has been active in opposing the plan. Brown, a Democrat, has made the project a touchstone of his administration. “I believe we’re going to go all of the way. Just taking the first step in and of itself will create value for our state,” he told reporters Monday at an event with U.S. Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood at the Port of Oakland. Brown initially tried to prevent courts from using the state’s complex environmental law to stop construction but backed down under pressure as he sought to win lawmakers’ approval. On Monday, he suggested the law might benefit from reforms to discourage people trying to keep projects from coming too close to their property. Some observers say the state might avoid an injunction delaying the project because courts often give the state the benefit of the doubt in environmental complaints. However, California has some of the most stringent environmental regulations in the country, and even if the lawsuits are thrown out, construction could be bogged down for years by the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act. LaHood on Monday praised Democratic lawmakers for approving the project, despite intense pressure from critics. He said it reinforces California’s position as a leader in high-speed rail. “The president’s vision is to get America to have high-speed rail. There’s no better place to do it than in California,” he said at a separate event in San Francisco. Funding is another potential line of attack against the state’s largest-ever construction project. California voters approved $10 billion in bonds for the project in 2008 and Friday’s vote assured that the state will be able to collect $3.2 billion in federal money that could have been rescinded if lawmakers failed to act. That leaves $55 billion still needed to finish the line, assuming it doesn’t go over budget. The cost is lower than the California High-Speed Rail Authority’s initial $98 billion estimate. LaHood said officials initially didn’t know where all the money would come from for the interstate highway system, but they forged ahead anyway. “Fifty years later, we have the best road system in America built with federal, state and private dollars, and that is the direction for high-speed rail,” he said. Congressional Republicans have said they will block any further funding for the bullet train, and investors have not flocked to the project as hoped. California voters also appear less willing to support additional funding. A Field Poll in December found the 2008 rail bond would fail if put to a vote today. The administration’s latest business plan relies on private investment and industrial fees from California’s cap-and-trade program to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to fill much of the funding gap for the rail line. “The money is there,” Brown said. “We have the capability in California in a $2 trillion annual economy to finance this thing.”

Republicans hate high-speed rail

Doyle, 6/30 [2012, Michael, Bee Washington Bureau, “House Republicans take stand against high-speed rail spending” Fresnobee.com, http://www.fresnobee.com/2012/06/29/2893074/house-republicans-take-stand-against.html]

WASHINGTON -- The Republican-controlled House on Friday reiterated its intention not to spend new federal dollars next year on California's controversial high-speed rail project. By a 239-185 vote, cast nearly entirely along party lines, the House approved language authored by Rep. Jeff Denham, R-Turlock, meant to block the high-speed rail spending. The amendment was added to a Fiscal 2013 transportation spending bill. "We've got highways that are falling apart. We've got bridges that are falling apart," Denham said Friday. "We need to ensure our gas tax dollars get used for their intended purpose -- of actually improving our roads." Denham's amendment sent a signal, in part, as the $51 billion transportation and housing bill did not include any funds for the Obama administration's high-speed rail initiative. California officials have indicated they do not need a new infusion of federal dollars during Fiscal 2013, which starts Oct. 1. In a similar vein, Rep. Tom McClintock, R-Elk Grove, won House approval Friday for an amendment blocking new federal spending for a subway system in San Francisco. Newlands and Company Inc. - A train travels through a wind farm in an illustration from the California High-Speed Rail Authority. McClintock's new congressional district, starting next year, includes portions of Calaveras, Tuolumne, Fresno, Madera and Mariposa counties.

**Pipelines Link – elections**

#### No link turns – impossible to spin pipeline as popular – public perception (no really, this card is on fire)

Mills 11 (Robin, Degress in Geological Sciences at Cambridge

“Capturing Carbon: The New Weapon in the War Against Climate Change,” CCS=Carbon Capture Sequestration, in case you didn’t read the tag, this is a good card)

CCS already labours under something of a public relations disadvan¬tage, due to its association with the unpopular petroleum, coal and electricity industries. It needs only to attract support from politicians, lawyers and real-estate agents to be completely condemned. CCS might suffer from its promotion by the Bush-era initiative on the 'Asia-Pacific Partnership on Clean Development and Climate', widely (and rather accurately) perceived as a literal and metaphorical smokescreen for pol¬luting countries and industries to escape mandatory carbon curbs8 and dismissed as 'a nice little PR ploy' by none other than former presiden¬tial candidate John McCain.9 The debate is further clouded by 'clean coal', a term trotted out by industry groups such as the American Coa¬lition for Clean Coal Electricity. Indeed, coal has become vastly cleaner in recent years in terms of non-greenhouse pollutants such as sulphur dioxide. But to be meaningful at all, 'clean coal' has to include carbon capture on at least 85-95% of its emissions. Otherwise, as in Joel and Ethan Coen's satirical adverts,10 'clean coal' becomes a byword for hype, empty spin and evading environmental responsibility. Such bad press leads the public to be suspicious of carbon capture's environmental and safety credentials. There is a natural cynicism when industry proposes a solution so convenient to itself, however solid the scientific arguments. Scrutiny is intensified when the oil and coal indus¬tries take the lead in campaigning against climate change bills, as dur¬ing August 2009,n and score PR own-goals such as forging letters opposing environmental legislation. Part of this lobbying is a reaction to elements of the proposed legislation, rather than to the idea of limit¬ing carbon dioxide emissions per se, but the subtlety of this message can easily be lost. Carbon capture may come to be seen—indeed, is sometimes already seen—as just one more tactic from the energy industry to delay or avoid taking real action on climate change.12 The major elements of the fossil fuel industry, particularly in the USA, were so slow to acknowledge the reality of climate change, denied the science at every turn, and still continue to spread doubt and misinformation, even allegedly generating fraudulent grass-roots campaigns.1" By doing so, they set themselves up to be the villains of the piece. To some extent, the global debate over carbon capture (and, indeed, over climate change legislation) is now being held hostage by the ideological clash in the USA between left and right. In Europe, a few mavericks apart, business and environmentalism agree much more closely than they might realise on the science of climate change, and the key solutions. Such public opposition can lead to lengthy delays, lawsuits, planning inquiries, permitting challenges and direct protests, against new CCS power plants, carbon dioxide pipelines and storage sites. A backlash from taxpayers or electricity consumers might be caused by percep¬tions that heavy subsidies or rising power prices are being used to sup¬port carbon capture. The substantial government aid being given to renewable energy in many developed countries may be more popular. Government programmes, as with America's FutureGen, may be more vulnerable to cuts amid the fickle winds of political fortune than those led by companies planning for their future. Recovery from the financial crisis will, at some point, have to be paid for by spending cuts and tax increases, and this may crimp funding for new technologies, however environmentally vital.

#### Public hate the plan – sees it as an excuse to keep using coal McQuale 10 (Cameron Wolfe McQuale, May 2010, member of Carbon Stock Engineering, <http://repository.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1038&context=mes_capstones>)

Another major issue concerning CCGS project development is the perception of the technology by the American public. The primary issue is that most people have not heard of CCS at all. If they have heard of it, they often cannot link it to C02, do not understand what C02 i.e. they do not know it is in carbonated soda, or do not understand how it works. The ones who are made more familiar with the technology often see it as synonymous with clean coal and therefore as an excuse to continue mining and see renewable energies as a preferred alternative. Many do not like the idea of storing C02 under their homes in what they image to be a big cave or balloon type formation and do not understand it would be done in the pore spaces of rocks. Others simply don't support the use of CCS because they do not believe in climate change.¶ The best example of this in the US is the DOE Phase III project meant to take place near Greenville, Ohio. The townspeople were rallied behind an anti-CCS group called "Citizens Against C02 Sequestration" who argued that 1) climate change was not something they saw as an issue for the town, 2) the new ethanol plant where the C02 was coming from was not adding much to the community in terms of economic gain, and 3) the storage would be dangerous. The project used a variety of techniques to explain the project and the CCS concept to the town but in the end the project was canceled.

### Pipelines Politics Links – Agenda

#### Enviormentalists oppose CCS Hopson 8 (Christopher Hopson, writer for Upstream, online news agency, <http://www.upstreamonline.com/hardcopy/features/article1151446.ece>)

CARBON capture and storage (CCS) is causing disagreements among governments and between¶ industry and some environmentalists, writes Christopher Hopson.¶ The controversial new technology proposed for combating climate change is¶ based on capturing carbon dioxide emissions from fossil fuel combustion and¶ industrial processes.¶ Greenpeace International executive director Gerd Leipold says his organisation¶ thinks CCS "is just a pipe dream".¶ "On the one hand it is, as yet, an unproven technology where the fossil fuel¶ industry is saying let us continue as normal and hopefully at some point in the¶ future we will have a solution to our emissions problem," he says.¶ Greenpeace opposes CCS, which it believes will encourage the use of fossil fuels¶ and divert investment away from clean energy technologies already in effective¶ operation.¶ It also fears unproven methods of carbon dioxide storage might not be safe in the¶ longer term.¶ Greenpeace climate and energy campaigner Emily Rochon says scientists believe¶ world CO2 emissions need to peak by 2015, yet CCS will not be ready on a large¶ scale until at least 2030.¶ She says many governments are set to spend lots of money on CCS, adding:¶ "Industry is looking to the European Union and the US to see if it can be done."¶ Greenpeace believes the world needs to completely change the way energy is¶ produced, using green power instead of turning the clock back to dirty coal.¶ Leipold says: "Unfortunately, in many countries there is an unhealthily close¶ connection between the power industry and politicians. Therefore, the power¶ sector enjoys more political protection than they would otherwise deserve."¶ At last month's United Nations climate talks in Bali there was heated debate¶ between some governments over whether CCS should be included for financial¶ assistance within the Kyoto Protocol's Clean Development Mechanism (CDM).¶ The matter will now be considered at the next big climate gathering in Poznan in¶ Poland later this year. "Greenpeace is opposed to CCS being put within the CDM,"¶ says Rochon.¶ However, not all environmentalists oppose CCS. Jonathon Porritt, a former¶ director of Friends of the Earth and now a founder director of the UK's sustainable¶ development charity Forum for the Future, says CCS has the potential over the¶ course of the next 20 years or so to store away hundreds of millions of tonnes of¶ CO2 that would otherwise be released into the atmosphere.¶ "Most environmentalists remain very nervous about CCS, but I just don't see how¶ we can achieve the necessary reductions in concentrations of CO2 in the¶ atmosphere without a massive international commitment to CCS," says Porritt.

#### Environmentalists are key to the Agenda

Williams 08Doctorate and Masters in Economics, Distinguished Professor of Economics, More than 50 of his publications have appeared in scholarly journals, Received the National Fellow at the Hoover Institute of War, Revolution, and Peace; the Ford Foundation Dissertation Fellowship; the National Service Award from the Institute for Socioeconomic Studies; and the George Washington Medal of Honor from the Valley Forge Freedom Foundation. In 1984-1985, he received the Faculty Member of the Year Award from the George Mason University Alumni. He is also a member of the American Economic Association, the Mont Pelerin Society and is a Distinguished Scholar of the Heritage Foundation, participates in many debates and conferences, is a frequent public speaker and often gives testimony before both houses of Congress (Walter, July 30, 2008, “Environmentalists' Hold on Congress,” <http://townhall.com/columnists/walterewilliams/2008/07/30/environmentalists_hold_on_congress/page/full/)//DR>. H

¶ Let's face it. The average individual American has little or no clout with Congress and can be safely ignored. But it's a different story with groups such as Environmental Defense Fund, Sierra Club and The Nature Conservancy. When they speak, Congress listens. Unlike the average American, they are well organized, loaded with cash and well positioned to be a disobedient congressman's worse nightmare. Their political and economic success has been a near disaster for our nation.¶ For several decades, environmentalists have managed to get Congress to keep most of our oil resources off-limits to exploration and drilling. They've managed to have the Congress enact onerous regulations that have made refinery construction impossible. Similarly, they've used the courts and Congress to completely stymie the construction of nuclear power plants. As a result, energy prices are at historical highs and threaten our economy and national security.¶ What's the political response to our energy problems? It's more congressional and White House kowtowing to environmentalists, farmers and multi-billion dollar corporations such as Archer Daniels Midlan**d.** Their "solution," rather than to solve our oil supply problem by permitting drilling for the billions upon billions of barrels of oil beneath the surface of our country, is to enact the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 that mandates that oil companies increase the amount of ethanol mixed with gasoline. Anyone with an ounce of brains would have realized that diverting crops from food to fuel use would raise the prices of corn-fed livestock, such as pork, beef, chicken and dairy products, and products made from corn, such as cereals. Ethanol production has led to increases in other grain prices, such as soybean and wheat. Since the U.S. is the world's largest grain producer and exporter, higher grain prices have had a huge impact on food prices worldwide.¶ Congress and the environmentalists aren't through with us. If you're bothered by skyrocketing food and energy prices, wait until Congress re-introduces its environmentalist-inspired Climate Security Act, so-called "Cap and Trade." Cap and Trade is deceptively peddled as a free-market solution to the yet-to-be-settled issue of manmade climate change. Under its provisions, companies would be able to emit greenhouse gases only if they had a government allowance. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that a 15 percent cut in emissions would raise the annual average household's energy costs by $1,300. Since energy is an input to everything we use, we can expect everything to become more costly, resulting in a reduction in economic growth.¶ There's a hateful side to Cap and Trade that's revealed by asking the question: How will it be decided who received how much allowance to emit greenhouse gases? Congress could sell the allowances and/or give them away to favorite constituents. You can bet the rent money that a new army of lobbyists, with special pleadings, will descend on Washington to lobby Congress. And you can be sure that campaign contributions and favoritism will play an important role in the decision of who received what amount of allowances.¶ Much worse than that is the massive control government would have over our economy and our lives. Congress might decide that since tobacco use is unhealthy, it might not issue allowances to tobacco companies. While many Americans might applaud that, how many would like Congress to refuse to issue allowances to companies that produce foods that some people deem unhealthy such as French fries, sodas, canned soups and potato chips. Congress might deny, or threaten to deny, allowances to companies that in their opinion didn't hire enough women and minorities. The possibilities for control over our lives would be endless and could include nuisance-type edicts such a requiring us to buy a permit to barbeque in our backyard.¶ The thirst to wield massive control over our economy helps explain the near religious belief in manmade global warming and the attacks on scientists and others who offer contradictory evidence.

#### Senators from coal states hate the plan Weiss 10

(Danilel K Weiss, Writer for Center for American Progress, September 12 2010, <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2010/09/coal_senators.html/>)

Senators from coal states who are trying to protect big coal companies from the impact of global warming pollution reductions may only hasten the decline of big coal.¶ Their efforts include opposition to clean energy and global warming legislation and blocking EPA from setting pollution limits on the largest emitters. Meanwhile, coal’s share of electricity generation declines while the shares of natural gas and renewable energy generation increase. And more declines in coal use are forecast.¶ A recent independent government analysis found that coal senators’ plan to invest in so-called “clean coal technology” to reduce global warming pollution from power plants are unlikely to succeed without putting a price on this pollution, which is also essential to producing revenue to invest in this emerging technology. Moreover, the public strongly backs EPA efforts to set pollution reduction requirements.¶ The latest effort by some senators from coal states to block global warming pollution reductions from coal-fired power plants in order to “protect” U.S. coal companies occurred on September 15. They participated in a rally organized by big coal companies to oppose EPA reductions in global warming pollution. AP reports:¶ The industry-backed group Faces of Coal paid for most of the travel and lodging expenses for the coal miners, who came from West Virginia, Virginia, Kentucky, Pennsylvania and Ohio.¶ At the rally these senators attacked EPA’s steps to reduce global warming pollution that were necessitated by the Senate’s failure to pass similar legislation. Yet most of these same senators opposed efforts by Sens. John Kerry (D-MA) and Joe Lieberman (I-CT) to pass the American Power Act that would have provided billions of dollars to develop and deploy carbon capture-and-storage technology or CCS that would enable power plants to burn coal with dramatically less carbon dioxide pollution. This would have provided a smooth transition toward a significantly lower carbon economy with little impact on coal consumption.

#### Coal senators control congress Marshall 9 (Christa Marshall, reporter for NTY, November 2, 2009, <http://www.nytimes.com/cwire/2009/11/02/02climatewire-coal-country-poses-the-biggest-obstacle-in-s-79147.html?pagewanted=all>) When Columbia University sociologist Dana Fisher investigated how U.S. senators lined up on a 2008 climate bill, one factor outside of party affiliation topped all others in predicting their vote. The "no" votes were more likely to come from coal states.¶ Now, there is a Democratic U.S. president and a somewhat different bill on the table than the one that collapsed last year, but Fisher said the political dynamics are largely the same.¶ "Dealing with U.S. coal is going to the biggest thing they're going to have to resolve," she said about U.S. senators currently working out the legislative details of a mandatory cap on greenhouse gases.¶ The reason the fossil fuel is not a political fossil is due to the financial depth and geographical reach of coal country, analysts say. More than 30 state economies, from Montana to West Virginia, rely to some degree on coal, which fires half of U.S. electricity.¶ It constitutes 75 percent of railroad shipments and 25 percent of the traffic on barges and lake carriers in the United States, according to the National Mining Association.¶ "There's 34 states with significant economic leverage to coal, either by mining it, burning it or shipping it," said Kevin Book, managing director of ClearView Energy Partners. He said only Vermont and Rhode Island lack any financial connection to coal.

#### They’ll specifically use clout for CCS Marshall 9 (Christa Marshall, reporter for NTY, November 2, 2009, <http://www.nytimes.com/cwire/2009/11/02/02climatewire-coal-country-poses-the-biggest-obstacle-in-s-79147.html?pagewanted=all>)

Book added that the "new" coal in the West and the Illinois Basin is better suited for CCS than much of the coal in the East.¶ That means that lawmakers like Sen. Max Baucus (D-Mont.) may not want to align with Democrats from the Eastern part of coal country, Book said. In other words, what benefits one type of coal and CCS development may come at the expense of coal from elsewhere.¶ At the same time, Montana is largely a rural state that gets some of its power from rural electric cooperatives that burn a lot of coal. Rural co-ops, along with small Midwestern utilities, protested strongly during the House debate about how their coal-dependent consumers would be hit hard with climate legislation.¶ "They have a lot of clout here," Tom Power, a professor of economics at the University of Montana, said about rural co-ops in his state.¶ In an interview, Glenn English, the head of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, said the "basis of a deal" on climate change would revolve around helping coal consumers weatherize their homes to cut costs. He also said he wants the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to gain authority to site electrical transmission lines to bring more renewable power online.¶ Other Midwestern utilities are pushing for more free allowances in a climate bill to cover what they say will be high costs for states with historically low electricity prices because of heavy coal usage.

Icebreakers – Agenda Links

#### Reps oppose new icebreakers Ahlers 11

(Mike M. Ahlers, November 4 2011, writer for CNN politics, <http://www.cnn.com/2011/11/03/politics/congress-polar-icebreakers/index.html>)

Washington (CNN) -- With the nation's only two heavy-duty polar icebreakers broken and out of service, the Obama administration and congressional Republicans are clashing on how best to put the U.S. Coast Guard back into the ice-busting business.¶ House Republicans, who say they want to force the administration's hand, are pushing a Coast Guard authorization bill that would decommission the icebreaker Polar Star, which is now being repaired, in just three years, saying that keeping the 35-year-old ship afloat is "throwing good money after bad."¶ The bill requires the administration to come up with a comprehensive plan to replace the aging icebreaker fleet.¶ On Thursday, the administration responded by announcing it is opposing the bill, citing the icebreaker issue.¶ Decommissioning the Polar Star would "create a significant gap in the nation's icebreaking capacity," the administration said. The ship is needed until long-term plans can be developed, it said.¶ The icebreaker issue is one that has been decades in the making, and has gained urgency with the thawing of ice in the Arctic Circle.

#### Enviormentalists hate the plan – seen as increasing drilling Mouawad 8

(Jad Mouawad, Nov 20 2008, New York Times, <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/11/21/business/21shell.html?_r=1>)

In a long-awaited ruling, the court said that the Minerals Management Service, the federal agency in charge of offshore leasing, had violated the 1970 National Environmental Policy Act by failing to take a “hard look” at the impact that offshore drilling would have on bowhead whales in the Beaufort Sea as well as indigenous communities on the North Slope.¶ The decision canceled Shell’s permit to drill at a prospect called Sivulliq, about 16 miles off northern Alaska, and ordered the agency to begin the process from scratch.¶ “There remain substantial questions as to whether Shell’s plan may cause significant harm to the people and wildlife of the Beaufort Sea region,” the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, in San Francisco, said in its ruling. One judge, Carlos T. Bea, on the three-judge panel dissented.¶ Environmental groups, including the Alaska Wilderness League, as well as the North Slope Borough, which represents the indigenous Inupiat people, had sued to stop Shell from drilling, claiming that the company’s plans to send icebreakers, drill ships and vessels to conduct seismic surveys might harm bowheads. The whales migrate through the Beaufort Sea twice a year and are the basis of the Inupiat community’s subsistence culture.

#### Environmentalists are key to the Agenda

Williams 08Doctorate and Masters in Economics, Distinguished Professor of Economics, More than 50 of his publications have appeared in scholarly journals, Received the National Fellow at the Hoover Institute of War, Revolution, and Peace; the Ford Foundation Dissertation Fellowship; the National Service Award from the Institute for Socioeconomic Studies; and the George Washington Medal of Honor from the Valley Forge Freedom Foundation. In 1984-1985, he received the Faculty Member of the Year Award from the George Mason University Alumni. He is also a member of the American Economic Association, the Mont Pelerin Society and is a Distinguished Scholar of the Heritage Foundation, participates in many debates and conferences, is a frequent public speaker and often gives testimony before both houses of Congress (Walter, July 30, 2008, “Environmentalists' Hold on Congress,” <http://townhall.com/columnists/walterewilliams/2008/07/30/environmentalists_hold_on_congress/page/full/)//DR>. H

¶ Let's face it. The average individual American has little or no clout with Congress and can be safely ignored. But it's a different story with groups such as Environmental Defense Fund, Sierra Club and The Nature Conservancy. When they speak, Congress listens. Unlike the average American, they are well organized, loaded with cash and well positioned to be a disobedient congressman's worse nightmare. Their political and economic success has been a near disaster for our nation.¶ For several decades, environmentalists have managed to get Congress to keep most of our oil resources off-limits to exploration and drilling. They've managed to have the Congress enact onerous regulations that have made refinery construction impossible. Similarly, they've used the courts and Congress to completely stymie the construction of nuclear power plants. As a result, energy prices are at historical highs and threaten our economy and national security.¶ What's the political response to our energy problems? It's more congressional and White House kowtowing to environmentalists, farmers and multi-billion dollar corporations such as Archer Daniels Midland**.** Their "solution," rather than to solve our oil supply problem by permitting drilling for the billions upon billions of barrels of oil beneath the surface of our country, is to enact the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 that mandates that oil companies increase the amount of ethanol mixed with gasoline. Anyone with an ounce of brains would have realized that diverting crops from food to fuel use would raise the prices of corn-fed livestock, such as pork, beef, chicken and dairy products, and products made from corn, such as cereals. Ethanol production has led to increases in other grain prices, such as soybean and wheat. Since the U.S. is the world's largest grain producer and exporter, higher grain prices have had a huge impact on food prices worldwide.¶ Congress and the environmentalists aren't through with us. If you're bothered by skyrocketing food and energy prices, wait until Congress re-introduces its environmentalist-inspired Climate Security Act, so-called "Cap and Trade." Cap and Trade is deceptively peddled as a free-market solution to the yet-to-be-settled issue of manmade climate change. Under its provisions, companies would be able to emit greenhouse gases only if they had a government allowance. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that a 15 percent cut in emissions would raise the annual average household's energy costs by $1,300. Since energy is an input to everything we use, we can expect everything to become more costly, resulting in a reduction in economic growth.¶ There's a hateful side to Cap and Trade that's revealed by asking the question: How will it be decided who received how much allowance to emit greenhouse gases? Congress could sell the allowances and/or give them away to favorite constituents. You can bet the rent money that a new army of lobbyists, with special pleadings, will descend on Washington to lobby Congress. And you can be sure that campaign contributions and favoritism will play an important role in the decision of who received what amount of allowances.¶ Much worse than that is the massive control government would have over our economy and our lives. Congress might decide that since tobacco use is unhealthy, it might not issue allowances to tobacco companies. While many Americans might applaud that, how many would like Congress to refuse to issue allowances to companies that produce foods that some people deem unhealthy such as French fries, sodas, canned soups and potato chips. Congress might deny, or threaten to deny, allowances to companies that in their opinion didn't hire enough women and minorities. The possibilities for control over our lives would be endless and could include nuisance-type edicts such a requiring us to buy a permit to barbeque in our backyard.¶ The thirst to wield massive control over our economy helps explain the near religious belief in manmade global warming and the attacks on scientists and others who offer contradictory evidence.

Refueling Station Links – Elections

#### Plan causes Obama to lose the elections

Dlouhy 7/17/12 (Jennifer A., political analyst and writer for Chron,con, **7/17**/12 “Natural gas glut a dilemma for Obama”, <http://www.chron.com/business/article/Natural-gas-glut-a-dilemma-for-Obama-3706576.php>)

WASHINGTON - The drilling boom that has led to a glut of natural gas and sent prices to 10-year lows is causing a quandary for the Obama administration, which is struggling to decide whether - and how much - the U.S. should share the bounty with foreign countries. Although the Energy Department recently approved Houston-based Cheniere Energy's plans to begin exporting liquefied natural gas from its Sabine Pass terminal in southwest Louisiana, the government has put off verdicts on similar applications from at least seven other companies. Administration officials say they'll make those decisions after they get the results of a study commissioned by the Energy Department on how allowing companies to sell U.S.-produced natural gas overseas would affect prices for American consumers. The study is due out this summer. "We want analysis to drive decisions," White House energy adviser Heather Zichal said at a recent forum. The administration supports domestic natural gas and isn't opposed to exports, she said, but also is committed to "protecting American consumers and making sure we're sending the right signal to industry and the manufacturing sector." The dilemma is politically treacherous in an election year and struggling economy**.** Although the United States already exports some natural gas - mostly by pipelines to Mexico and Canada - the flurry of proposals to liquefy natural gas for tanker shipment and sell it to foreign consumers would mean a big jump in exports. Applications filed with the Energy Department could put the United States on track to export about 16 billion cubic feet of liquefied natural gas each day - nearly a quarter of U.S. daily production in 2011. But few expect all of those proposals to win federal approval, and it could be years before construction is finished on even those projects that win the green light. Experts at IHS CERA say the realistic potential market for exports from the U.S. and Canada is 4 billion to 5 billion cubic feet per day by 2020. An Energy Information Administration report released in January concluded that exporting natural gas would cause prices to climb in the U.S. According to the agency, consumers' electricity bills would increase by 1 percent to 3 percent from 2015 to 2035 and industrial prices would climb 9 percent to 28 percent. Unlike crude, which is a globally traded commodity, natural gas is traded on non-integrated markets, resulting in huge price variations in different places**.** The prospect of selling natural gas in Asian and European markets at five times its price in the U.S. is enough to make most domestic producers giddy. Energy companies and analysts have argued that current U.S. natural gas prices are unsustainable. It closed Friday at $2.874 per million British thermal units in trading on the New York Mercantile Exchange. The opposing argument is that exports could cause prices to spike, sending electricity bills upward and jeopardizing a resurgence in domestic manufacturing tied to abundant, cheap natural gas. Manufacturers that use natural gas to fuel their plants and as a building block to make other products were hit hard over the past two decades by volatile swings in prices, which last peaked over $15 in 2005. Because any position risks alienating important constituencies - energy producers and manufacturers as well as voters - few elected officials are pushing the issue. 'Safer for politicians' "It's a lot safer for politicians who don't want to be on the wrong side to defer it," said Kevin Book, an analyst with ClearView Energy Partners. Even key stakeholders in the debate are keeping low profiles. Several major energy industry groups have kept mostly quiet, possibly for fear of advocating an export strategy linked to higher prices. Many manufacturers, meanwhile, are wary of visibly opposing energy exports and being painted as free trade foes. Some companies also are torn because their foreign operations could benefit from an influx of cheaper U.S. natural gas. President Barack Obama and Republican challenger Mitt Romney also have avoided making big pronouncements. Democratic U.S. Rep. Gene Green, whose east Houston district includes several chemical plants, says the key is finding a threshold that keeps prices low enough for manufacturers and high enough to sustain production levels. "I don't want our gas prices to get so outrageous as seven years ago, when the chemical industry was transferring jobs to other places," said Green, who backs case-by-case approvals. "I don't want to kill the good things we're doing, but I also know we want to keep those drillers working."

### Refueling Stations Links – Agenda

#### Enviormentalist hate the plan – seen has a distraction from renewable energy

Johnson 11 (Tom Johnson, reporter for NJ Spotlight, online news agency, June 17 2011, <http://www.njspotlight.com/stories/11/0616/2054/>)

Environmentalists, however, argued that the move to promote natural gas vehicles could undermine the effort to advance electric vehicles.¶ "Natural gas is not the administration’s best choice," said Dena Mottola Jabroska, director of Environment New Jersey. "Electric cars are by far the better technology for the future."¶ A New Jersey company, NRG Energy of Princeton, which has expressed interest in building the infrastructure for plug-in vehicles in the state, already is building a system of refueling stations in and around Houston, Texas.¶ Jeff Tittel, executive director of the New Jersey Sierra Club, agreed. "[Natural gas vehicles] will promote more burning of fossil fuels," he said, which could lead to the expansion of more natural gas pipelines through environmentally sensitive areas like the New Jersey Highlands.¶ The environmentalists also were concerned that promoting greater use of natural gas would accelerate the expansion of hydraulic fracturing drilling in Pennsylvania and New York, a technology they oppose because of threats to drinking water supplied by the Delaware River.¶ The filing also heightens their concerns that the new Energy Master Plan puts a greater emphasis on promoting the use of natural gas, instead of renewable energy. The state is currently engaged in a controversial effort to subsidize the construction of three new natural gas-fired power plants that would add nearly 2,000 megawatts of generating capacity, a move that officials believe would lower energy bills for businesses and consumers.¶

#### Environmentalists are key to the Agenda

Williams 08Doctorate and Masters in Economics, Distinguished Professor of Economics, More than 50 of his publications have appeared in scholarly journals, Received the National Fellow at the Hoover Institute of War, Revolution, and Peace; the Ford Foundation Dissertation Fellowship; the National Service Award from the Institute for Socioeconomic Studies; and the George Washington Medal of Honor from the Valley Forge Freedom Foundation. In 1984-1985, he received the Faculty Member of the Year Award from the George Mason University Alumni. He is also a member of the American Economic Association, the Mont Pelerin Society and is a Distinguished Scholar of the Heritage Foundation, participates in many debates and conferences, is a frequent public speaker and often gives testimony before both houses of Congress (Walter, July 30, 2008, “Environmentalists' Hold on Congress,” <http://townhall.com/columnists/walterewilliams/2008/07/30/environmentalists_hold_on_congress/page/full/)//DR>. H

¶ Let's face it. The average individual American has little or no clout with Congress and can be safely ignored. But it's a different story with groups such as Environmental Defense Fund, Sierra Club and The Nature Conservancy. When they speak, Congress listens. Unlike the average American, they are well organized, loaded with cash and well positioned to be a disobedient congressman's worse nightmare. Their political and economic success has been a near disaster for our nation.¶ For several decades, environmentalists have managed to get Congress to keep most of our oil resources off-limits to exploration and drilling. They've managed to have the Congress enact onerous regulations that have made refinery construction impossible. Similarly, they've used the courts and Congress to completely stymie the construction of nuclear power plants. As a result, energy prices are at historical highs and threaten our economy and national security.¶ What's the political response to our energy problems? It's more congressional and White House kowtowing to environmentalists, farmers and multi-billion dollar corporations such as Archer Daniels Midland**.** Their "solution," rather than to solve our oil supply problem by permitting drilling for the billions upon billions of barrels of oil beneath the surface of our country, is to enact the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 that mandates that oil companies increase the amount of ethanol mixed with gasoline. Anyone with an ounce of brains would have realized that diverting crops from food to fuel use would raise the prices of corn-fed livestock, such as pork, beef, chicken and dairy products, and products made from corn, such as cereals. Ethanol production has led to increases in other grain prices, such as soybean and wheat. Since the U.S. is the world's largest grain producer and exporter, higher grain prices have had a huge impact on food prices worldwide.¶ Congress and the environmentalists aren't through with us. If you're bothered by skyrocketing food and energy prices, wait until Congress re-introduces its environmentalist-inspired Climate Security Act, so-called "Cap and Trade." Cap and Trade is deceptively peddled as a free-market solution to the yet-to-be-settled issue of manmade climate change. Under its provisions, companies would be able to emit greenhouse gases only if they had a government allowance. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that a 15 percent cut in emissions would raise the annual average household's energy costs by $1,300. Since energy is an input to everything we use, we can expect everything to become more costly, resulting in a reduction in economic growth.¶ There's a hateful side to Cap and Trade that's revealed by asking the question: How will it be decided who received how much allowance to emit greenhouse gases? Congress could sell the allowances and/or give them away to favorite constituents. You can bet the rent money that a new army of lobbyists, with special pleadings, will descend on Washington to lobby Congress. And you can be sure that campaign contributions and favoritism will play an important role in the decision of who received what amount of allowances.¶ Much worse than that is the massive control government would have over our economy and our lives. Congress might decide that since tobacco use is unhealthy, it might not issue allowances to tobacco companies. While many Americans might applaud that, how many would like Congress to refuse to issue allowances to companies that produce foods that some people deem unhealthy such as French fries, sodas, canned soups and potato chips. Congress might deny, or threaten to deny, allowances to companies that in their opinion didn't hire enough women and minorities. The possibilities for control over our lives would be endless and could include nuisance-type edicts such a requiring us to buy a permit to barbeque in our backyard.¶ The thirst to wield massive control over our economy helps explain the near religious belief in manmade global warming and the attacks on scientists and others who offer contradictory evidence.

Remote sensing – General

#### Plan would be spun as supporting NASA Stearns 1 (Ron Stearns, Senior Consulting Analyst, Frost & Sullivan Market Insight Published: 3 Dec 2001¶ ¶ NASA: New Leadership Challenged to Forge Opportunities Among Ongoing Obligations¶ Date Published: 3 Dec 2001)

There is a perception that NASA is "chained" to both the Space Shuttle (STS) and International Space Station (ISS) programs. There appears to be a great deal of truth in this, as one program relies heavily on the other for continued existence and neither situation seems likely to change in the next several years. The cancellation/postponement of both the X-33 and X-34 programs would appear to be a blow to ongoing government-funded research in single stage to orbit replacements for the STS. This is not a criticism of the Shuttle program. No other country has been able to develop and fund such a system, but the ongoing costs of maintaining an aging orbiter fleet have arguably taken budget money from other programs - with no replacement in sight.

The ISS, routinely slammed for cost overruns in the billions, is undeniably over budget and behind schedule. The cancellation of the Crew Return Vehicle will likely mean fewer astronauts will be on station at any given time, and the justifiably bad press brought about by "space tourism" has further marred the ISS image. Although likely unpopular in world opinion, NASA and the United States should hold partners accountable, and either farm work out to other countries or let contracts internally if partner countries are unable to deliver. Although undeniably a geopolitical problem, NASA's primary objective should be ensuring that the ISS proceed as designed. The sooner these problems are behind the agency, the sooner it can move forward.

Making fundamental changes at a major government agency brings to mind analogies of steering a supertanker, but NASA still has within its power to strengthen government/commercial relationships and enhancing its image among its constituents. NASA's remote sensing satellite programs could be a good place to start. Canada's Radarsat program has in many ways created a model by which government and industry can work together to achieve both scientific and commercial ends (the U.S. government and NASA were also involved).

#### Data sharing would support NASA – have lobbied for it NASA not date (Remote Sensing & Technology for International Water Management¶ NA SA Applied Sciences Program: Including Water Resources, Natural Disasters, Agriculture, and Ecological Forecast)

Approximately $1.7B of the FY09 NASA budget supports Earth science technology, research, and applications.¶ • NASA and Earth observing remote sensing based observations are valuable to developing countries with sparse in situ data. NASA tools for combining satellite data with existing in situ networks can effectively fill observational gaps and are powerful for decision makers.¶ • NASA strongly supports a free and open exchange of its Earth science and satellite data throughout the world.¶ NA¶ SA’s Applied Sciences Program delivers satellite-based and modeled data to water managers, researchers,¶ and communities throughout the world, especially benefiting developing nations and data limited regions.¶ • The invaluable Earth and related information—satellite data, tools, ground measurements, and models—provided by NASA is a vital resource for addressing societal benefits such as:¶ - water resource planning and management,¶ - famine early warning and drought monitoring & prediction¶ for food security,¶ - disaster management including floods and landslides, and¶ - water quality and transboundary water issues.

Inter-agency data shift (plan) would help NASA

Lambright 10 (W. Henry, professor of political science and public administration and director of the Center for Environmental Policy and Administration, 10/7, http://history.nasa.gov/sp4801-chapter16.pdf, accessed 7-9-11, JMB)

The dilemma NASA now faces in designing a post-EOS future is shared with other agencies associated with the global change initiative of the early 1990s this interagency initiative never was fully implemented, coordinated, or led. There is a need to re-energize the vision many of the early advocates of EOS and USGCRP had—a strong earth system science and a capacity to predict global change (especially climate change)—that can be put to policy use. Achieving such a vision requires a planetary perspective and that is NASA’s distinctive environmental competence. It is based on NASA’s mission to the home planet and the comparative approach derived from its work beyond earth. That perspective needs renewal and advocacy for a twenty-first century setting, that setting almost surely will be influenced, perhaps dramatically, by events involving climate change, remaking NASA’s environmental mission, with resources to match, and connecting that role to other agencies and nations is a challenge. It is less a problem in science and technology, however, and much more a challenge of political will.

**Creating a new agency for remote sensing costs a lot of political capital**

**Szajinfarber et al 9** (Zoe Szajnfarber,i Thomas G. Beatty,ii Matthew W. Petersen,iii Anna Vasilyeva,iv D. Brent Whitev and Annalisa L. Weigelvi Massachusetts Institute of Technology, i Doctoral Research Assistant, Engineering Systems Division, 17-110; Cambridge MA, 02139, AIAA Student Member ii Graduate Research Assistant, Department of Physics, iii Undergraduate Research Assistant, Department of Aeronautics & Astronautics, iv Graduate Research Assistant, Department of Aeronautics & Astronautics, v Doctoral Research Assistant, Department of Aeronautics & Astronautics, vi Assistant Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics and Engineering Systems, 11/3, http://seari.mit.edu/documents/preprints/SZAJNFARBER\_SP\_AIAA09.pdf, accessed 7-5-11, JMB)

Precedence for creating a new agency to address a new problem can be found in the case of the creation of NASA in the 1950s. Most scholars agree that the NASA Act was successful; it created an agency dedicated exclusively to space and likely enabled the success of project Apollo. 20 However, as a basis for assessing the new agency option in the context of remote sensing, there exist important differences to between NASA and the hypothetical “remote sensing agency” that are worth highlighting. Firstly, whereas space was a new enterprise in the 50s, remote sensing is already a mature domain today. The question at hand is not where to develop a new set of competencies, rather how to organize existing competencies. Second, at the time of NASA’s inception, space was an issue of primary policy. While satellite remote sensing can inform many of the central policy issues today, labeling remote sensing as a hot policy topic today would be significantly overstating matters. Setting aside for a moment the practical reality that enacting a new agency requires an act of congress, to make the new agency viable, existing expertise, which are currently scattered across the multiplicity of agencies involved, would either have to be centralized or duplicated. As a result, however the restructuring were to happen, several agencies would either be losing one of their core competencies, or find themselves contracting to another federal agency. Neither scenario will be readily accepted. Thus, while structurally speaking, this is the most efficient option, since it also requires the most political capital, it would be hardest to implement. The requisite political inertia likely does not exist at this time, but it may in the future.

**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>)

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>)

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)](http://www.planetary.org/programs/projects/space_advocacy/letter_congress_joint.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)](http://www.planetary.org/programs/projects/space_advocacy/letter_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)](http://www.planetary.org/programs/projects/space_advocacy/letter_to_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.

**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)

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.

NIB – Agenda

#### Boehner hates the plan

Boehner no date (John Boehner, speaker of the house of the 112th congress, boehner.house.gov¶ John Boehner ¶ Contact: Press Office)

Nov 3¶ Washington - ¶ In the coming weeks, House Republicans will formally introduce an energy & infrastructure jobs bill, and hope to move the legislation through the House before the end of the year, Congressman John Boehner (R-West Chester) announced today. House Republicans oppose wasteful "stimulus" spending, and instead favor an approach that combines an expansion of American-made energy production with initiatives to repair and improve infrastructure and reform the way infrastructure money is spent. As Congressman Boehner said in his September 15, 2011 jobs address at the Economic Club of Washington, D.C., such an approach would support economic growth by removing government barriers to private-sector job creation, particularly in the area of American energy production.¶ The energy/infrastructure jobs bill will be the latest measure in the House GOP American Energy Initiative, an ongoing effort to support job creation and lower energy prices for families and businesses by allowing increased production of American-made energy. ¶ From Speaker Boehner's Sept. 15 economic address, proposing an energy/infrastructure jobs bill as an alternative to failed “stimulus” spending:¶ "There are [other things] we can do in the weeks and months ahead to free our economy and bolster confidence among our job creators. . .[one is] in the area of transportation and infrastructure. I’m not opposed to responsible spending to repair and improve infrastructure. But if we want to do it in a way that truly supports long-term economic growth and job creation, let’s link the next [infrastructure] bill to an expansion of American-made energy production. Removing some of the unnecessary government barriers that prevent our country from utilizing its vast energy resources could create millions of new jobs. There’s a natural link between the two: as we develop new sources of American energy, we’re going to need modern infrastructure to bring that energy to the market."

**Boehner will drain Obama’s capital**

**Collinson 11** (Stephen, writer @ AFP, 9/1/11, http://news.yahoo.com/obama-boehner-test-wills-jobs-speech-012130853.html) JPG

The White House Thursday denied President Barack Obama's latest row with Republicans proved he will struggle to pass a major new jobs program, describing the clash as an irrelevant sideshow. Obama's decision to back down Wednesday over an issue as mundane as the timing of a major economic address before a joint session of Congress next week cast new scrutiny on his diminished political heft in the US capital. New polls meanwhile showing Americans sour on his leadership and management of the economy further raised the stakes for Obama's new plan -- possibly his last chance to revive the economy before his 2012 reelection bid fires up. White House spokesman Jay Carney said Wednesday's political shoving match over the date of the speech with Republican House Speaker John Boehner left most Americans cold, as they look to Washington to lift their economic gloom. "It's irrelevant, this is small stuff. The sideshows don't matter. The economy matters. The American people matter. Jobs matter," Carney said. Though the White House took the high ground, the episode revived questions aired during a July debt standoff over whether Obama's penchant for compromise leads to him getting rolled over by Republicans. Obama offered a bold gambit on Wednesday by asking Boehner to host a rare joint session of Congress to debut his new economic plan on September 7 -- the same night as a Republican presidential candidates debate in California. The White House insisted the timing was "coincidental" though few Washington observers buy that, reasoning that the president wanted to steal the spotlight from candidates vying to turf him out of office. But Boehner refused to budge, and in what Capitol Hill sources said was an unprecedented move, said Obama should speak the next night instead. The White House insisted Boehner's camp had raised no prior objections to the date, but the speaker's aides said he had never given the go-ahead as the recriminations flew between the two sides. Knowing a president lacks the authority to simply show up at Congress and give a speech, Obama eventually relented and agreed to Boehner's date of September 8.

**Boehner’s has massive clout**

**Stirewalt 11** (Chris, reporter @ Fox, 4/9/11, http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2011/04/09/did-keys-boehners-budget-victory/) JPG

One week ago, John Boehner was dead meat. Facing a rebellion among his freshman members and with a government shutdown looming, Washington was preparing a professional obituary for the speaker of the House. If he agreed to any compromise on the plan to fund the government for the remainder of the federal fiscal year, Boehner would lose the confidence of his caucus and be a lame duck. If he dug in and joined the fiscal hard-liners in shutting down the government, Boehner would lose his ability to negotiate with Democrats in future fights. His options were to either lose face or to lose his most important bargaining tool. Checkmate. Yet today, Boehner’s clout in his caucus and as a negotiator have been enhanced. He is the primary author of a compromise to keep the government operating for the rest of the year with the largest spending reduction in history – 63 percent of the original GOP request of $61 billion. Republicans also got a potpourri of sweeteners, like up-or-down votes on politically painful subjects like President Obama’s health care law and federal subsidies for Planned Parenthood, the nation’s largest abortion provider. Not too shabby for a guy who held only one of three seats at the negotiating table.

**NIB Elections Link**

#### Pennsylvania would hate the plan James 8 (Sallie, trade policy analyst at the Cato Institute “Hurting the Rich Important to Obama,” 4/22/08, CATO, http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/hurting-rich-important-obama)

The debate between the Democratic candidates last week proved beyond a shadow of a doubt that voters face a choice between two starkly different visions. Barack Obama made one particularly startling statement that puts him well to the left of the already leftist Hillary Clinton. In a discussion over whether and how far to increase the capital-gains tax, ABC anchor Charles Gibson pointed out to Sen. Obama that a 1980s hike in the tax actually saw revenue fall, presumably a worry for a candidate who wants to increase government spending on social programs and "infrastructure" projects. Astonishingly, Obama replied: "I would look at raising the capital-gains tax for purposes of fairness." In other words, to Barack Obama, soaking the rich and discouraging investment is worth it for its own sake, even if it can't raise more money. The objective isn't to raise revenue, it's to inflict pain on those perceived as relatively well-off. How could this sentiment possibly satisfy the residents of Pennsylvania, Michigan or anywhere else? If raising tax rates will slow down the economy without increasing government revenue, they probably wondered, what's in it for them? In some ways, the debate was more notable for what the candidates didn't talk about. In spite of a slowing economy and local demographics, trade policy — which has a substantial impact on them — hardly got a mention. Sen. Obama gave a clear indication of his thoughts in this area earlier last week. In an address to the Alliance for American Manufacturing in Pittsburgh, Obama reiterated his line that trade policies are written to enhance the "corporate bottom line." As he said, trade policies haven't worked for America because labor unions haven't been given a seat at the negotiating table. "Special interests have bought every seat," he says. (As if unions were not special interests). Obama lamented the loss of manufacturing jobs and factory closures, and claimed "the few jobs that are being created" bring inferior pay and conditions. What is there, in all this rhetoric, for Americans? Where's the hope? The U.S. economy, over the past decade, has created an average net 1.4 million jobs per year. Sometimes other states offer more opportunities, and when the going gets tough, as they say, the tough get going. Like many who fret over global free trade, Obama seems to see manufacturing jobs as the pinnacle of human endeavor. Sen. Obama did admit that "not every job lost is due to trade." (According to the U.S. Council of Economic Advisers, it's about 3 percent.) And he noted that he does not oppose all trade deals. To his credit, Obama voted in favor of the U.S. trade agreement with Oman, and he rightly supports lifting the trade embargo on Cuba. But more broadly, instead of allowing people to buy goods and services from people who want to sell them, Sen. Obama advocates a government-directed program of redistributing wealth through a National Infrastructure Reinvestment Bank that, he claims, would "generate millions of new jobs." It might, indeed, create some new jobs, but only at the expense of jobs the private sector could have created responding to actual consumer demand with the money Obama took. Furthermore, Obama pledged to "modernize our steel industry." Meanwhile, the American Iron and Steel Institute boasts of its "world-class efficiency and advanced technology." Like many who fret over global free trade, Obama seems to see manufacturing jobs as the pinnacle of human endeavor. That's not surprising, in view of the audience, nor is it surprising that he promised to "strengthen our manufacturing base and open as many markets as we can to American manufactured goods." But as Obama might learn, it's difficult to open markets abroad when you don't open markets here. After today's Pennsylvania's primary will we know how closer Obama is to clinching the Democratic nomination. As Obama's remarks on the capital-gains tax make clear, his idea of fairness leaves something to be desired. Harming the wealthy without helping the poor does no good for anyone. It offers only, as John McCain may soon quip, no hope, and bad change.

#### Pennsylvania controls the elections – swing state White 12 (Deborah White, New York Times, <http://usliberals.about.com/od/BattlegroundStates2012/a/Pennsylvania-In-2012-Elections.htm>)

Even though Pennsylvanians have voted Democratic in the last five presidential elections, Pennsylvania is considered a swing state largely because the Keystone state voted Republican for most of the 20th century.¶ Also, the composition of Pennsylvania demographics... 81.9% white per the 2010 Census... predisposes its population to receptivity to conservative Republican messaging. No Democratic presidential candidate has garnered more than 45% of the white vote in three decades.¶ "Nationally, Obama won 43 percent of the white vote: 46 percent of white women and 41 percent of white men," reported The Times-Picayune newspaper reported after the 2008 election. Per USA Today about Pennsylvania's 2008 election results, "The candidates split the white vote, but Obama was the overwhelming choice among blacks and Hispanics, according to an analysis of information from voters interviewed as they left polling places."

### **Political Capital Key – Vanik Specific Cards**

#### Obama’s capital key to Russian relations –seen as a bigger reset in relations Weiss 12 (Michael Wiess, writer for The American Interest, http://www.the-american-interest.com/article.cfm?piece=1250)

For all his pretensions of being a “transformative” president, Barack Obama’s foreign policy prescriptions are rooted in a deeply conservative and nostalgic tradition. When it comes to Russia, the tradition this White House channels most is that of Richard Nixon. This seemingly incongruous resemblance was well illustrated in a recent controversy over the nullification of a Nixon-era piece of legislation, the Jackson-Vanik amendment, which binds U.S. trade relations with autocratic regimes to those regimes’ human rights records. Jackson-Vanik is the thorn in the side of Obama’s “reset” policy with Russia, which wants to accede to the World Trade Organization—a major component of the reset. So long as Jackson-Vanik still applies to Russia, American businesses won’t be able to fully profit from that accession. President Obama’s push to repeal Jackson-Vanik has been described as cynical and manipulative by both the veteran Russian dissidents who benefitted from its passage in the 1970s and the younger generation of oppositionists who seek new instruments of American leverage against Vladimir Putin.

#### Obama capital key – Russia sees him as a litmus test for relations Zabrovskaya 6/19 (June 19, 2012¶ Ekaterina Zabrovskaya¶ ,writer for the news agency “Russia, beyond the headlines, http://rbth.ru/articles/2012/06/19/the\_magnitsky\_blacklist\_may\_sour\_us-russia\_relations\_15900.html)

Markov believes that Presidents Barack Obama and Vladimir Putin have the potential to develop good personal relations. “Putin had the opportunity to receive evidence that Obama keeps his word. Putin values this most of all,” the analyst said. Markov thinks that Obama, in turn, respects Putin’s leadership potential. ¶ ¶ Maksim Grigoryev, president of the Foundation for the Study of Problems of Democracy, also believes that U.S.-Russian relations will improve relatively soon, at least after the U.S. presidential elections, should Obama win a second term. Grigoryev thinks that the discussion around the Magnitsky bill is all about political PR. “It is important for Obama to present himself as a strong man on the international arena and neutralize the Republican Party's attacks that he is not hard enough on Russia. For Republicans, it is important to show that they fight against totalitarianism in Russia,” said Grigoryev. “This is a PR move for both the Republicans and Obama.”¶ ¶ Both analysts think that Russia has a right to be upset over the Magnitsky bill.¶ ¶ Related:¶ Magnitsky for Jackson-Vanik: A fair trade?¶ Trade hearings renew debates on Russia¶ State Department move on "Magnitsky List" a gambit that failed¶ Russia can’t be manipulated through external pressure¶ “First, I think that there is an attempt to violate our sovereignty. Second, there is a violation of the presumption of innocence,” said Markov.

#### Obama key to legitamize relations and prevent Magnesky Colley 6/21 (Carroll Colley is the director of Eurasia Group’s Eurasia practice, 6/21/12, <http://eurasia.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/06/21/presidential_campaign_politics_delays_us_recognition_of_russia_at_wto>)

The White House is much more focused on November 6 (Election Day) than August 23 (the approximate date of Russia's WTO entry). Only after repeated requests from Republican lawmakers for senior level officials to testify on the Hill -- widely viewed as a Republican maneuver to force the administration to speak on the record about its Russian policy -- did the administration relent by sending the duo of Deputy Secretary of State William Burns and U.S. Trade Representative Ron Kirk to testify before the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee. The White House calculates that a "yes" vote on graduating Russia from Jackson-Vanik (a 1974 provision that ties trade relations to freedom of emigration and other human rights considerations) would have little electoral upside, and might even harm Obama before the election.¶ Obama's meeting on June 18 with President Vladimir Putin on the margins of the G20 in Los Cabos seemingly failed to produce a breakthrough on Syrian policy. Headlines about ongoing arms shipments bound for Syria and the potential for continued Russian intransigence at the U.N. Security Council also represent potential political liabilities during the election home stretch, not to mention a host of domestic political issues. Romney, meanwhile, has called Russia the U.S.'s greatest political "enemy" -- and later changing that description to "foe" -- because he senses a potential weakness in an Obama foreign policy that has otherwise produced several notable successes.¶ It would be much simpler, politically, if supporters of graduating Russia from Jackson-Vanik could cast it as a vote for American business, as Secretary of State Hillary Clinton did in a recent opinion piece. But they can't. Passage is complicated by the Magnitsky bill, human rights legislation that targets government officials involved in the case of Sergei Magnitsky, a Russian lawyer who died in police custody in 2009. Largely viewed as a replacement for Jackson-Vanik, the stated aim of the bill is to deny visas to corrupt officials, freeze any U.S. accounts they have, and publish their names. The reality is that the Obama administration last summer instituted its own visa ban and any potential offenders have long ago transferred any funds from the U.S.. The net effect of the bill, therefore, is the "naming of names," which would represent a significant embarrassment to the Putin regime. The bill enjoys broad bipartisan support, with a number of lawmakers stating publicly that passage of the Magnitsky bill is a prerequisite for their vote on Jackson-Vanik.¶ The Obama administration has sent contradictory messages about its support for the Magnitsky bill. While originally opposing the bill, the administration seems to have accepted the inevitable and has been working with its primary author, Democratic Sen. Ben Cardin of Maryland. One recent Senate version provides for the public list as well as a confidential annex, which would largely allow the administration to circumvent the thrust of the bill by invoking national security exemptions. This is strongly opposed by a number of senior lawmakers, including Sen. John McCain, who was a co-sponsor of the effort to repeal Jackson-Vanik on the caveat of corresponding passage of the Magnitsky bill.¶ As the August recess rapidly approaches, the window for graduating Russia from Jackson-Vanik prior to its WTO accession closes. Obama appears to have little room to maneuver in expending political capital on the matter without raising the risk of elevating Russia-and its collateral baggage including Syria, Georgia, Iran, and domestic protests-to a legitimate campaign issue. Unless Congress moves forward on its own prerogative-which appears unlikely-the repeal of Jackson-Vanik won't get passed before November, or later, leaving the world's largest economy unable to take advantage of the accession of the WTO's newest member.