### A2: Uniqueness Overwhelms the Link

**Romney can still come back**

**Silver 9-16**

Nate is a statistician and writes the fivethirtyeight blog for the New York Times, “Watching the Clock and Awaiting the Unknown,” <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/09/17/sept-16-watching-the-clock-and-awaiting-the-unknown/?utm_source=twitterfeed&utm_medium=twitter>

Before the conventions, the presidential race was routinely described with formulations like “tossup” or “too close to call” or “could go either way”. Personally, I prefer to use those phrases when the probabilities really are quite close to 50-50. I don’t think they were appropriate in the presidential race this year, when Mr. Obama held a small but quite persistent lead that made him the favorite.¶ Now, however, **we seem to have gone full circle, with some news organizations already writing obituaries for** Mr**. Romney**’s campaign:¶ Romney adviser Stuart Stevens “has become the leading staff scapegoat for a campaign that suddenly is behind in a race that had been expected to stay neck and neck through Nov. 6.”¶ I would see a little more justification for that if Mr. Obama had continued to hold at something like a six-point lead in the national race after this convention, as seemed possible when he was getting some very strong numbers in the polls early last week. To a slightly lesser extent, I’d see a justification for it if Mr. Obama’s numbers hold at their present levels for another two weeks or so.¶ **For the time being**, however, Mr. **Obama’s bounce seems to have tapered off a bit**, and it may taper off somewhat further, so I’m not sure there’s all that much news. Mr. **Romney has gone from a modest underdog in the presidential race to a modestly larger underdog, which isn’t good** news for him. **However, it isn’t a particularly sudden or night-and-day difference.** Whatever problems he is having convincing voters about his candidacy, they are probably mostly the same ones that he has had all year. But **the race is not over, by any means.**

#### Nate Silver is the best around

Leigh Bureau ‘10

the world’s preeminent lecture bureau, “Nate Silver,” http://www.leighbureau.com/speaker.asp?id=498

Nate Silver has been called a "spreadsheet psychic" and "number-crunching prodigy" by New York Magazine.¶ Nate comes out of the world of baseball statistics, but during the 2008 presidential election primaries, he turned his sights and his amazing predictive abilities and forecasting models to the game of politics and current events — with incredible results.¶ He began by predicting 2008 primary election results with stunning accuracy — and often in opposition to the better-known political pollsters. He then moved on to the general election, where he correctly predicted the presidential winner in 49 states and the District of Columbia.¶

**Romney can still win if events change**

**Cook 9-13**

Charlie is a Columnist for the National Journal and director of the Cook Political Report, “Obama’s a Good Bet,” <http://www.nationaljournal.com//columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-obama-s-a-good-bet-to-win-20120913?print=true>

By this time next week, there should be enough national and state-level polling data to present a pretty clear picture of where this election stands, post-Labor Day and after whatever bounces the candidates may have gotten from the conventions. But we have seen enough data in recent weeks to draw some preliminary conclusions about the contests for the White House, the Senate, and, to a lesser extent, the House.¶ **The presidential race is still close and, in a tight election,** either candidate can win. **Any number of events,** not the least of which are debates, campaign gaffes, **and domestic** or international **developments, could put President Obama or Mitt Romney over the top**. Although **it is pretty clear that Obama has an edge over Romney in national and swing-state polling**, the size of his advantage remains in doubt. Every event or development should be judged on whether it might change the path of this election.¶ My view is that if Obama is reelected, it will be despite the economy and because of his campaign; if Mitt Romney wins, it will be because of the economy and despite his campaign. This economy is an enormous millstone around Obama’s neck, yet he and his campaign have managed to secure the upper hand—albeit with a very tenuous grip. At the same time, despite an enormous advantage that the sluggish economy and the sentiment for change affords him, **Romney and his campaign, to an astonishing degree, seem to have squandered too many opportunities and undermined his chances of winning.¶ It should be emphasized again and again that this campaign isn’t over and that the race is still awfully close. But without a change in the trajectory, it’s a good bet that Obama will come out on top**. The questions are whether the opportunity will arise for that trajectory to change and whether the Romney campaign be able to effectively capitalize on it.¶ Looking at the math of the Senate a year and a half ago, Democrats were having to defend 23 seats and the GOP just 10. Democrats had seven open seats, compared with just two for Republicans; the arithmetic argued strongly that Republicans had a real shot at overturning the current 53-47 Democratic majority. At the time, it looked as if Republicans had at least a 60 percent, maybe even a 70 percent, chance of prevailing. Now, a 45 percent chance of a GOP majority is probably closer to the mark. It’s not that a pro-Republican tide has waned, but that developments in individual states have hurt Republicans more than Democrats, changing the status from “strong edge” for the GOP to “somewhat uphill.”¶ There are at least two important, yet seemingly opposing, dynamics at work in the Senate races. The first is an intensifying polarization that is making many contests more competitive and closer than they were even a month ago. Partisans, and even those just leaning toward one party or the other, have come home very quickly. This is true in Florida and Ohio, where Republican challengers have closed the gap against Democratic incumbents. This increased polarization is working against the GOP in Hawaii and New Mexico, where the party has fielded especially talented candidates. These challengers gave Republicans reason for hope in two Democratic-tilting states, but as President Obama has solidified his standing there, early GOP optimism no longer seems warranted.¶ The second dynamic is that neither party appears to have the wind at its back. As a result, candidates and the quality of their campaigns matter more than they have in the last three elections. This explains why Democratic candidates in Indiana and North Dakota are more than holding their own, making those two races in Republican-leaning states more competitive than they ought to be. Republicans are also benefiting from this. In Massachusetts, GOP Sen. Scott Brown is statistically tied with Democrat Elizabeth Warren, despite the state’s strong Democratic tilt. And, in Connecticut, Republican Linda McMahon has a lead over Democratic Rep. Chris Murphy, largely because she has run the better race to date. Perhaps whatever bias voters may have had against McMahon during her ill-fated 2010 Senate campaign because of her background as a professional-wrestling executive is no longer as much of a liability.¶ These strong and even sometimes contradictory dynamics have created much more uncertainty in the Senate picture in the past month. Now, 15 seats—10 held by Democrats and five by Republicans—can be called competitive. Ten or possibly 11 others can be considered legitimate toss-ups—six or seven held by Democrats and four held by Republicans.¶ The House still seems to be a hard-fought but fairly evenly matched fight, with little chance of a major shift in either direction. If there is a significant turnover, it will have been triggered by something that hasn’t happened yet.

#### Lots of time for Romney to come back

National Journal 9-21

“Not so Fast: You Can’t Count Romney out yet,” <http://nationaljournal.com/politics/not-so-fast-you-can-t-count-romney-out-yet-20120921>

After Mitt Romney’s latest stumble, and polls showing leads in key states for President Obama, the tone in the political universe has become decidedly bullish on the president’s chances, with some people acting as if he has locked it up. But the voters don’t seem ready to declare the campaign over, and it is way too early to be writing Romney’s political obituary. In a Twitter world, six weeks -- with four debates -- is an eternity.¶ Undeniably shell-shocked by two weeks that seemed to bring bad news on each day, Republicans are trying to regain their footing and start challenging what they fear is a growing consensus that Romney is blowing his challenge to a decidedly vulnerable president. Their message: not so fast. Not so fast with talk of Romney gaffes; not so fast with talk of falling behind in the polls; and not so fast with plans for Obama’s second inaugural.¶ Exhibiting a trace of urgency to try to prevent that consensus from taking hold, their argument echoes the president’s defense of his tax plan: It’s not politics; it’s math. They contend the math of the latest polls shows Romney behind, but not so far behind that it justifies some of the claims heard this week on cable television.¶ MSNBC’s Joe Scarborough, who backs Romney, irritated many of his fellow Republicans when he decried what he called “one of the worst weeks for any presidential candidate in a general election that any of us can remember” and predicted certain defeat “if he doesn’t dramatically change his strategy.” But even the most ardent Romney supporter cannot deny that there wasn’t much good news for the nominee in a 19-day stretch from Aug. 30, when Clint Eastwood debated his empty chair, when Democrats held a successful convention, when Romney jumped the gun and made ill-advised foreign policy remarks on Sept. 11, and when, this week, Romney’s admittedly “inelegant” remarks to fundraisers were disclosed.¶ In the middle of that stretch, the GOP frustration bubbled over when GOP insiders groused to Politico about the direction of the campaign.¶ It was not a great stretch, acknowledged Republican pollster Whit Ayres. “But that doesn’t justify a premature rush to judgment,” he insisted. “Pull yourself away from the piling-on of the Romney campaign and look at the data.” The numbers, he said, provide perspective. “To somehow assume that the race is over because you have an awkward challenger at a time when six out of 10 voters think we’re going in the wrong direction, two-thirds think we’re still in a recession, a majority thinks the president’s economic plan is not working, his job approval is below 50, and his ballot is below 50 -- that strikes me as just crazy.”¶ Ayres said Obama’s average lead in the public polls was 2.3 percent in June, 2.5 percent in July, 2.4 percent in August, and has been 2.6 percent in September. “It is a flat line.... That doesn’t strike me as a done deal, a race that is over.”¶ But those numbers do show Romney consistently losing, with not even his own campaign arguing that he leads the race. “Romney is behind, and his skills as a candidate are not exactly world-class,” acknowledged Ayres. “But he is in a position where he could win this thing. There are a bunch of people who are not yet sold on him but they sure are open to him and what he has to say.” He added that Romney can get those votes “if he can come up with a compelling vision of why their economic future is going to be brighter if they pick him instead of Obama.”¶ It is the single biggest failure of Romney’s campaign that after two years of effort he has yet to project that vision. But there are voters willing to hear him out, according to veteran Democratic pollster Peter Hart, who conducted a focus group with undecided voters in Virginia on Monday. Hart found voters in this battleground state have not yet bought Romney’s wares. But they are still willing to let him make his case.¶ Hart spent an evening in suburban Fairfax with a dozen voters. As reported by Carl Leubsdorf in The Dallas Morning News, many of the voters said they were disillusioned with Obama but not sold on Romney. Pamela Zacha, 64, of Reston, said Obama was “overconfident and unrealistic.” But she complained Romney has not offered a specific economic plan and said “there’s still a part of me that wants to give [Obama] more of a chance.” Others in the group had the same complaint -- that Romney has not been specific enough about what he would do to revive the economy.¶ Tom Rath, the longtime Republican figure in New Hampshire, said he is encouraged by the willingness of voters to still consider Romney despite all the recent bad publicity -- some of which he blamed on a “Greek chorus of unemployed consultants” taking shots at the campaign’s decision-makers in Boston. He said Republicans need to get beyond such “distractions,” and he insisted: “We can still win. It’s doable. But we’ll have to thread the needle a little bit.” To do that, he argued, analysts will have to stop “overreacting to some of these swing-state polls.”¶ And he urged patience, even setting a date when Republicans can legitimately worry if they still trail Obama. “The week of October 1st is probably an inflection point,” Rath said. “You’ll have a debate on Wednesday the 3rd, then job reports on the 5th. I think where we are polling on Columbus Day, October 8th, will tell us where this race really is. If we’re still close then, it will be like baseball. The Democrats will regret that they didn’t put us away early. The longer people say they are undecided, the less likely they are to go with the incumbent.”

### Wind Links

#### Wind is unpopular, 1NC Maxwell says key environmental groups hate Wind because of fears they will kill wildlife.

**Turnout is key- Incumbency elections prove**

Galston ’12

William is an election analyst for Brookings, “Six Months to Go: Where the Presidential Contest Stands as the General Election Begins,” <http://www.brookings.edu/research/papers/2012/05/~/media/research/files/papers/2012/5/10%20obama%20campaign%20galston/where%20the%20presidential%20contest%20stands.pdf>

**Despite the structural similarities of general elections involving incumbents, they are not the same. Some begin with relatively high levels of undecided “swing” voters, while others fight over much smaller** pools of voters who might change their minds. 1992 is an example of the former, 2004 of the latter. **When swing voters are a large share of the electorate, campaigns must focus their strategy on persuading them to support their respective candidates**. When most voters have made up their minds, the emphasis shifts to mobilizing supporters. In a recent survey, Pew usefully places the 2012 election in the context of recent contests with incumbents running for reelection: 43

May 1992 July 1996 June 2004 April 2012

Certain Democrat 34 39 39 39

Certain Republican 35 34 40 37

Swing voter 31 27 21 23

**It appears that 2012 will be more like 2004—a classic mobilization election**—than

either 1992 or 1996. Like George W. Bush, Barack **Obama has turned out to be a**

**polarizing president who has induced many voters to choose sides very early** in the

process. **So the enthusiasm of core supporters—their motivation to translate their**

**preferences into actual votes—will make a big difference**.

#### Environmental turnout outweighs. 1NC Lehrer says they make up 19% of the electorate and the shock of Obama passing an expansion of wind disillusions them swinging the election to Romney.

#### No Risk of a link turn- Independents vote Prospectively based on what can be accomplished, Wind would be off the table for them

Tomz & Houeling ‘07

Michael is an Assistant Professor of Political Science at Stanford University and Robert P. Van is Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of California at Berkley, “The Misfoundations of Voting,” <http://www.stanford.edu/~tomz/working/TomzVanHouweling-2007-08a.pdf>

We contribute to existing theoretical and empirical analyses in three ways. First, we¶ formally derive the complete set of conditions under which the theories lead to distinct predictions about how people vote. Second, we use the formal results to develop a statistical¶ 1model for estimating the prevalence of each voting rule in the electorate. Finally, we systematically test all three theories by conducting experiments that are tailored to our statistical¶ model. The experiments, embedded in public opinion surveys, avoid problems of endogeneity¶ and measurement that have impeded previous research.¶ We estimate the proportion of a nationally representative random sample of adults whose¶ choices about federal health care policy are consistent with each of the three issue-voting¶ logics. We Önd that voters typically employ proximity-based decision rules; they either choose¶ the closest candidate or select the one who, in their estimation, will bring policy nearest to¶ their ideal point. More precisely, 57.7 percent of respondents in our study behave as if¶ they they are following a pure proximity rule. Another signiÖcant proportion, 27.6 percent,¶ discount the announced positions of candidates by taking into account the location of the¶ status quo when voting. Finally, 14.7 percent of respondents appear to follow directional¶ logic.¶ We also found that discounting is more common, and directionalism less common, among¶ ideological centrists and non-partisans. This suggests that centrist voters, who often found¶ themselves choosing between polarized candidates (Fiorina 1995), make relatively sophisticated judgments aimed at bringing policy outcomes in line with their preferences. Overall,¶ our study both supports and qualiÖes the foundational assumptions in models of democratic¶ politics. It also demonstrates the promise of combining formal analysis, statistical modeling,¶ and experiments to answer previously intractable questions about democracy.

#### Public would hate plan- thermostatic response

Sides ’10

John is Professor of Political Science at Georgetown, “The Public is a Thermostat,” <http://themonkeycage.org/blog/2010/06/22/the_public_is_a_thermostat/>

David Brooks sees the public as largely opposed to the policies of the Obama administration and the Democratic majorities in Congress. He believes that this reflects a miscalculation on the Democrats’ part: the public is not that liberal.¶ Some Kool-Aid sippers on the left say the problem is that Republicans have better messaging (somehow John Boehner became magically charismatic to independents). Others say the shift to the right is a product of bad economic times. But Dr. Faustus saw a deeper truth. Moderate suburban voters do not see the world as liberals do, even in the most propitious circumstances, and never will.¶ But there is another possibility: the public is simply a thermostat. When government spending and activism increases, the public says “too hot” and demands less. When spending and activism decreases, the public says “too cold” demands more. Here is Christopher Wlezien in a 1995 paper (gated):¶ We observe that the signals the public sends to policymakers, in the form of preferences for “more” or “less” spending, react to changes in policy…[T]here is negative feedback of spending decisions on the public’s relative preferences, whereby the public adjusts its preferences for more spending downward when appropriations increase, and vice versa.¶ Erikson, MacKuen, and Stimson, writing in chapter 9 of The Macro Polity, refer to “the governing system as a thermostat.” Erikson et al. show that the public’s “mood”—a general measure of the policies it desires—moves in the opposite way as policy:¶ The correlation between policy innovation in one administration and before-after mood change is a strongly negative -0.76…The more liberal the policy stream, the more conservative is the change in mood. Notably, the most liberal presidency (Johnson’s full term ending in 1968) is associated with the greatest public reaction in the conservative direction. Similarly, the conservative presidencies of Reagan and Eisenhower moved the public in a liberal direction.¶ Brooks is wrong to assume that the public’s reaction to Democratic policies indicates a enduring ideological disjuncture or a failure of public relations. The public may not be more conservative. It may simply be saying “too hot.” As Matt put it in his email to me:¶ Current trends would not show that Democrats have been unusually unsuccessful in moving public opinion but that policy ideology in public opinion typically moves against the direction of policymaking. The public requests liberal policies, gets them, and then moves in the other direction; they then get more conservative policies and move against them.¶ Brooks wants to score this moment as a victory or defeat for someone—in this case, a defeat for liberalism and the Democrats. But If policy and thermostatic public opinion is cyclical, then any victory or defeat is temporary. The ebb and flow is the more important dynamic.

#### Thermostatic Response especially pronounced for liberals

Bolstad ’12

Jorgen is a former Fulbright Fellow at Harvard University and a post-doctorate researcher in European Politics at the Center for Comparative and International Studies, “Thermostatic Voting: Elections in Light of New Policy Data,” <http://journals.cambridge.org/download.php?file=%2FPSC%2FPSC45_01%2FS1049096511001697a.pdf&code=61d04501e14285b53e3ad43a422129d3>

As mentioned, the main hypothesis presented is that when current policy is more liberal, the Democratic candidate receives fewer¶ votes, and vice versa. The number of variables in the analysis is¶ kept to a minimum due to the limited number of observations.¶ Along with policy, only a variable representing the incumbency¶ advantage is included. This variable, which has proven relevant in¶ prior studies (e.g., Stimson 1999b, 97–120), is included because of¶ its theoretical importance, which will be discussed in the text that¶ follows. Thus, the main equation to be estimated is this:¶ Democratic Vote¶ t ab \* Policytl g \* Incumbencyt t¶ , (6)¶ where b is expected to be negative, g is expected to be positive,¶ and variation in the public’s non-relative policy preference is captured by the error term.¶ Leaving policy aside, the operationalization of the variables¶ is straightforward. The dependent variable is the Democratic¶ presidential candidate’s share of the combined Democratic and Republican votes. The data are from the US Census Bureau (2008)¶ and Federal Election Commission (2009). Although imperfect,¶ the two-party vote share is a convenient expression of the support for one major party relative to the other, leaving out thirdparty candidates. The incumbency advantage is represented by a¶ variable referred to as Incumbency. It has been scored 1 when a¶ Democratic president is seeking re-election, 0 when a Republican is, and .5 otherwise.¶ 10¶ As a ﬁnal step, the policy variable has¶ been recoded so that it takes on a maximum of 1 and minimum¶ of 0, making the magnitude of its eﬀect more readily interpretable and comparable.¶ The results of the analyses are reported in table 4. Model 1¶ includes only policy and shows a sizeable coeﬃcient for this variable. The coeﬃcient has the expected sign and it is signiﬁcant at¶ the 5% level. Measured by the adjusted R¶ 2¶ , it explains 13% of the¶ variance. Model 2 contains only the incumbency variable. This¶ variable also has a sizeable and signiﬁcant coeﬃcient with the¶ expected sign, explaining a fourth of the variance.Model 3 includes¶ both variables, which increases the explained variance to 41%. The¶ two estimates are hardly changed, while their standard errors are¶ reduced, underlining that this is a better-speciﬁed model.¶ 11¶ The identiﬁed feedback from policy to election outcomes is¶ not only statistically signiﬁcant, but also of a considerable magnitude. When policy is at its most liberal, as opposed to most¶ conservative, support for the Democratic candidate in terms of¶ the two-party vote is lower by more than eight percentage points.¶ 12¶ The corresponding standardized regression coeﬃcient is 0.44.¶ Figure 1 illustrates the eﬀect of policy, plotting it over time together¶ with residual vote shares, taken from model 2, which only includes¶ the incumbency advantage. As the eﬀect of policy is negative, the¶ residuals have been reversed to ease interpretation.Thus, the residuals refer to Republican votes, while liberalism still scores high¶ with regard to policy. The policy measure used here is the same as¶ noted earlier, except it is not lagged. Thus, not surprisingly, the¶ plot appears to show a lagged eﬀect of policy, in accordance with¶ earlier studies.

#### No risk the plan is popular- People are stupid sound bites will sway

Aol Energy 8-8

“What Voters Don’t Know About Energy,” <http://energy.aol.com/2012/08/08/what-voters-don-t-know-about-energy/>

"We are having all of these big political debates over fossil fuels and a good portion of the population doesn't even know what they are talking about," said Jean Johnson, a senior fellow at Public Agenda and author of the book, "Who Turned Out the Lights?"¶ It's not surprising really; voters are distracted and few have the time or interest to delve into energy complexities. The ailing economy looms as a larger preoccupation.¶ "They have busy lives. They are not sitting over EIA [US Energy Information Administration] books looking at statistics," said Rayola Dougher, senior economic advisor for the American Petroleum Institute, which has a Vote4Energy media campaign underway.¶ As energy becomes politicized this lack of understanding makes the electorate increasingly malleable to the sound bite and easily swayed on issues that have significant economic and environmental ramifications, according to Public Agenda, which recently published a citizens energy guide. This tendency to waffle comes at a particularly bad time. The energy industry is undergoing vast changes that will affect the country for decades; it wants consistent policy and direction before making large investments – and for good reason.¶ "With energy decisions, it takes a long, long, long time to see a result. A power plant lasts 40 to 50 years. They are huge and expensive. You don't build them every day. Even in terms of oil exploration – you don't just find it in Alaska, and we have it in our car tomorrow," Johnson said.¶ ¶ The problem is further exasperated by the tendency of political parties and special interest groups to reduce energy to simple black and white arguments that draw passion. Those who propose complex solutions find it difficult to be heard above the din.¶ ¶ Forget Nuance¶ ¶ Former Colorado Governor Bill Ritter discovered this firsthand when his administration embraced both renewable energy and natural gas. During Ritter's campaign for Governor, he appeared in a commercial with a wind farm, so therefore was perceived as anti-fossil fuel – even though he wasn't.¶ ¶ "What we were trying to do was promote a variety of resources. Wind was probably the biggest beneficiary, but our agenda was about clean energy broadly, including natural gas," said Ritter, who served as governor from 2007 to 2011 and is now director of the Center for the New Energy Economy at Colorado State University.¶ ¶ His image as anti-fossil fuel grew as he pushed for stiffer extraction rules for the natural gas industry. But later, when Ritter signed a bill that expanded the market for natural gas by shutting down coal-fired plants, people did not know how to peg him.¶ ¶ "We had said all along that we were in favor of this industry [natural gas] surviving and even thriving. But because we were stubborn about the extraction process being environmentally sound, we got slotted into another place," Ritter said. "It became very difficult to communicate a message that people understood. The mindset is that you are either an environmentalist or an industry person."

### Agencies Link

#### President will get blamed:

#### A) Responsible for Agencies **Ellis 94**

ELLIS, PROF OF GOV @ BERKELEY, 1994 PRICHARD, “PRESIDENTIAL LIGHTENING ROD, PG 2]

This argument seems plausible enough. But so too does the opposite case, argued by Harold Laski in his class *The American Presidency,* published in the same year (1940) as Herring’s treatise, An American president. Laski maintains, cannot deflect blame unto subordinates. A president’s position as head of the executive branch, Laski insists, “makes him a target to be attacked by ever person or interest at all critical of his purposes. He is, there in all cases, to be blamed; and there is no one, in any real sense, who can help to bear the burden of the blame. In contrast to England, where we blame an anonymous entity “the Government” if things go wrong, in the United States it is the president who is blamed. A decision of the Supreme Court is regarded as adverse to his policy; a defeat in Congress is a blow to *his* presidency; the mid-term congressional elections protect *his* policy, good or ill. NO one thinks of them in terms of their effects upon his cabinet.

#### B) Perception as figurehead

Edwards & Wayne 99  
PROF @ TEXAS A&M AND PROF @ GEORGETOWN, 1999 [GEORGE AND STEPHEN, “PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP: POLITICS AND POLICY MAKING, PG 327]

The hierarchical structure of the executive branch, with the president at the pinnacle, forces the president to take responsibility for the entire executive branch. Moreover, when the president exercises power, it is clear who is acting and who should be held accountable. Congress, on the other hand, is not responsible for implementing polices, and each member is relatively obscure compared to the president. Since Congress is so decentralized, any member can disclaim responsibility for policies or their consequences. Members of Congress, therefore, can, and do, make irresponsible or self serving decisions and then let the president take the blame.

#### C) People will think Obama approved

Cohen & Collier 99

PROF OF POLI SCI AT FORDHAM UNIV AND ASSIS PROF AT UNIV OF KANSAS, 1999 [JEFFREY AND KEN, “PRESIDENTIAL POLICYMAKING: AN END OF CENTURY ASSESSMENT, ED SHULL P. 42]

One of the President’s most important sources of political influence may be his ability to structure the agenda. While the literature on presidential agenda setting is not highly developed, there are suggestions that this type of presidential influence may exceed his often restricted ability to affect congressional decisionmaking. In his study of the agenda-setting process, Kingdon finds that respondents cite the president and his administration as perhaps the most important actor with agenda influence. As Kingdon states, “there is little doubt that the president remains a powerful force in agenda setting, particularly compared to other actors,” “Moreover, the views of the department heads and others associated with the administration are usually thought of as the president’s or as having the president’s stamp of approval. When they speak , it is for the administration and the president. Thus, the president has many “voices.”

#### D New Studies Agree

Krinner & Reeves ’12

Douglas is Associate Professor of Political Science at Boston University and Andrew is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Boston University, “The Influence of Federal Spending on Presidential Elections,” <http://journals.cambridge.org/download.php?file=%2FPSR%2FPSR106_02%2FS0003055412000159a.pdf&code=1c7ae66018f9fe746798fcc5c0bfb3b2>

Finally, recent scholarship argues that presidents are¶ held accountable for politically irrelevant factors like¶ severe weather (Achen and Bartels 2004; Gasper and¶ Reeves 2011), sporting events (Healy, Malhotra, and¶ Mo 2010), and even shark attacks (Achen and Bartels 2004). Across the gamut of issues, citizens expect¶ presidential action. As an article in The Economist¶ noted, even after the aggressive presidency of George¶ W. Bush, “Americans still want their commander-inchief to take command. It is pointless for a modern¶ president to plead that some things, such as the business cycle, are beyond his control” (“The Obama Cult”¶ 2009, 32). In short, for the general public the president¶ is the focal point of national politics and is likely to be¶ blamed or rewarded for changes in federal spending in¶ a constituency.

## A2- Space Colonization

#### Any risk of extinction outweighs because it makes space colonization impossible

Bostrom, 03 (Nick, professor of philosophy at Oxford University, director of the Future of Humanity Institute, Ph.D. from the London School of Economics. “Astronomical Waste: The Opportunity Cost of Delayed Technological Development” http://www.nickbostrom.com/astronomical/waste.pdf)

In light of the above discussion, it may seem as if a utilitarian ought to focus her efforts on accelerating technological development. The payoff from even a very slight success in this endeavor is so enormous that it dwarfs that of almost any other activity. We appear to have a utilitarian argument for the greatest possible urgency of technological development. However, the true lesson is a different one. If what we are concerned with is (something like) maximizing the expected number of worthwhile lives that we will create, then in addition to the opportunity cost of delayed colonization, we have to take into account the risk of failure to colonize at all. We might fall victim to an existential risk, one where an adverse outcome would either annihilate Earth-originating intelligent life or permanently and drastically curtail its potential.8 Because the lifespan of galaxies is measured in billions of years, whereas the time-scale of any delays that we could realistically affect would rather be measured in years or decades, the consideration of risk trumps the consideration of opportunity cost. For example, a single percentage point of reduction of existential risks would be worth (from a utilitarian expected utility point-of-view) a delay of over 10 million years. Therefore, if our actions have even the slightest effect on the probability of eventual colonization, this will outweigh their effect on when colonization takes place. For standard utilitarians, priority number one, two, three and four should consequently be to reduce existential risk. The utilitarian imperative “Maximize expected aggregate utility!” can be simplified to the maxim “Minimize existential risk!”.

#### Space exploration not needed to prevent extinction.

Kazan 10-1-09 Casey Kazan is an editor on the Daily Galaxy- Outskirts Press [“Space Colonization: Future or Fansty?” http://www.dailygalaxy.com/my\_weblog/2009/10/space-colonization-human-species-future-or-fanatsy.html]

Humans have always been fascinated by the idea of space travel. Some even believe that colonizing new planets or moons our best hope for the future. The popular idea is that we’ll eventually need some fresh, unexploited new worlds to inhabit. In a recent Galaxy post we wrote that Stephen Hawking, world-celebrated expert on the cosmological theories of gravity and black holes who holds Issac Newton's Lucasian Chair at Cambridge University, believes that traveling into space is the only way humans will be able to survive in the long-term. "Life on Earth," Hawking has said, "is at the ever-increasing risk of being wiped out by a disaster such as sudden global warming, nuclear war, a genetically engineered virus or other dangers ... I think the human race has no future if it doesn't go into space." Another of his famous quotes reiterates his position that we need to get off the planet relatively soon. "I don't think the human race will survive the next 1,000 years unless we spread into space." The problems with Hawking’s solution is that while it may save a “seed” of human life- a few lucky specimens- it won’t save Earth’s inhabitants. The majority of Earthlings would surely be left behind on a planet increasingly unfit for life. In a futuristic mode similar to Hawking, both Steven Dick, chief NASA historian and Carnegie-Mellon robotics pundit, Hans Moravec, believe that human biological evolution is but a passing phase: the future of mankind will be as vastly evolved sentient machines capable of self-replicating and exploring the farthest reaches of the Universe programmed with instructions on how to recreate earth life and humans to target stars. Dick believes that if there is a flaw in the logic of the Fermi Paradox, and extraterrestrials are a natural outcome of cosmic evolution, then cultural evolution may have resulted in a post-biological universe in which machines are the predominant intelligence. Renowned science-fiction writer, Charlie Stross, argued last week in his High Frontier Redux blog that space colonization is not in our future, not because it's impossible, but because to do so effectively you need either outrageous amounts of cheap energy, highly efficient robot probes, or "a magic wand." "I'm going to take it as read that the idea of space colonization isn't unfamiliar," Stross opens his post, "domed cities on Mars, orbiting cylindrical space habitats a la J. D. Bernal or Gerard K. O'Neill, that sort of thing. Generation ships that take hundreds of years to ferry colonists out to other star systems where — as we are now discovering — there are profusions of planets to explore." "The obstacles facing us are immense distance and time -the scale factor involved in space travel is strongly counter-intuitive." Stross adds that "Planets that are already habitable insofar as they orbit inside the habitable zone of their star, possess free oxygen in their atmosphere, and have a mass, surface gravity and escape velocity that are not too forbidding, are likely to be somewhat rarer. (And if there is free oxygen in the atmosphere on a planet, that implies something else — the presence of pre-existing photosynthetic life, a carbon cycle, and a bunch of other stuff that could well unleash a big can of whoop-ass on an unprimed human immune system."

#### Space Habitats would be too dangerous

Valdez 7-11 Michael E. Valdez is an assistant professor at Senton Hall University [“Space Colonization” http://home.mchsi.com/~mikevald/Colonization.html]

The first concept we need to analyze is the idea of space colonization. When this subject is discussed on the Internet or any other group, space colonization is understood to be when a group of colonists embark in a ship and travel to the Moon, Mars or any other place and establish a colony there. It is hard to understand why this idea is so entrenched. Consider the following points: All the bodies of the Solar System, the Earth included, are hostile places. If some group of persons comes to Earth from space, they would be subject to the harassment of the authorities, they would be charged taxes, they would be subject to medical examinations and who knows what else. Consider only what happens when a group of persons passes from one country to another. Landing on the Moon, Mars or any other body of the Solar System requires space suits, supply of air, water, food, energy sources, and many other conveniences. The next point to consider is that a group of colonists traveling to the Moon, Mars or anywhere else in the Solar System would require the design and construction of a ship to transport them there. Such a ship needs to have all the necessary life support systems. It needs air, water, food, heat as well as all other conveniences. Further more, even a trip to the Moon takes some time. A trip to Mars takes a substantial time. The colonists need something to do while they are in the ship. They also need to exercise to prevent lose of bone and muscle strength. Their ship needs to have gravity for the same reasons. Now consider that the colonists travel in a ship that has all they need and all additional conveniences. When they get to their destination, they must abandon these conveniences to land on whatever destination they have. They would need to start again by building a new habitat and create a way to satisfy their needs and develop their conveniences. Another point to consider is that the design and construction of the ship was done on Earth, where there is air to breath and all conveniences. The construction of the new habitat must be done under very hostile conditions, wearing space suits, having to carry air, water, food, power sources and who knows what else. For example on the Moon, they would need lighting equipment to work during the two weeks of lunar night. For all these reasons, unless the colonists are stupid, they would not abandon the conveniences of their ship for the uncertainties of a hostile environment. They would convert the ship into their home and remain there. Consequently, space colonization should not consider building ships to send colonists into space but it should consider building the habitats where the colonists would live in space. Another idea that is mentioned very often when considering habitats in space, as opposed to colonies on the Moon, Mars or wherever, is that the habitat must be placed in orbit around Earth. It is very hard to understand why anybody would want to do this except when considering a space station for scientific, political or military purposes, a hotel for very rich tourists or similar applications. A habitat in orbit around Earth would have many disadvantages. The most important of these disadvantages is that some government from Earth would claim authority over the habitat and its inhabitants. That government would create taxes, police, laws, regulations and all the bad things that all governments of the world have in common. Further more, a habitat in an orbit around Earth would need to expend more energy compensating for the variations on its orbit due to the presence of Earth and the Moon. This is a minor problem when considering communication satellites. A human habitat would have a considerable mass and suffer proportionally larger attractions and displacements. There is also the problem of the shadow of Earth and the Moon, reducing the source of energy. Another problem is that since the habitat is close to Earth, it would receive more meteoric impacts than in open space. This is because the mass of the Earth and the Moon attract meteorites. There are other considerations. A space habitat parked in open space in orbit around the Sun would have a constant source of energy, without shadows or eclipses, without day or night. Having a constant source of energy is a big step towards solving the other needs like air, water, etc. If there is abundant, clean, cheap, renewable energy, recycling the air and water is a minor problem. This can be achieved without any problem by parking a habitat in orbit around the Sun.

#### Space Colonization is too expensive

Globus 4-29-11 Al Globus is on the National Space Society Board of Directors- Astrobiology [“Space Settlement Basics” http://settlement.arc.nasa.gov/Basics/wwwwh.html]

Space colonization is extraordinarily expensive because launch vehicles are difficult to manufacture and operate. For example, the current (2004) cost to put an individual into orbit for a short time is about $20 million. To enable large scale space tourism by the middle class, this cost must be reduced to about $1,000-$10,000, a factor of 3 to 4 orders of magnitude. Space tourism has launch requirements similar to space settlement suggesting that a radical improvement in manufacturing technology may be necessary to enable space colonization. Note that current launch costs vary from $2,000-$14,000 per pound for operational vehicles. One candidate for a major improvement in manufacturing technology is molecular nanotechnology. An important branch of nanotechnology is concerned with developing diamonoid mechanosynthesis. This means building things out of diamond-like materials, placing each atom at a precise location (ignoring thermal motion). Diamond is 69 times stronger than titanium for the same weight and is much stiffer. If spacecraft were made of diamonoid materials rather than aluminum, they could be much lighter allowing more payload. For an excellent analysis applying nanotechnology to space development, see McKendree 1995 Diamond mechanosythesis may enable a radical transportation system that could allow millions of people to go to orbit each year -- an orbital tower. An orbital tower is a structure extending from the Earth's surface into orbit. To build an orbital tower, start construction at geosynchronous orbit. Extend the tower down towards Earth and upwards at the same rate. this keeps the center-of-mass at geosynchronous orbit so the tower stays over one point on the Earth's surface. Extend the tower all the way to the surface and attach it. then an elevator on the tower can move people and materials to and fromorbit at very low cost. There are many practical problems with orbital towers, but they may be feasible. An orbital tower is in tension so it won't collapse, but it must be very strong or it will break. The point of greatest strain is at geosynchronous orbit, so an orbital tower must be thickest at that point. The ratio of the diameter of the tower between geosynchronous orbit and the ground is called the taper factor. For steel, the taper factor is greater than 10,000 making a steel orbital tower completely impractical. However, for diamonoid materials the taper factor is 21.9 with a safety factor to McKendree 1995 . thus a diamonoid orbital tower 1 meter thick at the ground would be only 22 meters thick at geosynchronous orbit. Fullerene nanotechnology, using carbon nanotubes, may be even better than diamonoid allowing a smaller taper factor. Calculations suggest that the materials necessary for construction of such an orbital tower would require one asteroid with a radius between one and two kilometers. These calculations assume the tower is built from diamonoid material with a density of 4 g/cm^3 and the asteroid has a density of 1.8 g/cm^3 and is 3% carbon.

#### Space Colonization impossible- nowhere could support us

Skiles 9-3-09 Marcus Skiles is a writer of many articles in Helium- Helium [“Should Humans Colonize Space?” http://www.helium.com/items/1568809-should-humans-colonize-space]

Hawking presented his argument that this goal would be possible if the human race were to set aside one quarter of a percent of global GDP (Gross Domestic Product). The United States alone would have a share of 35 billion dollars a year, which is more than twice the current budget of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). He also argues that a new manned space-flight program would increase public enthusiasm about space and science in general. However, many in the scientific community are opposed to spending large sums of money on space, when scientific advancements could be more useful here on Earth. In addition, those against the idea of space colonization believe that it is not even possible, as all the planets in our solar system have problems that make it impossible to live on them currently. For example, the moon has no atmosphere, Venus is too hot, and Mars is too cool and has too thin of an atmosphere. Hawking disregards these claims, declaring that an immediate launch of a colonization program could have a moon base established in a few decades, and have humans on Mars by mid-century. He does admit, however, that it would be impossible to reach this goal with current technology, so he encourages the youth of the world to take an interest in science through his lectures and books. A few experts believe that Mars would be the best place to colonize first, seeing as how it contains the one element essential to life-water. However, there are no firm plans to colonize anytime soon, as NASA officials say that not enough is known about the long-term effects of space flight or radiation in space. In addition, a single human mission to Mars or anywhere else in the solar system is estimated to cost $10-$50 billion dollars or more.

### \*\*\*extensions\*\*\*

### Can’t Do It

#### Traveling to Colonialize Space would be harmful

Page 4-8-11 Lewis Page is a writer for the A Register- The A Register [“Deep=space travel bad for astronauts tickers, say boffins” http://www.theregister.co.uk/2011/04/08/deep\_space\_ticker\_risk/]

Deep-space travel could be bad for the heart, report boffins. This has been established by blasting mice with an ion beam from a powerful atom-smasher, causing the luckless murines to develop artery damage of the sort that might result from exposure to powerful cosmic space radiation. "Cosmic radiation is very different from X-rays and other radiation found on Earth," says Dr Dennis Kucik, pathology prof. "The radiation risks of deep-space travel are difficult to predict, largely because so few people have been exposed." In fact the only people who have ever travelled beyond the Earth's protective magnetic fields are the 24 US astronauts who landed on or orbited the Moon during the Apollo missions of the 1960s and 70s. It's pretty difficult to draw any conclusions from what happens among such a a small group: but Kucik and his colleagues nonetheless suspected for other reasons that one particular type of cosmic radiation - to wit, the hail of high-energy iron ions which permeates space beyond Earth orbit - could have noticeable health effects once more people go into deep space for longer periods. The scientists thought that iron ions might cause thickening of artery walls, aka atherosclerosis. In order to test this hypothesis they needed ideally to send some test mice into deep space, but this would naturally be expensive and time-consuming. However, it is possible to generate iron-ion radiation of the sort found out in the big black here on Earth, by using a powerful particle accelerator. Accordingly Kucik and his colleagues placed a group of mice in a beam of high-velocity iron ions blasted out of a suitable atom-smasher at the Brookhaven lab in New York\*. They found that the ion bombardment did indeed cause negative health effects of the sort expected. "At 13 weeks it was surprising and quite remarkable that we already could see permanent damage — an irreversible thickening of the artery wall where it had been exposed to radiation," says Kucik's fellow boffin Janusz Kabarowski. The scientists say that high-velocity iron ions are a particular headache for spacecraft and space-suit designers. Other kinds of space radiation can be blocked using shielding: for instance quite thin lead sheets will stop X-rays. But when iron ions hit metallic shields, they can generate secondary radiation on the other side which may be just as bad. When and if deep-space exploration begins - at the moment US aspirations appear to have slipped back into the 2020s for this - studies like Kucik and Kabarowski's will feed into the design of the ships and the preventive health measures used to protect the astronauts.

#### Space colonies will be reliant on Earth

Globus, 02 (Dr. Ruth Globus, NASA Ames Research Center. “Space Settlements: A Design Study” Chapter 3 - Human Needs In Space. http://www.nas.nasa.gov/About/Education/SpaceSettlement/75SummerStudy/Chapt3.html)

For communities of 10,000 people there is little hope of achieving self-sufficiency as measured by lack or absence of trade. There have been studies of sociology, economics, and geography which indicate the degree to which various specialities can be sustained. Colin Clark, one of the world's distinguished students of economic organizations, reports (ref. 45) that cities need populations of 100,000 to 200,000 in order to provide "an adequate range of commercial services....". Moreover, populations of 200,000 to 500,000 are required to support broadly-based manufacturing activity. A small settlement in space, of less than 100,000 people, would necessarily require continuing support from Earth. There is little possibility that such a settlement can be sustained without a steady and sizable movement of materials and information between Earth and the colony. Because of high demands on material productivity, ordinary business services such as banking, insurance, bookkeeping, inventory control, and purchasing would very likely remain on Earth. Management of the transportation system, and sales and delivery of products would be Earth based. The highly technological and specialized services of medicine, higher education and even of those branches of science and engineering not used in the day-to-day life of the colony would come from Earth. A community of 10,000 cannot conceivably support a large research university or a large medical center. Communities of this size on Earth do not encompass much social and cultural variety, and their major productive activities are usually limited in kind and number. To point up the lack of diversity that may reasonably be expected, consider how many and what variety of religious organizations and sects might be expected in a space colony of size 10,000. Economies of scale for communities suggest an optimal size well above that of the early settlement in space.

### Planet X Fake

#### Planet X is just another example of the publics inability to see things anyway but their own

Morrison, senior scientist at the NASA Astrobiology Institute, NASA Ames Research Center, 8(David, a space scientist at NASA Ames Research Center and interim director of NASA's new Lunar Science Institute, yousaytoo, “Another Hoax: Planet X Nibiru?”, 11/7/8, <http://www.yousaytoo.com/rdy/another-hoax-planet-x-nibiru/13831>, accessed 6/28/11, CW)

The scoop: Conspiracy theorists are convinced a rogue planet will destroy the Earth in 2012, and movie makers are already trying to cash in on the hysteria. An astrobiologist calls for a reality check Unbeknownst to most of us, a small but vocal group of conspiracy theorists is convinced that a rogue planet is about to enter the inner solar system and doom the Earth They say that this threatening planet on a 3600-year orbit was discovered by the ancient Mesopotamians, who named it Nibiru, and it was known also to the Mayans, who associated it with the end of their calendar "long count" in December 2012. In Web sites, blogs, and radio talk shows, they insist that NASA is tracking Nibiru -- but that this information is being kept from the public as part of a worldwide conspiracy. They say the official silence can't be maintained for much longer, however, because by 2009 Nibiru will be visible to the naked eye from the southern hemisphere. They also say Earth's axis is already tilting and the length of the day is changing under its influence. As one believer recently wrote to me, "Why are you lying. It's coming, and everyone knows it**.** I began to receive questions about this bizarre story in December 2007 through NASA's "Ask an Astrobiologist" site. Normally I receive up to a dozen questions per week from the public, dealing mostly with life in the universe -- but in the past 6 months the Nibiru traffic alone has grown to 20-25 messages a week, ranging from the anguished "I can't sleep," "I am really scared" or "I don't want to die" to the abusive "you are putting my family at risk" and "if NASA denies it then it must be true. As a scientist, I'm both fascinated and astonished by the deluge of questions from people who are genuinely frightened and, apparently, unable to distinguish astronomical fact from fiction. They're watching YouTube videos and visiting slick Web sites with nothing in their skeptical toolkit, or to quote Carl Sagan no "baloney detector." Now a blockbuster disaster film called "2012" is set for release in the summer of 2009, and the commercial enterprise is clearly trying to cash in on people's concern (perhaps contributing to their fear as well) My guess is that only a tiny fraction of people truly believes that Armageddon is coming in December 2012. But their uncritical acceptance of this story worries me as a warning of the dangers of our current scientific illiteracy We're facing monumental problems with global warming and loss of habitat, yet a substantial minority of Americans thinks the world was formed less than 10,000 years ago and deny that evolution is possible. Many Americans seem to prefer coal-fired generators to nuclear power plants without realizing the toll in public health that coal imposes. Billions are spent, including tax-payer dollars, for so-called alternative medicine with no scientific evidence for its efficacy. And legislators often resist efforts to collect the data that could actually demonstrate which government programs are effective and which ones don't work as intended.In spite of my frustrations, I can always hope that Nibiru will turn into a teaching moment. Its proponents are convinced that it will be visible to the unaided eye this coming spring, and its effects on the rotation and orbit of the Earth will be obvious by summer(just in time for the release of the film "2012"). When none of this happens, I hope they'll realize that they need better tools to distinguish fact from fiction But maybe they won't One of funniest things about this Nibiru story is that it is a rerun -- there was a big Internet concern that Nibiru would destroy the Earth in May of 2003. Something tells me this didn't happen, yet now the same myth is resurrected. Are we condemned to suffer a Nibiru scare every decade in this century, or will people come to their senses?

### A2- Mars Colonization

#### Humans couldn’t survive on Mars

Klerkx 2004 (Greg, senior manager of the SETI Institute. Lost in Space: The Fall of NASA and the Dream of a New Space Age, p. 283-284)

If you were to be lifted straight from the comfort of your living room and dropped onto the surface of Mars, the only upside is that you probably wouldn’t remain conscious long enough to fully register your fatal predicament. Unless you were sitting in your living room wearing Antarctic survival gear, you would most likely go into thermal shock almost immediately: the average temperature on Mars is about minus 82 degrees Fahrenheit. Even if you could stay warm enough, you wouldn’t be able to breathe. Unlike Earth’s atmosphere (a comfy mix of about 78 percent nitrogen, 20 percent oxygen and a smattering of other gases) the Martian mix is pure poison for humans: about 95 percent carbon dioxide with a bit of nitrogen and trace elements thrown in. There’s also the problem of atmospheric pressure, Mars doesn’t have any, at least not compared to Earth’s, which means that being on the surface of Mars without a pressurized space suit or spacecraft is only marginally better than being naked in the vacuum of space. Humans have been built to order for Earth’s atmospheric pressure: too much pressure, and our body’s all-important cavities and passageways (which allow us to respire and circulate blood and other fluids) get compacted. Too little pressure and everything expands, which is why creatures adapted to life in the crushing pressure of the deep ocean literally explode when brought to the surface. An unprotected human body on Mars would face a situation somewhat less dramatic than that of a relocated deep-sea creature, but you might find yourself wishing for such a quick and explosive demise, since the end result would be similar—it would just take a little longer. So here’s the summary: dropped unprepared onto the surface of Mars, you’d go into thermal shock, inhale lungfuls of poison, begin to feel extreme unpleasantness in your insides (that would be your blood beginning to boil in the super-low atmospheric pressure) and die within a few minutes. And have no illusion that you would be found in a well-preserved state sometime in the future by better-prepared Martian explorers. Adding insult to injury, the ultraviolent radiation hitting the surface of Mars (unimpeded by any ozone layer, as it is on Earth) would quickly char your corpse black. Soon afterward, your body would mummify as its liquid was sucked away by the near-vacuum Martian atmosphere.

#### No chance of Mars atmosphere – Solar wind proves

Darnell Clayton, Writer for Colony Worlds, Is Terraforming Mars Impossible?, Christian Science Monitor, May 10, 2010, Date Accessed: 7/11/11, http://www.csmonitor.com/Science/Cool-Astronomy/2010/0510/Is-terraforming-Mars-impossible

It looks like humanities hope of turning Mars into a second Earth may never translate into reality thanks in part to the red planet’s lack of a magnetic field. Scientists have discovered that our Sun’s solar radiation may thwart all attempts at increasing the atmospheric pressure of the crimson world, which means we may never get the chance of witnessing a green Mars, let alone a blue one. (Discovery News) Scientists have identified a sort of double-whammy solar super wave that is responsible for blowing away air from Mars and keeping its atmosphere thin, frigid and downright inhospitable for any possible future travelers. The waves happen when one stream of solar wind is overrun and amped up by another, faster gale of solar particles. That creates a flying traffic jam of particles that slam into Mars as one large pulse. [...] When Edberg and his colleagues compared these events at Mars to the flow of heavier atoms blowing past Mars Express, they discovered that fully a third of Martian air loss happens during the 15 percent of the time when doubled-up solar wind pulses hit the planet. Although this means that Mars may never become a second eden (unless we can create a global magnetic field), it does not mean that humanity will never settle the planet en mass.

#### Chemicals Make Mars Uninhabitable

University of Michigan Paper (Written by Atreya, and Delory, co authors of both papers, Farrell and Nilton Renno and Ah-San Wong, (University of Michigan), Steven Cummer (Duke University, Durham, N.C.), Davis Sentman (University of Alaska), John Marshall (SETI Inst., Mountain View, Calif.), Scot Rafkin (Southwest Research Institute, San Antonio, Texas) and David Catling (University of Washington). The research was funded by NASA's Mars Fundamental Research Program and NASA Goddard internal institutional funds, Mars surface probably can't support life, July 31, 2006, Date Accessed: 7/14/11, http://www.astrobiology.com/news/viewpr.html?pid=20516

The first Astrobiology paper calculated the excess carbon monoxide, hydroxyl and eventually hydrogen atoms produced when electric fields generated by dust devils and storms cause carbon dioxide and water molecules to split. Hydrogen and hydroxyl have been known to play a key role in the production of hydrogen peroxide in the Martian atmosphere. UCLA-Berkeley's Gregory Delory, senior fellow at the Space Sciences Laboratory, is first author, with co-authors Atreya and William Farrell of NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center, in Greenbelt, Maryland. That paper is called "Oxidant Enhancement in Martian Dust Devils and Storms: Storm Electric Fields and Electron Dissociative Attachment." Atreya's team then calculated that the amounts of hydrogen peroxide produced during these reactions would be large enough to result in its condensation---essentially hydrogen peroxide would snow from the sky and contaminate the planet when it fell. Atreya's paper suggests that the hydrogen peroxide would scavenge organic material from Mars, and it could also accelerate the loss of methane on Mars, requiring a larger source to explain the recent detection of this gas on Mars. "Methane is a metabolic byproduct of life as we know it, but presence of methane does not by itself imply existence of life on a planet", said Atreya.

#### Life on Mars isn’t possible – New research proves

University of Michigan Paper (Written by Atreya, and Delory, co authors of both papers, Farrell and Nilton Renno and Ah-San Wong, (University of Michigan), Steven Cummer (Duke University, Durham, N.C.), Davis Sentman (University of Alaska), John Marshall (SETI Inst., Mountain View, Calif.), Scot Rafkin (Southwest Research Institute, San Antonio, Texas) and David Catling (University of Washington). The research was funded by NASA's Mars Fundamental Research Program and NASA Goddard internal institutional funds, Mars surface probably can't support life, July 31, 2006, Date Accessed: 7/14/11, http://www.astrobiology.com/news/viewpr.html?pid=20516

The question of whether the planet Mars can support life has entranced lay people and scientists for years. New research suggests that dust devils and storms on Mars produce oxidants that would render the planet's surface uninhabitable for life as we know it. "As a consequence, any nascent life (microorganisms, for example) or even prebiotic molecules would find if hard to get a foothold on the surface of Mars, as the organic material would be scavenged efficiently by the surface oxidants," said Sushil Atreya, University of Michigan professor in the Department of Atmospheric Oceanic and Space Sciences. Atreya is lead author on one of two papers published last month in the journal Astrobiology that discuss the findings. Atreya's paper: "Oxidant Enhancement in Martian Dust Devils and Storms: Implications for Life and Habitability." The research for both papers was conducted by the U-M Department of Atmospheric Oceanic and Space Sciences, NASA Goddard Space Flight Center and the University of California, Berkley, with several other universities and institutes participating. The results also explain inconsistencies in earlier space experiments that sought to determine if Mars had or did support life. Mars is thought to have formed with the same ingredients that on Earth led to the formation of molecules associated with life. Yet, organic molecules have never been detected on Mars' surface, Atreya said.

### A2- Overview Effect

#### The overview effect disproven—time, psychology, and apathy prove

Okushi and Dudley-Flores 2007 -Jun Okushi, NASA-trained space architect, 2 decades of experience in space development, former NASA grant research student, co developer of the International Space Station. Marilyn Dudley-Flores, policy analyst and space policy expert http://www.astrosociology.com/Library/PDF/Contributions/Space%202007%20Articles/Space%20and%20Perceptions.pdf

The average human being has not experienced the view from space on a personal basis, although these pictures from space have been around for upwards to 40 years. Subsequent years have brought more space missions, both human and robotic, with fabulous imagery. Robotically, we have stood on the ground on Mars, we have seen up close mighty impacts on Jupiter, the rings of Saturn, and towering dune fields on Titan. We have even seen the great columns of hydrogen clouds spanning light years that are the incubation places of stars and looked back in time toward the very birth of the Cosmos. Why haven’t the peoples of the Earth been subsumed by this overwhelming experience of viewing things in space and the world from the space? Why haven’t they beaten their swords into plow shares, held hands and sang Kum Bah Yah, and turned their attention to turning the tide against global warming, a fairly immediate threat as time is kept over generations that can kill more people than all of the wars of the Earth put together? A. Searching for Answers A clue to this enigma lies in a prediction that failed to come true that was made by Sir Arthur C. Clarke in his novel 2061: Odyssey 3 (1987, p. 4). 6 In the story, the Earth had become relatively peaceful once everyone had access to free long-distance telephone calling service. With the Internet and the quality of communications technology today, we can make free long-distance telephone calls. At least those of us who can access, can operate, and can afford the technology can make those calls. One can be in London and make a phone call to someone in Peshawar and the other party sounds like he is speaking from the next room. But, there are still wars, India and Pakistan might yet fight a limited nuclear exchange, and the large part of Earth’s population hasn’t yet caught on to the impending devastation of global warming. What is the problem? The answer to that has to do with the inadequacy of the delivery systems of these images from space and to the fact that studies of how humans comprehend spatial and other types of relationships on the ground, in space, and across cultures are still in the infancy of synthesis and application. Lack of political will is another problem. In An Inconvenient Truth, both the documentary and the book, 7 Albert Gore also spoke of the “backburner” attitude that his American congressional colleagues demonstrated when he gave them slide shows about global warming. The problems on the radarscreens of congressional constituents were more immediate so their representatives did not move to act to hammer out legislation to help offset the more overwhelming planetary issue. Sitting in the gravity well of the Earth, with some people being able to see pretty pictures from space, and with some people being able to talk to other people cheaply at a distance still hasn’t communicated the gravity of our situation. The planetary situation awareness of the average person is poor. It isn’t very real to most people that Earth is a planet in space, that it is in danger from global warming, and that seeing it from space helps us assess the condition of the planet and provides us with direction how to keep it livable

#### The Overview Effect is not supported by scientific evidence.

Bainbridge 2006- Co-Director of Human-Centered Computing at the National Science Foundation has served as at Professor in the Department of Sociology at the University of Washington, Illinois State University, and Towson University <http://mysite.verizon.net/wsbainbridge/system/goals.pdf>

Several of the Idealistic goals assert that space travel gives a new perspective to the astronauts who look back at Earth from afar and to those Earth-bound enthusiasts who participate vicariously in voyages beyond our world. From the viewpoint of space, we see ourselves, our nations, and our planet in a new light. In a recent book, Frank White (1987) reports that astronauts commonly experience **“**the overview effect,” a radical shift in consciousness achieved by seeing the Earth as a unity and from outside the traditional limits of human experience. He documents this thesis with material from a number of interviews, but unfortunately his data collection and theoretical analysis were not conducted in a manner that social scientists would consider systematic. Furthermore, although White considers “consciousness” to be the essential ingredient of any culture, he does not draw upon any of the standard literature on this conceptually slippery topic. Yet, his hypothesis that from the new world-view offered by space

#### The Overview Effect is just an attempt of pro space activists to pursue control of the planet

Dickens and Ormrod 07’-Peter Affiliated Lecturer in the Department of Sociology at the University of Cambridge, Visiting Professor of Sociology at the University of Essex, James S. Teaching Fellow in Sociology at the University of Essex, holds a Ph.D. in Sociology from the University of Essex (“Outer Space and Internal Nature: Towards a Sociology of the Universe,” Sociology, Volume 41, Number 4, August

There are strong indications that these pro-space activists are amongst those most affected by late modern narcissism. Early on in life, these activists come to project infantile unconscious fantasies (those relating to omnipotence and fusion with the infant’s ‘universe’) into conscious fantasies about exploring and developing space, which increasingly seem a possibility and which now achieve legitimacy largely through the ideology of the libertarian right. Those who have grown up in the ‘post-Sputnik’ era and were exposed at an early date to science fiction are particularly likely to engage in fantasies or daydreams about travelling in space, owning it, occupying it, consuming it and bringing it under personal control. Advocates talk about fantasies of bouncing up and down on the moon or playing golf on it, of mining asteroids or setting up their own colonies. These fantasies serve to protect the unconscious fantasy that they are still in the stage of infantile narcissism. Of course not all of those people growing up in late modern societies come to fantasize about space at such an early age like this, and are less single minded in their attempts to control and consume the universe, but we argue that this is nonetheless the way in which some dominant sectors of Western society relate to the universe. It is not only pro-space activists, but many well-to-do businesspeople and celebrities who are lining up to take advantage of new commercial opportunities to explore space as tourists. The promise of power over the whole universe is therefore the latest stage in the escalation of the narcissistic personality. A new kind of ‘universal man’ is in the making. Space travel and possible occupation of other planets further inflates people’s sense of omnipotence. [end page 615] Fromm (1976) discusses how in Western societies people experience the world (or indeed the universe) through the ‘having’ mode, whereby individuals cannot simply appreciate the things around them, but must own and consume them. For the narcissistic pro-space activist, this sentiment means that they feel a desperate need to bring the distant objects of outer space under their control: Some people will look up at the full moon and they’ll think about the beauty of it and the romance and history and whatever. I’ll think of some of those too but the primary thing on my mind is gee I wonder what it looks like up there in that particular area, gee I’d love to see that myself. I don’t want to look at it up there, I want to walk on it. (25-year-old engineering graduate interviewed at ProSpace March Storm 2004) Omnipotent daydreaming of this kind is also closely linked to the idea of regaining a sense of wholeness and integration once experienced with the mother (or ‘monad’) in the stage of primary narcissism, counterposed to a society that is fragmenting and alienating. Experiencing weightlessness and seeing the Earth from space are other common fantasies. Both represent power, the ability to ‘break the bonds of gravity’, consuming the image of the Earth (Ingold, 1993; Szersynski and Urry, 2006) or ‘possessing’ it through gazing at it (Berger, 1972). They also represent a return to unity. Weightlessness represents the freedom from restraint experienced in pre-oedipal childhood, and perhaps even a return to the womb (Bainbridge, 1976: 255). Seeing the Earth from space is an experience in which the observer witnesses a world without borders. This experience has been dubbed ‘the overview effect’ based on the reported life-changing experiences of astronauts (see White, 1987). Humans’ sense of power in the universe means our experience of the cosmos and our selves is fundamentally changing: It really presents a different perspective on your life when you can think that you can actually throw yourself into another activity and transform it, and when we have a day when we look out in the sky and we see lights on the moon, something like that or you think that I know a friend who’s on the other side of the Sun right now. You know, it just changes the nature of looking at the sky too. (46-year-old space scientist interviewed at ProSpace March Storm 2004) In the future, this form of subjectivity may well characterize more and more of Western society. A widespread cosmic narcissism of this kind might appear to have an almost spiritual nature, but the cosmic spirituality we are witnessing here is not about becoming immortal in the purity of the heavens. Rather, it is spirituality taking the form of self-worship; further aggrandizing the atomized, self-seeking, 21st-century individual (see Heelas, 1996). Indeed, the pro-space activists we interviewed are usually opposed to those who would keep outer space uncontaminated, a couple suggesting we need to confront the pre-Copernican idea of a corrupt Earth and ideal ‘Heaven’. [end page 616] For these cosmic narcissists, the universe is very much experienced as an object; something to be conquered, controlled and consumed as a reflection of the powers of the self. This vision is no different to the Baconian assumptions about the relationship between man and nature on Earth. This kind of thinking has its roots in Anaxagoras’ theory of a material and infinite universe, and was extended by theorists from Copernicus, through Kepler and Galileo to Newton. The idea that the universe orients around the self was quashed by Copernicus as he showed the Earth was not at the centre of the universe and that therefore neither were we (Freud, 1973: 326). However, science has offered us the promise that we can still understand and control it. Robert Zubrin, founder of the Mars Society, trumpets Kepler’s role in developing the omniscient fantasy of science (it was Kepler who first calculated the elliptical orbits of the planets around the Sun): Kepler did not describe a model of the universe that was merely appealing – he was investigating a universe whose causal relationships could be understood in terms of a nature knowable to man. In so doing, Kepler catapulted the status of humanity in the universe. Though no longer residing at the centre of the cosmos, humanity, Kepler showed, could comprehend it. Therefore […] not only was the universe within man’s intellectual reach, it was, in principle, within physical reach as well. (Zubrin with Wagner, 1996: 24) Thus Zubrin begins to lay out his plan to colonize Mars.

### Can’t Do It

#### Traveling to Colonialize Space would be harmful

Page 4-8-11 Lewis Page is a writer for the A Register- The A Register [“Deep=space travel bad for astronauts tickers, say boffins” http://www.theregister.co.uk/2011/04/08/deep\_space\_ticker\_risk/]

Deep-space travel could be bad for the heart, report boffins. This has been established by blasting mice with an ion beam from a powerful atom-smasher, causing the luckless murines to develop artery damage of the sort that might result from exposure to powerful cosmic space radiation. "Cosmic radiation is very different from X-rays and other radiation found on Earth," says Dr Dennis Kucik, pathology prof. "The radiation risks of deep-space travel are difficult to predict, largely because so few people have been exposed." In fact the only people who have ever travelled beyond the Earth's protective magnetic fields are the 24 US astronauts who landed on or orbited the Moon during the Apollo missions of the 1960s and 70s. It's pretty difficult to draw any conclusions from what happens among such a a small group: but Kucik and his colleagues nonetheless suspected for other reasons that one particular type of cosmic radiation - to wit, the hail of high-energy iron ions which permeates space beyond Earth orbit - could have noticeable health effects once more people go into deep space for longer periods. The scientists thought that iron ions might cause thickening of artery walls, aka atherosclerosis. In order to test this hypothesis they needed ideally to send some test mice into deep space, but this would naturally be expensive and time-consuming. However, it is possible to generate iron-ion radiation of the sort found out in the big black here on Earth, by using a powerful particle accelerator. Accordingly Kucik and his colleagues placed a group of mice in a beam of high-velocity iron ions blasted out of a suitable atom-smasher at the Brookhaven lab in New York\*. They found that the ion bombardment did indeed cause negative health effects of the sort expected. "At 13 weeks it was surprising and quite remarkable that we already could see permanent damage — an irreversible thickening of the artery wall where it had been exposed to radiation," says Kucik's fellow boffin Janusz Kabarowski. The scientists say that high-velocity iron ions are a particular headache for spacecraft and space-suit designers. Other kinds of space radiation can be blocked using shielding: for instance quite thin lead sheets will stop X-rays. But when iron ions hit metallic shields, they can generate secondary radiation on the other side which may be just as bad. When and if deep-space exploration begins - at the moment US aspirations appear to have slipped back into the 2020s for this - studies like Kucik and Kabarowski's will feed into the design of the ships and the preventive health measures used to protect the astronauts.

#### Space colonies will be reliant on Earth

Globus, 02 (Dr. Ruth Globus, NASA Ames Research Center. “Space Settlements: A Design Study” Chapter 3 - Human Needs In Space. http://www.nas.nasa.gov/About/Education/SpaceSettlement/75SummerStudy/Chapt3.html)

For communities of 10,000 people there is little hope of achieving self-sufficiency as measured by lack or absence of trade. There have been studies of sociology, economics, and geography which indicate the degree to which various specialities can be sustained. Colin Clark, one of the world's distinguished students of economic organizations, reports (ref. 45) that cities need populations of 100,000 to 200,000 in order to provide "an adequate range of commercial services....". Moreover, populations of 200,000 to 500,000 are required to support broadly-based manufacturing activity. A small settlement in space, of less than 100,000 people, would necessarily require continuing support from Earth. There is little possibility that such a settlement can be sustained without a steady and sizable movement of materials and information between Earth and the colony. Because of high demands on material productivity, ordinary business services such as banking, insurance, bookkeeping, inventory control, and purchasing would very likely remain on Earth. Management of the transportation system, and sales and delivery of products would be Earth based. The highly technological and specialized services of medicine, higher education and even of those branches of science and engineering not used in the day-to-day life of the colony would come from Earth. A community of 10,000 cannot conceivably support a large research university or a large medical center. Communities of this size on Earth do not encompass much social and cultural variety, and their major productive activities are usually limited in kind and number. To point up the lack of diversity that may reasonably be expected, consider how many and what variety of religious organizations and sects might be expected in a space colony of size 10,000. Economies of scale for communities suggest an optimal size well above that of the early settlement in space.

#### Statistics prove – you’re an idiot if you think asteroids will kill us.

Everitt ‘8[James Everitt, energy and environment organizer for Pickens Plan; “If an asteroid hit the earth?” published 12/20/2008; <http://push.pickensplan.com/video/2187034:Video:1691581>; Jay]

[A computer video](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2008/12/27/watch-if-an-asteroid-hit_n_153724.html) circulating the internet has rekindled fears that an asteroid will hit Earth and send mankind the way of the brontosaurus. Based on NASA projections, there is indeed a chance that such an asteroid will impact Earth in the next year. **It is 1 in 2,518,072** This number is derived from [NASA calculations](http://neo.jpl.nasa.gov/risk) of the likelihood of a strike by any one of the six substantial Near-Earth Objects (NEOs) whose current course could intersect our planet's in 2009. The most likely of the bunch, an NEO named 2008 AO112, alone has a 1 in 4,000,000 chance of impacting Earth. In other words, there's a 99.999975% chance the thing will miss us. By comparison, in the new year, based on [recent National Safety Council data](http://www.nsc.org/research/odds.aspx), chances are less that you will be killed by an asteroid than by the following: Motor vehicle accident: 1 in 6,539 Exposure to noxious substances: 1 in 12,554 Assault by firearm: 1 in 24,005 Accidental drowning: 1 in 82,777 Exposure to smoke, fire or flames: 1 in 92,745 Exposure to forces of nature (lightning, flood, storms, etc.): 1 in 136,075 **Falling out of bed** or off other furniture: 1 in 329,819 Choking on food: 1 in 343,179 Air and space transport accidents: 1 in 502,554 Exposure to electric current, radiation, temperature, and pressure: 1 in 705,969 Being bitten, stung or crushed by another person or animal: 1 in 1,841,659 Chances You'll Be Killed by an Asteroid in 2009! Conclusion: It would be statistically unwise to sell your home (your chances of selling it aside) and use the proceeds for a pre-asteroid splurge in the tropics. Alternatively, if you are considering fleeing Earth, you are more likely to die by spacecraft accident than by asteroid. And if you do so anyway, given the chance of being bitten, stung or crushed by another person or animal, your chances are even worse if you bring company.

#### Space Debris can’t be cleared. Too much heritage value

Alice C. Gorman 2005 (Lecturer from Flinders University in Adelaide, Australia, Co-organizer of the session [*Critical Technologies: the Making of the Modern World*](http://www.spacearchaeology.org/wiki/index.php?title=Critical_Technologies:_the_Making_of_the_Modern_World)*)*, Academia.edu, “The Archaeology of Orbital Space”, http://flinders.academia.edu/AliceGorman/Papers/77163/The\_archaeology\_of\_orbital\_space

If space objects are considered as isolated artifacts, then their cultural heritage value inheres in their physical characteristics. This value may be considered to be intact if the object is intact, even though removed from its original location. However, the question alters significantly if we include the relationship of the artifact to other artifacts and to its physical location. In this case, its significance is assessed as part of a cultural landscape. This question hinges on the importance of place. Rather than regarding spacecraft and orbital debris as unrelated objects in an empty substrate, they can also be regarded as related by location, history and function. They are not separate from the space they inhabit, but part of it. They form a new kind of cultural landscape.