### T

#### “In” means “throughout”

Words and Phrases 8 (Permanent Edition, vol. 20a, p. 207)

Colo. 1887. In the Act of 1861 providing that justices of the peace shall have jurisdiction “in” their respective counties to hear and determine all complaints, the word “in” should be construed to mean “throughout” such counties. Reynolds v. Larkin, 14, p. 114, 117, 10 Colo. 126.

#### “The” means all parts

Webster’s 8 (Merriam-Webster's Online Collegiate Dictionary, 08, http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/the)

4 -- used as a function word before a noun or a substantivized adjective to indicate reference to a group as a whole <the elite>

#### In the US means the aff must happen in every state

EPA 6 (EPA, US Environmental Protection Agency Terminology Reference System, 2-1-2006, <http://iaspub.epa.gov/trs/trs_proc_qry.alphabet?p_term_nm=U>)

United States

When used in the geographic sense, means all of the States. [Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics](http://iaspub.epa.gov/trs/trs_proc_qry.org_info?P_REG_AUTH_ID=1019&P_LIST_OPTION_CD=ORG) : [Commercial Chemical Control Rules](http://iaspub.epa.gov/trs/trs_proc_qry.org_info?P_REG_AUTH_ID=1&P_DATA_ID=11722&P_VERSION=1&P_LIST_OPTION_CD=INFO) [Term Detail](http://iaspub.epa.gov/trs/trs_proc_qry.navigate_term?p_term_id=292529&p_term_cd=TERMDIS)

#### Violation: The plan doesn’t happen in every state and territory

#### AND EEZ is not in the US

**US Department of State Manual ’12**

“7 Fam 1113 Not Included in the Meaning of “in the United States” http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/86755.pdf

7 FAM 1113 NOT INCLUDED IN THE ¶ MEANING OF "IN THE UNITED STATES"¶ (CT:CON-314; 08-21-2009)¶ a. Birth on U.S. Registered Vessel On High Seas or in the Exclusive ¶ Economic Zone: A U.S.-registered or documented ship on the high seas ¶ or in the exclusive economic zone is not considered to be part of the ¶ United States. Under the law of the sea, an Exclusive Economic Zone ¶ (EEZ) is a maritime zone over which a State has special rights over the ¶ exploration and use of natural resources. The Exclusive Economic Zone ¶ extends up to 200 nautical miles from the coastal baseline. A child born ¶ on such a vessel does not acquire U.S. citizenship by reason of the ¶ place of birth (Lam Mow v. Nagle, 24 F.2d 316 (9th Cir., 1928)).

#### Vote Negative

#### 1. Limits --- they allow “region of the week” Affs that target specific states or localities --- unique areas like Puerto Rico, federal lands, or “Indian Country” open up huge new research burdens --- limits are key to preparation and clash

#### 2. Ground --- national change is key to quality of disads links --- specific regions give the Aff unpredictable angles against core generics --- core ground is key to fairness

#### 3. Topicality is a voting issue for fairness and education

### CP

#### Text- In a relevant test case, the Supreme Court of the United States should rule the access restrictions on conventional natural gas drilling on federal lands in the Outer Continental Shelf are unconstitutional as applied.

#### Counterplan competes: "The" means whole USFG- Cross-apply Websters ev from the T flow

#### Solves the aff. They have authority to rule on it.

Spakosvky & Loris 8/13

Offshore Drilling: Increase Access, Reduce the Risk, and Stop Hurting American Companies

By Hans von Spakovsky and Nicolas Loris

August 13, 2012

http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2012/08/offshore-drilling-increase-access-reduce-the-risk-and-stop-hurting-american-companies

Hans A. von Spakovsky is a Senior Legal Fellow in the Center for Legal and Judicial Studies, and Nicolas D. Loris is the Herbert and Joyce Morgan Fellow in the Thomas A. Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies, at The Heritage Foundation

But while this sale was a positive development for American energy production, the Obama Administration is doing everything in its power to prevent companies that obtain offshore leases from actually drilling and producing oil—a fact evidenced by a new lawsuit recently filed in the U.S. Court of Federal Claims by an independent U.S. oil and gas company.¶ Preparing for Growth¶ By March 2010, ATP Oil & Gas Corporation had obtained oil leases and necessary permits to drill in the Gulf of Mexico. In fact, after installing state-of-the art drilling and processing equipment, ATP was poised to double its oil production.¶ This massive increase in production was made possible, in part, by the ATP Titan—a platform in 4,000 feet of water in the Gulf of Mexico that was designed to allow ATP to safely drill deeper into already-penetrated oil reservoirs. The first, and only, deepwater platform built entirely in America by a U.S. labor force, the Titan was constructed over the course of three years, creating a number of much-needed jobs in the process. And while the Titan’s price tag was steep—ATP secured $1.5 billion in financing from J.P. Morgan—the ability to safely and securely drill into already-penetrated oil reservoirs promised to produce a steady stream of oil and revenue for the company, thereby allowing ATP to pay back this enormous investment.¶ On April 20, 2010, however, America’s offshore drilling industry was thrown in chaos when, while drilling an exploration well into an unknown reservoir, the BP-operated Deepwater Horizon rig exploded. This explosion occurred when BP was drilling a wildcat well with a dynamically positioned, semi-submersible rig, in formations never before explored—an operation that, according to ATP, is completely distinct from development drilling into already-penetrated reservoirs, a process where complete information is available about every aspect of the area being explored, from pressure gradients to rock properties.¶ But in the aftermath of the BP explosion, the Obama Administration arbitrarily ordered the entire deepwater industry to cease drilling, issuing two industry-wide moratoria on drilling activities and barring consideration of new permits. Even though ATP not only had no connection to the BP rig or any of the equipment being used there, but was proposing to drill in an entirely different area of the Gulf than where the BP disaster occurred, the Titan operation was shut down.¶ ATP’s Litigation and the Cost to the American Economy¶ Development of offshore oil and gas takes years of operational and financial planning. As illustrated by ATP’s Titan project, labor and equipment must be secured far in advance of actual drilling, and enormous investments are required before a single dollar is earned through production of oil and gas. While the government’s moratorium curtailed ATP’s ability to generate revenue, it did not reduce ATP’s costs or expenses. In fact, for ATP—which had already borrowed $1.5 billion and spent years preparing to drill these deepwater wells and constructing the safety-redundant Titan platform—the nightmare had just begun: In addition to the expensive ATP Titan platform, the company was burdened with paying for two other drilling rigs idled by the government’s arbitrary moratoria.¶ As a result of the government’s actions, ATP filed suit in federal court. In ATP Oil & Gas Corporation v. U. S., ATP alleges that the Interior Department:¶ Improperly and illegally suspended all deepwater offshore drilling activities and imposed two illegal moratoria on the deepwater drilling permit application process and then unreasonably and unlawfully delayed the issuance of drilling permits after the lifting of the formal moratoria.¶ Essentially, ATP is asserting that the government breached its offshore leases with ATP by violating the Administrative Procedure Act in two ways: 1) by issuing overbroad moratoria; and 2) by manipulating seven experts from the National Academy of Engineering (NAE) to bolster a recommendation for the moratoria.¶ ATP’s prospects for legal vindication appear strong: All seven of the NAE experts denied supporting moratoria recommendations and, in Hornbeck Offshore Services v. Salazar, a case addressing the government’s first six-month moratorium, the court concluded that “a White House official had changed” the report on which the moratorium was based “which created the misleading appearance of scientific peer review.” ATP also says the government “breached the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing” under the leases that ATP paid the government when it prevented ATP from exploring, drilling, and producing oil.¶ Furthermore, in Hornbeck Offshore Services, a federal district court concluded that the government’s first six-month moratorium was “arbitrary and capricious” and, therefore, illegal, and found the government in contempt for issuing a second moratorium after the court had ordered the first one dissolved.[1] As a result of the Administration’s defiant behavior, taxpayers ended up paying more than half a million dollars in attorneys’ fees awarded to the plaintiffs.¶ In another case involving ATP and other oil industry vendors, the same federal court in Louisiana also found that the Interior Department acted unlawfully by unreasonably delaying the processing of drilling permits in Ensco Offshore Company v. Salazar.[2] The court held that the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (OCSLA), in addition to the Administrative Procedure Act, “establishes a nondiscretionary duty on the Department of the Interior to act on OCSLA drilling permit applications within a reasonable time.” Yet, despite this duty, the court determined that the Obama Administration had “unreasonably delayed” action on nine different permit applications from the various companies that had sued Ken Salazar, the Secretary of the Department of the Interior.[3]

#### Court spurs legislative action

Devins, ‘92

(William and Mary Associate Poli Sci Prof, July, 80 Calif. L. Rev. 1027)

Courts matter. They matter a lot**.** Sometimes their orders set in motion market mechanisms which guarantee their effectiveness. n199 Sometimes the threat of judicial action prompts either settlement or legislativeinitiative**.** n200 Their opinions influence legislative deliberations n201 and change the statusquo. n202 Occasionally, they trump agencies and interpose their normative views into the law. It may be that these influences sometimes result in unwise policy decisions and sometimes exceed the proper judicial role in our system of separated powers, but they are judicial influences nonetheless

#### Courts don’t link to elections- shielded from political pressure

Ward ‘9

(Artemus Ward, Professor at NIU, Political Foundations of Judicial Supremacy, Congress and The Presidency, pg. 119)

After the old order has collapse the once- united, new-regime coalition begins to fracture as original commitments are extended to new issues. In chapter 3 Whittington combines Skowronek's articulation and disjunctive categories into the overarching "affiliated" presidencies as both seek to elaborate the regime begun under reconstructive leaders. By this point in the ascendant regime, Bourts are staffed by justices from the dominant ruling coalition via the appointment process - and Whittington spends time on appointment politics here and more fully in chapter 4. Perhaps counter-intuitively, affiliated political actors - including presidents - encourage Courts to exercise vetoes and operate in issue areas of relatively low political salience. Of course, this "activism" is never used against the affiliated president per se. Instead, affiliated Courts correct for the overreaching of those who operate outside the preferred constitutional vision, which are often state and local governments who need to be brought into line with nationally dominant constitutional commitments. Whittington explains why it is easier for affilitated judges, rather than affiliated presidents, to rein in outliers and conduct constitutional maintenance. The latter are saddled with controlling opposition political figures, satisfying short-term political demands, and navigating intraregime gridlock and political thickets. Furthermore, because of their electoral accountability, politicians engage in position-taking, credit-claiming, and blame-avoidance behavior. By contrast, their judicial counterparts are relatively sheltered from political pressures and have more straightforward decisional processes. Activist Courts can take the blame for advancing and legitimizing constitutional commitments that might have electoral costs. In short, a division of labor exists between politicians and judges affiliated with the dominant regime.

### Production Shell

#### Obama will win- Polls prove but race could shift if an event comes up

Cook 10-4

Charlie is a National Journal Columnist and writes the Cook Political Report, “Mitt Romney Breaks his Losing Streak,” <http://nationaljournal.com/columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-romney-breaks-his-losing-streak-20121004>

Too many political observers see politics in an entirely binary way: Everything has to be either a “0” or a “1”; a race is either tied or it’s over; every election is either won or stolen. Some people never want to admit that their side lost. And some people think that a poll either tells them what they want to hear or is methodologically flawed—or crooked. It’s like an obnoxious sports fan (often found in Philadelphia) who views a ruling by a referee or umpire as either favorable or a bad call. Denial and simplicity reign.¶ The presidential election is neither tied nor over. Of the 16 most recent national polls using live telephone interviewers calling both respondents with landlines and those with cell phones (between 30 and 40 percent of voters do not have landlines and cannot legally be called by robo-pollsters), one has the race even, two have Obama with a narrow 2-point edge, five have 3-point Obama margins, two have 5-point Obama advantages, another pair have 6-point Obama leads, two have 7-point leads, and one has an 8-point Obama lead. This would strongly suggest that the Obama lead is between 3 and 6 percentage points; such brand-name polls as those by CNN, Fox News, and NBC News/Wall Street Journal are among those in that 3- to 6-point range.¶ Conversations with Democratic and Republican pollsters and strategists suggest that Colorado, Florida, North Carolina, and Virginia are the most competitive swing states. Some high-quality private polling shows Romney with very narrow leads in both North Carolina and Virginia, but a few other equally sophisticated surveys show Obama with narrow advantages in those two states. At least one private survey shows Florida even, but most show the Sunshine State and Colorado with narrow Obama leads, in the small- to mid-single-digit range. Just a hair or two better for Obama but still quite close are Nevada and Wisconsin, followed by Iowa. Things really get ugly for Romney in Ohio and Michigan, and, finally, in Pennsylvania, which is no longer competitive. Ohio shows a 5- to 8-point lead for Obama in private polling. In Michigan, Obama’s lead is slightly wider, and in Pennsylvania, Romney faces close to a 10-point deficit. It is mathematically possible for Romney to reach 270 electoral votes without Michigan, Ohio, or Pennsylvania, but it is in reality exceedingly unlikely.¶ It would take a very consequential event to change the trajectory of this race. Time will tell whether Romney’s strong debate performance on Wednesday night was the event that he needed—particularly in swing states such as Ohio. But at least he energized his supporters and sent a clear message that the race is not over.¶ As for down-ballot races, my hunch is that there is a pretty good chance that we may not know which party will hold a majority in the Senate in the next Congress by breakfast or lunch the day after the election. With 10 seats in the toss-up category—five for each party—the Senate outlook couldn’t be more volatile.¶ Republicans can be confident that they will pick up the open seat in Nebraska, but they have to be very worried about their own open seats in Indiana and Maine. The latter is particularly troublesome for the GOP. Republican incumbents Scott Brown in Massachusetts and Dean Heller in Nevada are in very tight races; the odds of Heller winning are better than those for Brown. The newest entry on the toss-up list is the open Republican seat in Arizona, where Democrat Richard Carmona has pulled even or slightly ahead of GOP Rep. Jeff Flake.¶ Conversely, Democrats have to be most worried about hanging on to the open seat in Connecticut, where former pro-wrestling CEO Linda McMahon now has a narrow lead, and in Montana, where incumbent Jon Tester is locked in a nail-biter. The top of the ticket is a challenge for both McMahon and Tester. Open seats in North Dakota, Virginia, and Wisconsin are statistical dead heats, notwithstanding some public polls that show rather substantial leads for former Democratic Gov. Tim Kaine over former Sen. George Allen in the Old Dominion.¶ A look at the polling data shows two inflection points in the presidential contest and many Senate races. The Democratic convention clearly had a positive impact for Democrats, while Republicans took a real hit after the release of the video of Mitt Romney suggesting that 47 percent of voters are basically deadbeats who see themselves as victims. We are now hearing reports of a similar drop for down-ballot Republicans in some districts, particularly in places like California and New York where Romney was already going nowhere. Many GOP candidates took a hit the week of Sept. 17, then stabilized the following week. They didn’t drop further but they didn’t regain any altitude, either.¶ For now, the GOP majority in the House seems fairly secure; The Cook Political Report currently sees GOP losses in the zero- to 10-seat range, well short of the 25-seat net gain Democrats need to gain control.¶ It’s always difficult to gauge how any event will be interpreted and what impact it will have on a campaign, but there is considerable evidence that the “47 percent” video did make a mark. Democratic pollster Peter Hart and his Republican counterpart Bill McInturff asked in the Sept. 26-30 NBC News/Wall Street Journal poll of 832 likely voters nationwide, “Has what you have seen, read, or heard in the past couple of weeks about Mitt Romney and his campaign for president given you a more favorable impression of him or a less favorable impression of him?” Some 28 percent responded that they felt more complimentary about Romney, but 51 percent indicated that what they heard made them feel less likely to support him.¶ Romney had a six-week stretch where nothing broke his way. Now we’ll see if his debate performance was a turning point—or a brief interruption—in the campaign narrative.

#### Obama’s base hates increased natural gas production

Prandoni 3-30

“Democrat Policies Threaten to Starve American Refiners,” <http://m.atr.org/article.php?id=6823>

With the 2012 election cycle in full swing, yesterday Obama took to the stump calling for job-killing tax increases on nefarious oil companies. Although nothing gets the Democrat base excited like demonizing oil and natural gas producers—an industry responsible for over 9 million American jobs, mind you—raising taxes on the oil industry will necessarily stymie American production of our natural resources.¶ What those hoping “Big Oil” topples over don’t realize is that thousands of American manufacturers rely on the oil and natural gas industry—businesses sell equipment to oil and natural gas producers and also transform crude oil into fuel and a variety of other useful products. One industry that would be hardest hit from a reduction in oil and natural gas production would be America’s refiners. Already struggling for a variety of mostly government-induced reasons, further reductions in crude would literally starve America’s robust refining sector of its lifeblood.¶ I say further reductions because the Obama Administration is already inhibiting domestic oil and natural gas production wherever possible. Cancelling lease sales on the Atlantic coast, delaying lease sales for nearly a year in the gulf, and increasing the amount of time it takes companies to receive requisite permits have all immediately impacted domestic oil production, and intern, America’s refiners.¶ To learn more, check out the House Natural Resources Committee’s depressing compilation of all the ways Democrats have attempted to impede domestic energy.¶ Over in the other chamber, the Republican Energy and Natural Resources staff created this great chart illustrating how difficult it became for job creators to receive an Application for Permit to Drill (APD) under Obama’s tenure:But it doesn’t end there. The most explicit attack on refiners from the Obama Administration thus far must be the decision to kill the Keystone pipeline. As most people know by now, the Keystone Pipeline would have delivered around 800,000 barrels of Canadian crude oil to, you guessed it, America’s refiners. Creating tens of thousands of construction jobs and ensuring that America’s refiners have crude oil to manufacture into other products, the Keystone pipeline would have been a shot of life for the recession weary construction and refining industries. Unfortunately, Obama’s decision to kill the pipeline is indicative of the Administration’s antagonistic stance towards anyone involved in the oil and natural gas supply chain.¶ So while oil production on federal lands will in all likelihood continue to decline as long as Obama is in the White House, America’s refiners will have to rely on oil production from private lands. Instead of using oil and natural gas companies as an applause line, the Obama Administration should look to increase American jobs and energy security—it sure would make life for America’s refiners a whole lot easier.

#### The environmental vote will decide the election

Lehrer, 12

(Eli, "How Mitt Romney can win the environmental vote", 6/11, Huffington Post,¶ http://rstreet.org/op-ed/how-mitt-romney-can-win-the-environmental-vote/-http://rstreet.org/op-ed/how-mitt-romney-can-win-the-environmental-vote/

Since the (few) positives in Obama’s record and the incumbency are unalterable, the Romney camp can only win by shaving parts of Obama’s base.¶ And environmentalists are one place big place where it could work. Stanford University researchers have found that about 38 million Americans care a lot about the environment and might vote on it. Assuming that environmental voters turn out at roughly the same rate as other citizens who can vote, this means that somewhere between 15% and 19% of the electorate will vote partly on environmental issues.¶ Although there’s no current, detailed polling, it’s likely that Obama currently stands to get around 75% of this group — taking 50% of it would probably be enough to put Romney over the top. So how can he do it?

#### China label kills relations and the economy

Roach 8-28

Stephen is a lecturer at Yale University’s School of Management and Jackson Institute for International Affairs. He is also a Senior executive with Morgan Stanley, “How Romney Could go Wrong from Day 1,” <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/c74802de-f0f9-11e1-89b2-00144feabdc0.html#axzz25ue916Yz>

True to his word as a candidate, a few hours after taking office as US president on January 20, 2013, Mitt Romney issued his first executive order, declaring China guilty of currency manipulation. In accordance with the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988, President Romney’s act triggered immediate negotiations between US and Chinese officials. But the negotiations stalled and both parties blamed the other in press releases.¶ In early February, in his first State of the Union address, Mr Romney said: “Enough is enough. It is high time for China to play by our rules.” Congress roared its approval and within a week, overwhelming bipartisan majorities of both houses passed the Defend America Trade Act of 2013. Modelled on the currency manipulation “remedies” of countervailing tariffs first proposed in 2005, DATA was signed into law on President’s Day, February 18 2013. China was quickly deemed to be in violation of the new statute.¶ More¶ At that point negotiations took on a new urgency. But the new leaders in both countries were in no mood for compromise and the talks failed. In accordance with the provisions of DATA, Washington slapped immediate tariffs of 20 per cent on all Chinese products entering the US.¶ As plants shut down across China, Beijing declared this to be an act of economic war and filed a complaint with the World Trade Organization. Li Keqiang, newly installed as premier, announced after the National People’s Congress in March that China had no patience to endure a WTO dispute process that could take anywhere from two to five years to run its course.¶ China’s Ministry of Commerce then announced retaliatory tariffs of 20 per cent on all US exports to China. This hit growth-starved America right between the eyes. With $104bn of American-made goods sold in Chinese markets in 2011, China had become the US’s third-largest and its fastest-growing export market. To add insult to injury, China-dependent Walmart announced average price increases of 5 per cent. Other retailers followed suit. Talk of stagflation was in the air and hard-pressed American consumers hunkered down further.¶ US financial markets swooned. The stock market was hit by pressures on profit margins, growth and inflation. The bond market was also unnerved by the realisation that the Federal Reserve was seriously behind the curve. With good reason. After its meeting in June 2013, the Fed reaffirmed its ever-extending commitment to keep its benchmark policy rate near zero through 2015, and even dangled the possibility of yet another round of quantitative easing, QE4. Yields on 10-year Treasuries moved back above 4 per cent and stocks fell sharply further.¶ Feeling the heat from financial markets, Washington turned up the heat on China. Mr Romney called Congress back from its Independence Day holiday into a special session. By unanimous consent, Congress passed an amendment to DATA – upping the tariffs on China by another 10 percentage points.¶ At that point an indignant China turned to its own version of the big bazooka. The biggest foreign buyer of US debt was nowhere to be seen at the Treasury’s August 2013 auction. Long-term interest rates spiked and within weeks yields on 10-year Treasuries hit 7 per cent. The dollar plunged and the US stock market went into free fall.¶ Just like that, the so-called exorbitant privilege of the haven asset vanished. When asked at a press conference why China would willingly engage in actions that would undermine the value of more than $2tn in Treasuries and other dollar-based holdings, Zhou Xiaochuan, retiring governor of the People’s Bank of China, said: “This is not about risk-adjusted portfolio returns. We are defending our people against an act of economic war.”¶ By the autumn of 2013 there was little doubt of the severity of renewed recession in the US. Trade sanctions on China had backfired. Beleaguered American workers paid the highest price of all, as the unemployment rate shot back up above 10 per cent. A horrific policy blunder had confirmed that there was no bilateral fix for the multilateral trade imbalance of a savings-starved US economy.¶ In China, growth had slipped below the dreaded 6 per cent threshold and the new leadership was rolling out yet another investment stimulus for a still unbalanced and unstable Chinese economy. As the global economy slipped back into recession, the Great Crisis of 2008-09 suddenly looked like child’s play. Globalisation itself hung in the balance.¶ History warns us never to say never. We need only look at the legacy of US Senator Reed Smoot and Representative Willis Hawley, who sponsored the infamous Tariff Act of 1930 – America’s worst economic policy blunder. Bad dreams can – and have – become reality.

### 1nc K

#### EXPANDING NATURAL GAS INFRASTRUCTURE IS KEY TO ENABLE ENVIRONMENTAL EXPLOITATION TO DESTROY THE GLOBE FOR PROFIT— THEIR EV IS EQUIVALENT TO INDUSTRY PROPAGANDA. IMPACT IS EXTINCTION.

CHARMAN 2K10

[Karen, Trashing the Planet for Natural Gas: Shale Gas Development Threatens

Freshwater Sources, Likely Escalates Climate Destabilization, Capitalism Nature and

Socialism, 21:4, 72-82]

As the large, easy reservoirs of fossil fuels are exhausted, the capitalist machine¶ is now scouring the earth in a frenzy to exploit sources that are much more¶ difficult, risky, ecologically damaging, and expensive to extract. Natural¶ gas from coalbed methane, shale, and tight gas sands; oil from tarsands or¶ increasingly deep wells far below the ocean floor; and thin coal seams that are¶ only ‘‘economic’’ for companies to exploit by blowing up whole mountaintops define¶ the new era of fossil fuel extraction. All of these activities are destroying ever-¶ larger swathes of land, ecosystems, and the communities that depend on them,¶ greatly escalating the global ecological crisis that, if it continues unabated, will¶ make the earth uninhabitable for life as we know it.¶ Evidence and public awareness of the ecological threats\*particularly the use of fossil¶ fuels\*have been mounting for some time. But so far, global fossil fuel consumption¶ has only increased, and several forecasts expect substantial rises in energy¶ consumption in the coming decades. Although the explosion in the availability¶ of environmentally friendly products over the last several years indicates that¶ strong support for non-polluting, renewable energy sources does exist, private¶ energy corporations use every means at their disposal to prevent the widespread¶ adoption of alternatives that would threaten their enormous profits. Energy¶ corporations and their proponents manipulate the public sphere by engaging¶ in sophisticated propaganda campaigns to both strengthen the perceived¶ need for fossil fuels and confuse public debate by distorting facts about the¶ environmental harm of extracting and burning them. Energy corporations¶ have also been supremely successful at manipulating the political process,¶ which supports them with massive public subsidies and laws that ensure¶ their profitability while limiting liability for the direct and indirect harm they¶ cause.

#### OUR ALT: REJECT THE AFF.

#### EXPANDING NATURAL GAS DEMAND AND INFRASTRUCTURE IS THE OPERATIVE LYNCHPIN OF A CYCLE OF CAPITALIST EXPLOITATION. THERE IS AN ETHICAL OBLIGATION TO INTERRUPT THIS DRIVE TOWARDS DESTRUCTION OF THE GLOBE.

CHARMAN 2K10

[Karen, Trashing the Planet for Natural Gas: Shale Gas Development Threatens

Freshwater Sources, Likely Escalates Climate Destabilization, Capitalism Nature and

Socialism, 21:4, 72-82]

Despite increasing evidence of the danger and irreversible ecological damage¶ in areas where horizontal hydrofracking for natural gas is taking place,¶ governments around the world appear to be embracing this new method of¶ resource exploitation. The United States encourages gas drilling with more¶ than $13.5 billion of subsidies, most of which were authorized in the 2005 Energy Policy¶ Act.46 As a result, for five years prior to 2009, a typical U.S. gas company paid 0.3 percent tax on its¶ profit instead of the standard corporate tax rate of 35 percent.47 Though most of the subsidies apply to the¶ exploration rather than the production phase of natural gas extraction, townships and residents¶ don’t collect taxes or royalties until gas production reaches a certain level. Gas¶ companies, however, receive subsidies whether or not their wells produce,¶ thus leasing land, exploration, and drilling are essentially risk-free activities,¶ possibly even if companies abandon drilled wells without cleaning them up.48¶ A 2004 law that deems oil and gas a ‘‘manufactured good’’ permits companies¶ to claim billions of dollars in tax deductions, shifting much of the cost of gas production to¶ American taxpayers.49 Another subsidy allows compani es to write off 70-100¶ percent of their outlay for equipment, supplies, and other costs of drilling.50¶ Other subsidies guarantee that the gas industry pays almost nothing for¶ the cost of gas distribution and gas pipelines.51 Gas companies and their¶ investors are also allowed to write off losses, enabling them to shelter other¶ income.52 Currently, efforts are underway in the U.S. Congress for substantial¶ new subsidies to switch fuels in the transportation sector by encouraging the¶ widespread adoption of cars and trucks that run on natural gas.53¶ The various subsidies and incentives were adopted ostensibly to boost domestic natural gas production to¶ make the U.S. energy independent. However, as Investing Daily points out, ‘‘it’s important to remember¶ that energy markets are global.’’54 A raft of recent international deals indicates that much of the gas drilled¶ in the U.S. is intended for the international energy market. In November 2008, U.S.-based Chesapeake¶ Energy, a major investor in the Marcellus Shale, sold the second largest supplier of natural gas in Europe,¶ the Norwegian company StatoilHydro, a 32.5 percent stake in its Marcellus leases, a deal that could add the¶ equivalent of 2.5 to 3 billion barrels of oil to StatoilHydro’s reserves.55 Investing Daily reports that also in¶ 2008, Chesapeake joined BP in a $1.9 billion joint venture in the Fayetteville Shale in Arkansas. In early¶ 2010, Chesapeake formed a $2.25 billion joint venture with the French energy giant Total that gives Total¶ a 25 percent stake in Chesapeake’s assets in the Barnett Shale in Texas. India’s largest company, Reliance,¶ bought a 45 percent stake in Pioneer Natural Resources’ gas leases in the Eagle Ford Shale in southern¶ Texas after purchasing a 40 percent stake in Atlas Energy’s Marcellus Shale holdings. Oil giants Royal¶ Dutch Shell, ExxonMobil, and ConocoPhillips are also making significant investments in unconventional¶ natural gas in the U.S. and elsewhere, as are Chinese companies.56Proponents argue unconventional natural gas is clean and needed as a ‘‘bridge¶ fuel’’ that will help reduce greenhouse gas emissions to help curb global¶ climate destabilization until we can transition away from coal. But this claim¶ neglects to account for both the energy required and the resulting emissions¶ from extracting, processing, and distributing the gas\*i.e., the use of fossil¶ fuels to build pipelines, truck the enormous amounts of water needed for¶ hydrofracking, drill wells, manufacture the chemicals for the fracking fluids,¶ run the compressors, and treat and transport the wastewater.57 Nor does¶ it consider the loss of carbon sinks from forests cleared for drilling.58 No¶ scientific peer-reviewed analyses of greenhouse gas emissions measuring the¶ entire fuel cycle for shale and other unconventional gas sources have yet been¶ completed and published. Cornell ecologist Robert W. Howarth is analyzing total greenhouse¶ gas emissions from Marcellus Shale gas development. His preliminary data suggest that because¶ of the difficulty of obtaining the more diffuse shale gas, these additional¶ emissions are likely to be at least three times the greenhouse gas emissions¶ for extracting, processing, and transporting diesel fuel and gasoline.59¶ Much more of a concern, however, is the leakage of methane into the¶ atmosphere during all stages of drilling, processing, transporting and burning¶ the gas. Methane, which is 72 times more powerful a greenhouse gas per¶ molecule than CO2,60 is the major component of natural gas. Howarth notes¶ that the numerous incidents of explosions and contaminated wells in shale¶ gas drilling areas in Pennsylvania, Wyoming, and Ohio in recent years reveal¶ pathways for methane to escape into the atmosphere: ‘‘The concentrations¶ of methane necessary for an explosion are at least 10,000-fold higher than¶ those normally in the atmosphere, and this leakage from contaminated¶ groundwater is probably quite significant in terms of the greenhouse-gas¶ footprint of shale gas.’’61 Although Howarth’s study is not yet complete, his preliminary results¶ indicate that the greenhouse gas footprint of Marcellus Shale gas is ‘‘probably at¶ least twice as great as the emissions from just burning the gas. That is, shale¶ gas is not a clean fuel and appears to be a poor choice as a transitional fuel¶ over the coming decades if the U.S. is serious about addressing global climate¶ disruption.’’62 Two California scientists, Mark Jacobson from Stanford University and Mark Delucchi¶ from the University of California at Davis, have laid out a plan to eliminate fossil fuel use in every country¶ on the planet and replace it with clean, renewable energy\*currently existing wind, solar, geothermal, tidal¶ and hydroelectric power technologies\*in just ten years.63 Their plan calls for ‘‘millions of wind turbines,¶ water machines, and solar installations.’’¶ While they acknowledge the numbers are large, they point out that massive societal transformations have¶ taken place before, for example when the U.S. retooled its automobile manufacturers during World War¶ II to build 300,000 aircraft, and other countries produced another 486,000. They also acknowledge some¶ technical hurdles, but none that seem insurmountable. The biggest roadblock appears to be¶ the juggernaut of capitalist ideology and power that in the face of escalating¶ ecological catastrophe refuses to give up its short-term profit-driven death¶ grip on the planet.

### 1NC—Energy Rev Adv

#### **Pushing for U.S. gas hegemony causes blowback by China, increased European dependency on Russia, and loss of influence in South America and the Middle East – turns their heg impact**

Hulbert 11/20/2011

(Matthew, specialises in energy security and political risk and is a regular contributor to European Energy Review; “ Why "energy independence" means less power for the US, not more,” European Energy Review <http://www.europeanenergyreview.eu/site/pagina.php?id=3346> – Kurr)

But even with these health warnings in place, the bottom line (irrespective of Venezuelan output), is that unconventional reserves in the US, Canada and South America far outstrip conventional Middle East and North African (MENA) plays. In oil, the scorecard shows 6.5 trillion unconventional Americas barrels vs. 1.2 trillion MENA conventional plays. It’s little wonder that this geological shake-up is prompting a serious rethink of the geopolitical energy map. The position of leading US observers, including some of the Founding Fathers of US energy analysis, is pretty clear: America can declare energy independence. Import dependence will go. The trade deficit will look a lot better. Dollars will stay in America rather than filling OPEC coffers. Oil will flow from North to South and South to North rather than East to West. Americas’ oil for American consumers at American prices. Some have even noted US superpower status is now back with a vengeance. Geopolitical snags It all sounds terrific, but there are several problems with this story. First of all, it’s a bit of a case of the signs hanging up in British pubs: “free beer tomorrow”. The lead times for most of this production is 2020-ish for some, 2030-ish for others. These resources might well one day make it to market, assuming the figures don’t prove to be bunk, but it will be “tomorrow” rather than today. The fact is that over the next decade OPEC market share is going to be as concentrated as ever. The cartel already controls over 40% of the physical market, that figure will rise to over 50% as mature non-OPEC reserves continue to deplete and new finds in Russia, Central Asia and Africa struggle to make it to the wellhead. In conventional terms, that leaves OPEC with over 80% of proven reserves; reserves that will invariably remain cheaper marginal barrels to play with than dirtier unconventional grades. Secondly, and probably even more importantly, there is the politics to consider. Ironic newsflash for the US: they aren’t dependent on Middle East oil reserves, and haven’t been for a long time. Washington sources less than 20% of its supplies from the Gulf; it has a larger off-take from West Africa. The decision to underwrite Middle East oil supplies was made to retain dominant US status ensuring the safe flow of hydrocarbons to global markets – not for US consumption purposes. Play that role, and much else follows as the geo-economic and geo-political lynchpin of the world – lose it, and the chances are you’ll be geopolitically downgraded quicker than S&P analysts can get stuck into Greek debt. That’s before we even consider where the Gulf States decide to recycle their petrodollars in future. No security, no $? It’s certainly a question for the US to ponder – not only in terms of who they are going to sell their Treasuries too, but also what currency oil is priced in. Middle East oil isn’t about oil for America, it’s ultimately about power. If the US wasn’t part of the Gulf energy game, it would have zero sway in Saudi, no powers of persuasion over Iranian nukes, no say in how the Arab Spring plays out or how Gulf Monarchies handle succession problems in future. And even though WTI and Brent are showing major spreads, geopolitical flashpoints still affect US consumers at the pumps – that’s as true for recent turmoil in the Middle East as it would be for blockages in key choke points such as the Bosporus or Malacca Straits. So, like it or not, these remain vital US interests so long as America remains even remotely connected to world oil flows. Seven Sisters There could of course be a plan B that makes the energy independence narrative more credible, and it’s called China. That is to say: an orderly re-division of geopolitical labour between the US and China. However, this is not likely to happen, precisely because Washington wants to continue playing a central geopolitical role. Although widely missed by the energy independence crowd, the major overseas investor in the Americas hydrocarbon rush has been … Beijing. The Chinese snapped up new plays in Canada, injecting $15billion in the past 18 months in Alberta alone. Sinopec spent $4.65 billion buying ConocoPhillips’ stake in Syncrude Canada, while the third Chinese national oil company, CNOOC, acquired OPTI Canada for $2.1bn. Turn to Brazil and we see a similar picture. Sao Paulo secured a $10billion loan from China to help finance Brazil’s $174billion five year strategic energy plan, directly paid back in oil supplies to Sinopec and CNPC. Argentina has also been on China’s resource list, not to mention Venezuela, where Caracas has received $12billion(and rising) in Chinese loans, on the back of PDVSA oil supplies to Beijing. This isn’t a case of Seven Sisters, then, but of Three Chinese Brothers getting the Americas’ unconventional ball rolling. Even in the US, China finally managed to gain a stake in Chesapeake Energy which is developing Eagle Ford shale in Texas. It rather makes you wonder what all the Unocal fuss was about in 2005. But China is nothing if not strategic. Beijing might just be willing to trade in its assets in the Americas, but only if the US is willing to accept that the Middle East becomes a Chinese lake. That means Saudi Arabia (where China sources around 1mb/d), Iraq, Iran, and arguably Central Asian players – all of which would fall within the Chinese sphere. ‘East is East, West is West’. If current ‘hard balancing’ between the US and China in South Asia is anything to go by, this looks remarkably unlikely to happen. Washington will fight Beijing for every inch of geopolitical territory it can maintain. The US finger has already been firmly stuck in the Vietnamese dyke, more digits will be applied across the Indian Ocean. Washington should therefore be very careful as too how far and how quickly it plays its ‘energy independence’ hand. It might look an attractive option from Capitol Hill, but it will come with serious geopolitical downside risks that many in the US aren’t yet fully willing to contemplate. Losing the Middle East would be a bitter US pill to swallow; many MENA states would hardly relish a rapid US withdrawal from the region either. And even if the US and China went for a grand bargain, swapping the Gulf for the Americas (with West Africa thrown into the Atlantic mix and East Africa heading to the Pacific Basin), there is yet another little problem: the attitude of the US’s “neighbours” in the Americas. Canada, Venezuela, Mexico, Bolivia, Ecuador and Argentina all share a common purpose on the hydrocarbon front. They realise that relying on a single source of supply and a single source of demand isn’t particularly smart. These countries (not to mention the US oil majors) will look to load tankers to sell oil into global markets – and they will want to do so as core parts of their hedging/arbitrage strategies, not just surplus supply after the US is sated. Canada is so determined to feed global markets it isn’t just lobbying the EU hard on tar sand regulations, but looking at pipeline options via the ‘Northern Gateway’ to make life easier for tankers to head East. We all know that Venezuela isn’t a fan of the US, but Brazil will hardly want to dance to Washington’s tune either. Brazil has its own ambitions and own global agenda; making sure that oil remains a fungible, readily traded commodity will be a key part of that narrative. If we take the forecasts for the Americas seriously, the US will not only lose global sway as the independence bug bites, but it might struggle to retain a dominant role in its own backyard. A change of government could be all it takes for Brazil to join OPEC, Canada will play hard ball with the US over its Arctic assets, and even when Chavez is gone, don’t expect his successor(s) to be any more pro-American. New found petro-states will not be traditional US silos. Straight and narrow Given its nearest neighbours aren’t buying the energy independence line, the smarter move for Washington is not to keep jumping up and down about going solo, but to use the threat of unconventional production to keep OPEC on the straight and narrow as cartel control tightens in the next ten years. The prospect of flooded markets is the last thing Arab leaders want, either now, or in future. But make OPEC too nervous about unconventional gains, and they could go for the atomic option of scuppering unconventional output by depressing prices. Indeed, the fact that the US has new options from geological shifts is what’s interesting here. Forget energy independence as a concept – it’s not going to happen in the stark terms US analysts have portrayed. But what it does do is open up an à la carte option for the US to pick and choose where and when it decides to do some heavy geopolitical lifting for global oil supplies. China is painfully aware that it is unable to pick up all the geopolitical pieces just yet. This will give the US leverage over Beijing, and most notably on the status of the dollar. These intertwined geo-economic and geopolitical games will take a long time to play out, but they will be played. The biggest ball likely to be dropped from US energy independence actually relates to Europe. Libya should be a massive wakeup call for the EU – not least because it told us far more about European deficiencies than US preferences. Growing US recoil will clearly affect European supplies, increasing Europe’s structural dependence on Russia oil and gas as its default supply option. Assuming Europe continues its current (dis)orderly management of decline, Brussels will fail to open up new MENA or Central Asian reserves, because its security sealant is too leaky for upstream players to take politically seriously. What’s worse, many in Brussels believe that diversification is still working. They are more than happy to re-badge Russian projects with ‘European stamps’, and are even starting to think that projects such as the BTC (Baku–Tbilisi–Ceyhan)oil pipeline and the BTE (Baku-Tbilisi-Erzurum) gas pipeline were more to do with Europe than American designs. Any notion that Europe needs to reach out towards major consumers in the East to offset future Russian pressures at both ends of the Eurasian pipeline, is not one that Brussels seems willing or ready to accept. The Commission is too busy trying to convince the likes of Turkmenistan that they should build a pipeline under the legally contested Caspian Sea. Europe will probably have to find out about the perils of structural dependence the hard way. So while the US might be tempted by the allure of energy independence, it will probably end up meaning far less to Washington than it eventually does for Brussels. In this sense, American independence might take on a whole new transatlantic definition.

China and OPEC politics means there’s no benefit to establishing the U.S. as a gas hegemon

Klare 6/25/2012

(Michael T., professor of peace and world security studies at Hampshire College; “Is Barack Obama morphing into Dick Cheney?,” European Energy Review <http://www.europeanenergyreview.eu/site/pagina.php?id=3774#artikel_3774> – Kurr)

Obama as Cheney This four-part geopolitical blueprint, relentlessly pursued by Cheney while vice president, is now being implemented in every respect by President Obama. When it comes to the pursuit of enhanced energy independence, Obama has embraced the ultra-nationalistic orientation of the 2001 Cheney report, with its call for increased reliance on domestic and Western Hemisphere oil and natural gas – no matter the dangers of drilling in environmentally fragile offshore areas or the use of hazardous techniques like hydro-fracking. In recent speeches, he has boasted of his administration’s efforts to facilitate increased oil and gas drilling at home and promised to speed drilling in new locations, including offshore Alaska and the Gulf of Mexico. "Over the last three years," he boasted in his January State of the Union address, "we've opened millions of new acres for oil and gas exploration, and tonight, I'm directing my administration to open more than 75% of our potential offshore oil and gas resources. Right now - right now - American oil production is the highest that it's been in eight years… Not only that - last year, we relied less on foreign oil than in any of the past 16 years." He spoke with particular enthusiasm about the extraction of natural gas via fracking from shale deposits: "We have a supply of natural gas that can last America nearly 100 years. And my administration will take every possible action to safely develop this energy." Obama has also voiced his desire to increase U.S. reliance on Western Hemisphere energy, thereby diminishing its dependence on unreliable and unfriendly suppliers in the Middle East and Africa. In March 2011, with the Arab Spring gaining momentum, he traveled to Brazil for five days of trade talks, a geopolitical energy pivot noted at the time. In the eyes of many observers, Obama's focus on Brazil was inextricably linked to that country’s emergence as a major oil producer, thanks to new discoveries in the “pre-salt” fields off its coast in the depths of the Atlantic Ocean, discoveries that could help the U.S. wean itself off Middle Eastern oil but could also turn out to be pollution nightmares. Although environmentalists have warned of the risks of drilling in the pre-salt fields, where a Deepwater Horizon-like blowout is an ever-present danger, Obama has made no secret of his geopolitical priorities. “By some estimates, the oil you recently discovered off the shores of Brazil could amount to twice the reserves we have in the United States,” he told Brazilian business leaders in that country’s capital. “When you’re ready to start selling, we want to be one of your best customers. At a time when we’ve been reminded how easily instability in other parts of the world can affect the price of oil, the United States could not be happier with the potential for a new, stable source of energy.” At the same time, Obama has made it clear that the U.S. will retain its role as the ultimate guardian of the Persian Gulf sea lanes. Even while trumpeting the withdrawal of U.S. combat forces from Iraq, he has insisted that the United States will bolster its air, naval, and special operations forces in the Gulf region, so as to remain the preeminent military power there. "Back to the future," is how Major General Karl R. Horst, chief of staff of the U.S. Central Command, described the new posture, referring to a time before the Iraq War when the U.S. exercised dominance in the region mainly through its air and naval superiority. While less conspicuous than “boots on the ground,” the expanded air and naval presence will be kept strong enough to overpower any conceivable adversary. “We will have a robust continuing presence throughout the region,” Secretary of State Hillary Clinton declared last October. Such a build-up has in fact been accentuated, in preparation either for a strike on Iranian nuclear facilities, should Obama conclude that negotiations to curb Iranian enrichment activities have reached a dead end, or to clear the Strait of Hormuz, if the Iranians carry out threats to block oil shipping there in retaliation for the even harsher economic sanctions due to be imposed after July 1st. Like Cheney, Obama also seeks to ensure U.S. control over the vital sea lanes extending from the Strait of Hormuz to the South China Sea. This is, in fact, the heart of Obama’s much publicized policy “pivot” to Asia and his new military doctrine, first revealed in a speech to the Australian Parliament on November 17th. “As we plan and budget for the future,” he declared, “we will allocate the resources necessary to maintain our strong military presence in this region.” A major priority of this effort, he indicated, would be enhanced “maritime security,” especially in the South China Sea. Central to the Obama plan – like that advanced by Dick Cheney in 2007 – is the construction of a network of bases and alliances encircling China, the globe’s rising power, in an arc stretching from Japan and South Korea in the north to Australia, Vietnam, and the Philippines in the southeast and thence to India in the southwest. When describing this effort in Canberra, Obama revealed that he had just concluded an agreement with the Australian government to establish a new U.S. military basing facility at Darwin on the country’s northern coast, near the South China Sea. He also spoke of the ultimate goal of U.S. geopolitics: a region-embracing coalition of anti-Chinese states that would include India. “We see America’s enhanced presence across Southeast Asia,” both in growing ties with local powers like Australia and “in our welcome of India as it ‘looks east’ and plays a larger role as an Asian power.” As anyone who follows Asian affairs is aware, a strategy aimed at encircling China – especially one intended to incorporate India into America’s existing Asian alliance system – is certain to produce alarm and pushback from Beijing. “I don’t think they’re going to be very happy,” said Mark Valencia, a senior researcher at the National Bureau of Asian Research, speaking of China’s reaction. “I’m not optimistic in the long run as to how this is going to wind up.” Finally, Obama has followed in Cheney’s footsteps in his efforts to reduce Russia’s influence in Europe and Central Asia by promoting the construction of new oil and gas pipelines from the Caspian via Georgia and Turkey to Europe. On June 5th, at the Caspian Oil and Gas Conference in Baku, President Ilham Aliyev of Azerbaijan read a message from Obama promising Washington’s support for a proposed Trans-Anatolia gas pipeline, a conduit designed to carry natural gas from Azerbaijan across Georgia and Turkey to Europe – bypassing Russia, naturally. At the same time, Secretary of State Clinton traveled to Georgia, just as Cheney had, to reaffirm U.S. support and offer increased U.S. military aid. As during the Bush-Cheney era, these moves are bound to be seen in Moscow as part of a calculated drive to lessen Russia’s influence in the region – and so are certain to elicit a hostile response. In virtually every respect, then, when it comes to energy geopolitics the Obama administration continues to carry out the strategic blueprint pioneered by Dick Cheney during the two Bush administrations. What explains this surprising behavior? Assuming that it doesn’t represent a literal effort to replicate Cheney's thinking - and there's no evidence of that - it clearly represents the triumph of imperial geopolitics (and hidebound thinking) over ideology, principle, or even simple openness to new ideas. When you get two figures as different as Obama and Cheney pursuing the same pathways in the world - and the first time around was anything but a success - it's a sign of just how closed and airless the world of Washington really has become. At a time when most Americans are weary of grand ideological crusades, the pursuit of what looks like simple national self-interest - in the form of assured energy supplies - may appear far more attractive as a rationale for military and political involvement abroad. In addition, Obama and his advisers are no doubt influenced by talk of a new "golden age" of North American oil and gas, made possible by the exploitation of shale deposits and other unconventional - and often dirty - energy resources. According to projections given by the Department of Energy, U.S. reliance on imported energy is likely to decline in the years ahead (though there is a domestic price to be paid for such "independence"), while China's will only rise - a seeming geopolitical advantage for the United States that Obama appears to relish. It is easy enough to grasp the appeal of such energy geopolitics for White House strategists, especially given the woeful state of the U.S. economy and the declining utility of other instruments of state power. And if you are prepared to overlook the growing environmental risks of reliance on offshore oil, shale gas, and other unconventional forms of energy, rising U.S. energy output conveys certain geopolitical advantages. But as history suggests, engaging in aggressive global geopolitical confrontations with other determined, well-armed players usually leads to friction, crisis, war, and disaster. In this regard, Cheney's geopolitical maneuvering led us into two costly Middle Eastern wars while heightening tensions with both China and Russia. President Obama claims he seeks to build a more peaceful world, but copying the Cheney energy blueprint is bound to produce the exact opposite.

#### The Unipolar Moment is over and can’t be recovered – 08 financial crash means the US can’t prevent competition

Rachman 11

(Gideon Rachman, Financial Times chief foreign affairs commentator, Zero-Sum Future, 2011, pp 3-4)

But the economic crisis that struck the world in 2008 has changed the logic of international relations. It is no longer obvious that globalization benefits all the world's major powers. It is no longer clear that the United States faces no serious international rivals. And it is increasingly apparent that the world is facing an array of truly global problems-such as climate change and nuclear proliferation-that are causing rivalry and division between nations. After a long period of international cooperation, competition and rivalry are returning to the international system. A win-win world is giving way to a zero-sum world. Both as individuals and as a nation, Americans have begun to question whether the "new world order" that emerged after the cold war still favors the United States. The rise of Asia is increasingly associated with job losses for ordinary Americans and with a challenge to American power from an increasingly confident China. The crash has heightened awareness of American economic vulnerability and the country's reliance on continued Chinese and Middle Eastern lending. Of course, even after the crash, the United States remains the most powerful country in the world-with its largest economy, its most powerful military, and its leading universities. But the United States will never recover the unchallenged superiority of the "unipolar moment" that began with the collapse of the Soviet Union

#### Entitlement spending makes hege collapse inevitable

Cohen ‘12

[Michael A. Cohen is a regular columnist for Foreign Policy's Election 2012 Channel and a fellow at the Century Foundation. <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/02/21/rotting_from_the_inside_out?page=full> ETB]

There is, however, one serious problem with this analysis. Any discussion of American national security that focuses solely on the issue of U.S. power vis-à-vis other countries -- and ignores domestic inputs -- is decidedly incomplete. In Kagan's New Republic article, for example, he has little to say about the country's domestic challenges except to obliquely argue that to focus on "nation-building" at home while ignoring the importance of maintaining U.S. power abroad would be a mistake. In fact, in a recent FP debate with the Financial Times' Gideon Rachman on the issue of American decline, Kagan diagnoses what he, and many other political analysts, appear to believe is the country's most serious problem: "enormous fiscal deficits driven by entitlements." Why is this bad? It makes it harder, says Kagan, for the United States to "continue playing its vital role in the world" and will lead to significant cutbacks in defense spending. However, a focus on U.S. global dominance or suasion that doesn't factor in those elements that constitute American power at home ignores substantial and worsening signs of decline. Indeed, by virtually any measure, a closer look at the state of the United States today tells a sobering tale of rapid and unchecked decay and deterioration in a host of areas. While not all of them are generally considered elements of national security, perhaps they should be.

#### Heg not solve war –

#### A. No threats require primacy and other factors ensure security.

Friedman and Preble 10 (Benjamin Friedman is a research fellow in defense and homeland security studies at the Cato Institute, Christopher Preble is director of foreign policy studies at the Cato Institute, Budgetary Savings from Military Restraint, September 22, 2010 Cato Policy Analysis No. 667 September 23, 2010 <http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/PA667.pdf>

The United States confuses what it wants from its military, which is global primacy or hegemony, with what its needs, which is safety. Our leaders tend to exaggerate the capability of the enemies we have and invent new enemies by defining traditional foreign troubles —geopolitical competition among states and instability within them, for example—as pressing threats to our security. Geography, wealth, and nuclear weapons provide us with safety that our ancestors would envy. Our hyperactive military policies damage it by encouraging rivalry and resentment. Global military primacy is a game not worth the candle.56

#### B. No war – States have an incentive to avoid it.

Zakaria 08 (Fareed Zakaria, editor of Newsweek International, 2008, The Post-American World, p. 244)

In certain areas – the South China Sea, for example – U.S. military force is likely to be less relevant than that of China. In international negotiations, America will have to bargain and compromise with the others. Does all this add up to instability and disorder? Not necessarily. Two hundred years of Anglo-American hegemony has in fact created a system that is not as fragile is it might have been in the 1920s and 1930s. (When British power waned, American power was unwilling to stip in, and Europe fell through the cracks). The basic conception of the current system – an open world economy, multilateral negotiations – has wide acceptance. And new forms of cooperation are growing. Ann-Marie Slaughter has written about how legal systems are constructing a set of standards without anyone’s forcing them to do so—creating a bottom-up, networked order. Not every issue will lend itself to such stabilization, but many will. In other words, the search for a superpower solution to every problem may be futile and unnecessary. Small work-arounds might be just as effective.

#### Natural gas bubble is being avoided now, which restores companies to profitability. Increase in prices is key.

Wallace 7/17

(Christopher, Former private equity fund manager, now full time private investor; 7/17/2012, “Natural Gas: Movements Into Storage Suggest Glut Will Soon Disappear,” Seeking Alpha, <http://seekingalpha.com/article/725781-natural-gas-movements-into-storage-suggest-glut-will-soon-disappear> - Kurr)

How much of a glut is there?¶ The glut was significant, about 60% above the 5 year average at the beginning of this injection season. Natural gas is stored (in underground structures) and there is a finite amount of gas that can be stored. That amount of maximum storage capacity is estimated to be about 4,200 billion cubic feet. Gas in storage is very much a function of peak and trough usage. There are times of the year when consumption exceeds production and inventories of gas in storage decline, "withdrawal season". This runs from November through March. From April through October, production exceeds consumption and inventories build through what is called "injection season". Many will be familiar with the following graph produced and updated by the EIA, showing the two seasons:¶ As the graph depicts, this year we began injection season with inventories 60% above the 5 year average (2,437 bcf this year versus the 5 year average of 1,514 bcf). For the last 5 years, the average inventory build over the injection season has been 2,146 bcf. A normal injection season would take inventories above storage capacity, a prospect that could have a devastating effect on gas prices. Just a few months ago, pundits were calling for this to happen and for natural gas prices to approach zero.¶ Injections are below normal this season, for two fundamental reasons¶ Natural gas inventories are building at a much slower rate this season. The glut that was built caused natural gas prices to plummet from $14 to a low of $1.92 reached this April 19. The reduction in prices was so steep that it has brought gas to a level that is below most fields all-in cost of production. When the economics are such that you are forced to sell below cost, production naturally curtails. The natural gas rig count has fallen dramatically from a peak of over 1,600 to 522 as at July 13, as drilling new wells ceased to be profitable.¶ The other factor at work here is the decline rate that all wells go through. Natural gas wells are most productive after they are initially drilled and then decline thereafter over their natural lifetime. Horizontally drilled wells are unique in that their decline rate is very steep after the first year, falling by about 70%. The growth in horizontal wells has contributed to an increased overall decline rate.¶ The injection and storage numbers show the glut being removed¶ So far this season, injections are well behind the 5 year average. The glut, which began this injection season at 60% above the 5 year average inventory level is now only 19% above the 5 year average inventory level. From week 12 to week 28 this year injections have totaled 766 bcf, compared to the 5 year average for that period of 1,087 bcf, a reduction of 30%. If the trend continues at 30% below the 5 year average, storage at the end of injection season (beginning November) should be at 3,761 bcf, only 80 bcf above the 5 year average. The glut will effectively be removed.¶ But the story does not end here. The rate of injection relative to the 5 year average has been declining over the course of the injection season. I track the current year 4 week rolling average which has been declining steadily relative to the 5 year 4 week rolling average. Most recently the current year 4 week average is 43% below the 5 year 4 week average. If the rate of injections continues at that rate, this forecasts a season end inventory of 3,627 bcf, which is slightly below the 5 year average.¶ What is the implication of this forecast?¶ A removal of the supply glut should elevate the price of natural gas to its full cycle cost of production plus a reasonable profit. We are seeing basic economics at work. Markets are in the long term pursuit of equilibrium. When supply and demand get out of balance, the price mechanism adjusts to restore equilibrium. Excessive supply brought prices down. Producers will exhibit rational behavior in the long run, and they will curtail production at prices that are below cost. We should expect no significant deviation from this pattern of lower injections until equilibrium prices are achieved, meaning total costs plus reasonable profit. Different companies operating in different fields have different cost structures so it is difficult to make a general statement about industry-wide costs and therefore where prices will return to. However, from what I have read from a variety of sources, I think that costs plus a reasonable profit forecasts $5 - $6 natural gas. It likely won't be a steady rise to that point, but once the market accepts that the glut has been removed, prices should get there. The time frame for this to occur should be measured in months, not years.

#### Popping the bubble turns the aff and causes a supply crunch

Business Insider 7/4

(“Looking Ahead to the Next Oil Price Spike and the Threat of War,” 7/4/2012 Lexis - Kurr)

The difficulty is that an analogous scenario has unfolded before, in the natural gas industry. Out of sync with other commodities, the boom and bust in natural gas is giving us a glimpse of the future for unconventional oil. The extraction techniques are the same ones that have generated tremendous hype, while simultaneously setting up a ponzi scheme in flipping land leases, creating the perception of supply glut, crashing the price of natural gas in North America to far below break-even, amplifying financial risk for increasingly indebted producers, and threatening to put those same producers out of business.¶ This is the dynamic that is set to lead North America into a natural gas supply crunch over the next few years, as we discussed recently in Shale Gas Reality Begins to Dawn.Those involved in unconventional oil would do well to take note.

### Exports ADV

#### Exporting wont happen – too much opposition

Maykuth 9/27

(Andrew, 2012, “Awash with natural gas, industry eyes exporting fuel” Philadelphia Inquirer, <http://seattletimes.com/html/businesstechnology/2019281613_naturalgasexportsxml.html>)

#### But proposals to build more LNG export terminals are controversial. Three Pacific Northwest proposals, two in Oregon and at least one in British Columbia, face opposition as fierce as the coal-export terminals proposed in Bellingham and Grays Harbor. And some American chemical producers fear that shipping LNG to foreign consumers would make gas scarce here, just as the industry is undergoing a revival thanks to abundant supplies of natural gas, a principal raw material. American Public Gas Association, the trade group for utilities, has said that exports would produce “predictable and disastrous” results for household consumers. Environmental groups like the Sierra Club have opposed new export terminals because they would induce more drilling, causing more environmental impact. Others appeal to patriotic sentiments to block exports. T. Boone Pickens, who wants to replace imports of crude oil from unfriendly nations, thinks it would be folly to export natural gas. The Energy Department is studying the economic effects of expanding LNG exports, but Reuters reported last week that the Obama administration delayed the release of the report until after the November election.

#### Squo has solved the FTA – their card is discussing Korea, Colombia, and Panama FTA’s that have been ratified

Smith 11 (Rod, Editor – Feedstuffs, “US Trade Leadership Slipping,” Feedstuffs Food Link, 6-24, http://www.feedstuffsfoodlink.com/ME2/dirmod.asp?sid=andnm=andtype=newsandmod=Newsandmid=9A02E3B96F2A415ABC72CB5F516B4C10andtier=3andnid=FAA1AC2A45944313AAC3C0F446B2E2C4)

THE number of bilateral and regional free trade …. but our leadership in the world.

However, the U.S., once the world's vanguard in negotiating trade agreements and urging fair and free trade, is rapidly sliding into the background as other countries and regions implement trade pacts in which the U.S. is not a member. This not only affects our economic health but our leadership in the world.

THEIR CARD ENDS

President Barack Obama has said he believes in trade and wants the U.S. to double exports by 2015, but his actions don't seem to support his talk. The U.S. has had three very important trade agreements ready to go to Congress for ratification since the day Obama took office, but he has not yet even submitted the implementing legislation much less urged Congress to act on them. The agreements would substantially increase U.S. exports -- including agricultural exports like beef, pork, poultry, grains and oilseeds -- and would lead to thousands of new jobs. One of the agreements is with South Korea, and the Korean ambassador to the U.S. recently said the pact would serve as a signal to the Asian Pacific region that the U.S. will be a major presence there, contributing to peace and stability. The other two agreements, with Colombia and Panama, would increase U.S. competitiveness there and provide those countries with resources to build their economies and nations. It's time for the President to hand over the three pacts to Congress, work with congressional leadership to get them ratified and put the U.S. back into its prominent role in global trade.

#### Their Levi evidence is in the context of TPP negotiations. They don’t solve those – too many alt causes

Gordon 12

(Bernard, Professor Emeritus of Political Science at the University of New Hampshire. He is the author of America's Trade Follies and a forthcoming book about the Trans-Pacific Partnership; Jul/Aug, “Trading Up in Asia,” Foreign Affairs, Vol. 91, Iss. 4 – Kurr)

PROPERTY WRONGS Even as Washington hopes that its efforts to shape the TPP will sooth the concerns of U.S. industries and unions, it has already rankled public interest groups and the governments of the other countries negotiating the agreement-particularly when it comes to intellectual property. In February 2011, a draft text regarding intellectual property from the TPP negotiations was leaked online. A number of U.S. and foreign groups, such as Intellectual Property Watch, Public Knowledge, TPP Watch, and Anonymous harshly criticized several measures outlined in the document. In particular, they condemned proposals for criminal enforcement of copyright and patent law that go beyond existing treaties between the various negotiating countries. They also asserted that the TPP would require Internet service providers to identify users and that the United States is unreasonably seeking to impose its own extensive copyright protections on the agreement. U.S. law stipulates that the vast majority of copyrights should end after 70 years, but critics claim, incorrectly, that the Obama administration has called for the TPP to include a 95-year minimum copyright term on some works. The legal scholars Sean Flynn and Jimmy Koo captured critics' fears when they wrote in 2011 that the TPP would create "the most extreme, anti-consumer and anti-development international instrument on intellectual property to date." The administration has supported these proposals not to harm consumers but to protect American innovators. Intellectual property is already a major source of value for the United States; in 2010, for example, 40 percent of worldwide payments made to intellectual property holders-nearly $100 billion-went to Americans. According to the U.S. Commerce Department, those sums matched the profits earned from the export of aircraft, grain, and business services, three sectors that lead the U.S. trade surplus. And U.S. intellectual property will only become more important in the coming years, as several U.S.-based technological innovations, such as next- generation manufacturing techniques and cutting-edge wireless communications, drive the country's trade. The creators of those technologies will need as much shelter under the TPP as those who currently hold copyrights and patents under U.S. law. The United States is hardly the only nation affiliated with the TPP that has an interest in securing copyright and patent protections for its citizens. In 2008, for example, Japan led the world in patent applications. And Singapore, with its- multibillion-dollar biotechnology investments, also needs to protect its homegrown efforts. In rightly defending the intellectual property rights of American innovators, the United States has also led the way for these other nations. But it is clear that some of those countries do not believe that the United States has their best interests in mind. FREE TALKS Despite the broad interest in strong intellectual property protections among some countries negotiating the TPP, some nations continue to charge that the United States is making unreasonable demands. At the 11th TPP negotiating session, in Australia this past March, for example, the Australian press reported that every TPP negotiating member had rebuffed U.S. proposals regarding intellectual property rights. And in mid-April, several negotiators from Chile put the future of the agreement in doubt when they questioned "whether joining the TPP would be worth its costs if it included additional demands on intellectual property." Meanwhile, during the same meeting in Australia in March, several organizations condemned the TPP for its potential impact on the availability of cheap drugs. Doctors Without Borders, for example, accused the U.S. government of inserting provisions into the TPP that would interfere with the low-cost delivery of malaria and HIV/AIDS medicines to developing nations. During a previous round of TPP negotiations, the group claimed that the agreement would "extend monopoly protection for old drugs by simply making minor modifications to existing formulas," thereby preventing the introduction of cheaper generic drugs.

#### No Impact to rare earth minerals- alternatives and market shift solve

**Broadband ’11** (October 26, 2011 http://www.voanews.com/english/news/asia/Chinas-Rare-Earth-Minerals-Supply-Manipulation-Could-Backfire-132605798.html Manipulation of China's Rare Earth Minerals Supply Could Backfire Ivan Broadband | Hong Kong

**Unlike previous occasions when Beijing has manipulated supply**, the world is now looking increasingly prepared to move away from its dependence on Chinese rare earths. Manufacturers, including Toyota and General Motors, are already developing processes that minimize the use of rare earths in vehicle design, says Matthew Fusarelli, head of research at AME. “Rare earths generally have a very high degree of substitutability," Fusarelli said. "So electronics manufacturers can, over time, change their production processes to use rare earths more sparingly, if at all.” **Andrew Bloodworth says it will not take many new suppliers to alter the dependence on China.** “The amount we use compared to industrial metals is absolutely tiny," he explained. "Last year in the world we mined about 17, 18 million tons of copper. We mined about 130,-140,000 tons of rare earth. A couple of new mines will change the picture completely.” Alternatives **New mines are being planned in the United States, Russia and Australia. Other mines once moth-balled or not developed on concerns about viability are moving towards production.** Among these is the Molycorp mine in Mountain Pass, California. This closed in 2002 when China swamped the market with cheap supplies. **Molycorp directors say they have discovered several new rare earth deposits at the site and expect the old mine to be one of the world’s largest rare earth suppliers by 2014.**

#### The WTO guarantees U.S. access to Chinese REE- no shortages

Bosco 12

David Bosco 1-30, assistant professor at American University's School of International Service, January 30, 2012, “WTO rules against China on 'rare earth' minerals,” online: <http://bosco.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/01/30/wto_rules_against_china_on_rare_earth_minerals>

The World Trade Organization's appellate body [ruled today](http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5iQWDjbSMV_bSItDoHNC6x4tq31qA?docId=CNG.fab869aea95c0cb3ce801070fba43334.271) that China's restrictions on the export of certain key minerals was illegal:¶ The World Trade Organization on Monday upheld its ruling that Chinese restrictions on key raw material exports broke trade rules following an appeal by Beijing.¶ China must bring its duty and export quota measures on elements including magnesium and zinc into line with its WTO obligations, an appeal body said.¶ The WTO found in favour of the United States, European Union and Mexico in July following a complaint that China had failed to meet the promises it made when joining the body.¶ U.S. trade officials--who have made targeting Chinese trade practices a focus of their work-- immediately [celebrated the ruling](http://www.ustr.gov/about-us/press-office/press-releases/2012/january/ambassador-kirk-announces-us-victory-challenge-chi):¶ The Obama Administration will continue to ensure that China and every other country play by the rules so that U.S. workers and companies can compete and succeed on a level playing field. During his State of the Union Address last week, the President laid out a blueprint for an economy that’s built to last – an economy built with the renewed strength of American manufacturing. Today’s decision ensures that core manufacturing industries in this country can get the materials they need to produce and compete on a level playing field.

#### Domestic production and E-waste recycling make China irrelevant by next year- and demand increase inevitable

Kaye 11

Leon Kaye 12-6, editor of GreenGoPost and contributor to The Guardian’s Sustainable Business section, December 6, 2011, “Conflicted Rare Earth Minerals Prices to Decline,” online: <http://www.triplepundit.com/2011/12/rare-earth-minerals-prices/>

Now [various reports](http://www.nytimes.com/2011/11/17/business/global/prices-of-rare-earth-metals-declining-sharply.html) suggest that prices for these materials will start trending downward.¶ Global demand for rare earth minerals will increase over seven percent a year, and their market value will triple from its current value to US$9.2 billion by 2015. Prices should peak in 2013, but by then improved processes and increased research and development in rare earth mineral refining technologies will have a role in pushing those prices down.¶ [Molycorp](http://www.molycorp.com/) is one reason why rare earths’ prices should stabilize and even decrease. The Colorado-based company owns California’s Mountain Pass Mine, which once supplied most of the world’s rare earth minerals when they were used in color televisions. The mine was shuttered in 2002 because of cheaper minerals from China and growing environmental concerns. But the Mountain Pass facility is due to [reopen](http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2012/02/a-visit-to-the-only-american-mine-for-rare-earth-metals/253372/) soon, and companies in Japan including Sumitomo and Mitsubishi have already [signed agreements](http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2009/05/clean-energy-apos-s-dirty-little-secret/7377/) to purchase these minerals from Molycorp. Another company, [Simbol Materials](http://www.simbolmaterials.com/), extracts rare earths from California’s Salton Sea and promises a more sustainable [process](http://www.simbolmaterials.com/breakthrough_technology.htm) to produce lithium in addition to other minerals.¶ Another factor in decreasing rare earth mineral costs will be the increased and improved [recycling](http://greengopost.com/ups-sustainability-report-2010-e-waste/) of electronics. These conflict minerals are technically not rare. They are, however, widely dispersed in minuscule amounts, and therefore a massive volume of ore is required to extract just a few ounces of that valuable neodymium that keeps wind turbines swirling and the latest Prius models humming. One start-up, [BioMine](http://www.greenbiz.com/blog/2011/10/12/if11-why-innovation-requires-death-good-ideas), envisions electronic waste smelters throughout North America that will gather unwanted computers and electronic gadgets and salvage rare earths in addition to expensive metals like gold and copper. E-waste actually has a much [higher concentration](http://www.guardian.co.uk/sustainable-business/electronic-waste-refining) of rare earths than virgin ore; more efficient recycling will help keep prices down while lessening their environmental impact. Recycling regulations like those in [Japan](http://www.triplepundit.com/2011/11/21st-century-treasure-hunt-thrives-japanese-recycling-plant/) that puts the responsibility for recycling on everyone, from consumers to retailers to manufacturers, will also help the collection of electronic waste, the treasure of the 21st century.¶ As battery, electromagnets and other technologies improve, watch for increased efficiency from batteries, wind turbines and yes, even smartphones. Dystopian fear that we are unsustainably sourcing materials for “sustainable” technologies will be replaced by optimism from more innovative products that will benefit all of us in the long run.

#### No impact on the military

\*DoD will step in to prevent shortages from affecting the military, new producers will fill-in, and domestic suppliers will meet defense needs by 2013

Bloomberg ‘12

<http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-04-09/rare-earths-shortage-would-spur-pentagon-to-action.html> ETB

The Defense Department would intervene in case of a shortage of rare earth materials for defense electronics and motors, Brett Lambert, the Pentagon official responsible for industrial policy, said. ¶ “If we see restrictions, we would look to activate one of many measures, including contingency contracting” that lets U.S. defense contractors buy materials on behalf of the Pentagon, Lambert, the U.S. deputy assistant secretary of defense for manufacturing and industrial base policy, said today in an interview. “The tripwire” for such action is “if we are unable to meet requirements.” ¶ Even at the height of export restrictions placed by [China](http://topics.bloomberg.com/china/) in 2010, there was no evidence that U.S. defense contractors faced such shortages, Lambert said. China, the world’s largest producer of rare earth materials accounting for at least 90 percent of the global supply, cut export quotas by 72 percent that year, sending prices of some materials up more than sixfold. ¶ The global market responded to those restrictions as new producers such as [Molycorp Inc. (MCP)](http://www.bloomberg.com/quote/MCP:US) of the U.S. and Lynas Corp. of [Australia](http://topics.bloomberg.com/australia/) emerged. “Prices of materials have fallen dramatically,” Lambert said. ¶ The U.S. defense industry’s consumption of rare earth materials accounts for less than 5 percent of the nation’s annual use, Lambert said. A report prepared by his office and sent to Congress last month said domestic rare earth supplies will meet defense needs by 2013. To prepare the report, the Pentagon created a database of which materials went into what components and of available alternatives, he said.

#### No rise of protectionism and any rise wouldn’t cause extinction

Naim 10 – editor in chief of foreign policy magazine

Moises Naim, Editor in Chief of Foreign Policy Magazine. Foreign Policy. “It Didn't Happen”. January/February 2010. http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/01/04/it\_didnt\_happen?page=full

Protectionism will surge. It didn't. Trade flows did drop dramatically in late 2008 and early 2009, but they started to grow again in the second half of 2009 as economies recovered. Pascal Lamy, director-general of the World Trade Organization, had warned that the global financial crisis was bound to lead to surges in protectionism as governments sought to blame foreigners for their problems. "That is exactly what happened in the 1930s when [protectionism] was the virus that spread the crisis all over the place," he said in October 2008, echoing a widely held sentiment among trade experts. And it is true that many governments dabbled in protectionism, including not only the U.S. Congress's much-derided "Buy American" provision, but also measures such as increased tariffs or import restrictions imposed in 17 of the G-20 countries. Yet one year later, a report from the European Union concluded that "a widespread and systemic escalation of protectionism has been prevented." The protectionist temptation is always there, and a meaningful increase in trade barriers cannot be ruled out. But it has not happened yet.

#### ( ) Numerous constraints prevent protectionism

Rajiv Kumar, 11/12/08, Protectionism and Obama, p. http://www.mydigitalfc.com/opinion/protectionism-and-obama

President designate Obama, while he can, of course, take the protectionist route, is **unlikely to do so** for several reasons. First, he appears to be **strongly committed** to reversing the decline in US's global prestige and leadership that has happened during the Bush presidency, especially over the last four years. He cannot hope to achieve this by leading the US away from globalisation and turning his back to US’s long-standing commitment to free market for goods and services. This will seriously erode the legitimacy that Pax American enjoys at present. A protectionist move by Obama presidency must surely imply the beginning of the end of the US economic hegemony in the world and accelerate the shift away from the Atlantic basin to Asia. Second, US firms with overseas operations, especially in Asia, will for good reason, **resist these moves** as their competitiveness and **indeed survival** will be threatened. The loss of competitiveness and eventual shutting down of these firms will also result in job losses within the US. Third, any unilateral protectionist moves by the US will raise the spectre of competitive tariff escalation by its trading partners, which will surely exacerbate the current crisis and make a world-wide depression that much more possible. There are more than enough people within the US academia, and hopefully also within the administration, who can **hammer home the dangers inherent** in such an approach and thus **stop** the **Obama** administration from going ahead in the protectionist direction. Fourth and last, higher protection levels will imply ringing the death knell of the Doha Round and effectively also the near complete loss of World Trade Organisation's credibility and indeed legitimacy. I doubt if any US president can precipitate such an eventuality. These factors will hopefully **ensure** that while there will be **plenty of threats**, and perhaps even some calls from voluntary export restraints from the incoming administration, these will not be **carried forward to actual imposition** of higher tariff or non-tariff walls by the US.