### UQ

#### Wont pass - massive delays over “path to citizenship”

CSM 3-28 (“'Path to citizenship' roils immigration reform. But what is it, exactly?”, http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/DC-Decoder/2013/0328/Path-to-citizenship-roils-immigration-reform.-But-what-is-it-exactly/%28page%29/2)

Immigration advocates demand it. Conservative immigration reformers say it's not happening. The very mention of it freaks out Sen. Rand Paul.¶ It’s the most politically-explosive issue in the ongoing immigration reform debate – but what is a “path to citizenship,” anyway?¶ In short, the question of a pathway to citizenship asks whether the more than 10 million undocumented immigrants in the country can ever become US citizens.¶ The question today is largely what kind of route the currently undocumented would take to become citizens – a special path designed specifically for the current illegal population or the regular channels available to other potential immigrants.¶ Everyone agrees that a final bill won’t have any sort of deportation for the vast majority of the undocumented population. In the past, some hardliners on immigration hoped the federal government would either begin a deportation program or adopt policies making enforcement conditions so unbearable for those in the country illegally that they self-deport (as Mitt Romney put it).¶ Instead, both conservative and Democratic reformers from Sen. Marco Rubio (R) of Florida to President Obama and Rep. Luis Gutierrez (D) of Illinois believe the first step for immigration reform is putting undocumented people on a pathway to “legal status” in the US.¶ Want your top political issues explained? Get customized DC Decoder updates.¶ Whenever you hear a phrase similar to “bringing people out of the shadows,” you’re hearing a politician talking about a “probationary” period where the currently-illegal can work, get drivers licenses and generally live their lives with many of the responsibilities of US citizens but a diminished number of rights.¶ This isn’t a status conferred for free, however.¶ Those here illegally would have to hit eligibility criteria like paying a fine and taxes and passing a background check before they would be eligible for such a program. Lawmakers in both houses of Congress have said that those in this status will not be eligible for a slew of federal-benefits programs like welfare or SNAP, formerly known as food stamps. And, of course, they couldn’t vote. ¶ Moreover, everybody agrees that the undocumented who qualify for probationary legal status in the US will have to wait at least eight years before they can attempt to change their immigration status.¶ What happens next is the tricky part.¶ Republicans are opposed to allowing these people, at the end of their eight-year probation, a special path to obtaining green cards (formally known as becoming a “legal permanent resident”). The green card is the doorway to citizenship: Green card holders wait five years before applying to become US citizens.¶ ”It would be a travesty in my opinion to treat those who violated our laws to get here much better than those who have patiently waited their turn to come to the United States,” said Rep. Raul Labrador (R) of Idaho, a key GOP immigration negotiator, at a large gathering of conservative political activists in Maryland recently.¶ But Republicans, including Representative Labrador and Rep. Paul Ryan (R) of Wisconsin, agree that creating what Democrats call a “permanent underclass” of noncitizen residents of the US is undesirable.¶ Instead, Republicans want to channel the currently undocumented through a reformed legal immigration system.¶ Immigrant advocates point out the difficulties inherent in this approach, which requires each applicant to be sponsored by an employer or a family member. Currently, the US offers 1 million new green cards each year. That means it would take 50 years or longer for all the undocumented immigrants already in the country to reach citizenship. Broadening the current system to expedite those applications would be a tall, if not impossible, order, immigration advocates add.

### Won’t pass – Rushing

#### Rushing the bill is ruining it

The Examiner 3-28 (“Byron York: Democrats set to jam immigration reform through Senate”, http://washingtonexaminer.com/byron-york-democrats-set-to-jam-immigration-reform-through-senate/article/2525736)

Given the enormity of the changes that would result from comprehensive immigration reform, Senate Democrats wouldn't try to rush a bill through the Judiciary Committee before the public gets a chance to know what's in it -- would they?¶ In the past few days, even though proposed reform legislation from the so-called Gang of Eight hasn't even been written, there have been strong indications that that's exactly what Democrats intend to do.¶ More than a week ago, most of the Republican members of the committee wrote a letter to Chairman Patrick Leahy asking that the panel take its time considering a reform proposal. It took years, and a hundred hearings, and hundreds of witnesses, to reach an agreement when reform was last passed in the 1980s, the senators argued. This time, the committee shouldn't hurry a bill through committee in a few weeks.¶ Among other requests, the GOP senators asked for the chance to question Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano. The Judiciary Committee's last Homeland Security oversight hearing was in April 2012, they noted, and Napolitano still hasn't answered follow-up questions from that session. Now, especially since Napolitano has clearly voiced her opposition to GOP border security demands, it seems logical that she would appear before the committee considering reform.¶ The Republican letter carried a certain amount of weight because it was signed by six of the eight GOP members of the committee: ranking member Jeff Sessions, John Cornyn (the No. 2 Republican in the Senate), Orrin Hatch, Charles Grassley, Mike Lee and Ted Cruz. The other two Republicans on the committee, Lindsey Graham and Marco Rubio, are part of the Gang of Eight.¶ If the GOP lawmakers hoped to receive a quiet, well-reasoned response from Leahy, they were certainly disappointed. In a letter to Sessions laced with pique, personal invective and an unmistakable air of fuggedaboudit, Leahy told committee Republicans what they can do with their concerns.¶ First, he complained that Sessions had not spoken to him directly. Then he accused Sessions of grandstanding for the press. And then he complained about the way Republicans treated Democrats when the GOP held the Senate majority before 2007. And that was just in the first paragraph.¶ More substantially, Leahy suggested the Judiciary Committee has already done enough talking about immigration reform. There were lots of hearings on the subject back in 2006, he said, and a few in the past couple of months. Although there is no bill to evaluate yet -- "I regret that we do not have a legislative proposal before us," Leahy said -- the chairman strongly suggested he sees little need for further discussion.¶ So when the Gang of Eight bill is finished, Leahy declared, it will be considered "with all deliberate speed." After it is introduced in committee, Republicans will be allowed to delay consideration by one week (a standard prerogative of the minority party). After that, there will be no more hearings, no extended discussion of the bill's provisions. Voting on amendments and then a final committee vote will soon follow.¶ "I hope it is not your intention to discredit the process we undertake in the Judiciary Committee before we begin," Leahy wrote Sessions. "Artificial delays, delays for delays' sake [have] tainted too much of the Senate's work over the last few years."¶ Leahy's timetable left Republicans slack-jawed. Said one GOP aide: "The suggestion that you are going to create a new guest worker program, new border security protocols, new interior enforcement protocols, change worksite rules, future flow of immigrants, family migration, every category of visas, high-skill workers, low-skill workers, an entry system, an exit system, a tracking system, and on top of that consider the complex legal and economic concerns relating to legalizing an untold number of people who are currently here illegally ?-- the idea that you're going to do that in a couple of weeks is --" At that point, the aide stopped, unable to come up with a word to describe such an undertaking.

#### Political interest is not going to translate

AgriPulse 3-28 (“Congress faces ‘tall order' on immigration reform, Cantor says”, http://www.agri-pulse.com/Congress-faces-tall-order-on-immigration-reform,-Cantor-says-03282013.asp)

WASHINGTON, March 28, 2013 - Congress could approve a comprehensive immigration reform package - possibly containing a revised guest worker program - this year, but is considered a “tall order,” House Majority Leader Eric Cantor, R-Va., said today.¶ Speaking on Fox News, Cantor said there was a “lot of interest” to arrive at legislation that both parties could accept, but that any comprehensive package would be “tough to come by.”

### 1AR Link Turns

### 1AR

#### All of their arguments about other Dems backlashing STRENGTHEN our conservative Dem turns- angering the liberal base lets Landrieu and Begich differentiate themselves from the national party so they’ll feel more confident for 2014 and support Obama on things like immigration- PTR says they’re not on board yet and they are NECESSARY for passage- Heitkamp ev proves spillover is MOST LIKELY with the turn since they’re backlashing now whereas the environmental base would never do anything to hurt Obama

#### Here’s more ev supporting our *differentiation from the national party* arg

National Journal 1/23/2013 (Red-State Democrats' Reelection Playbook, http://www.nationaljournal.com/politics/red-state-democrats-reelection-playbook-20130123)

President Obama won't have to face voters again, but a handful of Democratic senators from conservative states will, and the president's agenda, newly stamped with a liberal imprimatur at the inauguration, could prove tricky for them to navigate.¶ How they go about doing that will require distancing themselves from the national Democratic Party and keeping their political antennae attuned to possible stumbling blocks in the Senate--what Democratic strategist Jim Manley calls a "yin and a yang equation."¶ "The yin is differentiation; the yang is also trying to avoid the minefield that the Republicans are going to lay for you on the floor of the Senate," he said.¶ One "minefield" issue is gun control, which for many of the vulnerable lawmakers is shaping up to be difficult to support. Obama will need their support, but it's far from certain that enough Democratic lawmakers would be willing to risk reelection to support the president's legislation.¶ "I refuse to believe that anyone in this day and age isn't taking their election cycle seriously," Manley said. That translates into a cautious approach.¶ Just look at the replies to gun control: Sen. Mary Landrieu of Louisiana pointed to her state's strong hunting culture and called for "balance." Sen. Tim Johnson of South Dakota said his state doesn't have the same problems with guns as New York or New Jersey, and he stressed that he was a hunter himself. Sen. Joe Manchin of West Virginia, who is not up for reelection until 2018, has become a leading voice in the gun-control debate since the Connecticut shooting, telling gun owners "that there is no way they are going to take your Second Amendment rights away."

#### The only people who don’t like the plan are hyper-liberals that would never abandon Obama- recent votes prove

Washington Guardian 2/20/2013 (Two Senate Democrats seek to end signature effort by Obama to make coal cleaner burning, renewing 'war on coal' allegations, http://www.washingtonguardian.com/ending-clean-coal)

The major climate bill introduced last week by two key liberal senators would not only impose carbon fees on major energy sources and oil refiners, it would also effectively end President Barack Obama's research and development into "clean coal."¶ The Energy Department's Office of Fossil Energy Research and Development would be eliminated under the Sustainable Energy Act introduced by Senate Environment and Public Works Chairman Barbara Boxer, D-Calif. and Sen. Bernie Sanders, I-Vt.¶ The office got about $560 million for its work in 2012 and Obama proposed putting $421 million toward its programs this fiscal year.¶ The Obama administration did not respond to a request for comment on the legislation, which isn't expected to pass Congress. Boxer has vowed to push the legislation through her committee this coming spring, however, in a move intended to force a renewed debate on climate change.¶ The elimination of the office was proposed by Sanders last year in the End Polluter Welfare Act bill, said his spokesman Mike Briggs. That bill would have terminated direct spending and tax provisions for fossil fuels. It did not advance beyond the introduction stage.¶ "The fossil fuel industry should be developing cleaner technologies to cut pollution, but this mature and profitable industry does not need government assistance," Briggs said.¶ In his last budget submission to Congress in early 2012, Obama said the Energy Department fossil fuel office "supports high-priority, high-risk research that will improve the nation's ability to use fossil energy resources cleanly, affordably, and efficiently."¶ The office was projected to spend $334 million last year on research into carbon capture, carbon storage, advanced coal-fired power generation, and other research and development.¶ The office is also directed to support the Interior Department and the Environmental Protection Agency programs to reduce environmental and health impacts from hydraulic fracturing of oil and gas reservoirs.¶ Boxer and Sanders would also eliminate spending in other programs and departments that goes to fossil fuel development and power generation. No funds for oil, coal or natural gas projects could be spent by the Energy Department's Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy grants program, the Agriculture Department's Rural Utility Service or the Transportation Department's Federal Railroad Administration under their proposal.

#### Link Goes One Way – Coal Interests Outweigh Environmental Concerns

By Brian Merchant November 2012 How Coal Trumps Climate in Washington http://motherboard.vice.com/blog/washington-fights-for-coal-amidst-deafening-climate-silence

Our fossil fueled climate problem is massively asymmetrical; in the ‘Pro-’ column you have the executives of the richest companies in the world, the politicians who benefit from their campaign contributions, and, as Hayes says, real live people who work in the industry and stand to lose their jobs if a coal plant shuts down. All of those folks have an intensely focused incentive to maintain the climate-altering status quo; also, some are richer and more influential than almost anyone else on the planet.¶ Here’s a fine example from today’s news, of the pro-fossil fuel complex in action. The Hill has a story headlined Inhofe starts pro-coal campaign tour for GOP Senate candidates:¶ Sen. James Inhofe (R-Okla.) is hitting the road to fire up support for GOP Senate candidates opposed to Obama administration rules on coal and other energy sources. ¶ Inhofe began his tour in Montana, where he touted Rep. Denny Rehberg’s (R-Mont.) coal credentials. Inhofe said the Montana Senate candidate would fight to keep the Corette power plant in Billings, Mont., open, while incumbent Sen. Jon Tester’s (D) support of the administration’s air pollution rules put the plant’s future in jeopardy … Inhofe is backing the candidates to bring GOP colleagues to the Senate to achieve one of his key legislative aims — curbing the administration’s environmental and air rules.¶ Inhofe is, of course, one of the largest recipients of coal and oil cash in the Senate. As so, in a year where extreme weather events, exacerbated by climate change, turned most of the nation into a disaster zone, Inhofe hops on his chariot and calls for more coal, more gas, more pollution. Unabashedly and with a straight face. There’s nothing to stop him.¶ See, the “Anti” fossil fuels contingent is a comparatively ragtag band of environmental activists,

#### FINISHING----

 concerned citizens, and progressive businesses that, while having made incredible use of their resources, are hopelessly outmanned and outgunned. They can catch the public’s eye with creative protests and passionate demonstrations, they can make every argument with the facts and the moral imperative on their side. But ultimately, they can only struggle to compete with the sheer capital amassed by the fossil fuel industry—they fund few reelection campaigns, their numbers appear too few, and they have, for the moment, been swept aside.

#### **The link is non-unique Obama is pro clean coal**

Sarah Battaglia, 3-6- 13 (“Clean Coal Could be the Solution to Global Warming”, Heyl and Patterson, http://info.heylpatterson.com/blog/bid/113777/Clean-Coal-Could-be-the-Solution-to-Global-Warming)

President Obama is already in complete support for the development of clean coal. In 2011, he declared his goal of generating 80 percent of the nation’s energy from clean sources, including clean coal. The following year, he summarized the “all-of-the-above” energy strategy, which also incorporated clean coal technologies.

#### Turn the Chamber of Commerce supports coal

Jeremy P. Jacobs and Manuel Quinones, 3-14-13 (“Congressional intent at issue as judges wrestle with EPA's Clean Water Act veto power”, E and E)

Skeptical appellate judges put tough questions today to both U.S. EPA and a major coal mining company as the two argued over the agency's 2007 Clean Water Act veto of a federal strip-mining permit issued by the Army Corps of Engineers for a sprawling West Virginia mine.¶ The stakes are high in the battle over Mingo Logan Coal Co.'s Spruce No. 1 mine -- one of the largest-ever mountaintop-removal mining projects -- as the mining company challenges one of EPA's most potent regulatory weapons, its Clean Water Act veto.¶ EPA's use of that veto in 2011 effectively revoked the 4-year-old mining permit issued under the George W. Bush administration. The agency cited its authority under the pollution law's Section 404, which empowers the EPA administrator to scrap a "specification" in a corps permit "whenever he determines" a potentially unacceptable environmental damage.¶ Mingo Logan's corporate parent, St. Louis-based Arch Coal Inc., challenged EPA's ability to take retroactive veto action and prevailed in a lower court.¶ EPA appealed the decision to a three-judge panel of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, where Judge Thomas Griffith today asked EPA why it used its veto power so many years after the permit had been issued.¶ "EPA came late," Griffith said. "Doesn't that create the instability that Congress wanted to avoid?"¶ He also asked whether EPA effectively negated the Army Corps' permitting authority.¶ Matthew Littleton of the Department of Justice replied, "There is no temporal limitation to EPA's authority."¶ At the time of the veto of the mining permit, the 13th time the agency had used the veto under the 1970 water pollution law, EPA said it was the first time it had used that authority retroactively. But in court documents filed later, the agency said it had taken retroactive action twice before.¶ EPA said it used retroactive vetoes in 1981 when it blocked a North Miami, Fla., plan to fill Biscayne Bay wetlands at the edge of a municipal garbage dump, and in 1992 to stop a permit to turn wetlands into a reservoir in James City County, Va. EPA contends that decision was later upheld by the Richmond, Va.-based 4th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals.¶ Littleton argued that Congress intended that EPA serve as an "environmental backstop" for the Army Corps and that the court should give EPA deference in its interpretation of Section 404.¶ The law intends that the corps and EPA collaborate on Section 404(c) permits, he added. "That balance of authority persists after the permit is issued," he said.¶ Littleton also said the effect of EPA's action -- the revoking of Arch's permit -- shouldn't influence the court. At issue, he said, is whether EPA had veto authority.¶ That sparked questions from Judge Karen Henderson, who didn't see the two issues as necessarily separate matters.¶ "I don't understand why we shouldn't look at the effect," she said.¶ Arch Coal attorney Robert Rolfe faced similarly aggressive queries as judges probed the meaning of technical language in the Clean Water Act.¶ Rolfe contended that EPA is only allowed to withdraw a "specification," meaning a condition on which a permit is issued, and only during the permitting process.¶ But Griffith acknowledged EPA has a "strong textural argument."¶ "That is exactly what the statute allows them to do," Griffith said, arguing that EPA vetoed a specification that in effect nullified the permit.¶ But Rolfe battled on.¶ "'Withdrawal' means withdrawal of a specification, not a permit. Congress used the term 'specification.' It did not use the term 'permit,'" he said.¶ "EPA certainly has a role" in permitting, he added. "But that role has to be exercised before the permit is issued."¶ Judge Brett Kavanaugh expressed reservation about whether there should be procedures for EPA and the corps to resolve permit issues, but he also appeared receptive to EPA's arguments.¶ "What Congress may have thought," he said, "is EPA may have been more sensitive to environmental issues, so let's make them a backstop."¶ Kavanaugh also noted that there is inherent instability in Section 404 permitting because the corps can modify, suspend or withdraw a permit at any time.¶ "I don't see how anyone could have a permit and assume it is going to stay in place," he said.¶ The case could have far-reaching implications for both industry and resource protection.¶ A broad industry coalition has lambasted the EPA veto, arguing that the retroactive action threatens the certainty on which businesses rely. Groups including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and American Farm Bureau Federation have argued that if EPA can use this authority in this case, it could effectively rip the rug out from under countless other industries (Greenwire, March 13).

### 1AR Link Turn At Environmentalists

#### Environmental Lobbies will be pragmatic and support the plan

Daniel Vermeer, PhD is executive director of Duke University’s Center on Energy, Development and the Global Environment (EDGE), 3-27-13 (“Coal Use Rising Internationally, Environmentalists Must Shape Its Course”, The Energy Collective)

For an elegant treatment of the prospects for CCUS (along with a coolheaded assessment of geoengineering), we recommend Marc Gunther’s Kindle Single, “Suck it Up.” In an interview, he sums up environmentalists’ recent support of the Texas Clean Energy Project coal plant: “They understand there’s lots of coal in the ground here in the US…There’s very little reason to believe companies will leave that coal in the ground, so [environmentalists are] trying to figure out if this idea of ‘clean coal’ or ‘low carbon coal’ can work.”¶ Non-Generation Uses for Coal: Veteran environmental lawyer David Wooley, who spent much of his career fighting new coal plants and now advises energy efficiency businesses, sees economic waste as one of the real tragedies of coal. “It just seems to me that it’s crazy for the US to be burning up all its coal reserves in just 2-3 generations” Wooley said to us in a recent conversation. “And wasting a lot of it.”¶ Other uses for coal – as a feedstock for chemicals and materials for example – could eventually displace burning coal for electrical generation as we come to see the substance as too valuable to burn. Coal has long been used to make steel, and in recent years fly ash from burning coal has shown promise as a feedstock for concrete. But more promising from an environmental perspective is the prospect of keeping coal’s carbon out of the air by doing things with it other than burning it. The chart below, from IHS Global Insight, shows that coal can be processed to make many of the building blocks of today’s chemicals and materials industries. The challenge will be to make the processes economic and environmentally benign, and Chinese players have to date shown the most activity – at least toward the goal of economic feasibility. Cooperation and Innovation: In order to remain economically and environmentally viable, players in the coal value chain must work in concert toward the bold innovations that will be its lifeline. There is some evidence of progress so far, according to Gary Gereffi, Director of the Center on Globalization, Governance & Competitiveness at Duke University, which has just produced a new report on the U.S. coal value chain with an emphasis on coal-related technologies being generated by diverse companies along the value chain.¶ “Innovation in many contemporary global industries is coming from collaboration among firms that occupy different positions along the value chain, and the coal industry is no exception,” Gereffi told us. “Major U.S. coal firms are already benefitting from partnerships established with other technology companies that are linked to the coal value chain, and this trend could accelerate in the future.”¶ Fostering collaboration and innovation among coal companies, and helping coal value chain players to align incentives, could have deep resonance for environmentalists. If coal players do not innovate, their industry will likely continue to sputter along without developing new ideas. Environmentalists may force some power plants or mines to clean up through policy, but the global path for coal will be toward a lot more of the same. Environmentalists have an opportunity to help the coal industry to evolve and find a stronger business vision – one with a brighter environmental and economic future. The more that environmentalists can work with mining, power generation, and chemical industry coal players to imagine and realize a new future for coal, the better off we all will be.

#### The Coal lobby outweighs their links

Nina Kate, 3-26-13 (“THE DIRT ON CLEAN COAL: LOOKING BEYOND THE ALTERNATIVE FUEL HYPE”,EcoSalon)

The truth is that coal has powerful lobbyists spending tens of millions of dollars to convince us and Congress that clean coal is the answer, says Greenpeace. Lobbyists run alluring ads on TV during prime viewing times, omitting the fact that coal burning produces mercury contamination in addition to air pollution, literally spewing carcinogens. Coal already produces about half of our electricity, which is the biggest source of greenhouse gas emissions in the country.

#### Big business outweighs environmental lobby backlash

Pointman, 9-14-12 (“THE DECLINE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL LOBBY’S POLITICAL INFLUENCE.”, Internet Blogger, http://thepointman.wordpress.com/2012/09/14/the-decline-of-the-environmental-lobbys-political-influence/)

Political influence is not only exercised by politicians, but also exercised upon them by what’s commonly called lobby groups. These come in two distinct flavours. The first tends to be representing business interests, who, because they contribute money, services or influence to election campaigns, quite rightly expect to get something back for them. People may not like that, but it’s part of the eternal horse trading associated with politics. The simple calculation made by all business lobbies is the amount of money or services donated, will be exceeded by the amount they can earn as a result of favourable political treatment.¶ The unspoken rule of that game is, ask for something reasonable, that won’t put the politician into an awkward position with his other interests, and you’ll probably get it. There are times when two business lobby groups desire conflicting things, so the usual form is for them to agree something they can both live with, and then approach the politician. Where they can’t agree a way forward, it’ll be the biggest contributor who’ll get the decision. The higher you get up a power structure, the more brutally simple things get.¶ The second type of lobby group is political in nature. They represent, and are the organised spokesmen for, a concern held by a significant portion of the electorate. They’re usually one issue groups and the particular issue varies considerably, but dependent on how big a proportion of the active electorate they speak for and how much influence they have over the voting pattern of those they represent, they can wield considerable power. The deal they’ll make with politicians, is to deliver their supporter’s vote, in return for favourable changes in legislation and money, in the form of grants.¶ While business lobby groups are hardy perennials, the political lobby groups tend to be annuals by nature. They appear, blossom for a while, and disappear. The reason they always disappear, is that they can no longer deliver a significant number of votes. This may come about for a variety of reasons; the desired changes may have been achieved, whatever concerned their supporters no longer worries them, the cause is no longer fashionable or quite simply, their support has melted away to other causes. Professional career lobbyists have perfected the art of hopping off lobbies on the way down and onto the new ones on the way up.¶ For a decade or more, the environmental lobby was the biggest and most influential political lobby in most democratic administrations around the developed world. Because it could withhold or deliver a substantial number of votes, politicians were naturally obliged to pander to its wishes. It actually didn’t matter how sensible or not the policies it wanted were, they got them put in place in exchange for delivering support.¶ For reasons I’ve gone into elsewhere, the environmental movement is in decline. The current devastation of green parties around the world in national elections, demonstrates this obvious change in the political landscape. It no longer has the mass following it had and can therefore no longer deliver or withhold, a significant block of votes. In political terms, this means that beyond a few nice words in their direction, politicians can safely ignore them. This is fortunate, since as it happens, politicians are having to roll back the green policies of yesteryear, because a lot of those policies the lobby managed to get into place, have now become real electoral liabilities for the politicians.¶ An example of this is the artificial skewing of the domestic power supply market, in favour of heavily subsidised renewables, which has resulted in sky rocketing electricity bills for most people. Renewable energy sources, against all their proponent’s optimistic expectations, stubbornly refuse to get cheaper. When the average potential voter is hurting that badly, every politician makes with the feet, to fix it quick. They don’t want to get the blame for it and they’ll kill each other, to get the credit for cutting your bill. They all want to be your new best friend.¶ A lot of current environmental policies will be not only be reversed, but dropped entirely. The pressure to do this comes from these cash strapped recessionary times and it will be accelerated by the changes of administrations, caused by the forthcoming presidential election in America and next year’s federal election in Australia. New governments can wipe the slate clean and start afresh, and in these instances where they’ve got a big majority, they will. I discussed how such radical changes in policy are accomplished in a previous article, a link to which is below, but in essence its done by utilising two techniques; blaming the previous administration for everything and simply never mentioning any commitments you might have previously made in support of the by now deeply unpopular policies. You just stop talking about it. The trick of not even mentioning the environment in significant speeches, has been in place for nearly the last two years. Recently, President Obama had to be blackmailed into mentioning it in a major speech by big donors to his re-election campaign, who threatened to withhold money unless he did. He of course did, but that’ll be that. Prime Minister Cameron has successfully managed not to mention it in a single major speech since 2010. Chancellor Merkel only mentions it in connection with changing renewables policy, to alleviate soaring power bills in Germany, amid a record number of household disconnections. Prime Minister Gillard of Australia mentions it a lot, because she’s essentially inept and fighting vainly for her political life. She won’t be succeeding, by the way. Indeed, thanks to her peculiar idea of what constitutes political acumen, her party now faces the political equivalent of what Geologists term an ELE or an Extinction Level Event.