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## Politics

#### Will pass – capital key – issues will be worked out

CT POST 3 – 28 – 13 Connecticut Post <http://www.ctpost.com/local/article/Immigration-reform-gaining-support-in-Congress-4393187.php>

A Republican Party in desperate search for relevance to Latino voters. An expanded Democratic advantage in the Senate. A second-term President with his legacy on the line.

Does all that add up to enough to break decades of impasse and produce comprehensive immigration reform? As expectations -- and tensions -- rise, the answer won't be long in coming.

A bipartisan bill could be filed in the Senate as early as next week, followed in relatively short order by a House bill, also crafted by a bipartisan group, aiming at a compromise on the key issue of citizenship.

The efforts are being applauded by President Barack Obama, who is using every ounce of his political clout to try to get comprehensive reform.

Obama said the time has come "to work up the political courage to do what's required to be done."

"I expect a bill to be put forward. I expect a debate to begin next month. I want to sign that bill into law as soon as possible," Obama said at a White House naturalization ceremony.

In addition to the issue of eventual citizenship for 11 million undocumented immigrants, Congress is expected to address the need for temporary or guest worker programs.

Congress last passed comprehensive bipartisan reform legislation in 1986, when President Ronald Reagan signed a law that granted citizenship to several million undocumented immigrants and created a guest worker program.

Up until now, Republicans have opposed citizenship programs as an "amnesty" for lawbreakers who entered the country illegally, and labor has chafed at guest worker programs.

But Republican losses in the 2012 elections and increased public support for reform have many in the GOP talking compromise.

"If there is one issue that the two parties could produce something meaningful on in this Congress, it would be immigration," said Stephen Hess, a political expert at The Brookings Institution.

Hess said an eventual bill "will have lots of provisos, and it will go back and forth, but it would be hard not to produce something given the general feeling that something has to be produced."

More and more Republicans are moving toward immigration-reform measures as the party seeks to reach out to Latinos, the nation's largest -- and growing -- minority voting bloc.

Public opinion is behind them.

A recent poll showed 63 percent of Americans supported a path to citizenship for undocumented workers provided they meet certain requirements, according to a survey by the Public Religion Research Institute.

Notable Republicans who have recently spoken in favor of compromise on citizenship proposals include Sen. Rand Paul, R-Ky.; former Mississippi Gov. Haley Barbour; and Rep. Paul Ryan, R-Wis.

And a March report by the National Republican Committee, considered a "post mortem" on the 2012 elections, recommended the GOP embrace comprehensive immigration reform to shore up its shaky standing with minorities -- Latinos, in particular.

Roy Beck, executive director of Numbers USA, which advocates lower numerical numbers on immigration, predicted a majority of Republican senators would oppose citizenship.

Groups like Numbers USA are working to hold GOP senators in line. They sent 13,000 emails to Kentucky voters that claimed Paul's position was "more radical and pro-immigration than anything proposed by President Obama."

The group has targeted Sen. Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., one of the "Gang of Eight" senators writing the Senate bipartisan bill, as a lawmaker who favors foreign workers over unemployed South Carolinians.

Democrats from conservative-leaning states could also feel political heat.

Beck said if five to 10 Democrats in the Senate oppose a bill, proponents would need 10 to 15 Republicans to reach the 60 votes needed to cut off debate and vote on legislation.

"You do the math," Beck said.

In 2007, an effort to cut off debate on a Senate immigration reform bill died on a 46-53 vote.

But immigrant reform proponents, such as America's Voice, say there is a "tectonic shift" in the GOP, and the Democrats also have expanded their Senate majority to 53-45, plus two independents who caucus with them. They predict the Senate will muster the votes necessary to pass a reform bill.

Still, it won't be easy.

"We will have not only a few potholes, but a few near-death experiences along the way," said Frank Sharry, America's Voice executive director.

#### Offshore drilling causes backlash

Lacey 12 [Stephen Lacey, “60 Members of congress and nearly 40,000 American citizens urge Obama to Halt Arctic Offshore Drilling,” February 8, 2012, http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/02/08/421360/congress-citizens-obama-halt-arctic-offshore-drilling/?mobile=nc]

As the Obama Administration moves to open up Arctic waters for exploratory offshore oil and gas drilling, a raising tide of opposition is emerging to counter the decision.

In the last two weeks, dozens of members of Congress, hundreds of scientists, and tens of thousands of concerned citizens have expressed their concerns about the environmental impact of drilling in Arctic waters.

In an open letter signed yesterday by 60 members of Congress, federal lawmakers called on Interior Secretary Ken Salazar to halt all leases for the Arctic in the agency’s five-year plan until a more sound review of disaster-response capabilities can be conducted:

“Successful oil spill response methods … cannot simply be transferred to the Arctic. The Arctic is a unique environment with significant hurdles that the DOI and related agencies must genuinely address before considering any new leasing in the region prior to including Arctic areas in a five-year plan.”

This follows a [months-long investigation](http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2012/02/arctic_ocean_drilling.html" \t "_blank" \o "investigation) into disaster preparation in the Arctic by the Center for American Progress oceans team, which found a complete lack of infrastructure to deal with an oil spill:

There are no U.S. Coast Guard stations north of the Arctic Circle, and we currently operate just one functional icebreaking vessel. Alaska’s tiny ports and airports are incapable of supporting an extensive and sustained airlift effort. The region even lacks such basics as paved roads and railroads. This dearth of infrastructure would severely hamper the ability to transport the supplies and personnel required for any large-scale emergency response effort. Furthermore, the extreme and unpredictable weather conditions complicate transportation, preparedness, and cleanup of spilled oil to an even greater degree.

Just two weeks before, 573 scientists [sent a letter to the White House](http://thinkprogress.org/green/2012/01/27/413667/scientists-beg-obama-to-slow-arctic-drilling-rush/" \t "_blank" \o "sent a letter) urging the Obama Administration to take a science-based approach to issuing leases in the Arctic and to avoid opening up the region because of political pressure to expand drilling:

“Doing so prior to authorizing new oil and gas activity in the Arctic Ocean will respect the national significance of the environment and cultures of U.S. Arctic waters and demonstrate the value that your Administration places on having a sound scientific basis for managing industrial development of the Outer Continental Shelf.”

If one were to follow these concerns about taking a science-based approach to their logical conclusion, it’s highly unlikely that anyone would consider drilling for more fossil fuels in the Arctic. In its [environmental impact statement](http://www.alaska.boemre.gov/ref/EIS%20EA/2012_Shell_CamdenEP_EA/2011_039.pdf" \t "_blank" \o "eis), the Department of Interior even admits that “the Arctic is experiencing variations that are accelerating faster than previously realized” due to climate change — ironically making the region more attractive for oil and gas extraction as sea ice continues its downward spiral.

Apparently, the plan isn’t sitting well with many interested citizens either. Today was the final deadline for public comments, and almost 400,000 people have asked President Obama to stop the sales of leases in the Department of Interior’s five-year plan, according to the Alaska Wilderness League.

The Obama Administration is set to approve exploratory Arctic drilling permits to Royal Dutch Shell for operations next summer — a company that recently spilled 218 tons of oil in the North Sea and has the [worst spill record](http://thinkprogress.org/romm/2011/08/24/302474/oil-investigation-shell-has-dreadful-safety-record-in-north-sea-now-it-wants-to-drill-in-arctic/" \t "_blank" \o "spill record) in the UK since 2000.

#### Key to relations and economic growth in China and India.

Los Angeles Times, 11/9/2012 (Other countries eagerly await U.S. immigration reform, p. <http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/world_now/2012/11/us-immigration-reform-eagerly-awaited-by-source-countries.html>)

"Comprehensive immigration reform will see expansion of skilled labor visas," predicted B. Lindsay Lowell, director of policy studies for the Institute for the Study of International Migration at Georgetown University. A former research chief for the congressionally appointed Commission on Immigration Reform, Lowell said he expects to see at least a fivefold increase in the number of highly skilled labor visas that would provide "a significant shot in the arm for India and China." There is widespread consensus among economists and academics that skilled migration fosters new trade and business relationships between countries and enhances links to the global economy, Lowell said. "Countries like India and China weigh the opportunities of business abroad from their expats with the possibility of brain drain, and I think they still see the immigration opportunity as a bigger plus than not," he said.

#### Nuclear war

**Schaffer**, Spring **2002** (Teresita – Director of the South Asia Program at the Center for Strategic and International Security, Washington Quarterly, p. Lexis)

Washington's increased interest in India since the late 1990s reflects India's economic expansion and position as Asia's newest rising power. New Delhi, for its part, is adjusting to the end of the Cold War. As a result, both giant democracies see that they can benefit by closer cooperation. For Washington, the advantages include a wider network of friends in Asia at a time when the region is changing rapidly, as well as a stronger position from which to help calm possible future nuclear tensions in the region. Enhanced trade and investment benefit both countries and are a prerequisite for improved U.S. relations with India. For India, the country's ambition to assume a stronger leadership role in the world and to maintain an economy that lifts its people out of poverty depends critically on good relations with the United States.

## EPA DA

#### Obama commitment to climate is boosting EPA authority

Strassel 1/24/13 [KIMBERLY A. STRASSEL, “The Real Obama Climate Deal,” Wall Street Journal, January 24, 2013, 8:20 p.m. ET, pg. http://tinyurl.com/ag7rmn2

President Obama set off a guessing game this week as to what he intended with his inaugural promise to double down on climate change. There's no need to guess. California Democrat Barbara Boxer, the Senate's climate guru, was happy to fill in the gory details. The president's climate shout-out sent the green community into flurries of ecstasy, with grand hopes of a new push for cap-and-trade in Congress, or of a redoubled U.S. commitment to a global carbon pact. It fell to Mrs. Boxer to tamp down those ambitions, even as she reassured her devotees that there is more than one way to skin the climate cat. "A lot of you press me . . . on: 'Where is the bill on climate change? Where is the bill?' There doesn't have to be a bill," Mrs. Boxer explained in a briefing the day after Mr. Obama's speech. "I'm telling you right now, EPA has the authority in the transportation sector, the electricity sector, and the industrial sector under the Clean Air Act" to do everything that legislation might otherwise do. In other words, with the election over, all pretense is gone. Democrats won't waste political capital on a doomed cap-and-trade bill. Yet they'll get their carbon program all the same, by deputizing the EPA to impose sweeping new rules and using their Senate majority to block any GOP effort to check the agency's power grab. The further upside? Brute regulation is not only certain and efficient, it allows vulnerable Democrats to foist any blame on a lame-duck administration. Mrs. Boxer has spent years on climate, and she wouldn't be surrendering her legislative ambitions without clear assurances the White House has her covered. Her words were a signal that the Obama EPA is about to re-energize the regulatory machine that it put on ice during the election. Republicans who hoped Lisa Jackson's resignation signaled a more humble EPA approach should instead prepare for an agency with a new and turbocharged mission.

#### EPA staffers are sensitive to presidential messaging

**Andreen 07**– Professor of Law @ University of Alabama (Roll Tide) [William L. Andreen, “Motivating Enforcement: Institutional Culture and the Clean Water Act,” 24 Pace Envtl. L. Rev. 67 (2007) pg: <http://digitalcommons.pace.edu/pelr/vol24/iss1/4>

In a recent article, Professor Joel Mintz perceptively observed that one generally unrecognized characteristic of EPA enforcement is "its high sensitivity to staff-level perceptions and concerns." 128

He quotes a former EPA regional official as saying: The people [at the EPA] who work on enforcement are very sensitive to signals about what they are doing. Because enforcement has always been.., controversial and contentious, it is... critical that the people working on it have entirely clear signals that enforcement is important, . . . and that the people who do the work will be supported. Those signals have to come from the top. 129

Ambiguous signals from the top can easily be read by the staff as a kind of coded message expressing reluctance about, perhaps even hostility towards, enforcement. Hence, as a senior EPA enforcement official recently recounted: The current [Bush] administration would typically say[:] "Oh, I want you to enforce, but can you please check in with us before you do any major new cases, e.g., concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs)." That was taken by the staff as a directive not to enforce .... [Former EPA Administrator Christine Todd] Whitman also sent her political staffers out to check on particular cases. That also chilled enforcement. 130

The consequence, of course, was a severe downturn in EPA enforcement from 2002 to 2003.131 While one would expect enforcement personnel to scrutinize the language and action of the agency's political appointees, it is a little surprising that it appears so easy at times for the agency's top brass to intentionally or even unintentionally slow down EPA enforcement. Pg. 86

#### Gas drilling contradicts the current message

**Begos 12** [Kevin Begos, “President Barack Obama faces historic natural gas drilling choice,” Associated Press, Posted:11/17/2012 10:52:34 PM MST

PITTSBURGH -- Energy companies, environmental groups, and even Hollywood stars are watching to see what decisions President Barack Obama makes about regulating or promoting natural gas drilling.

The stakes are huge. Business leaders don't want government regulations to slow the flow of hundreds of billions of dollars of clean, cheap domestic energy over the next few decades. Environmental groups see that same tide as a potential threat, not just to air and water, but to renewable energy. And on a strategic level, diplomats envision a future when natural gas helps make the U.S. less beholden to imports.

Some say the unexpected drilling boom presents historic options -- and risks -- for the Obama administration.

"It's a tough choice. The president is in a real bind," said Charles Ebinger, director of the energy security initiative at the Brookings Institution, a Washington, D.C., nonprofit. "I think the question is what does he want his legacy to be?"

Ebinger said that if Obama fully embraced the boom in gas drilling the nation could see "incredible" job gains that could lead to "a re-industrialization of America." Possibilities like that are tempting to any president, and perhaps even more so in the current economy.

"But really embracing this stuff is going to bring him squarely in conflict with some of his environmental supporters. It's not without some possible peril, particularly if he gets to be seen too cozy with the oil and gas folks," Ebinger said.

#### EPA’ climate adaptation strategies protect water supplies

**Goad 2/8/**13 [Ben Goad, “EPA moves forward with climate change protection plan, asks for comments,” The Hill, 02/08/13 10:55 AM ET, pg. http://tinyurl.com/aaz8ual

It is essential that EPA adapt to anticipate and plan for future changes in climate,” according to [the 55-page plan](http://epa.gov/climatechange/pdfs/EPA-climate-change-adaptation-plan-final-for-public-comment-2-7-13.pdf), which carries a 2012 date but was put forth now for public consideration. “It must integrate, or mainstream, considerations of climate change into its programs, policies, rules and operations to ensure they are effective under future climatic conditions.”  
Rising sea levels, loss of snowpack and drought linked to climate change will likely require the agency to take additional steps to protect watersheds, wetlands and water supplies, the report argues.   
Increasing temperatures and more frequent extreme weather events, meanwhile, will demand measures to protect public safety and adapt emergency response plans, it says.  
The report does not propose specific rules but rather sets a framework to support and prioritize future actions. By 2015, the report says, EPA will have integrated “climate change science trend and scenario information” into its rule-making processes.

The agency would also account for future global warming in its grant and loan programs and contract decisions by that year, according to the report.

Earthjustice, a nonprofit environmental advocacy group, lauded the plan.

“We are pleased the EPA is getting its house in order to respond to climate change impacts on its personnel, facilities and programs, said Sarah Saylor, senior legislative representative for the group. "This type of planning can be used to inspire states, regions, localities and individuals to follow suit."

The plan stems from Obama’s 2009 executive order requiring federal agencies to issue annual Strategic Sustainability Performance Plans, which set targets for reducing waste and pollution. For the first time this year, those plans include the climate change adaptation plans, which can be viewed [here](http://sustainability.performance.gov/).

#### The impact is water wars

**Hodges 12** [Dave Hodges, “The Coming Water Wars,” [The Common Sense Show.com](http://www.thecommonsenseshow.com), December 11, 2012, pg. http://www.thecommonsenseshow.com/2012/12/11/the-coming-water-wars/

Very soon, America will be forced into water wars in order to secure the precious asset of water for our people. This will force our people into more wars of occupation in a search for water. Meanwhile, every nation that America conquers, is one less country that the bankers have to worry about taking over. At the end of the day, if America wants water, someday, Americans will have to go to war to obtain water.

As any aware person knows, Agenda 21 is being used as a front for the purpose of increasing the bottom of line of select global corporations. Bolivia is being exploited to this end and is serving as the canary in the mine with regard to what lies ahead for the United States and the coming water wars.

The United States sits upon a fiscal cliff. Economic devastation is in the cards for the US. Many wonder what will happen when the country defaults and cannot pay its bills. The answer is simple, our country will enter receivership. Once receivership is thrust upon our country, the bankers will begin to take control of our assets. Among the prize assets coveted by the globalist bankers will be our water supply.  Soon, very soon, our water supplies will become the most expensive in the world. Obtaining water for many Americans will soon be a life and death struggle.

#### Nuclear escalation

**Hellman 12** – Professor Emeritus of Electrical Engineering @ Stanford University [Dr. [Martin Hellman](http://www-ee.stanford.edu/%7Ehellman/" \t "_blank), [War Games and Nuclear Risk](http://nuclearrisk.wordpress.com/2012/11/25/war-games-and-nuclear-risk/),” Defusing the Nuclear Threat, [November 25, 2012](http://nuclearrisk.wordpress.com/2012/11/25/war-games-and-nuclear-risk/), pg. http://nuclearrisk.wordpress.com/2012/11/25/war-games-and-nuclear-risk/

A 2008 RAND [Project Air Force report](http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2008/RAND_MG614.pdf" \t "_blank) states:

In 2004, Director of Air Force Strategic Planning Major General Ronald J. Bath sponsored a war game in which uncontrolled escalation occurred, surprising players and controllers alike … this experience was just one in a series of escalatory events occurring in major war games over the past several years.

A [2012 report](http://www.ifri.org/downloads/pp40morgan.pdf) by the lead author of the above report, RAND’s Dr. Forrest E. Morgan, added a few more details:

By 2004, strategic planners at Headquarters U.S. Air Force had become concerned that they did not adequately understand escalation risks in the contemporary security environment. … An increasing number of war games … had ended in uncontrolled escalation, games in which the scenarios called for only limited U.S. military intervention against notional adversaries that were clearly outmatched by U.S. forces. … At first game analysts assumed the outcomes were spurious, the result of overly aggressive “red teams” … But the increasing frequency with which the games turned escalatory and the wide range of participants and scenarios suggested that something else was at work, something that Air Force planners did not understand.

While classification prevented more details from being disseminated, Yale Professor Paul Bracken’s excellent, [just-released book](http://www.amazon.com/The-Second-Nuclear-Age-Strategy/dp/080509430X/ref=tmm_hrd_title_0?ie=UTF8&qid=1353829045&sr=8-1), The Second Nuclear Age, reveals significant details of a June 1983 war game, codenamed Proud Prophet (pp. 81-89).\* This war game differed from earlier exercises in that Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger and JCS Chairman. General John W. Vessey Jr. played themselves and our actual war-fighting plans were used. According to Bracken:

The result was a catastrophe that made all the wars of the past five hundred years pale in comparison. A half billion human beings were killed in the initial exchanges and at least that many more would have died from radiation and starvation. NATO was gone. So was a good part of Europe, the United States, and the Soviet Union. Major parts of the northern hemisphere would be uninhabitable for decades. (page 88) …

This game went nuclear big time, not because Secretary Weinberger and the chairman of the Joint Chiefs were crazy but because they faithfully implemented the prevailing U.S. strategy. (page 88) …  after Proud Prophet, there was no more over-the-top nuclear rhetoric coming out of the United States. Launch on warning, horizontal escalation, early use of nuclear weapons, tit-for-tat nuclear exchanges – these were banished, conceptually and rhetorically. The Reagan administration switched gears. The chairman of the Joint Chiefs spent the next several years cleaning up U.S. war plans. Nuclear threats were gone. (page 89)

But is the nuclear threat gone today? The 2004 war games, described above, seem to indicate that threat is alive and well, as do recent implied US nuclear threats against both Russia and China – see my blog posts of [November 10](http://nuclearrisk.wordpress.com/2012/11/10/us-creates-nuclear-trip-wire-in-poland/), [September 28](http://nuclearrisk.wordpress.com/2012/09/28/another-early-warning-sign/), and [September 26](http://nuclearrisk.wordpress.com/2012/09/26/poking-the-russian-bear-and-baiting-the-chinese-dragon/) for details. And, as Prof. Bracken’s book ably demonstrates, nuclear proliferation and terrorism have added dangerous new dimensions.

## enviro da

#### Drilling will destroy numerous biological hotspots

Gravitz 9—Oceans Advocate for Environment America [Michael Gravitz, Statement at the Department of Interior Hearing On Offshore Ocean Energy Development in Atlantic City, New Jersey, April 6, 2009, pg. http://tinyurl.com/cxkzanz]

3. When deciding whether to approve seismic testing or exploration and production off the east coast, your department needs to balance the safety of those special areas against the potential for damage from oil drilling. The only way to adequately assess the balance would be for your department (with the participation of NOAA and possibly the National Academy of Science) to do a comprehensive census of those special places and analyze possible impacts on them from drilling.

1. The Ocean: More Like A Diverse Forest Than A Desert

Many people look at the ocean and see it as a pretty, shiny surface. They may imagine a few fish swimming below the surface and a plain featureless bottom. This is not an accurate picture of the ocean in most places. Unless the bottom is sandy and continually disturbed by wind, wave or current the bottom of the ocean is filled with communities of diverse creatures. Depending on depth, penetration of light, type of bottom (i.e., muddy, sandy, pebbles, boulders) and other factors, the ocean’s floor is teaming with diverse communities of plants, invertebrates, shellfish, crustaceans and fish. Numerous kinds of fish live on the bottom. Other fish swim above the bottom in the water column at different levels. Thousands of types of phytoplankton, zooplankton and larvae at the base of most food chains ‘float’ around. Marine mammals, sea turtles and sea birds spend most of their time at or near the surface of the ocean.

All of these creatures are sensitive to the impacts of oil and pollution from oil and gas drilling; some are more sensitive than others. But none are immune to the short or long term effects of oil.

With this as background, it is important to recognize the special places in the ocean that are unique, especially sensitive to pollution or those that are especially productive. These include: submarine canyons cutting across the continental shelf; deep water coral gardens; plateaus where the floor of the ocean rises and becomes unusually productive because deeper nutrient rich waters come closer to the warmer temperatures and light of the surface; migratory pathways for marine mammals and sea turtles; and areas where fish aggregate to spawn or where larval stages of animals are concentrated. Finally, the margins of the ocean: beaches, bays and marshes are often unusually sensitive to oil pollution.

2. Special Places in the Atlantic Ocean Deserving of Protection

Based on the Environmental Sensitivity Index (ESI) and a crude measure of marine productivity that your own department uses, the New England, Mid Atlantic and South Atlantic planning areas are all very environmentally sensitive and highly productive. The South Atlantic planning area and Mid Atlantic have the first and third most environmentally sensitive coastlines, respectively, of all 22 MMS planning areas. New England comes in at #11. The South Atlantic and Mid Atlantic are ranked first and second respectively in terms of primary productivity among all the planning areas with North Atlantic being #12.

There are 14 submarine canyons between Massachusetts and Virginia that slice through the continental shelf (See attached list). Submarine canyons, some with a mouth as wide as eight to ten miles and 30-40 miles long, are important because they shelter unusual species, provide hard bottoms and sidewalls for creatures to attach to or burrow in, provide nursery areas for many commercially important fish and bring nutrients from the deep ocean up to more shallow waters. Sea life in these canyons is unusually diverse which is why drilling in or near submarine canyons with their risk from spills and chronic pollution from production would be a very bad idea.

There are a number of important underwater plateaus and reefs off the eastern seaboard which serve as fish baskets, places of unusual marine productivity where very high populations of fish reproduce and grow. Often these are called ‘banks’ or ‘reefs’ with names like Georges Bank, Stellwagen Bank, Gray’s Reef or Occulina Bank. Some of these areas of the ocean are shallow enough to allow sunlight to penetrate to the seafloor and nutrients from the deeper ocean feed a richer abundance of life. These banks and reefs sometimes offer the only hard substrate for creatures to attach in a wide area. . Drilling in biological hot spots like these and jeopardizing productive commercial and recreational fisheries would make no sense.

Like on land, certain areas of the ocean support migration corridors for fish, marine mammals, sea turtles and sea birds. For much of the Mid Atlantic there is a coastal corridor extending out 20 miles from shore in which endangered marine mammals like the northern right whale, various sea turtles and migratory fish travel. For example, the last 350 northern right whales on earth travel each year from the Georgia-Florida border where they give birth and nurse their calves to an area off Cape Cod where they spend the summer feeding. Loggerheads, leatherback and Kemp’s ridley turtles all use this corridor at various times of the year.

Another corridor, farther offshore at the edge of the continental shelf break and slope provides food for various endangered sea turtles and other kinds of whales and dolphins. Whales and dolphins are typically migratory and each is only seasonally present but taken together the area is important year round to these marine mammals.

There are four more hotspots of marine diversity and unusual productivity off the Mid Atlantic caused by ocean currents, type of bottom, [and] submarine canyons and other special characteristics. These include: the coastal waters off North Carolina near and south of Cape Hatteras, the mouth of the Chesapeake and Delaware Bays and off New York harbor. Coastal waters and sandy bottoms off New Jersey support a large and economically important clam and scallop industry.

#### Human survival is at risk

Nautiyal & Nidamanuri 10—Centre for Ecological Economics and Natural Resources @ Institute for Social and Economic Change & Department of Earth and Space Sciences @ Indian Institute of Space Science and Technology [SUNIL NAUTIYAL1 & RAMA RAO NIDAMANURI “Conserving Biodiversity in Protected Area of Biodiversity Hotspot in India: A Case Study,” International Journal of Ecology and Environmental Sciences 36 (2-3): 195-200, 2010

The hotspots are the world’s most biologically rich areas hence recognized as important ecosystems not important¶ only for the rich biodiversity but equally important for the human survival as these are the homes for more than¶ 20% of the world’s population. India got recognition of one of the mega-diversity countries of world as the country¶ is home of the two important biodiversity hotspots: the Himalaya in north and the Western Ghats in the southern¶ peninsula. Policy makers and decision takers have recognized the importance of biodiversity (flora and fauna) and¶ this has resulted to segregate (in the form of protected areas) the rich and diverse landscape for biodiversity¶ conservation. An approach which leads towards conservation of biological diversity is good efforts but such¶ approaches should deal with humans equally who are residing in biodiversity hotspots since time immemorial. In¶ this endeavor, a study was conducted in Nagarahole National Park of Nilgiri Biosphere Reserve, in Karnataka. Our¶ empirical studies reveal that banning all the human activities in this ecosystem including agriculture, animal¶ husbandry has produced the results opposite to the approach ‘multiple values’ of national park. To monitor the¶ impact, existing policies have been tested from an economic and ecological view-point. Unfortunately, the local¶ livelihoods (most of them belongs to indigenous tribes) in the area have received setbacks due to the¶ implementation of the policies, though unintentionally. However, the ecological perspective is also not showing¶ support for the approach and framework of the current policies in the hotspots. Satellite data showed that the¶ temporal pattern of ecosystem processes has been changing. An integrated approach for ecosystem conservation and¶ strengthening local institutions for sustainable ecosystem management in such areas is therefore supported by this¶ study.

## arctic da

#### Arctic cooperation is high but drilling causes US militarization

**Backus tech staff @ Sandia National Lab 12** - Principal member of technical staff at Sandia National Laboratories and uses behavioral and physical simulation methods to access security risks associated with climate change [George Backus (Director of environmental and energy research at Cambridge Econometrics), “Arctic 2030: What are the consequences of climate change? The US response,” Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists July/August 2012 vol. 68 no. 4 9-16

Because no entity, other than perhaps the Russian government, has the military bases and means to accommodate area-wide protection and enforcement needs, the United States will necessarily have to maintain strong cooperative arrangements with nations and corporations for the coordinated, safe, and secure use of Arctic resources. Although the Arctic nations themselves may strive for cooperation, **entanglement with corporations** and other foreign entities will assuredly produce tensions that are outside the domain of the US Coast Guard.

Right now, the US military position in the Arctic is problematic. Both the Northern Command and the European Command have responsibility for what, in a cooperative multinational environment, is a single area ([Carafano et al., 2011](http://bos.sagepub.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/content/68/4/9.full#ref-7); [Carmen et al., 2010](http://bos.sagepub.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/content/68/4/9.full#ref-8)). Some analysts argue that NATO should play the coordinating role in the Arctic ([Conley, 2012](http://bos.sagepub.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/content/68/4/9.full#ref-9)), but such a path would create new tensions among the national players, and it does not resolve the specific position of the United States in the Arctic ([Wezeman, 2012](http://bos.sagepub.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/content/68/4/9.full#ref-28)).

The United States asserts that it has power projection and strategic deterrence capabilities in the Arctic because of its submarine, missile, and airborne assets ([Defense Department, 2011](http://bos.sagepub.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/content/68/4/9.full#ref-10)). But security events in the Arctic may be largely associated with expensive commercial assets populated by civilians and monitored or escorted by foreign government representatives. Fighter jets and torpedoes have no role to play in such confrontations. A naval presence is required, with personnel who can board and secure the facility, as necessary. In general, the US Defense Department lacks the naval resources to maintain sea control for these situations. If non-Arctic countries set a precedent—even simply through prospecting surveys or shipping activity—their case for limiting the unresolved sovereignty rights of the Arctic nations is strengthened. Corporations necessarily engage in such activities, and it is natural for commercial ventures to test the boundaries of their franchises. But in a more negative sense, there is also the fear that access to a relatively unmonitored Arctic may offer an alternative location for companies to dispose of toxic waste.

In assessing US security needs in the Arctic, the question to ask is not “What are the security risks when the Arctic opens?” but rather “How will security risks evolve as the geopolitical and economic expansion play out?” The physical speed with which the Arctic changes will determine the gap between reality and expectations. For example, the more Russia, China, or South Korea experience significant benefit from Arctic activities—to the point where they expect and depend on the growth from those activities—the more likely that a period where the Arctic again becomes environmentally inhospitable, or that the rules of sovereignty change to **limit access**, or that commercialization of the region will cause **political strains** from lost revenue or prestige.

Abrupt changes in expectations and in a nation’s ability to cope with changing circumstances appear to be factors that can trigger conflict ([Agency for International Development, 2009](http://bos.sagepub.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/content/68/4/9.full#ref-1)). If the early international relations dynamics in the Arctic move fairly slowly, all parties could co-evolve toward balanced positions with relatively little conflict. Rapid dynamics could raise tensions. If all nations sustain approximately equal positive or negative repercussions from changes in Arctic regulations or climatic conditions, or they all believe they could limit the pace and extent of negative impacts through negotiation, routine diplomatic processes could mollify tensions. Climate change will, however, produce an ever-shifting playing field that heightens tensions among countries more concerned with relative rather than absolute advantage in the area.

Will events in the Arctic require US military responses before 2030? The consideration of uncertainty is part of climate and economic forecasting ([Hendry and Ericsson, 2001](http://bos.sagepub.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/content/68/4/9.full#ref-12); [Meehl et al., 2007](http://bos.sagepub.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/content/68/4/9.full#ref-18)), and uncertainty is a mainstay of military planning: The adversary seldom announces battle plans prior to engagement. Military preparedness hinges not on best estimates, but on uncertainties that reflect risks the nation wants managed. From the vantage point of the present, the best estimate is that the Arctic of the near future will be free of military conflict. Risk, however, is the combination of probability (uncertainty) and consequence. Lower-probability, high-consequence events generally contribute more to risk than the best estimate. They are consequently much more relevant to national security planning than high-probability, routine-consequence conditions.

Perceived economic accessibility to the Arctic and commercial success in the Arctic change the conditional probabilities; they increase the odds that a sequence of events that leads to conflict will materialize. It would be foolhardy to disregard the risks that low-probability, high-consequence events imply. An unexpected confluence of vessels and aircraft being in the wrong place, when Arctic weather conditions prevent adequate communications, could lead to tense situations, unless national security forces have the ability to readily manage the situation.

#### Capabilities will include ballistic missile defense and increase the risk of conflict escalation

**Al-Achkar Researcher at Harvard 12** - Data Collection and Analysis Coordinator @ Harvard University [[Ziad Al-Achkar](http://www.theinternationalistathawk.com/author/editorinchief2/) (Co-Founder of Internationalist at Hawk) , “The Implications of a melting Arctic: Militarization, Security Concerns, Power and Policy,” The Internationalist at Hawk, August 7, 2012 at 8:26 pm, pg. http://www.theinternationalistathawk.com/the-implications-of-a-melting-arctic-militarization-security-concerns-power-and-policy/

In 2009, The United States Navy released a roadmap for the Artic in which they report “Opening of the Arctic may lead to increased resource development, research, tourism and could reshape the global transportation system. These developments offer opportunities for growth, but also are potential sources of competition and conflict for access and natural resources”**[Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](file:///C:%5CUsers%5CUser%5CDesktop%5CArctic%20Paper%20Series.docx#_ftn11)** The report continues to add that “ While the US has stable relationships with other Arctic nations, the changing environment and competition for resources may contribute to increasing tension, or, conversely, provide opportunities for cooperative solutions.” The United States Navy, the biggest actor for US policy in the area, hence realizes the delicacy of the area and the potential for security escalation while at the same time understands the potential for cooperation. It is with this mentality that the report states that “The Navy’s arctic experience and current operational capabilities and limitations provide the point of departure for this roadmap”**[Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](file:///C:%5CUsers%5CUser%5CDesktop%5CArctic%20Paper%20Series.docx#_ftn13)** Tt goes on to add “While the Arctic is not unfamiliar for the Navy, expanded capabilities and capacity may be required for the Navy to increase its engagement in this region.”

Compared to Russia; The navy roadmap indicated the U.S is dragging behind, especially in terms of Icebreakers, which The U.S Coast guard only possess three (2010 estimate), in comparison to Russia’s military fleet of 18 icebreakers, and their seven modern multi-mission capable fleet (2010 estimate) powered by nuclear reactors that are capable of cutting through ice twice as thick as the other icebreakers; the report highlighted the need for vast modernization and development of the U.S. Capabilities “A more robust operational icebreaker fleet is essential for supporting U.S. military operations, maintaining U.S. presence, and preserving U.S. economic and other interests throughout the region”.  In January of 2009, the U.S. government released the National Security Presidential Directive 66/Homeland Security Presidential Directive 25, which included a new policy for the U.S in the Arctic Ocean; it highlights the same concerns raised by the Navy Roadmap report: “the United States to assert a more active and influential national presence to protect its Arctic interests and to project sea power throughout the region “. The navy roadmap reports emphasized the need for the United States to work on filling the gaps in its military capacity, the roadmap recommended that the U.S.: “the United States to Strengthen ballistic and cruise-missile defensive systems, asserting that the navy needs to reestablish itself in antisubmarine warfare and in littoral dominance in order t-o assure sea control.” The United States recognizing it’s lacking behind other countries such as Russia and Canada planned on stationing in Anchorage, Alaska, 36 F-22 Raptor stealth fighter jets; a number which equaled up to 20% of the U.S total fleet of F-22 fighter planes (2010est), highlighting the seriousness from which the United States is viewing the Arctic. The United States of America along with Canada worked to renew and hence Canada ratified the North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD) “a bi-national U.S.-Canada command charged with aerospace and maritime warning for North America.” The United States has taken the most diplomatic initiatives and steps to ensure the Arctic Stability which is highlighted by the statement made by NORAD describing their operation in Alaska as “positive interaction with Russian military counterparts during the reset of relationships between our nations” The 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review Report noted “we will seek opportunities to work with Moscow on emerging issues, such as the future of the Arctic”**[Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](file:///C:%5CUsers%5CUser%5CDesktop%5CArctic%20Paper%20Series.docx" \l "_ftn21" \o ")** and adds that “will also enhance defense relationships and continue to work with Canada in the context of regional security [and] increased interaction in the Arctic.”.

#### That risks war

Blunden Professor of IR 09 – Professor of International Affairs @ University of Westminster [Margaret Blunden, “The New Problem of Arctic Stability,” Survival | vol. 51 no. 5 | Oct–Nov 2009 | pp. 121–142

The Arctic region remains stable for the moment but there is a risk that it could be sucked into a vicious spiral. New and upgraded military infrastructure, increased¶ military activity and the expanding tentacles of NATO are increasing Russia’s sense of strategic isolation. Moscow is concerned with questions of equality among¶ the Arctic states and has repeatedly asked that dividing lines should not be created.40 Although immediate national interests may conflict among the NATO Arctic states, and bilateral deals spanning¶ Alliance boundaries cannot be ruled out, there does appear to be growing anti-Russian solidarity in the region. This could jeopardise détente and the wide-ranging collaboration put in place in the region since the end of the Cold War. From vicious to virtuous circle The overriding concern in the Arctic must be to resist a slide back into confrontation at the expense of cooperation. Focusing on security is bound to increase because of the economic stakes. The defence and security strategies of all the Arctic powers have also to take into account that armed aggression in the High North could result from a major crisis elsewhere.41 Active measures to improve defences, and defence coordination among the Western states should, however, be set in the context of the strategic objective of maintaining stability in the region. Deployment of new defence systems, and upgrading or expanding existing ones, needs to be evaluated in this context. Policymakers need to pay explicit attention to the incidental impact of security measures directed elsewhere, as in the case of missile-defence plans, currently under review in Washington, or of NATO expansion. The identification of common interests and common challenges with Russia, and agreement on a desired end state (necessary for cooperation to take root in any relationship42) are particular imperatives in the shifting climatic, economic and security circumstances of the Arctic. Deterrence needs to be balanced with reassurance and engagement. A search for opportunities for security collaboration, confidence building and the development of common procedures needs to go hand in hand with the avoidance of alarmist or provocative rhetoric, and robust resistance to self-interested domestic¶ constituencies. Inclusive institutions and multilateral, bilateral and regional collaboration need radical strengthening to help maintain the Arctic as a zone of harmony and cooperation, an objective espoused in Russia’s own Arctic strategy. Russian officials insist that, despite plans to reinforce the security of the northern border, its preferred policy is to pursue closer cooperation in a region it describes as a ‘zone of peace’.43A number of the issues identified after 2002 by the NATO–Russia Council as suitable to be addressed jointly, with the help of specialist committees and expert groups, are particularly relevant to the Arctic. These include the struggle against terrorism, counter-narcotics, airspace management, military-to-military cooperation, submarine-crew search and rescue, crisis management, logistics and civil emergencies. Although the achievements of the NATO–Russia Council have been disappointing, the resumption of its activities following the interruption caused by the Georgia crisis in 2008 offers a new opportunity for progress.

## adv cp- china talks

The United States Federal government should ask Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe to immediately pay a goodwill visit to China.

Abe Visit solves war—Aff impact author

Klare, Three days ago [The Aff’s Author, Peace and World Security Studies professor at Hampshire, Three Days Ago, 1-23-13  
(Michael, “The Next War,” 1-23-13, <http://www.realclearworld.com/articles/2013/01/23/the_next_war_100500.html>, accessed 1-24-13]

Can such a crisis be averted? Yes, if the leaders of China, Japan, and the United States, the key countries involved, take steps to defuse the belligerent and ultra-nationalistic pronouncements now holding sway and begin talking with one another about practical steps to resolve the disputes. Similarly, an emotional and unexpected gesture -- Prime Minister Abe, for instance, pulling a Nixon and paying a surprise goodwill visit to China -- might carry the day and change the atmosphere. Should these minor disputes in the Pacific get out of hand, however, not just those directly involved but the whole planet will look with sadness and horror on the failure of everyone involved.

## 1NC Federal Lands CP

#### The United States federal government should reduce relevant restrictions on natural gas production on onshore federal lands in the United States.

#### The counterplan solves every production based advantage- that provides a shit ton of gas [GREEN]

#### (1083.27 billion barrels of oil and 1730.6 trillion cubic feet of natural gas)

Hutzler 13—Mary J. Hutzler is a Senior Fellow at the Institute for Energy Research (IER). She was a top energy analyst for the U.S. Government, having spent more than 25 years at the Energy Information Administration (EIA), where she specialized in data collection, analysis, and forecasting. In 2001, Hutzler was named by President Bush to lead the EIA as Acting Administrator. Hutzler received a 2004 Presidential Rank Award. Hutzler received her B.A. in mathematics from Adelphi University, her M.A. in applied mathematics from the University of Maryland, and completed her course work and exams for a D.Sc. in operations research at George Washington University [February 8, 2013, “U.S. Energy Innovation (Part III: Federal Land Potential),” http://www.masterresource.org/2013/02/u-s-energy-iii-federal-lands/]

Potential Openings

Areas that the federal government could open to oil and gas development include:

· The 10.4 billion barrels of oil and 8.6 trillion cubic feet of natural gas in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge

· The 86 billion barrels of oil and 420 trillion cubic feet of natural gas in the outer continental shelf of the lower 48 states

· The 896 million barrels of oil and 53 trillion cubic feet of natural gas in the Naval Petroleum Reserve-Alaska

· The 25 billion barrels of oil in the outer continental shelf of Alaska

· The 90 billion barrels of oil and 1,669 trillion cubic feet of natural gas in the geologic provinces north of the Arctic circle

· The 982 billion barrels of oil shale in the Green River Formation in Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming.

These technically recoverable resources total 1,194 billion barrels of oil and 2,150 trillion cubic feet of natural gas that is owned by the federal taxpayer. At today’s prices ($100.00 per barrel of oil and $4.00 per thousand cubic feet of natural gas), the value of the estimated oil resources is $119.4 trillion and the value of the estimated natural gas resources is $8.6 trillion for a grand total of $128 trillion. [18]

The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimated that under current policies, revenues from royalties, rents, and bonuses from oil and gas leases on public lands will generate about $150 billion over the next 10 years. The CBO further estimated that if certain resources currently off limits were immediately opened to oil and gas leasing, another $7 billion would be realized over that period. [19] The CBO study estimates are considered to be conservative when compared to historical data and estimates by other analysts and do not consider the earnings from taxes paid by these industries or their employees.

Mason Study: Untapped Bounty

Partially in response but also for education purposes, IER commissioned a groundbreaking paper that will soon be released highlighting the larger economic effects, including economic growth, wages, jobs, and federal and state and local tax revenues, of opening Federal lands and waters to oil and gas leasing.

The IER paper relies on the CBO natural resource and oil and gas price estimates to maintain direct comparability with the CBO analysis while recognizing that those figures have historically been proven to vastly underestimate resources and revenues. The government’s resource information is poor in large part due to the lack of exploration resulting from practices limiting access to federal lands such as the moratoria.

The study finds that if the federal government opened up additional federal lands and waters to exploration and production, the increase to GDP would be $127 billion annually for the next seven years, and $450 billion annually in the long run. Most impressively, the opening of federal lands would have a cumulative increase in economic activity of up to $14.4 trillion over a period of 37 years.

The ripple effect of that boom would be 552,000 in job gains annually over the next 7 years with annual wage increases of up to $32 billion over that time period and an increase of 1.9 million jobs annually in the long run with annual wage increases of $115 billion. Federal and state and local tax revenues would also increase to the tune of $2.7 trillion in federal revenues and $1.1 trillion in state and local revenues over 37 years. [20]

Conclusion

The United States has more combined oil, coal, and natural gas resources than any other country on the planet. As we used these energy resources over the past 50 years, not only did we grow our economy and improve our quality of life, but we improved our air quality as well. We are energy rich, not poor. We have enough energy resources to provide reliable and affordable energy for decades, even centuries to come. The real question is whether the federal government will permit us to have access to our abundant energy resources, not whether sufficient resources exist.

Decisions made today about access to energy resources affect energy production for years and decades into the future. The more areas that are accessible to energy production today increases the likelihood of more domestic energy production later. Increased energy production promotes jobs, government revenues from taxes and lease sales, and increased economic activity.

In turn, this supplies the revenue, wealth and technology to provide the energy breakthroughs of the future. Energy is defined as “the capacity to do work.” Its reliability, affordability and abundance are critical to the future work of our nation.

## Solvency 1nc

#### Alt cause- worker shortage [not enough workers for current rigs]

Sixel, 12 -- Fuel Fix writer [L.M., "Drilling company looks high and low for workers," Fuel Fix, 12-10-12, fuelfix.com/blog/2012/12/10/drilling-company-looks-high-and-low-for-workers/, accessed 2-6-12]

Drilling company looks high and low for workers

How hot is offshore drilling? So hot that it’s hard to find enough roustabouts, mechanics and experienced managers to staff all the rigs **under construction**. So hot that Ensco, with six new rigs set to debut over the next two years, will need 1,000 more people, said Kurt Basler, the company’s manager of strategic staffing in Houston. So hot that some 20,000 to **25,000** offshore workers will be needed industrywide over the next two to three years, Basler said. “**The shortages are acute everywhere**,” said Steve Colville, president and CEO of the International Association of Drilling Contractors in Houston. The search for workers with the right skills who would be the right fit has sent companies like Ensco looking outside traditional oil and gas businesses. Not everyone is enthusiastic about working 12 hours a day for up to 28 days straight on a drilling rig half a world away.

#### Shale sustainable --- peer reviewed, thorough, comprehensive and contains control variables

UT 2-28 ["New, Rigorous Assessment of Shale Gas Reserves Forecasts Reliable Supply from Barnett Shale Through 2030," 2-28, http://www.utexas.edu/news/2013/02/28/new-rigorous-assessment-of-shale-gas-reserves-forecasts-reliable-supply-from-barnett-shale-through-2030/]

AUSTIN, Texas — A new study, believed to be the most thorough assessment yet of the natural gas production potential of the Barnett Shale, foresees slowly declining production through the year 2030 and beyond and total recovery at greater than three times cumulative production to date. This forecast has broad implications for the future of U.S energy production and policy. The study, conducted by the Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) at The University of Texas at Austin and funded by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, integrates engineering, geology and economics in a numerical model that allows for scenario testing based on many input parameters. In the base case, the study forecasts a cumulative 44 trillion cubic feet (TCF) of recoverable reserves from the Barnett, with annual production declining in a predictable curve from the current peak of 2 TCF per year to about 900 billion cubic feet (BCF) per year by 2030. This forecast falls in between some of the more optimistic and pessimistic predictions of production from the Barnett and suggests that the formation will continue to be a major contributor to U.S. natural gas production through 2030. The Bureau of Economic Geology will be completing similar studies of three other major U.S. shale gas basins by the end of this year. The BEG study examines actual production data from more than 16,000 individual wells drilled in the Barnett play through mid-2011. Other assessments of the Barnett have relied on aggregate views of average production, offering a “top down” view of production, says Scott Tinker, director of the BEG and co-principal investigator for the study. The BEG study, in contrast, takes a “bottom up” approach, starting with the production history of every well and then determining what areas remain to be drilled. The result is a more accurate and comprehensive view of the basin. The BEG team enhanced the view by identifying and assessing the potential in 10 production quality tiers and then using those tiers to more accurately forecast future production. The economic feasibility of production varies tremendously across the basin depending upon production quality tier. The study’s model centers around a base case assuming average natural gas prices of $4 for a thousand cubic feet but allows for variations in price, volume drained by each well, economic limit of a well, advances in technology, gas plant processing incentives and many other factors to determine how much natural gas operators will be able to extract economically. “We have created a very dynamic and granular model that accounts for the key geologic, engineering and economic parameters, and this adds significant rigor to the forecasts,” said Svetlana Ikonnikova, energy economist at the BEG and co-principal investigator of the project. Whereas thickness and porosity affect the reserves greatly, price is a dominant factor affecting production. While the BEG model shows the correlation between price and production, it suggests that price sensitivity is not overly dramatic, at least in the early phase of a formation’s development. This is because there are still many locations to drill in the better rock, explains Tinker, which is cost effective even at lower prices. “Drilling in the better rock won’t last forever,” says Tinker, “but there are still a few more years of development remaining in the better rock quality areas.” The data in the model stop at the end of 2010, after approximately 15,000 wells were drilled in the field. In the base case, the assessment forecasts another 13,000 wells would be drilled through 2030. In 2011 and 2012 more than 2900 wells were actually drilled, in line with the forecast, leaving just over 10,000 wells remaining to be drilled through 2030 in the base case. Wells range widely in their ultimate recovery of natural gas, a factor the study takes into account. A new method of estimating production for each well, based on the physics of the system, was integral to the project and should offer a more accurate method of forecasting production declines in shale gas wells. This method, along with several other components in the work flow, has been submitted in several manuscripts to peer-reviewed journals. The papers have already undergone a form of professional peer review built into the BEG research process. Before submitting the papers to journals, the BEG team invited an independent review panel with members from government, industry and academia to critique their research. At an open day for academics and industry scientists, 100 attendees were invited to offer additional feedback. Scientists and engineers from two of the larger producers in the Barnett — Devon Energy and ExxonMobil — offered critical feedback on the methodology during two in-house corporate review days. Finally, the BEG hired a private consulting firm to individually critique the draft manuscripts and offer suggestions for improvement of the work. Overall, the rigorous assessment of the country’s second most productive shale gas formation reaffirms the transformative, long-term impact of shale and other unconventional reservoirs of oil and gas on U.S. energy markets. Tinker compares the expansion of hydrocarbon reserves from shale gas to the expansion of global oil reserves from deep-water exploration that has happened in the past several decades. “Drilling into unconventional reserves is potentially analogous to offshore oil in terms of impact,” Tinker says.

#### Low prices kill offshore investment

Schaefer **editor of the Oil & Gas Investments** 12 [Keith, editor and publisher of the Oil & Gas Investments Bulletin, "Investing in Offshore Drilling & Deepwater Exploration," 3-14, http://oilandgas-investments.com/2012/investing/offshore-drilling-exploration-investing/]

Offshore drilling is the most complex and expensive way of accessing oil and gas reserves, particularly when it comes to deep water and ultra-deep water exploration activities. While presenting the industry with its biggest challenges, deep water exploration and development yields the greatest potential rewards and healthy profit margins to the oil service companies involved. The rising complexity and costs of such endeavours demands huge capital investments, long term commitments, higher efficiencies and a growing reliance on technology in order to reduce uncertainties. The market fundamentals for oil service companies remain solid, oil prices are stubbornly holding their ground above $100 per barrel in a tough macroeconomic environment. The resiliency of high oil prices is fuelling increasing exploration and production spending by operators as the industry pushes further offshore into ever-deeper water. By 2020, offshore oil production is expected to account for 34% of the global output up from 25% in 1990. Offshore drilling companies are seeing a significant increase in tenders and requests from customers, particularly for the ultra-deep water rigs which are commanding higher daily rates for its units. The brightening outlook mirrored by record backlog orders and rising rates encouraged the industry to focus on adding new equipment in all market segments in a bid to provide the most versatile fleets of mobile offshore drilling units. Jack-up rigs are mobile, self-elevating drilling platforms that are towed by tugboats to the drill site with water depth of up to 400 feet. Jack-Ups are equipped with tubular structure legs that are lowered to the sea floor where jacking elevates the hull above the water surface before drilling operations begin. Semi-submersible rigs operate in a semi-submerged position with the lower hull ballasted down below the waterline. The rig consists of a deck which contains working areas, equipment and living quarters that is able to carry drilling operations in deep and ultra-deep waters of up to 10,000 feet in water depth. Drill Ships are self-propelled ships equipped for drilling in water depths in which jack-up rigs are incapable of working. They can drill in deep and ultra-deep waters in up to 12,000 feet of water depth. Rising oil prices have also spurred a construction boom in drilling rigs; the cost for a drilling ship easily surpasses $600M per unit where it is leased at $500k/day or more on 2 or 3 year contracts. The Jack-up market is seeing increased demand in Mexico, the North Sea, the Middle East and Asia while the floaters market which includes ultra-deep water rigs has been improving markedly in Brazil, Africa and the Gulf of Mexico. “There’s always a bull market somewhere.” There is more truth to this than most investors realize. And right now one of the biggest — if not THE biggest — bull markets in the entire Energy Patch is quietly taking shape. I’m referring to the technological revolution in oil & gas — the technologies, for example, that can increase yields by 4 to 7 times… launch huge new “discovery” fields… or even “extend the lives” of older fields. It is exactly these kinds of innovations that are creating triple-digit profit opportunities in the Oil & Gas Investments Bulletin portfolio. To learn more about what’s driving these opportunities in my OGIB personal portfolio — and how it all works, keep reading here. ————————————– The New Sweet Spot in North America’s Oil Patch It’s one of the hottest picks in the OGIB portfolio… A company operating in the heart of one of North America’s fastest-growing shale oil plays — with major short-term gain potential. And in my newest research, I explain how recent drill success could see this company’s production more than double AND “slingshot” its valuation. Follow this link to get it. ————————————– On top of strong oil prices, successful exploration drilling results continue to be reported. Last year, 23 discoveries were announced in 12 different countries in an average water depth of 6,200 feet representing the sixth consecutive year of 20+ announced discoveries. Successful exploration results pave the way for development drilling over the coming years which is another factor in driving future demand. For instance, Petrobras (a Brazilian semi-public multinational energy company) will be renting 26 rigs for the next 15 years in order to develop its deep water oil field discovered back in 2006. The oildfield known as Tupi holds an estimated 8 billion barrels of light sweet oil. In contrast to Brazil’s newly discovered deep water prospects, the Gulf of Mexico is an established deepwater region which is also seeing rising activity levels. The industry expects drilling activity to reach and surpass the pre-Macondo level of about 30 wells by early 2013. Ultra-deepwater rig demand is expected to increase dramatically through 2016 as exploration activity drives future development demand growth. Even with the construction boom, the ultra-deepwater utilization is expected to remain tight in the coming years. Not surprisingly, deep water’s contribution to global oil output is expected to reach 13% by 2020 up from 0% in 1990. Declining production from large onshore oilfields has to be replaced somehow and the era of easy to extract cheap oil is behind us. The following offshore drilling companies provide you with a strong exposure to the offshore oil services sector and a broad geographic reach since the world is their playground: Company Name Ticker & Price Dividend 2012E Yield Atwood Oceanics ATW 45.61 [+0.74] Diamond DO 68.51 [+0.57] $0.50 0.70% Ensco ESV 56.24 [+1.63] $1.40 2.40% Noble NE 38.77 [+0.57] $0.57 1.50% Ocean Rig ORIG 16.80 [+0.25] Pacific Drilling S.A. PACD 10.32 [+0.41] Rowan RDC 35.53 [+0.67] Seadrill Limited SDRL 38.70 [+0.89] $3.00 7.50% Transocean RIG 53.095 [+1.655] $3.16 6.20% Vantage Drilling Company VTG 1.41 [+0.11] Finally, there’s no free lunch as investing in any sector carries its risks. For offshore drilling companies, you’ll want to keep in mind every operator faces risks ranging from storm damage to volatile commodity prices. Offshore drilling accidents, while rare, may result in significant damage or a total loss of a rig. Capital budgets set by E&P companies are dependent on commodity prices; a sharp drop in oil prices will result in an oversupply of drill rigs on the market as capital budgets are scaled down. These companies usually borrow in order to finance construction of new rigs – What happens if prices collapse and contracts are renewed at much lower day rates? Can the company afford to service its debt? For dividend paying companies, future dividends depend on 3 variables of paramount importance: the business outlook, the debt leverage and the contract coverage.

#### No investment in natural gas only leases

**MarEx 11** (Maritime Executive , “Gas-Only Drilling in Offshore Moratorium Areas Suggested”, 1/19, http://www.maritime-executive.com/article/2005-10-20gas-only-drilling-in-offshore-moratori)

Oil and gas industry groups are criticizing a provision in House offshore drilling legislation that would allow the government to offer "natural gas-only" leases in areas that are currently off-limits to new production. The criticism is included in wider comments by petroleum producers to the Minerals Management Service (MMS), which has begun collecting public comments as it begins preparing an outer continental shelf leasing plan for 2007-2012. MMS asked for comment on the gas-only concept. Gas-only leasing was included in a bill by House Resources Committee Chairman Richard Pombo (R-CA.) that allows states to "opt-out" of offshore leasing bans. States exercising the option could allow gas-only leasing, or oil and gas leasing. Senate legislation by Senator Lamar Alexander (R-TN.) -- and supported by chemical companies and other industries that rely on the costly fuel -- also accepts the idea. However, the American Petroleum Institute (API), in comments this week to MMS, says gas-only and gas-preference leasing would offer the "false promise" of future supplies. The group says the concept would create uncertainties that could dampen investment, since it is impossible to predict with certainty what types of resources will be in an area. "A company might spend up to $80 million to buy a lease, conduct seismic testing, obtain the necessary permits, and drill a well(s) to determine whether any resources are present in amounts that make the prospect economic," the group says. "A company is unlikely to know if it had met the gas only or gas preference requirement until the capital investment had been made. Companies will be reluctant to spend tens of millions of dollars to explore for and develop a prospect, only to be forced to abandon the resource, stranding substantial investments."

#### Decades until production

#### News Observer 12 ["Opening Atlantic Ocean to offshore drilling likely," 10-2, http://www.newsobserver.com/2012/10/02/2384560/opening-atlantic-ocean-to-offshore.html#storylink=cpy]

But even if the Atlantic Ocean is opened to energy companies, oil and gas production would likely not get underway for at least a decade. The energy exploration cycle is heavily regulated and requires seismic testing, environmental assessments, oceanographic mapping, military reviews and other regulatory hurdles before any oil and gas can start flowing. “There’s no way to speed this up,” said Athan Manuel, director of the Sierra Club’s lands protection program. The latest federal estimates from the U.S. Bureau of Ocean Energy Management for the entire Atlantic coast is between 11 trillion cubic feet and 54 trillion cubic feet of natural gas – well below the 84.2 trillion cubic feet found in the Marcellus Shale that spans New York and Pennsylvania. The amount of oil is likely between 1.3 billion barrels and 5.58 billion barrels, less than a year’s supply. With the market price of gas hovering near all-time lows, the Energy Information Administration, a division within the U.S. Department of Energy, has estimated that no oil or gas will be produced in the Atlantic or outer continental shelf before 2035. Drilling offshore could begin 3 miles beyond the coast, the point at which federal waters begin, extending as far as 200 miles in the ocean. Each mile away from land increases the cost of pipelines, land-to-rig travel and drilling in ever-deeper waters. $66M to $400M a year Beyond the engineering and technical challenges, offshore drilling would mobilize state governments to press Congress to change federal law to allow states to collect royalties on the lease fees, as is done for Gulf Coast states. North Carolina could collect $66 million to $400 million a year for the life of the reserves, according to a 145-page report issued September 2011 by a scientific advisory panel created by Gov. Perdue. The revenue amount, at the top end, could approach 2 percent of the state’s $20.2 billion annual budget. “You could scatter that money around all over state government,” said Weatherspoon of the N.C. Petroleum Council. He said the money could bolster programs such as environmental regulation, mental health services, community colleges and others that have been hard-hit by budget cuts. Weatherspoon said that offshore exploration would pit neighboring states against each other to host shore bases that would supply and support the offshore rigs. Such bases could involve hundreds of jobs in metallurgy, food preparation, transportation and related work. A 2009 report from the Southeast Energy Alliance, an industry trade group, estimated that offshore drilling could create 6,700 new jobs in North Carolina. Bill Holman, director of the State Policy Program at Duke University’s Nicholas Institute for Environmental Policy Solutions, said chances are slim that North Carolina could compete with larger ports in South Carolina and Virginia. Holman based his assessment on his tenure as a member of another offshore study panel, the Legislative Research Commission’s Advisory Subcommittee on Offshore Energy Exploration, which prepared a report in 2010. He said little research has been done on offshore resources, and noted that projected natural gas prices suggest that little will change in this regard in the near future. “We’re at the same state of knowledge on these issues as we were 20 years ago,” Holman said. “Until the price of natural gas goes way up, I’d be surprised if there would be very much interest, given the cost of developing those offshore resources versus the cost of developing the known resources.”

## SCS

#### Exports risk greater conflict in the SCS --- they are concerned with protecting supply lines

Clement editor at Dezan Shira Law Firm 12—Nicholas Clement, editor at Dezan Shira Law Firm (China) [May 25, 2012, “China and India Vie for Energy Security,” http://www.2point6billion.com/news/2012/05/25/china-and-india-vie-for-energy-security-11177.html]

Energy security is of utmost strategic importance to China and India if they hope to continue to expand their economies. Rapid growth rates in both countries have grown in tandem with increased demand for energy. By 2020, it is estimated that China and India combined will account for roughly one-third of the world’s GDP and, as such, will require vast amounts of energy to fuel their economies. As such, the competition for energy resources such as oil and natural gas will only become fiercer. An important aspect of energy security is maritime control in the Asia-Pacific oceans. The sea lines of communication that run through Asia effectively act as the vital arteries for both countries. Maritime security is thus of major national interest for both China and India, and is directly linked to their energy security. Recent military modernization within China has been focused towards upgrading its naval capabilities, and ultimately moving towards creating a strong and powerful blue-water navy. India’s drive for maritime dominance has resulted in its naval budget increasing from US$1.3 billion in 2001 to US$3.5 billion in 2006, with plans to further increase naval spending 40 percent by 2014. China’s thirst for oil has doubled over the last decade, and is only predicted to rise. Similarly, India relies on the energy shipped through maritime regions to fund its own industrialization. India continues to state its maritime goals in pure geopolitical terms, even explicitly acknowledging in their 2004 Maritime Doctrine that “control of the choke points would be useful as a bargaining chip in the international power game, where the currency of military power remains a stark reality.” Thus it is clear that energy security has been directly translated into a national security issue, which has both political and military implications.

#### No exports --- too expensive, spread of shale boom and local opposition

#### NYT 13 [Clifford, reporter for the NYT, "Exports of American Natural Gas May Fall Short of High Hopes," 1-5, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/05/business/energy-environment/exports-of-us-gas-may-fall-short-of-high-hopes.html?pagewanted=all&\_r=0]

Countries around the world are importing drilling expertise and equipment in hopes of cracking open their own gas reserves through the same techniques of hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling that unleashed shale gas production in the United States. Demand for American gas — which would be shipped in a condensed form called liquefied natural gas, or L.N.G. — could easily taper off by the time the new export terminals really get going, some energy specialists say. “It will be easier to export the technology for extracting shale gas than exporting actual gas**,”** said Jay Hakes, former administrator of the Energy Department’s Energy Information Administration. “I know the pitch about our price differentials will justify the high costs of L.N.G. We will see. Gas by pipeline is a good deal. L.N.G.? Not so clear.” Even the terminal operators acknowledge that probably only a lucky few companies will export gas because it can cost $7 billionor moreto build a terminal, and then only after a rigorous federal regulatory permitting process. The exploratory process to find a suitable site for a new terminal alone can take a year and cost $100 million**,** operators say, and financing can be secured only once long-term purchase agreements — 20 years or more — are reached with foreign buyers.“It’s a monumental effort to put a deal together like this, and you need well-heeled partners,” said Mark A. Snell, president of [Sempra Energy](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/business/companies/sempra_energy/index.html?inline=nyt-org), which is based in San Diego and is applying for permits to turn around a Hackberry, La., import terminal for export. “There are only a handful of people who can do this kind of thing.” At least 15 proposed terminal projects have filed regulatory applications to export gas, and if all were approved, they could export more than 25 billion cubic feet a day, equivalent to more than a third of domestically consumed natural gas. Environmental advocates say that kind of surge in demand would produce a frenzy of shale drilling dependent on hydraulic fracturing of hard rocks, an industrial method they say endangers local water supplies and pollutes the air. [Dow Chemical](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/business/companies/dow_chemical_company/index.html?inline=nyt-org), a big user of natural gas, and some other manufacturers express concerns that an export boom could threaten to raise natural gas prices for factories and consumers and, ultimately, kill jobs. Opponents are already lobbying the Obama administration to reject most of the planned terminals, and protests have already occurred. Sempra, [Exxon Mobil](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/business/companies/exxon_mobil_corporation/index.html?inline=nyt-org), [Cheniere Energy](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/business/companies/cheniere-energy-inc/index.html?inline=nyt-org)and others have already built import terminals on the Gulf of Mexico. With docking facilities and giant gas tanks already built on land they had acquired and received permits for, they have a huge advantage over companies that have not yet built terminals. Cheniere, the only company to secure an export license, already has entered long-term purchase agreements for its L.N.G., and several other companies are only a few steps behind. Dominion Power, which operates a nearly idle import terminal near Cove Point on Chesapeake Bay in Maryland, is also expected to proceed with a conversion to exports, since it is strategically located near the mid-Atlantic gas fields of the Marcellus Shale. “You have got to be able to change, adapt as changes take place in the world,” said Michael E. Gardner, manager of the Cove Point plant. The companies with import terminals now wanting to export won a victory in December when an Energy Department report said exports of L.N.G. could produce $30 billion a year in export earnings without driving up domestic gas prices significantly. Many energy specialists expect the Obama administration to approve several export license applications in the next couple of years, and exports could begin as soon as 2015. The plans for a gas export boom are based on the theory that cheap American gas will remain cheap for decades while Asian and European gas supplies remain tight and expensive. Global demand for natural gas is expected to expand for decades as nations seek a replacement for coal, [nuclear energy](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/business/energy-environment/atomic-energy/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier) and increasingly expensive [oil](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/business/energy-environment/oil-petroleum-and-gasoline/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier), energy specialists say. If the American terminals could be built tomorrow, they would have a perfect market opportunity. The production glut in the United States has reduced natural gas prices in this country by more than two-thirds since 2008. Gas prices in most other places around the world are much higher because they are linked to oil, which has remained comparatively expensive. Gas prices in the United States are around $3.30 per thousand cubic feet, compared with $10 to $11 in Europe and over $15 in Asia. But analysts say that the price spread could quickly shrink as a host of factors converge. Gas prices in the United States will face upward pressure as exports rise, electric utilities switch to gas-fired plants from coal, and companies use more natural gas in manufacturing and for fleet vehicles. “With rising U.S. gas prices, U.S. L.N.G. could be priced out of the market,” said Noel Tomnay, head of global gas research at the consultancy Wood Mackenzie. “Even without L.N.G. exports, the price of gas will go up.” The indexing of Asian and European gas to oil prices is beginning to erode. At the same time, huge natural gas pipelines are being built around Asia to supply China, while new gas finds around Australia, East Africa and the eastern Mediterranean are likely to flood the markets with more L.N.G. Russia, a major global gas producer, is also moving aggressively to protect its markets. And the cost of shipping and processing liquefied gas will cut into American suppliers’ competitiveness. Nikos Tsafos, a gas analyst at PFC Energy, said if the current gas price of slightly less than $3.30 per thousand cubic feet rose to $6, “by the time it gets to Asia, it’s double that price and that means there is no arbitrage.” The biggest threat, over the long term, is the spread of the American shale boom overseas. The United States has a big lead; shale drilling has been slow to get started in Europe, South Africa and South America because of environmental concerns, water shortages and political obstacles. But China, which potentially has more shale resources than the United States, is poised for development. And Poland, Britain and Argentina are moving forward with more shale drilling. Resistance from environmental groups like the Sierra Club could help stop some export projects, especially outside the Gulf of Mexico region, which has long been comfortable with the oil and gas industry. And manufacturers like Dow Chemical are campaigning against unfettered exports to keep their costs down. Over all, these factors will make it challenging for export projects to raise enough financing. L.N.G. terminal developers note that more than 20 import terminals proposed a decade ago were never built because of local opposition or lack of government permits and financing.

#### Natural gas not the lynchpin of energy security

#### Paik, senior research fellow at OIES, 13 [Keun-Wook, senior research fellow at the Oxford Institute for Energy Studies (OIES) and associate fellow, Energy, Environment and Resource Program at Chatham House, "Sino-Russian gas cooperation: the reality and implications," 1-19, http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2013/01/19/sino-russian-gas-cooperation-the-reality-and-implications/]

Further complicating the Altai-to-west-China pipeline development is that Beijing’s need for Russian gas is not as desperate as its need for Russian oil. Natural gas is still considered the most expensive fuel source for power generation, accounting for only around 15 per cent of total gas consumption in China. It also tends to be treated as a peak load energy source, not a base load source. Though Beijing claims that more natural gas will be used in the gas-for-power sector in the future, this would be prohibitively expensive without reform of the distorted electricity, gas and coal pricing system.

#### Downs evidence is about Chinese domestic shale gas --- not exports from the US

#### Multiple factors check escalation

**Jakarta Post 12** [reporter for the Jakarta Post, "Three possible scenarios in South China Sea," 12-31, http://www2.thejakartapost.com/news/2012/12/31/three-possible-scenarios-south-china-sea.html]

In the status-quo scenario, which is the most likely scenario for the next 10 years, the claimants adopt half-hearted attitudes to resolving the territorial claims and maintaining stability. The current information suggests that a major conflict will not take place. Military analysts at IHS Jane’s say that Southeast Asian countries, including the claimants, together increased defense spending by 13.5 percent last year, to US$24.5 billion. The figure is projected to rise to $40 billion by 2016. This will prevent China from forcefully pressuring other claimants or occupying the territory that it claims. The other stabilizing factor is the US. The US pivot to Asia Pacific since 2009 includes the commitment to keep all claimants in check since this area has a high strategic and economic value. Nearly a third of the world’s maritime shipping traverse this area. An encouraging sign has come from China’s next leader Xi Jinping. In his address to the annual meeting with ASEAN members, held in the southern Chinese city of Nanning recently, Xi said China was committed to “common development and a peaceful regional solution to the dispute”.

#### Resource nationalism will not lead to war – History is on our side

Hughes **Professor of Political Science** 11 - Professor of Political Science and International Affairs@ George Washington University Llewelyn Hughes, “Resource Nationalism in the Asia-Pacific: Why Does It Matter?,” Asia’s Rising Energy and Resource Nationalism: Implications for the United States, China, and the Asia-Pacific Region, National Bureau of Asian Research, NBR Special Report #31 | September 2011

The biggest concern about resource nationalism is that energy scarcity could lead governments to use military force to ensure access to supplies. History suggests this concern is unfounded. Resource nationalism in the Asia-Pacific in fact replicates the approach taken historically in Europe and Japan to managing risk in oil markets. For decades, these governments sought to increase the share of their domestic markets controlled by national firms and to increase the amount of oil reserves held by these firms internationally. In each case, resource competition did not lead to worst-case outcomes such as a descent into militarized conflict. China and India, in this sense, are following the path previously taken by the governments of other major oil-importing states.

The predominant trend over the last three decades has also been for these early resource nationalists to reduce, rather than increase, support for NOCs. Indeed, the weakening of links between governments and NOCs is the biggest change in patterns of oil ownership since the oil shocks of the 1970s; over the last three decades, Japan, France, Italy, Spain, and other countries have substantially reduced the importance of resource nationalism in their national energy strategies.

This change means there are fewer governments that see control over oil as a useful strategy for managing risk in the international oil market. It also means that, even as the newly industrializing powers of China and India increase their intervention in oil markets though their NOCs, they are less likely to bump up against other state-sponsored NOCs from oil-importing countries. Pg. 9-10 //1nc

## New

Zhukov says they have to solve by mid-2013- the aff doesn’t get exports online in time

**No risk of U.S.-Russian war – Russia knows the U.S. is infinitely more powerful and that it couldn’t be a threat.**

**Bandow, 8** (Doug, former senior fellow at the Cato Institute and former columnist with Copley News Service, 3/“Turning China into the Next Big Enemy.” http://www.antiwar.com/bandow/?articleid=12472)

In fact, America remains a military colossus. The Bush administration has proposed spending $515 billion next year on the military; more, adjusted for inflation, than at any time since World War II. The U.S. accounts for roughly half of the world's military outlays. Washington is allied with every major industrialized state except China and Russia. America's avowed enemies are a pitiful few: Burma, Cuba, Syria, Venezuela, Iran, North Korea. The U.S. government could destroy every one of these states with a flick of the president's wrist. Russia has become rather contentious of late, but that hardly makes it an enemy. Moreover, the idea that Moscow could rearm, reconquer the nations that once were part of the Soviet Union or communist satellites, overrun Western Europe, and then attack the U.S. – without anyone in America noticing the threat along the way – is, well, a paranoid fantasy more extreme than the usual science fiction plot. The Leninist Humpty-Dumpty has fallen off the wall and even a bunch of former KGB agents aren't going to be able to put him back together.

**Russia are nationalists, not suicidal. Won't escalate border conflicts.**

**Bandow, ‘10** (Doug, Senior Fellow – Cato, Huffington Post, “China: The Next “Necessary” Enemy?” 1-3, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/doug-bandow/china-the-next-necessary\_b\_443349.html)

What else is there? Russia is the enemy du jour for some, but Moscow today is a pale imitation of Moscow during the Cold War. The Soviet Union has been dismantled; its constituent states have seceded and shifted westward in orientation; the European Union alone has more than ten times Russia's GDP and spends more than Moscow on the military. Most important, though Vladimir Putin's Russia has taken a nasty authoritarian turn and exhibits near paranoid concern about the security of its border, world domination is no longer on Moscow's agenda. Even the most nationalistic Russian is not suicidal, and initiating war against America would be suicidal.

**De-escalation and global deterrence---best empirical cases prove no conflict despite heightened tensions, instability, and regional threats**

**Terrill 9,** member of Strategic Studies Institute (SSI) since October 2001; General Douglas MacArthur Professor of National Security Affairs; Middle East Nonprolif analyst for the International Assessments Division of the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL); Visiting Professor at the U.S. Air War College; former faculty member at Old Dominion University; retired U.S. Army Reserve lieutenant colonel and Foreign Area Officer (Middle East); published in numerous academic journals; participated in the Middle Eastern Arms Control and Regional Security (ACRS) Track 2 talks, which are part of the Middle East Peace Process; served as a member of the military and security working group of the Baker/Hamilton Iraq Study; holds a B.A. from California State Polytechnic University; M.A. from the University of California, Riverside, both in Political Science; holds a Ph.D. in International Relations from Claremont Graduate Universit—(W. Andrew Terrill, Escalation and intrawar deterrence During limited wars in the middle east,” September 2009, http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/pub941.pdf)

The number of declared nuclear powers has expanded significantly in the last 20 years to include Pakistan, India, and North Korea. Additionally, other powers such as Iran are almost certainly striving for a nuclear weapons capability while a number of count- ries in the developing world possess or seek biological and chemical weapons. In this milieu, a central purpose of this monograph by W. Andrew Terrill is to reexamine two earlier conflicts for insights that may be relevant for ongoing dangers during limited wars involving nations possessing chemical or biological weapons or emerging nuclear arsenals. Decision-makers from the United States and other countries may have to consider the circumstances under which a smaller and weaker enemy will use nuclear weapons or other mass destruction weapons. Some of Dr. Terrill’s observations may be particularly useful for policymakers dealing with future crises involving developing nations that possess weapons of mass destruction (WMD). Although it is possible that the United States could be a party to such a conflict, any crisis involving nuclear weapons states is expected to be of inherent concern to Washington, even if it is not a combatant. Dr. Terrill has examined two important **Mid**dle Eastern wars. These conflicts are the 1973 Arab- Israeli War and the 1991 Gulf War. This monograph may be particularly valuable in providing readers, including senior military and political leaders, with a discussion of the implications of these historical case studies in which WMD-armed nations may have seriously **considered** their use **but ultimately did not resort to them**. Both of these wars were fought at the conventional level, although the prospect of Israel using nuclear weapons (1973), Egypt using biological weapons (1973), or Iraq using chemical and biological weapons (1991) were of serious concern at various points during the fighting. The prospect of a U.S. war with WMD-armed opponents (such as occurred in 1991) raises the question of how **escalation can be controlled** in such circumstances and what are the most likelyways that intrawar deterrence can break down. This monograph will consider why **efforts at escalation control and intrawar deterrence were successful** in the two case studies and assess the points at which these efforts were under the most intensive stress that might have caused them to fail. Dr. Terrill notes that intrawar deterrence is always difficult and usually based on a variety of factors that no combatant can control in all circumstances of an ongoing conflict. The Strategic Studies Institute is pleased to offer this monograph as a contribution to the national secur- ity debate on this important subject as our nation continues to grapple with a variety of problems associated with the proliferation of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons. This analysis should be especially useful to U.S. strategic leaders and intelli- gence professionals as they seek to address the complicated interplay of factors related to regional security issues and the support of local allies. This work may also benefit those seeking greater understanding of long range issues of Middle Eastern and global security. We hope this work will be of benefit to officers of all services as well as other U.S. Government officials involved in military planning, and that it may cause them to reconsider some of the instances where intrawar deterrence seemed to work well but may have done so by a much closer margin than future planners can comfortably accept. In this regard, Dr. Terrill’s work is important to understanding the **lessons** of these conflicts which might **otherwise be forgotten or oversimplified**. Additionally, an understanding of the issues involved with **these earlier case studies** may be **useful in future circumstances** where the United States may seek to **deter wartime WMD** use by potential adversaries such as Iran or North Korea. The two case studies may also point out the inherent difficulties in doing so and the need to enter into conflict with these states only if one is prepared to accept the strong possibility that any efforts to control escalation have a good chance of breaking down. This understanding is particularly important in a wartime environment in which all parties should rationally have an interest in controlling escalation, but may have trouble doing so due to both systemic and wartime misperceptions and mistakes that distort communications between adversaries and may cause fundamental misunderstandings about the nature of the conflict in which these states may find themselves embroiled.

### A2 hezbollah

#### Hamas and Hezbollah are avoiding any pretext for conflict and Israel doesn't want to fight.

**Leverett and Leverett**, 2-25-20**10**

[Flynt, Senior Research Fellow – New American Foundation, and Hillary Mann, CEO – Strategic Energy and Global Analysis, “IS ANOTHER ISRAEL-IRAN “PROXY WAR” LOOMING?” 2010, http://www.raceforiran.com/is-another-israel-iran-%E2%80%9Cproxy-war%E2%80%9D-looming]

But, contra General Jones, after spending much of last week in Lebanon and Syria, we are struck by how disinclined both Hizballah and HAMAS are to provoke another round of military conflict with Israel. The day before we arrived in Beirut last week, Nasrallah gave a speech on the second anniversary of Imad Mughniyah’s assassination that also commemorated Hizballah fighters who fell in the fight against Israeli occupation (including one of Nasrallah’s own sons). In the course of the speech, Nasrallah addressed Israel directly, declaring that “if you destroy buildings in Dahiyeh [a large Shi’a neighborhood south of Beirut], we will demolish buildings in Tel Aviv…If you strike martyr Rafiq Hariri’s international airport in Beirut, we will strike your Ben Gurion airport in Tel Aviv. If you hit our ports, we will hit your ports. If you attack our refineries or factories, we will bomb your refineries and factories”. Western media reports characterized Nasrallah’s speech as “throwing down the gauntlet” to Israel, while pro-Saudi commentators in the regional media denounced Nasrallah’s speech—and Ahmadinejad’s endorsement of it—as inviting war. Writing in Al Hayat and Al Arabiyya, one of these commentators argued that “previous experience has shown that Iran’s talk of war has been serious when the matter concerns the regime’s interests. The summer 2006 Lebanon war erupted after economic sanctions were imposed on Tehran, and there is nothing preventing such a scenario from being repeated, a scenario which produced a ‘victory’ Iran and its allies still boast of”. But this reading of Nasrallah’s speech is diametrically opposed to the prevailing local interpretation of the Hizballah leader’s rhetoric. In his address, Nasrallah stressed that, while Hizballah would respond to any Israeli aggression, it does not seek war. Nasrallah noted that “since July 2006, nothing has happened on the South Lebanon front”. A prominent Hizballah parliamentarian described Nasrallah’s speech as “historic and crucial”, underscoring that, while Hizballah was not fearful of another war, it was not seeking one. Another Lebanese politician with close ties to Nasrallah told us that, the day after the speech, people throughout south Lebanon “breathed a sigh of relief” because, in their perception, the Hizballah leader’s speech had substantially reduced the risk of conflict with Israel over the next several months. The message that local resistance forces are not out to provoke another round of confrontation with Israel also came through clearly during a meeting with Khalid Mishal in Damascus. Mishal was very explicit in stating that, while HAMAS is prepared to deal with another Israeli military incursion into Gaza, it “does not want another war”—among other reasons, to spare Palestinians in Gaza the suffering that would come with another conflict, especially so soon after the 2008-09 Gaza war. Mishal said he had given instructions to HAMAS in Gaza not to fire rockets or do anything else that would give Israel a pretext for military action.

#### Hezbollah attack doesn’t escalate

Ferguson 6 Niall (Professor of History at Harvard University) July 23 2006 “This May not be a World War, But It Still Needs a Sense of Urgency”, Telegraph,

[http://www.telegraph.co.uk/opinion/main.jhtml?xml=/o pinion/2006/07/23/do2302.xml](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/opinion/main.jhtml?xml=/o%20pinion/2006/07/23/do2302.xml)

Such language can - for now, at least - safely be dismissed as hyperbole. This crisis is not going to trigger another world war. Indeed, I do not expect it to produce even another Middle Eastern war worthy of comparison with those of June 1967 or October 1973. In 1967, Israel fought four of its Arab neighbours, Egypt, Syria, Jordan and Iraq. In 1973, Egypt and Syria attacked Israel. Such combinations are very hard to imagine today. Nor does it seem to me likely that Syria and Iran will escalate their involvement in the crisis beyond continuing their support for Hezbollah. Neither is in a position to risk a full-scale military confrontation with Israel, given the risk that this might precipitate an American military reaction. Crucially, America's consistent support for Israel is not matched by any great power support for Israel's neighbours. During the Cold War, by contrast, the risk was that a Middle Eastern war could spill over into a superpower conflict. Henry Kissinger, secretary of state in the twilight of the Nixon presidency, first heard the news of an Arab-Israeli War at 6.15am on October 6, 1973. Half an hour later he was on the phone to the Soviet ambassador in Washington, Anatoly Dobrynin. Two weeks later Kissinger flew to Moscow to meet the Soviet leader, Leonid Brezhnev. The stakes were high indeed. At one point during the 1973 crisis, as Brezhnev vainly tried to resist Kissinger's efforts to squeeze him out of the diplomatic loop, the White House raised America's state of military readiness to Defcon 3, putting its strategic nuclear forces on high alert. It is hard to imagine anything like that today.

### No global escalation

**Dyer, 02** – Ph.D. in Military and Middle Eastern History from the University of London and former professor at the Royal Military Academy Sandhurst and Oxford University (Gwynne, Queen’s Quarterly, “The coming war”, December, questia)

All of this indicates an extremely dangerous situation, with many variables that are impossible to assess fully. But there is one comforting reality here: this will not become World War III. Not long ago, wars in the Middle East always went to the brink very quickly, with the Americans and Soviets deeply involved on opposite sides, bristling their nuclear weapons at one another. And for quite some time we lived on the brink of oblivion. But that is over. World War III has been cancelled, and I don't think we could pump it up again no matter how hard we tried. The connections that once tied Middle Eastern confrontations to a global confrontation involving tens of thousands of nuclear weapons have all been undone. The East-West Cold War is finished. The truly dangerous powers in the world today are the industrialized countries in general. We are the ones with the resources and the technology to churn out weapons of mass destruction like sausages. But the good news is: we are out of the business.

### No risk of Middle East war

**Maloney and Takeyh, 07** - \*senior fellow for Middle East Policy at the Saban Center for Middle East Studies at the Brookings Institution AND \*\*senior fellow for Middle East Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations (Susan and Ray, International Herald Tribune, 6/28, “Why the Iraq War Won't Engulf the Mideast”,

http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2007/0628iraq\_maloney.aspx)

Yet, the Saudis, Iranians, Jordanians, Syrians, and others are very unlikely to go to war either to protect their own sect or ethnic group or to prevent one country from gaining the upper hand in Iraq. The reasons are fairly straightforward. First, Middle Eastern leaders, like politicians everywhere, are primarily interested in one thing: self-preservation. Committing forces to Iraq is an inherently risky proposition, which, if the conflict went badly, could threaten domestic political stability. Moreover, most Arab armies are geared toward regime protection rather than projecting power and thus have little capability for sending troops to Iraq. Second, there is cause for concern about the so-called blowback scenario in which jihadis returning from Iraq destabilize their home countries, plunging the region into conflict. Middle Eastern leaders are preparing for this possibility. Unlike in the 1990s, when Arab fighters in the Afghan jihad against the Soviet Union returned to Algeria, Egypt and Saudi Arabia and became a source of instability, Arab security services are being vigilant about who is coming in and going from their countries. In the last month, the Saudi government has arrested approximately 200 people suspected of ties with militants. Riyadh is also building a 700 kilometer wall along part of its frontier with Iraq in order to keep militants out of the kingdom. Finally, there is no precedent for Arab leaders to commit forces to conflicts in which they are not directly involved. The Iraqis and the Saudis did send small contingents to fight the Israelis in 1948 and 1967, but they were either ineffective or never made it. In the 1970s and 1980s, Arab countries other than Syria, which had a compelling interest in establishing its hegemony over Lebanon, never committed forces either to protect the Lebanese from the Israelis or from other Lebanese. The civil war in Lebanon was regarded as someone else's fight. Indeed, this is the way many leaders view the current situation in Iraq. To Cairo, Amman and Riyadh, the situation in Iraq is worrisome, but in the end it is an Iraqi and American fight. As far as Iranian mullahs are concerned, they have long preferred to press their interests through proxies as opposed to direct engagement. At a time when Tehran has access and influence over powerful Shiite militias, a massive cross-border incursion is both unlikely and unnecessary. So Iraqis will remain locked in a sectarian and ethnic struggle that outside powers may abet, but will remain within the borders of Iraq. The Middle East is a region both prone and accustomed to civil wars. But given its experience with ambiguous conflicts, the region has also developed an intuitive ability to contain its civil strife and prevent local conflicts from enveloping the entire Middle East.
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### AT: Not Much Supply

#### We have a ton of oil and gas—the issue is politics, not supply. Claims of ‘peak’ energy are empirically denied scare tactics

Hutzler 13—Mary J. Hutzler is a Senior Fellow at the Institute for Energy Research (IER). She was a top energy analyst for the U.S. Government, having spent more than 25 years at the Energy Information Administration (EIA), where she specialized in data collection, analysis, and forecasting. In 2001, Hutzler was named by President Bush to lead the EIA as Acting Administrator. Hutzler received a 2004 Presidential Rank Award. Hutzler received her B.A. in mathematics from Adelphi University, her M.A. in applied mathematics from the University of Maryland, and completed her course work and exams for a D.Sc. in operations research at George Washington University [February 6, 2013, “U.S. Energy Innovation (Part I: Expanding “Depletable” Resources),” http://www.masterresource.org/2013/02/us-energy-i-expanding-resources/]

The United States has vast resources of oil, natural gas, and coal. In just a few short years, a forty-year paradigm that the U.S. was energy poor has been reversed. The world’s mineral-energy resource base is enlarging, not depleting–and leading the way is the U.S. with private firms exploring and producing from private lands.

In December 2011, IER published a report entitled North American Energy Inventory that provides the magnitude of these resources for the United States, Canada, and Mexico. [1] As the report shows, the United States is vastly endowed in all three forms of organic fossil energy. In fact, the amount of technically recoverable oil in the United States totals almost 90 percent of the entire oil reserves in the world. [2]

Technically recoverable resources are not equivalent to reserves, but comparing their magnitudes provides a way to measure size. Technically recoverable resources are undiscovered resources that are recoverable with existing drilling and production technologies, but may not be economic at today’s prices. Reserves, on the other hand, are resources that are easily accessible and recoverable with today’s technology and at today’s oil prices. IER’s estimate of technically recoverable oil in the United States is 1,422 billion barrels.

That amount of oil can satisfy U.S. oil demand for 250 years at current usage rates or it can fuel every passenger car in the United States for 430 years. It is also more oil than the entire world has used in all human history.

The technically recoverable natural gas resources in the United States total 40 percent of the world’s natural gas reserves. At 2,744 trillion cubic feet, it can fuel natural gas demand in the United States for 175 years at current usage rates, or selectively, it can satisfy the nation’s residential demand for 857 years or the nation’s electricity demand for 575 years.

The technically recoverable coal resources in the United States are unsurpassed and total 50 percent of the world’s coal reserves. At 486 billion short tons, it can supply our country’s electricity demand for coal for almost 500 years at current usage rates.

In fact, the United States has the largest coal reserves of any country in the world with Russia and China rounding out the top three countries in ranking. While we have the largest coal reserves in the world, we do not consume the largest amount of coal. China consumes almost 4 times the amount of coal as we do here in the United States, although its coal reserves are much smaller than ours. [3]

In 2011, China consumed more than 3.8 billion short tons of coal while the United States consumed 1 billion short tons. [4] Because government policies are making coal more difficult to use in the United States, some U.S. mining companies are exporting coal to China and elsewhere, in turn keeping mining jobs here at home.

Restocking Supply

The reason why technically recoverable resources are important is that they become reserves when one or more of the following occurs:

Technology is developed that enables the resource to become economic such as with hydraulic fracturing;

The price of the resource increases to enable production with existing technology, or more resource-rich lands or waters are made available to industry to develop.

Historical production and reserve numbers provide documentation regarding the transition from technically recoverable resources to reserves. For example, in 1944, U.S. oil reserves totaled 20 billion barrels and yet our oil and gas industry produced 167 billion barrels between 1945 and 2010—8 times the amount of reserves available in 1944—and the amount of U.S. oil reserves in 2010 still totaled 20.7 billion barrels. Thus, there was no reserve depletion; there was reserve replenishment.

The same is true for natural gas. In 1944, the United states had 147 trillion cubic feet of natural gas reserves, and yet had produced 1,041 trillion cubic feet between 1945 and 2010—7 times the amount of reserves available in 1944. In this case, however, the U.S. oil and gas industry was able to double the 1944 natural gas reserve level with 318 trillion cubic feet in reserves in 2010.

“Peak” Myths

For many years, we have heard of fossil fuels reaching their peak production levels or at the verge of being depleted. In 1855, an advertisement for “Kier’s Rock Oil” indicated “…Hurry, before this wonderful product is depleted from Nature’s laboratory!” and that was four years before the first U.S. oil well was drilled! And in 1919, David White, the Chief Geologist of the United States Geologic Survey stated “…the peak of [U.S.] production will soon be passed—possibly within three years.”

But, instead, we find that our oil production is growing with forecasters such as the International Energy Agency now predicting that the United States will become the world’s largest oil producer by 2017. [5] Further, the IEA predicts that the United States will become almost energy self-sufficient by 2035.

And the peak production myth was not confined to just oil. For example, in January of 2007, Paul Hanrahan, the Chief Executive Officer of AES Power stated “The U.S. is running out of natural gas—production is declining and demand growing—so the expectation is that the import levels will go from 3 percent today to about 24 percent in 2020.”

Forecasters such as the Energy Information Administration were predicting that there would not be enough North American natural gas to meet demand and that we needed to build facilities for importing liquefied natural gas. Just a few years later, we find instead a shale gas boom and economics dictating that those importing facilities will become terminals for exporting natural gas as long as the government approves.

The same is true for the myth of ‘peak’ coal. In 2007, David Hughes, Geologist for the Geological Survey of Canada, stated, “Peak coal looks like it’s occurred in the lower 48.” And yet, the United States still has the largest coal reserves in the world. Rather than depletion effects, our coal industry is faced with overly broad and restrictive regulations on the use of coal and increasing restrictions on coal production from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

The U.S. Shale Oil and Gas Revolution

The reason for the boom in both oil and natural gas production in the United States is that our oil and gas industry was able to revolutionize drilling and production from shale formations by combining hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling technology. Hydraulic fracturing uses water, sand, and trace amounts of chemicals to break apart the shale rock and horizontal drilling allows the oil to be produced from the shale formations which, vein-like, run parallel to the surface thousands of feet below.

Hydraulic fracturing has been in use since the 1940s, but combining fracturing with horizontal drilling allows much more of the oil and natural gas to be extracted than if the hydraulic fracturing was only used in vertical wells. When combined with the incredible advances in computer interpretive capabilities, an energy miracle is afoot.

That these technologies have combined to revolutionize the industry can be seen from the following example. In 1995, before hydraulic fracturing was being used in shale oil and shale gas drilling, the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) estimated that the Bakken formation held 151 million barrels of technically recoverable oil.

But in 2008, after the impact of hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling was included in the USGS’s assessment, the estimate of recoverable oil in the Bakken jumped by a factor of 25. [6] The oil was always there, but it was human ingenuity, free enterprise and the application of technology—the things that have always made America great—that combined to free these energy riches.

Ten years ago, shale oil formations produced about 200,000 barrels of oil a day. Today, these formations produce over one million barrels and production could reach three million barrels a day by 2020. This new oil production is occurring in a number of places around the country, including the Bakken formation in North Dakota, the Eagle Ford formation in Texas, and the Niobrara formation in Colorado.

Unlike the large oil fields of the past few decades such as the fields in the Gulf of Mexico or Prudhoe Bay, Alaska, these new shale fields are mostly on private and state lands. As a result, total U.S. oil production has increased, in spite of the federal government leasing fewer and fewer acres for energy production.

Shale gas has greatly increased the nation’s supply of natural gas and has made the United States the largest natural gas producer in the world. In 2011, the United States out-produced Russia by almost 5 trillion cubic feet (28.6 trillion cubic feet of natural gas produced here compared to 23.7 trillion cubic feet produced in Russia). [7]

The U.S. Marcellus and Barnett shale formations are providing vast new natural gas reserves. U.S. proven reserves of shale gas increased from 21.7 trillion cubic feet in 2007 [8] to 60.6 trillion cubic feet [9] in 2010. Between 2007 and 2010, shale gas production increased by over 300 percent from 1.3 trillion cubic feet produced in 2007 and 5.3 trillion cubic feet produced in 2010. [10]

The outlook for natural gas production in the United States has dramatically changed over the last decade. Just a few years ago, U.S. manufacturing facilities were moving abroad to pursue more affordable gas. At the time, the U.S. had relatively high natural gas prices.

Now, due to hydraulic fracturing technology, energy companies are considering building liquefied natural gas terminals to export natural gas and new manufacturing plants are springing up around the country. The boom in natural gas production has completely changed the natural gas landscape and has greatly lowered natural gas prices for consumers and industrial users.

Lower energy prices benefit the entire economy, but especially the economically disadvantaged and those on fixed incomes. Expanded energy production resulting in lower prices is thus a benefit to society.

### AT: Pyle

#### Amount of oil/gas in fed lands vastly outweighs the amount in the OCS

Pyle, 1ac author, 12—President of the Institute for Energy Research [Thomas, “Energy Department sneaks offshore moratorium past public; Jobs and oil-supply potential are shut down,” 7-10-12, http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2012/jul/9/energy-department-sneaks-offshore-moratorium-past-/]

But since taking office, Mr. Obama and Mr. Salazar have worked to restrict access to our offshore oil and gas resources by canceling lease sales, delaying others and creating an atmosphere of uncertainty about America’s future offshore development that has left job creators looking for other countries’ waters to host their offshore rigs. More than 3 1/2 years into the Obama regime, nearly 86 billion barrels of undiscovered oil on the Outer Continental Shelf remain off-limits to Americans. Alaska alone has about 24 billion barrels of oil in unleased federal waters. The Commonwealth of Virginia - where Mr. Obama has reversed policies that would have allowed offshore development - is home to 130 million barrels of offshore oil and 1.14 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. But thanks to the president, Virginians will have to wait at least another five years before they can begin creating the jobs that will unlock their offshore resources.

### AT: Griles

#### Griles says federal lands, specifically ANWR is the “largest untapped source” of oil and gas. Plus he specifies that the OCS would provide 22 billion barrels of oil and 61 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. The counterplan accesses far more than that

Griles 3—Deputy Secretary of the Department of the Interior [Steven, “ENERGY PRODUCTION ON FEDERAL LANDS,” Hearing before the Energy and Natural Resources Committee of the US Senate, 2-27-03, http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CHRG-108shrg86709/html/CHRG-108shrg86709.htm]

Mr. Griles. America's public lands have an abundant opportunity for exploration and development of renewable and nonrenewable energy resources. Energy reserves contained on the Department of the Interior's onshore and offshore Federal lands are very important to meeting our current and future estimates of what it is going to take to continue to supply America's energy demand.

Estimates suggest that these lands contain approximately 68 percent of the undiscovered U.S. oil resources and 74 percent of the undiscovered natural gas resources. President Bush has developed a national energy policy that laid out a comprehensive, long-term energy strategy for America's future. That strategy recognizes we need to raise domestic production of energy, both renewable and nonrenewable, to meet our dependence for energy.

For oil and gas, the United States uses about 7 billion barrels a year, of which about 4 billion are currently imported and 3 billion are domestically produced. The President proposed to open a small portion of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to environmentally responsible oil and gas exploration.

Now there is a new and environmentally friendly technology, similar to directional drilling, with mobile platforms, self- containing drilling units. These things will allow producers to access large energy reserves with almost no footprint on the tundra. Each day, even since I have assumed this job, our ability to minimize our effect on the environment continues to improve to where it is almost nonexistent in such areas as even in Alaska.

According to the latest oil and gas assessment, ANWR is the largest untapped source of domestic production available to us. The production for ANWR would equal about 60 years of imports from Iraq.

The National Energy Policy also encourages development of cleaner, more diverse portfolios of domestic renewable energy sources. The renewable policy in areas cover geothermal, wind, solar, and biomass. And it urges research on hydrogen as an alternate energy source.

To advance the National Energy Policy, the Bureau of Land Management and the DOE's National Renewable Energy Lab last week announced the release of a renewable energy report. It identifies and evaluates renewable energy resources on public lands.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit this for the record.\* This report, which has just come out, assess the potential for renewable energy on public lands. It is a very good report that we hope will allow for the private sector, after working with the various other agencies, to where can we best use renewable resource, and how do we take this assessment and put it into the land use planning that we are currently going, so that right-of-ways and understanding of what renewable resources can be done in the West can, in fact, have a better opportunity.

The Department completed the first of an energy inventory this year. Now the EPCA report, which is laying here, also, Mr. Chairman, is an estimate of the undiscovered, technically recoverable oil and gas. Part one of that report covers five oil and gas basins. The second part of the report will be out later this year.

Now this report, it is not--there are people who have different opinions of it. But the fact is we believe it will be a good guidance tool, as we look at where the oil and gas potential is and where we need to do land use planning. And as we update these land use plannings and do our EISs, that will help guide further the private sector, the public sector, and all stakeholders on how we can better do land use planning and develop oil and gas in a sound fashion.

Also, I have laying here in front of me the two EISs that have been done on the two major coal methane basins in the United States, San Juan Basis and the Powder River Basin. Completing these reports, which are in draft, will increase and offer the opportunity for production of natural gas with coal bed methane.

Now these reports are in draft and, once completed, will authorize and allow for additional exploration and development. It has taken 2 years to get these in place. It has taken 2 years to get some of these in place. This planning process that Congress has initiated under FLPMA and other statutes allows for a deliberative, conscious understanding of what the impacts are. We believe that when these are finalized, that is in fact what will occur.

One of the areas which we believe that the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Land Management is and is going to engage in is coordination with landowners. Mr. Chairman, the private sector in the oil and gas industry must be good neighbors with the ranchers in the West. The BLM is going to be addressing the issues of bonding requirements that will assure that landowners have their surface rights and their values protected.

BLM is working to make the consultation process with the landowners, with the States and local governments and other Federal agencies more efficient and meaningful. But we must assure that the surface owners are protected and the values of their ranches are in fact assured. And by being good neighbors, we can do that.

In the BLM land use planning process, we have priorities, ten current resource management planning areas that contain the major oil and gas reserves that are reported out in the EPCA study. Once this process is completed, then we can move forward with consideration of development of the natural gas.

We are also working with the Western Governors' Association and the Western Utilities Group. The purpose is to identify and designate right-of-way corridors on public lands. We would like to do it now as to where right-of-way corridors make sense and put those in our land use planning processes, so that when the need is truly identified, utilities, energy companies, and the public will know where they are Instead of taking two years to amend a land use plan, hopefully this will expedite and have future opportunity so that when the need is there, we can go ahead and make that investment through the private sector. It should speed up the process of right-of-way permits for both pipelines and electric transmission.

Now let me switch to the offshore, the Outer Continental Shelf. It is a huge contributor to our Nation's energy and economic security.

The Chairman. Mr. Secretary, everything you have talked about so far is onshore.

Mr. Griles. That is correct.

The Chairman. You now will speak to offshore.

Mr. Griles. Yes, sir, I will.

Now we are keeping on schedule the holding lease sales in the areas that are available for leasing. In the past year, scheduled sales in several areas were either delayed, canceled, or put under moratoria, even though they were in the 5-year plan. It undermined certainty. It made investing, particularly in the Gulf, more risky.

We have approved a 5-year oil and gas leasing program in July 2002 that calls for 20 new lease sales in the Gulf of Mexico and several other areas of the offshore, specifically in Alaska by 2007. Now our estimates indicate that these areas contain resources up to 22 billion barrels of oil and 61 trillion cubic feet of natural gas.

We are also acting to raise energy production from these offshore areas by providing royalty relief on the OCS leases for new deep wells that are drilled in shallow water. These are at depths that heretofore were very and are very costly to produce from and costly to drill to. We need to encourage that exploration. These deep wells, which are greater than 15,000 feet in depth, are expected to access between 5 to 20 trillion cubic feet of natural gas and can be developed quickly due to existing infrastructure and the shallow water.

We have also issued a final rule in July 2002 that allows companies to apply for a lease extension, giving them more time to analyze complex geological data that underlies salt domes. That is, where geologically salt overlays the geologically clay. And you try to do seismic, and the seismic just gets distorted. So we have extended the lease terms, so that hopefully those companies can figure out where and where to best drill. Vast resources of oil and natural gas lie, we hope, beneath these sheets of salt in the OCS in the Gulf of Mexico. But it is very difficult to get clear seismic images.

We are also working to create a process of reviewing and permitting alternative energy sources on the OCS lands. We have sent legislation to Congress that would give the Minerals Management Service of the Department of the Interior clear authority to lease parts of the OCS for renewable energy. The renewables could be wind, wave, or solar energy, and related projects that are auxiliary to oil and gas development, such as offshore staging facilities and emergency medical facilities.

We need this authority in order to be able to truly give the private sector what are the rules to play from and buy, so they can have certainty about where to go.

### Shale Sustainable 2NC

#### Shale gas is sustainable --- total production is nearly three times what it has been to date in just one field, shale has just as much if not more gas than offshore drilling, and price sensitivity isn't a major factor in drilling --- that's UT

#### Prioritize our study --- it is the most thorough assessment, includes many input parameters, uses a bottom up approach rather than flawed top down assessments, controls for price changes, volume, economic limits, tech changes, incentives and other factors and was profesionally peer reviewed.

#### Their evidence is all from one person's analysis rather than independent review panels.

#### Your authors agree

Gold 2-27 [Russel, "Gas Boom Projected to Grow for Decades," 2-27, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887323293704578330700203397128.html]

Art Berman, a petroleum geologist and consultant who has been a leading critic of what he says are overly optimistic projections of shale-gas production, said the research "is probably the most comprehensive study of the Barnett shale that will ever be done." But he said it bolsters his view that only a quarter of Barnett wells generate an economic return. The question for the industry, he said, is, "why didn't they identify the sweet spots initially, before spending $40 billion on land and wells?" The study does show that many of the wells drilled in the Barnett have been poor performers. And while the gas-bearing rock covers 8,000 square miles in and around Fort Worth, Texas, the study suggests it can be economically developed in an area only half that size. Some of the energy companies that spent enormous sums to lease thousands of acres in far-flung parts of the Barnett may be sitting on acreage of little value. Mr. Tinker agrees that the study shows the Barnett is highly variable, with some areas producing enough gas to make the wells profitable and other areas generating duds. Even so, the study concludes that 44 trillion cubic feet of natural gas will be recovered from the Barnett—more than three times what has been produced so far and about two years' worth of U.S. consumption at current rates. The university also is examining shale formations in Pennsylvania, Louisiana and Arkansas, work that has led investigators to conclude that U.S. natural gas production won't plateau until 2040. Reports on these formations are expected to be released next year. Enlarge Image Associated Press A drilling rig is seen near Kennedy, Texas, in May. U.S. natural-gas production will accelerate over the next three decades, new research indicates. One reason there has been a dispute over projections of shale-gas production is that much of the research, even inside universities, has been funded by groups with either pro- or anti- energy-development agendas. Many of the latter have strong views about the environmental impact of fracking on the air and groundwater. The Sloan Foundation said it looked into whether the researchers who performed the new study were unduly influenced by outside ties and was satisfied that "potential conflicts of interest or sources of bias have not influenced the research." The co-lead investigator of the study, Mr. Tinker, is paid to serve on the technical advisory boards of BP BP.LN +0.70% PLC and two smaller energy companies. He also receives speaking fees a few times a year for appearances before industry groups and private companies. The Bureau of Economic Geology receives research funding from government, industry and the University of Texas. The other lead investigator, Svetlana Ikonnikova, didn't disclose any potential conflicts to the university. Scott Anderson, who researches shale development for the Environmental Defense Fund, which is working on lowering the environmental impact of gas drilling, reviewed some of the study's preliminary results. He praised the report as "robust" and "sophisticated." The U.S. energy industry welcomed the conclusion that a large number of successful gas wells remain to be drilled. The American Petroleum Institute, the lobbying arm of large U.S. oil and gas companies, said in a statement that the study "underscores the fact that the U.S. has substantial and growing natural gas resources that will be able to supply future domestic markets and provide exports as well."

#### We'll go through their warrants here ---

#### Yes it declines rapidly after the first year --- but lasts significantly longer

#### Maize 12 [Kennedy, executive editor of MANAGING POWER, "Is Shale Gas Shallow or the Real Deal?," Power, Dec2012, Vol. 156, Issue 12, EBSCO]

Bullish on Gas

But Perm State geologist Terry Engelder, the major domo of Marcellus Shale (see sidebar), doesn't share Berman's pessimism about gas supply and prices, or Berman's assessment of the production decline of shale gas wells. "All wells decline," Engelder said in an interview. "What distinguishes shale wells from conventional reservoirs is the percentage of gas delivered over a long period of time." Shale wells, Engelder said, start producing at very high volumes, decrease considerably during the first year, but continue producing much longer than conventional gas wells, because the tight rock formations slow the release of the gas.

With shale gas, Engelder said, "You have a steeper decline curve initially, but a much longer period of production." That's a function of the tight shale reservoirs, "with inherent low permeability," he said. "The gas takes longer to get" to the well head "but remains economic over a longer period of time."

Here is where it can get pretty wonky. Engelder notes that the dispute with Berman and others in his camp who say shale wells decline too rapidly is a matter of hyperbolic production curves versus exponential curves. Engelder is in the hyperbolic school and Berman is one of the exponential advocates. If a well's decline is hyperbolic, Engelder explained, you get a decreasing rate of decline year after year. The best data for eastern shale wells available, he said, shows a general hyperbolic decline over a 40-year period, versus a 25-year lifespan for conventional gas wells.

#### Our study is the goldilocks of predictions --- it is not the widely optimistic forecasts they assume, but notes that the pessimistic collapse scenarios of the aff are not a concern --- we will have plenty to solve all the aff's advantages

#### Industry won't collapse --- industries will adapt to lower prices

Liou 12 [Joann, editorial coordinator for Drilling Contractor, [Positive rig demand steers 2013 outlook](http://www.drillingcontractor.org/positive-rig-demand-steers-2013-outlook-19247)," 11-2, http://www.drillingcontractor.org/positive-rig-demand-steers-2013-outlook-19247]

Mr LaMotte believes more consolidation is needed in the onshore US services market, moving from a phase that addressed a capacity shortage in services through the construction of rigs.

“We’ve been through the period of ‘shock and awe,’ during which the industry tossed hundreds of billions of dollars at the near-simultaneous identification and early development of the largest unconventional gas and liquids plays in the Lower 48; however, with more than 70% of the nation’s resource potential in a more mature ‘standardization’ phase, we believe E&P companies will become increasingly focused on the productivity of their spending as opposed to just spending more,” Mr LaMotte explained. “It will require the industry to focus on reducing the cost of services delivery, on efficiency and on developing technologies that improve the recovery factors.”

#### Berman’s wrong---flawed data, ignores new highly productive plays

Hurdle 12 – Jon Hurdle, December 5th, 2012, "Are US Shale Gas Resources Overstated? Part 2" energy.aol.com/2012/12/05/are-us-shale-gas-resources-overstated-part-2/

Enthusiasm over the US natural gas production renaissance has been steadily building over the past few years and increasing production of both gas and oil from shale deposits came up numerous times during the 2012 US presidential election cycle. However, not everyone views shale gas as a supply panacea, which is the thrust of a book due out next spring written by Bill Powers with a forward by Arthur Berman.¶ Potential Gas Committee executive director John Curtis rejected Berman's reliance on the committee's "probable" category, which is based on gas in existing fields.¶ "He's dead wrong," Curtis said, arguing that restricting the resource estimate to only "probable" gas ignores the existence of highly productive plays **like the Marcellus and the Haynesville that** were not initially included **in that category because they had not been drilled**.¶ Curtis added that **any deficit between a field's actual production and its resource estimate** may reflect a lack of pipelines or undeveloped markets **for the gas** rather than a resource that undershoots expectations**.**¶ The PGC's latest estimate, published in 2010, is for total US shale resource of 687 tcf, including "probable", "possible" and "speculative" gas. Including all categories of gas, the committee estimated a total resource of 1,900 tcf, not far below the EIA's assessment of 2,203 tcf.¶ Ahead of the next PGC report, due in April 2013, Curtis said there was no indication of a need to cut its current estimate of gas resources, and there had not been in 2010 compared with the previous report two years earlier.¶ The Thorny Issue of Reserve Estimates¶ "From year-end 2008 to year-end 2010 we saw no reason to move away from our position for the quality and quantity of resources, and from 2010 to now we still do not," he said.¶ For his part, Powers cited the EIA's own data in support of his case, noting that the organization sharply cut its estimate of unproved technically recoverable resource to 482 tcf in the latest outlook from 827 tcf a year earlier, largely because of a big decline in its TRR estimate for the Marcellus Shale to 141 tcf from 410 tcf a year earlier.¶ "**The EIA is starting to walk back from its earlier claims**," Powers said, in an interview ahead of the book's scheduled publication in May 2013. He said the EIA's credibility was hurt when it cut its Marcellus estimate after the US Geological Survey calculated in its own 2011 study that the Appalachian shale play contained just 84 tcf.¶ Philip Budzik, a spokesman for the EIA, said the changing estimates reflect the industry's increasing experience in the field. "The numbers have been changing significantly over the last couple of years," he said. "Producers have been experimenting with drilling and completion techniques."¶ Any confirmed cut in US shale gas resources could have far-reaching consequences ranging from reduced energy security to more greenhouse gas emissions and higher energy costs. With increased production and optimistic projections for recoverable resources, natural gas is assuming an increasingly important role in US energy policy.¶ The EIA estimated the TRR for all forms of natural gas including tight gas and coal bed methane is 2,203 tcf, or about a century's supply at the current national consumption rate of some 24 tcf a year. Shale gas represents about a quarter of the EIA's total, or around 22 years' worth; that resource would shrink to just 5.5 years if Powers is right.¶ Dan Whitten, a spokesman for the trade group America's Natural Gas Alliance, rejected Powers's estimates, **saying that shale gas production has risen more than 12-fold over the last decade, and estimates of recoverable resources have risen at a similar rate.** Whitten said Powers's assertions have been refuted by prominent organizations including the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the Potential Gas Committee.¶ "There is no question**, with continued advances in both the technology used to produce natural gas and our understanding of resource potential, that** projections will continue to evolve," Whitten wrote in an email. "While we have not seen Mr. Powers' book, his conclusions run counter to the established science on the abundance of natural gas."

#### Their ev says the plan results in 80tcf of natural gas

Medlock, 8 [Medlock is a fellow in Energy Studies at Rice University's James A Baker III Institute for Public Policy and an adjunct assistant professor in the [Economics Department](http://www.chron.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=opinion%2Foutlook&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Economics+Department%22) at Rice, “Open outer continental shelf”, http://www.chron.com/opinion/outlook/article/Open-outer-continental-shelf-1597898.php]

A confluence of factors is responsible for the recent price run-up at the pump. One important factor behind the strength of oil prices is the expectation of inadequate oil supply in the future. This has led to a debate regarding the removal of drilling access restrictions in the U.S. Outer Continental Shelf (OCS). According to the Department of Interior's Minerals Management Service (MMS), the OCS in the Lower 48 states currently under moratorium holds 19 billion barrels of technically recoverable oil. Some analysts claim that opening the OCS will not matter that much, as the quantity of oil is only about two years of U.S. consumption. But a more appropriate way to look at the issue is this: If the OCS could provide additional production of 1 million barrels per day of oil, our import dependence on Persian Gulf crude oil would be reduced by about 40 percent. Moreover, at 1 million barrels per day, the currently blocked OCS resource would last about 50 years. Of course, opening the OCS will not bring immediate supplies because it would take time to organize the lease sales and then develop the supply delivery infrastructure. However, as development progressed, the expected growth in supply would have an effect on market sentiment and eventually prices. Thus, opening the OCS should be viewed as a relevant part of a larger strategy to help ease prices over time because an increase in activity in the OCS would generally improve expectations about future oil supplies. Lifting the current moratorium in the OCS would also provide almost 80 trillion cubic feet of technically recoverable natural gas that is currently off-limits. A recent study by the Baker Institute indicates that removing current restrictions on resource development in the OCS would reduce future liquefied natural gas import dependence of the United States and lessen the influence of any future gas producers' cartel.

#### The US uses 24tcf per year – means the plan is only good for 3 years

Energy Information Administration, 8-29-2012, “Frequently Asked Questions,” http://www.eia.gov/tools/faqs/faq.cfm?id=58&t=8

EIA estimates that there are 2,203 trillion cubic feet (Tcf) of natural gas that is technically recoverable in the United States. At the rate of U.S. natural gas consumption in 2011 of about 24 Tcf per year, 2,203 Tcf of natural gas is enough to last about 92 years.

#### Even a single onshore shale field is six times bigger than all OCS resources

Inman 12 Mason, National Geographic News, Feb 29, "Estimates Clash for How Much Natural Gas in the United States", news.nationalgeographic.com/news/energy/2012/03/120301-natural-gas-reserves-united-states/

Engelder is often given credit for spurring the shale gas rush in the Marcellus with early estimates that the formation held large amounts of natural gas. In his most recent published estimate, from 2009, he figured the Marcellus could in the long run yield 489 tcf, a number in the same ballpark as the EIA's 2011 estimate.

#### Their solvency evidence prove OCS restrictions only make a difference of 1.5tcf per year

Baker Institute, ‘8 (Baker Institute for Public Policy, Rice University, Baker Institute Policy Report, January 2008, “Natural Gas in North America: Markets and Security,” http://connection.ebscohost.com/c/articles/30064519/study-lift-u-s-drilling-restrictions-avoid-international-lng-cartel)//CC

As might be expected, the lower requirements for LNG under this scenario stem from larger, lowcost U.S. Lower 48 natural gas production. Modeling predicts that lifting access restrictions would lead to an increase overall in Lower 48 production of about 1.5 tcf in 2015 (or a 7.5 percent increase), increasing to 3.1 tcf greater production (or a 10.1 percent increase) in every year from 2015 through 2030. More specifically, OCS production would total 5.0 tcf in 2015 and 6.1 tcf in 2025 as compared to only 3.5 tcf in 2015 and 3.9 tcf in 2025 if the restrictions remain in place. Lifting restrictions in the Rocky Mountains adds another 0.10 tcf by 2015 and 0.93 tcf by 2025.

#### Their evidence conclusively says that the consensus of experts agree on-shore shale is sustainable enough for exports now

Ebinger, Senior fellow and Director of the Energy Security Initiative at Brookings, ‘12

(Charles, “Liquid Markets: Assessing the Case for US Exports of Liquefied Natural Gas,” 5-2-12, http:~/~/www.brookings.edu/~~/media/events/2012/5/02%20lng%20exports/20120502\_lng\_edu/~~/media/events/2012/5/02%20lng%20exports/20120502\_lng\_exports, accessed 10-22-12) PM

For an increase in U.S. exports of LNG to be considered feasible, there has to be an adequate and sustainable domestic resource base to support it. Natural gas currently accounts for approximately 25 percent of the U.S. primary energy mix. 3 While it currently provides only a minority of U.S. gas supply, shale gas production is increasing at a rapid rate: from 2000 to 2006, shale gas production increased by an average annual rate of 17 percent; from 2006 to 2010, production increased by an annual average rate of 48 percent (see Figure 2). 4 According to the Energy Information Adminis tration (EIA), shale gas production in the United States reached 4.87 trillion cubic feet (tcf) in 2010, or 23 percent of U.S. dry gas production. By 2035, it is estimated that shale gas production will account for 46 percent of total domestic natural gas production. 5 Given the centrality of shale gas to the future of the U.S. gas sector, much of the discussion over potential exports hinges on the prospects for its sustained availability and development. For exports to be feasible, gas from shale and other unconventional sources needs to both offset declines in conventional production and compete with new and incumbent domestic end uses. There have been a number of reports and studies that attempt to identify the total amount of technically recoverable shale gas resources—the volumes of gas retrievable using current technology irrespective of cost—available in the United States. These estimates vary from just under 700 trillion cubic feet (tcf) of shale gas to over 1,800 tcf (see table 1). To put these numbers in context, the United States consumed just over 24 tcf of gas in 2010, suggesting that the estimates for the shale gas resource alone would be enough to satisfy between 25 and 80 years of U.S. domestic demand. 6 The estimates for recoverable shale gas resources also compare with an estimate for total U.S. gas resources (onshore and offshore, including Alaska) of 2,543 tcf. 7 Based on the range of estimates below, shale gas could therefore account for between 29 percent and 52 percent of the total technically recoverable natural gas resource in the United States. sustainability of shale Gas Production In addition to the size of the economically recoverable resources, two other major factors will have an impact on the sustainability of shale gas production: the productivity of shale gas wells; and the demand for the equipment used for shale gas production. The productivity of shale gas wells has been a subject of much recent debate, with some industry observers suggesting that undeveloped wells may prove to be less productive than those developed to date. However, a prominent view among independent experts is that sustainability of shale gas production is not a cause for serious concern, owing to the continued rapid improvement in technologies and production processes.

#### EVEN IF they win that shale is unsustainable --- vote neg. Proves that industries and investors will flip out and stop the transition when the dream is stopped

### No Exports 2nc

#### Plan doesn't result in additional exports --- global shale boom, expensive construction, exploratory time, high opposition --- thats Krauss

#### None of their 1ac evidence speaks to the technical and financial difficulties of developing and exporting LNG --- even if it is approved by Congress that doesn't mean that companies will find it economical to do so

#### Drilling can't solve prices in time to make exports viable

#### EIA 7 ["Impacts of Increased Access to Oil and Natural Gas Resources in the Lower 48 Federal Outer Continental Shelf," http://www.eia.gov/oiaf/aeo/otheranalysis/ongr.html]

The projections in the OCS access case indicate that access to the Pacific, Atlantic, and eastern Gulf regions would not have a significant impact on domestic crude oil and natural gas production or prices before 2030. Leasing would begin no sooner than 2012, and production would not be expected to start before 2017. Total domestic production of crude oil from 2012 through 2030 in the OCS access case is projected to be 1.6 percent higher than in the reference case, and 3 percent higher in 2030 alone, at 5.6 million barrels per day. For the lower 48 OCS, annual crude oil production in 2030 is projected to be 7 percent higher—2.4 million barrels per day in the OCS access case compared with 2.2 million barrels per day in the reference case (Figure 20). Because oil prices are determined on the international market, however, any impact on average wellhead prices is expected to be insignificant. Similarly, lower 48 natural gas production is not projected to increase substantially by 2030 as a result of increased access to the OCS. Cumulatively, lower 48 natural gas production from 2012 through 2030 is projected to be 1.8 percent higher in the OCS access case than in the reference case. Production levels in the OCS access case are projected at 19.0 trillion cubic feet in 2030, a 3-percent increase over the reference case projection of 18.4 trillion cubic feet. However, natural gas production from the lower 48 offshore in 2030 is projected to be 18 percent (590 billion cubic feet) higher in the OCS access case (Figure 21). In 2030, the OCS access case projects a decrease of $0.13 in the average wellhead price of natural gas (2005 dollars per thousand cubic feet), a decrease of 250 billion cubic feet in imports of liquefied natural gas, and an increase of 360 billion cubic feet in natural gas consumption relative to the reference case projections. In addition, despite the increase in production from previously restricted areas after 2012, total natural gas production from the lower 48 OCS is projected generally to decline after 2020. Although a significant volume of undiscovered, technically recoverable oil and natural gas resources is added in the OCS access case, conversion of those resources to production would require both time and money. In addition, the average field size in the Pacific and Atlantic regions tends to be smaller than the average in the Gulf of Mexico, implying that a significant portion of the additional resource would not be economically attractive to develop at the reference case prices.

#### No exports --- resource nationalism outweighs.

Reuters, 6/8/2012. “U.S. likely to cap gas exports – analysts,” http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/06/08/usa-lng-exports-idUSL5E8H678C20120608.

Industrial lobbying in the United States is likely to put a cap on potentially huge natural gas exports, benefiting domestic industries such as petrochemicals and refining, but limiting export profits from gas-hungry Asia and Europe.¶ The U.S. has experienced a boom in shale gas exploration, which will potentially turn it from a net importer of natural gas into a gas exporter. Several companies have applied for licences to export excess domestic reserves to Europe and Asia.¶ Baringa, a London-based consultancy with a focus on energy, said that between 40 and 80 billion cubic metres (bcm) of liquefied natural gas (LNG) will be exported each year, starting from 2015.¶ These figures are below some estimates that expect U.S. LNG exports to rise above 110 bcm by 2020, but Baringa's Jayesh Parmar and other analysts have said that political pressure could limit export capacities.¶ "There is a lot of lobbying in the U.S. to limit LNG exports and to instead use the gas to allow the domestic industry to benefit from low energy prices," Parmar told Reuters.¶ "Petrochemicals and refined products, as well transportation industries that use natural gas, stand to gain from such a policy, and this could change the entire oil balance in the U.S. economy."¶ A report this week by Eurasia Group, the New York-based political risk consultancy, said: "Resource nationalism is the biggest political risk to U.S. LNG (exports), with many opponents to exports concerned about the impact on domestic natural gas prices."

### China Escalation 2nc

ALSO:

THEIR INTERNAL LINK TO SCS IS "SUPPLY".  SUPPLY IS TOO SLOW TO SOLVE THEIR IMPACT (they are reading impact cards about tensions from THIS WEEK) BUT, it still links to our DA.  Whoopsies for them.

**cooperation now – experts agree no escalation**

**Håkansson 2/28/**2013 [ Christina, The Lund Association of Foreign Affairs (UPF Lund)The South China Sea’s “Cold War” http://globalbalita.com/2013/02/28/the-south-china-seas-cold-war/]

Unlike NATO for developed countries, ASEAN countries do not have any military cooperation, so it will be difficult for solutions to arise since each country will defend its own interest. **With the emerging conflict, fears of a new “Cold War” in Asia have started to materialise. Experts,** however, **believe that common interests between the Asian nations arising from economic integration will provide an incentive to harmonize the management of the resources and resolve the other conflicts. China and Vietnam,** for example, **have started to cooperate on a common fishery zone.** Is this enough to start resolving the conflicts? One can only hope that the ASEAN cooperate more enthusiastically again and find a solution to the sovereignty problems in the South China Sea so that the development of the region can continue unabated.

**no war – all talk. US security guarantees, Chinese desire to rise peacefully**

**Vu Duc 3/08**/2013 [Khanh Vu Duc (Khanh Vu Duc is a Vietnamese-Canadian lawyer who researches on Vietnamese politics, international relations and international law. Who's Bluffing Whom in the South China Sea? Asia Sentenial http://www.asiasentinel.com/index.php?option=com\_content&task=view&id=5237&Itemid=171]

**Who's Bluffing Whom in the South China Sea**?

Yet, **it may be that all of this talk of war is simply that: talk**.

Opponents in Conflict

China is presently engaged in a series of disputes with several countries spanning the Western Pacific, among which include Japan, the Philippines, and Vietnam.

Japan and the Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands, however, may prove to be an unnecessary distraction for China's aspirations in the Pacific. **Japan is too close an ally of the US for Washington to ignore their request for assistance,** never mind the very capable Japan Self-Defense Forces. As such, it **is unlikely that the Senkaku/Diaoyu dispute will amount to more than a diplomatic fuss**, **something to be used to stoke the flames of nationalism in both countries**.

The **Philippines**, similar to Japan, **holds a mutual defense treaty with the US**. In addition to the Spratly dispute, the Philippines are in dispute with China over the Scarborough Shoal, a collection of reefs, rocks, and small islands just off the coast of the country. Yet, unlike Japan, the Philippines do not have an equally sizeable and effective military to counter Chinese aggression, if necessary. As such, in the event of any conflict or war between the Philippines and China, Manila will be dependent on US assistance and support.

That said, it remains to be seen if the US would risk military confrontation with China, even given its treaty with the Philippines. Much will be dependent on the circumstances of the conflict and interpretation of the treaty by the White House. However, should Washington ignore the Philippine cry for help, it would jeopardize current and future US strategic partnerships, never mind the political fallout at home. The US has no desire to be lured into a conflict not of its making or choosing, but it also cannot risk violating its mutual defense treaty without harming the legitimacy of other defense agreements.

Unlike Japan and the Philippines, Vietnam does not hold a defense treaty with the US. Moreover, although Vietnam may share strategic partnerships with several nations, it is unlikely that they will go far in aiding Vietnam in the event of a conflict with China. In addition to the Spratlys dispute, Vietnam is also in dispute with China over the Paracels, seized by Chinese forces in 1974 from then-South Vietnam.

Vietnam remains isolated in the world, for its only "partner" has been China; however, should Hanoi cozy up too closely or compromise too much with Beijing, the government's legitimacy would be called into question by its citizens, raising and/or confirming the suspicions of those who believe the government and Communist Party are puppets of China, and inflame nationalist sentiments.

In the event that China should seize one or several Vietnamese-occupied Spratly Islands, Hanoi cannot rely on foreign assistance. It cannot attack China, even if such an attack could be argued as self-defence; but it cannot also do nothing and allow the government to be seen as weak and ineffective by the Vietnamese people. The options are limited for Hanoi. To say they would be stuck between a rock and a hard place would be an understatement.

Consequences

Nevertheless, **it remains unlikely that any conflict between China and Japan, Philippines, or Vietnam will amount to more than saber rattling and harsh words. Even a "small" police action against the Philippines or Vietnam over the Spratly Islands, however successful for China, would have severe consequences**. Any Chinese use of force would realize the fears of every state in the region. Moreover, **Beijing's hope for a peaceful rise would be immediately set back, if not ruined**.

Presently, tensions are already running high; however, **any clear displays of Chinese aggression** would simply add fuel to the fire. Countries such as the **Philippines and Vietnam would** then **be able to turn some of their neighbours**—previously skeptical, if not cautious, about standing in opposition to China—**and convince these states to protest openly. Any goodwill China possessed among some of these countries would evaporate** as the Philippines and/or Vietnam make their case.

However, of all the scenarios of a conflict involving China, what can be certain is the potential for an immediate American intervention. While it is questionable that the US would directly intervene in any skirmish between nations, **it is likely that Washington would use the conflict as an excuse for deploying a larger**, if not more permanent, **security force in Asia-Pacific**. Although an increased American footprint would not be welcomed by all in the region**, the US would prove to be an appropriate balance against China**.

Conversely, China would find an increased American presence unacceptable and a nuisance. Of course, **neither country is likely to find itself staring down the barrel of the other's gun**. China's plans for the region would undoubtedly be under greater American scrutiny if Washington decides to allocate more assets to Asia-Pacific.

For the US, returning in force to Asia-Pacific would prove to be a costly endeavour, resources the country may or may not be able to muster. Yet, even if this is true, Washington's calculations may determine that the security risk posed by China in the region outweighs whatever investment required by the US.

**China's dispute with Japan over the Senkaku/Diaoyu Island, however heated, will prove to be a peripheral issue** with respect to China's dispute with the several claimant states over the Spratlys. Ultimately, it is not improbable that China would seize one or several of the Spratlys under foreign control as a means to demonstrate its resolve in the disputes and the region; but to do so is to engage in unnecessary risk. The consequences stemming from such action are too great for Beijing to ignore.

Although **it is unlikely that China's neighbors would be able to mount more than a diplomatic protest, the fuss deriving from such an incident could prove more burdensome for China than it is willing to risk. The real consequence for China of any and all conflict in the region is and has always been an American intervention**. As is, **it would benefit Beijing to seek a peaceful, mutually agreed upon resolution, rather than brute force**.

### 2NC Royal

#### Economic collapse doesn’t cause war---that’s Jervis---if the current downturn didn’t cause global war then the factors cited in their evidence aren’t sufficient to cause hot wars

#### Royal cites a few warrants

#### First -- Diversionary theory --- it’s wrong

Boehmer, 07 – political science professor at the University of Texas (Charles, Politics & Policy, 35:4, “The Effects of Economic Crisis, Domestic Discord, and State Efficacy on the Decision to Initiate Interstate Conflict”)

This article examines the contemporaneous effect of low economic growth and domestic instability on the threat of regime change and/ or involvement in external militarized conflicts. Many studies of diversionary conflict argue that lower rates of economic growth should heighten the risk of international conflict. Yet we know that militarized interstate conflicts, and especially wars, are generally rare events whereas lower rates of growth are not. Additionally, a growing body of literature shows that regime changes are also associated with lower rates of economic growth. The question then becomes which event, militarized interstate conflict or regime change, is the most likely to occur with domestic discord and lower rates of economic growth? Diversionary theory claims that leaders seek to divert attention away from domestic problems such as a bad economy or political scandals, or to garner increased support prior to elections. Leaders then supposedly externalize discontented domestic sentiments onto other nations, sometimes as scapegoats based on the similar in-group/out-group dynamic found in the research of Coser (1956) and Simmel (1955), where foreign countries are blamed for domestic problems. This process is said to involve a “rally-round-the-flag” effect, where a leader can expect a short-term boost in popularity with the threat or use of force (Blechman, Kaplan, and Hall 1978; Mueller 1973). Scholarship on diversionary conflict has focused most often on the American case1 but recent studies have sought to identify this possible behavior in other countries.2 The Falklands War is often a popular example of diversionary conflict (Levy and Vakili 1992). Argentina was reeling from hyperinflation and rampant unemployment associated with the Latin American debt crisis. It is plausible that a success in the Falklands War may have helped to rally support for the governing Galtieri regime, although Argentina lost the war and the ruling regime lost power. How many other attempts to use diversionary tactics, if they indeed occur, can be seen to generate a similar outcome? The goal of this article is to provide an assessment of the extent to which diversionary strategy is a threat to peace. Is this a colorful theory kept alive by academics that has little bearing upon real events, or is this a real problem that policy makers should be concerned with? If it is a strategy readily available to leaders, then it is important to know what domestic factors trigger this gambit. Moreover, to know that requires an understanding of the context in external conflict, which occurs relative to regime changes. Theories of diversionary conflict usually emphasize the potential benefits of diversionary tactics, although few pay equal attention to the prospective costs associated with such behavior. It is not contentious to claim that leaders typically seek to remain in office. However, whether they can successfully manipulate public opinion regularly during periods of domestic unpopularity through their states’ participation in foreign militarized conflicts—especially outside of the American case—is a question open for debate. Furthermore, there appears to be a logical disconnect between diversionary theories and extant studies of domestic conflict and regime change. Lower rates of economic growth are purported to increase the risk of both militarized interstate conflicts (and internal conflicts) as well as regime changes (Bloomberg and Hess 2002). This implies that if leaders do, in fact, undertake diversionary conflicts, many may still be thrown from the seat of power—especially if the outcome is defeat to a foreign enemy. Diversionary conflict would thus seem to be a risky gambit (Smith 1996). Scholars such as MacFie (1938) and Blainey (1988) have nevertheless questioned the validity of the diversionary thesis. As noted by Levy (1989), this perspective is rarely formulated as a cohesive and comprehensive theory, and there has been little or no knowledge cumulation. Later analyses do not necessarily build on past studies and the discrepancies between inquiries are often difficult to unravel. “Studies have used a variety of research designs, different dependent variables (uses of force, major uses of force, militarized disputes), different estimation techniques, and different data sets covering different time periods and different states” (Bennett and Nordstrom 2000, 39). To these problems, we should add a lack of theoretical precision and incomplete model specification. By a lack of theoretical precision, I am referring to the linkages between economic conditions and domestic strife that remain unclear in some studies (Miller 1995; Russett 1990). Consequently, extant studies are to a degree incommensurate; they offer a step in the right direction but do not provide robust cross-national explanations and tests of economic growth and interstate conflict. Yet a few studies have attempted to provide deductive explanations about when and how diversionary tactics might be employed. Using a Bayesian updating game, Richards and others (1993) theorize that while the use of force would appear to offer leaders a means to boost their popularity, a poorly performing economy acts as a signal to a leader’s constituents about his or her competence. Hence, attempts to use diversion are likely to fail either because incompetent leaders will likewise fail in foreign policy or people will recognize the gambit for what it is. Instead, these two models conclude that diversion is likely to be undertaken particularly by risk-acceptant leaders. This stress on a heightened risk of removal from office is also apparent in the work of Bueno de Mesquita and others (1999), and Downs and Rocke (1994), where leaders may “gamble for resurrection,” although the diversionary scenario in the former study is only a partial extension of their theory on selectorates, winning coalitions, and leader survival. Again, how often do leaders fail in the process or are removed from positions of power before they can even initiate diversionary tactics? A few studies focusing on leader tenure have examined the removal of leaders following war, although almost no study in the diversionary literature has looked at the effects of domestic problems on the relative risks of regime change, interstate conflict, or both events occurring in the same year.3

### 2NC Israel

Israel has already developed its gas fields- no chance they would stop now

Aljazeera 3/31/13 (¶ Gas from Israeli Tamar field starts flowing¶ Production could save Israel billions of dollars in annual costs and eventually turn country into an energy exporter.¶ http://www.aljazeera.com/news/middleeast/2013/03/2013331113117512770.html¶ )

The field was discovered in 2009, and a larger field was found in the Mediterranean shortly afterwards [EPA]

Natural gas from the Tamar field off Israel's Mediterranean shores has started flowing, the first step towards Israel possibly becoming an energy-exporting country within the next few years.

The discovery in 2009 led to an exploration frenzy in the Levant Basin - shared between Israel, Cyprus and Lebanon - and the uncovering of a second bigger find, Leviathan, which prompted Israel to set up a natural gas wealth fund. Tamar alone is expected to meet the country's natural gas needs for decades.

"Today [we begin] independence in Israeli natural gas. It is an enormous achievement for the Israeli economy and the start of a new era," said Israeli billionaire Yitzhak Tshuva, the controlling shareholder in Delek Group, one of the partners in Tamar on Saturday.

The gas should lead to a reduction in production costs for state utility Israel Electric Corp., as well as a decline in the price of electricity, the Israeli water and energy ministry said last week.

A statement from the production partners, who said they had invested $3bn in developing Tamar, estimated the new gas supplies would save Israel's economy, which relies heavily on oil imports, $3.6bn per year.

Texas-based Noble Energy holds 36 percent of Tamar.

'Independence in the energy sector'

Charles Davidson, Noble's chairman and CEO, said bringing Tamar to production in four years was a "transformational achievement" and that the field's partners would now work to invest in increasing piping capacity.

"Building on this success, we will work with our partners and the government to sanction the next phase of development at Tamar and the domestic phase of Leviathan," Davidson said.

Israeli prime minister Binyamin Netanyahu highlighted the achievement in a statement issued by his office.

"We are taking an important step towards independence in the energy sector. In the past decade we have promoted Israel's gas sector and this will enhance Israel's economy and benefit all the country's citizens," he said.

Tamar is located 90km off Israel's northern coast and has an estimated 10 trillion cubic feet of gas.

Development of Tamar and Leviathan will make Israel less dependent on energy imports, but the country has said it will also allow a significant amount of its natural gas to be exported.

Tamar has already signed a number of large deals, including one to supply as much as $23bn of natural gas to Israel Electric Corp. and $4bn worth to units of conglomerate Israel Corp.

### Hezz

#### \*Hezbollah-Israel War

**Hezbollah politically can’t start another war with Israel -- Iranian and domestic interests.**

**Saab & Blanford, ‘11**

[Bilal Y., Visiting Fellow at the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies (CNS) at the Monterey Institute of International Studies, a Ph.D. Candidate at the University of Maryland’s Department of Government & Politics, where he focuses on regional security and arms control in the Middle East, contracted consultant for Centra Technology Inc and Oxford Analytica and a monthly contributor to several IHS/Jane’s publications, Nicholas, Beirut correspondent for The Christian Science Monitor and The Times of London, regular contributor to Time Magazine, and several IHS/Jane’s publications, “THE NEXT WAR: How Another Conflict between Hizballah and Israel Could Look and How Both Sides are Preparing for It,” ANALYSIS PAPER Number 24, August 2011]

Hizballah’s Long-Term Goals and Overall Strategy Attempting to analyze Hizballah’s long-term strategy is complicated by the fact that it encompasses two broad agendas—the pragmatic and the ideological— and seeks to satisfy two, not always compatible, interests—those of its domestic Shi’i constituency and Iran. Hizballah presents itself to its domestic audience as a defensive force with Lebanon’s best interests at heart. It argues that it must retain its weapons because only its unique style of warfare (sometimes dubbed “hybrid,” meaning a blend of conventional and guerrilla warfare) can protect Lebanon from the possibility of future Israeli aggression. While there is an element of truth in these assertions, the source of its weaponry indicates something else at play. The principal reason why Iran has invested millions of dollars in upgrading Hizballah’s weaponry and SIGINT capabilities since May 2000 is less an altruistic gesture to enable Lebanon to defend itself against Israel, and more to serve as a deterrent against a military strike against its nuclear facilities, though the two goals can be interrelated. Because Hizballah is heavily armed and highly skilled in overt combat and clandestine operations, planners of an attack on Iran must take into consideration the response, not only of Iran, but also of Hizballah along the Lebanon-Israel border. The stronger Hizballah becomes thanks to Iranian support, the more formidable the potential retaliation, a factor of which U.S. strategic planners are perfectly aware.32 Iran’s calculated sponsorship33 helps to explain why Hizballah has not staged a single attack against the IDF in the past five years, not even in the Sheb’a Farms, the Israeli-occupied mountainside territory running along Lebanon’s southeast border. Before 2006, Hizballah staged sporadic “reminder” operations in the Farms, firing mortars and anti-tank missiles against IDF outposts. But, because Iran is looking to preserve its deterrent for the greater threat of an attack on its nuclear facilities, it is unwilling for now to indulge Hizballah’s ingrained jihadist instincts by giving it the green light to resume the low-intensity-conflict with Israel which could inadvertently spark a full-scale conflict, as in 2006. On the ideological level, Hizballah seeks the eventual destruction of Israel and the liberation of Jerusalem. Hizballah has never denied this broader ambition, although it plays it down for tactical reasons related to expanding its base of support within Lebanon’s pluralistic society. Still, when new recruits begin the obligatory educational indoctrination process, they are not taught that they are a component of Iranian deterrence or that Hizballah supports the notion of a “consensual democracy” as the preferred political system for Lebanon. Rather, they are imbued with the raw ideology of the group—obedience to the wali al-faqih, the supreme leader of Iran, and hostility toward Israel. Through multiple conversations with Hizballah fighters since 2006, it is clear that many of them firmly believe that Israel’s destruction is imminent and that the next war will be the last. (The cadres believe their leaders’ words that Israel’s demise is inevitable and drawing near. This ideological and religious indoctrination has tactical benefits for the group—it is essential in shaping a dedicated, motivated, and disciplined combatant.) Hizballah has expended much effort in building and sustaining its support base through the provision of social services primarily to its constituencies since the mid 1980s, thus creating a culture of dependency on the organization. But no amount of social services or Iranian funds will save Hizballah if it loses the support of Lebanon’s Shi’i population. Hizballah has to therefore tread a fine line between following the edicts of Iran and respecting the interests of the Lebanese Shi’i community. The majority of Lebanese Shi’a, who make up the largest share of the population in southern Lebanon, do not want war with Israel. There have been numerous occasions since 2006 when nervous southerners have packed their bags and headed north in anticipation of a flareup along the border. While Lebanon’s war-weary Shi’a generally support Hizballah’s defensive posture against Israel, they will have little sympathy for the group if it plunges Lebanon into another war with Israel for the sake of protecting the nuclear ambitions of a country lying 650 miles to the east.

### `1NC DA—UQ

#### Obama’s 5 year lease plan solves the case without opening up the Arctic or the Atlantic seaboard to drilling

Taylor 12—Environmental and Energy Policy reporter [Phil Taylor, “Interior to proceed with 'targeted' Arctic leases,” Greenwire: Tuesday, June 26, 2012, pg. http://www.eenews.net/public/Greenwire/2012/06/26/3

The Obama administration today said it will finalize a plan to offer new leases in the Arctic Ocean but will take precautions to protect sensitive waters, wildlife and Alaskan subsistence hunters.

The announcement by Interior Department officials from Norway signals the administration's commitment to long-term development of the Arctic -- a region believed to be flush with oil, but which environmentalists and some Alaska Natives warn is too fragile, remote and risky to drill.

In addition, Interior Secretary Ken Salazar said he believed it was "probable" that Royal Dutch Shell PLC would be issued final permits to drill in both the Beaufort and Chukchi seas, the strongest indication yet that drilling could commence as early as mid-July.

Salazar said the agency's final leasing plan for the next five years will include potential lease sales in the Chukchi Sea in 2016 and in the Beaufort Sea in 2017. The plan would postpone by two years a sale in the Beaufort that was initially [planned](http://www.boem.gov/uploadedFiles/Proposed_OCS_Oil_Gas_Lease_Program_2012-2017.pdf) for 2015 ([Greenwire](http://www.eenews.net/Greenwire/2011/11/08/archive/3), Nov. 8, 2011).

"We want to make sure we get it right, so we are not going to rush to process," Interior Deputy Secretary David Hayes said.

In contrast to recent Gulf of Mexico leases that included virtually all of the federal planning areas, the size and location of the Arctic sales will be determined by factors including resource potential, subsistence use and environmental conditions, Salazar said.

"We are taking a different approach -- a more strategic approach -- than the past," Salazar said in prepared remarks at a roundtable on Arctic development in Trondheim, Norway. "We intend to gather information from industry, Native Alaskan communities, the scientific community and the public to identify specific high-resource, low-conflict areas that are best suited for exploration and development."

Salazar said the agency will maintain a 25-mile buffer along the Chukchi coast put in place under the George W. Bush administration to protect Native Alaskan communities. He said the new plan would also include an additional area north of Barrow that has attracted minimal industry interest but that has very high subsistence value.

Today's announcement advances a five-year leasing plan first announced last November that also includes a dozen sales in the western, central and eastern Gulf, but excluded the entire Atlantic and Pacific seaboards -- to industry and most Republican lawmakers' chagrin.

Interior officials said that East Coast states lack infrastructure to respond to potential oil spills and that West Coast states do not support offshore development. Federal agencies also lack adequate resource data to proceed with development in either ocean, the agency said.

### 2NC DA Outweighs

### 2NC Atlantic Overview—Hotspots

#### 1. Extend our Nautiyal & Nidamanuri—You should prioritize the preservation of biodiversity hotspots because they are endemic and many unknown species with important ecological functions will be destroyed.

#### 2. We will control the impact framing debate—You must focus on preserving biological hotspots

Kunich 1—Professor of Law @ Roger Williams University School of Law [John Charles Kunich, “ARTICLE: Fiddling Around While the Hotspots Burn Out,” Georgetown International Environmental Law Review Winter, 2001 14 Geo. Int'l Envtl. L. Rev. 179]

Thus, this author has called the hotspots the "womb of the unknown species." [n15](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348161499045&returnToKey=20_T15575614965&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.693104.9208654866" \l "n15) The intention is to draw a parallel between the phrase "womb of the unknown species" and the well-known "Tomb of the Unknown Soldier." Just as the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier contains the remains of unidentified American soldiers who died in various wars, the hotspots and the unidentified species they harbor are both the womb and, potentially, the tomb for species we cannot call by name. And if the hotspots are home to millions of unknown species, with potentially immense utilitarian worth for humankind, it is of the utmost importance that effective conservation measures be implemented to prevent their degradation and destruction. It makes sense, from an efficiency standpoint, to focus the effort to preserve biodiversity on the hotspots, at least initially. The number of different species, and the number of individuals from each species, would be much higher than in most other eco-regions. Given limited conservation resources, both financial and political, it is prudent and rational to devote these resources to the places where they will do the greatest good for the greatest number.

#### 3. Preserving US marine ecosystems is key to human survival

Craig 03—Associate Dean for Environmental Programs @ Florida State University [Robin Kundis Craig, “ARTICLE: Taking Steps Toward Marine Wilderness Protection? Fishing and Coral Reef Marine Reserves in Florida and Hawaii,” McGeorge Law Review, Winter 2003, 34 McGeorge L. Rev. 155

Biodiversity and ecosystem function arguments for conserving marine ecosystems also exist, just as they do for terrestrial ecosystems, but these arguments have thus far rarely been raised in political debates. For example, besides significant tourism values—the most economically valuable ecosystem service coral reefs provide, worldwide—coral reefs protect against storms and dampen other environmental fluctuations, services worth more than ten times the reefs' value for food production. [n856](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348077471187&returnToKey=20_T15565363878&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.167770.63840861383#n856) Waste treatment is another significant, non-extractive ecosystem function that intact coral reef ecosystems provide. [n857](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348077471187&returnToKey=20_T15565363878&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.167770.63840861383#n857) More generally, "ocean ecosystems play a major role in the global geochemical cycling of all the elements that represent the basic building blocks of living organisms, carbon, nitrogen, oxygen, phosphorus, and sulfur, as well as other less abundant but necessary elements." [n858](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348077471187&returnToKey=20_T15565363878&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.167770.63840861383#n858) In a very real and direct sense, therefore, human degradation of marine ecosystems impairs the planet's ability to support life.

Maintaining biodiversity is often critical to maintaining the functions of marine ecosystems. Current evidence shows that, in general, an ecosystem's ability to keep functioning in the face of disturbance is strongly dependent on its biodiversity, "indicating that more diverse ecosystems are more stable." [n859](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348077471187&returnToKey=20_T15565363878&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.167770.63840861383#n859) Coral reef ecosystems are particularly dependent on their biodiversity. [\*265]   
Most ecologists agree that the complexity of interactions and degree of interrelatedness among component species is higher on coral reefs than in any other marine environment. This implies that the ecosystem functioning that produces the most highly valued components is also complex and that many otherwise insignificant species have strong effects on sustaining the rest of the reef system. [n860](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348077471187&returnToKey=20_T15565363878&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.167770.63840861383#n860)  
Thus, maintaining and restoring the biodiversity of marine ecosystems is critical to maintaining and restoring the ecosystem services that they provide. Non-use biodiversity values for marine ecosystems have been calculated in the wake of marine disasters, like the Exxon Valdez oil spill in Alaska. [n861](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348077471187&returnToKey=20_T15565363878&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.167770.63840861383#n861) Similar calculations could derive preservation values for marine wilderness.

However, economic value, or economic value equivalents, should not be "the sole or even primary justification for conservation of ocean ecosystems. Ethical arguments also have considerable force and merit." [n862](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348077471187&returnToKey=20_T15565363878&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.167770.63840861383#n862) At the forefront of such arguments should be a recognition of how little we know about the sea—and about the actual effect of human activities on marine ecosystems. The United States has traditionally failed to protect marine ecosystems because it was difficult to detect anthropogenic harm to the oceans, but we now know that such harm is occurring—even though we are not completely sure about causation or about how to fix every problem. Ecosystems like the NWHI coral reef ecosystem should inspire lawmakers and policymakers to admit that most of the time we really do not know what we are doing to the sea and hence should be preserving marine wilderness whenever we can—especially when the United States has within its territory relatively pristine marine ecosystems that may be unique in the world.

### 2NC—Environment Turns War

#### Enviro destruction is the more likely scenario for conflict

Keil 1/31/13—Europe Director for Arctic Security, Cooperation, and Institutions [Kathrin Keil (PhD Candidate at the Berlin Graduate School for Transnational Studies(BTS) at the Freie Universität Berlin), “Opening Oil and Gas Development in the Arctic—A Conflict and Risk Assessment,” Arctic Institute, Thursday, January 31, 2013, pg. http://www.thearcticinstitute.org/2013/01/opening-oil-and-gas-development-in.html

The picture looks different for environmental consequences of Arctic oil and gas development. The institutions setting up rules for the development of oil and gas resources to minimise the risks of environmental degradation must be very robust, given that they are usually directed against the short-term interests of the affected actors. Relevant institutions for Arctic oil and gas development are often not entirely adequate for various reasons. While the United Nations Convention on the Law of The Sea (UNCLOS) provides binding rules for the protection and preservation of the marine environment (Part XII), it does not sufficiently provide for Arctic-specific rules and dispute-settlement competencies. The International Convention on Oil Pollution Preparedness, Response and Co-operation (OPRC), while providing binding provisions, only calls for minimum standards for national systems for preparedness and response.

The Arctic Council Arctic Offshore Oil and Gas Guidelines provide highly precise but no binding rules for marine environmental protection. The Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic (OSPAR) in contrast provides binding and highly precise rules together with strong monitoring and verification competencies. However, the regional scope of the Convention is limited to the Northeast Atlantic and of the A5 only Denmark and Norway are members. In sum, it is not the extraction of the resources themselves that contain a high conflict potential but rather their side effects, first and foremost the environmental dangers they entail.

In addition to the absence of adequate institutional arrangements for the development of Arctic oil and gas resources, an additional challenge is the linkage between various Arctic economic activities as well as the linkage with the broader social and ecological circumstances of the specific region in which they occur. In other words, institutions for the sustainable development of the Arctic have to take account of the complexity of the Arctic region as a system of various dynamic internal and external relationships that change over time. Importantly, such institutions would take account of the fact that many potential victims of extraction-induced pollution do not have their interests adequately represented in the existing institutions. These are especially residents with no, or only weak, representation options and especially the flora and fauna of Arctic lands and waters. The appropriate institutional device could be an ecosystem-based management (EBM) approach, which leaves out none of the links in the ecosystem and which is flexible enough to take into account new knowledge about affected actors and their concerns and interests<http://www.blogger.com/blogger.g?blogID=2556253771192506081>. These are the actual challenges ahead and not the often-stated likelihood of possibly violent conflicts over Arctic resources.

#### 4. Err neg—the consequences are too dire.

Kunich 5—Professor of Law @ Roger Williams University School of Law [John Charles Kunich, “ARTICLE: Losing Nemo: The Mass Extinction Now Threatening the World's Ocean Hotspots,” Columbia Journal of Environmental Law, 2005, 30 Colum. J. Envtl. L. 1]

On the other hand, there is an unimaginable cost from failing to preserve the marine hotspots if they contain numerous species of high value at great risk of extinction. We could cost ourselves and our posterity untold advancements in medicine, therapies, genetic resources, nutrients, ecosystem services, and other areas, including perhaps a cure to a global health threat that might not materialize until centuries from now...truly a "grave error" of the first order. [\*128] But if we sit on the sidelines and fail to invest in hotspots preservation, and we "get lucky" (few species, low value, small extinction risk), our only gain is in the form of saving the money and effort we could have spent on the hotspots. Even if this amounts to several billion dollars a year, it is a small benefit compared to the incalculably catastrophic losses we could suffer if we guess wrong in betting on the inaction option.

The Decision Matrix actually under-represents the extent to which the rational decision is to invest in hotspots preservation. Because the Decision Matrix, in tabular form, devotes equal space to each of the sixteen possible combinations of extreme variable values, it can mislead readers into thinking that each of the sixteen outcomes is equally probable. This is most emphatically not the case. Some of these results are far more probable than others. This problem of apparent equality of disparate results is of the same type as a chart that depicts a person's chances of being fatally injured by a plummeting comet on the way home from work on any given day. There are only two possible results in such a table (survives another day, or killed by meteor), and they would occupy an equal amount of tabular space on the printed page, but the probability of the former outcome is, thankfully, much higher than the likelihood of the latter tragic event.

As explained in this Article, it is much more likely that there are numerous, even millions, of unidentified species currently living in the marine hotspots than that these hotspots are really not centers of profuse biodiversity. It is also very probable that the extinction threat in our oceans is real, and significant, given what we know about the horrific effects wrought on coral reefs and other known marine population centers by overfishing, pollution, sedimentation, and other human-made stressors. n525 Recent discoveries have revealed very high rates of endemism in small areas such as seamounts, which are extremely vulnerable to trawl damage. n526 Even in the deep ocean areas, there is evidence that new technologies are making it both a possibility and a reality to exploit the previously unexploitable biodiversity in these waters via [\*129] demersal fishing/trawling, to devastating effect. n527 Only a truly Orwellian brand of doublethink could label as progress the development of fishing methods that do to the benthic habitats what modern clearcutting has done to so many forests, only on a scale 150 times as severe, but it is this "progress" that has brought mass extinction to the seas. n528 However, there is also the positive side, in light of the large numbers of marine species and habitat types, including life forms adapted to extraordinary niches such as hydrothermal vents and the abyss. That is, it would be surprising if there were not highly valuable genetic resources, natural medicines, potential sources of food, and other boons waiting to be discovered there.

Therefore, the results that are linked to high, rather than low, values of each of the three variables are far more probable than the converse outcomes. In terms of probabilities, it is much more likely that either a "first order grave error" or "first order jackpot" will occur than a "lucky wager" or an "unused insurance" result. In fact, all of the combinations with either two or three "high" values of the variables are significantly more probable that any of the combinations with two or three "low" variable values. This means that the tilt in favor of betting on the hotspots is much more pronounced than is apparent from a cursory glance at the Decision Matrix. The extreme results are far likelier to fall in favor of hotspots preservation than the opposite.

### AT: We can safely drill

#### 1. Our Moringstar and Gravitz ev preempt this—the likelihood of safe drilling is remote in both the Alaska and the Atlantic

#### A. Temperature and pressure makes methane hydrate drilling inherently dangerous

#### B. Atlantic hotspots are fragile. Their survival is dependent on limiting human activity.

#### 2. Tech failure is inevitable—they will fracture in the Ocean floor.

Pravica 12—Professor of Physics and Astronomy @ [University of Nevada](http://content.usatoday.com/topics/topic/Organizations/Schools/University+of+Nevada), Las Vegas [Michael Pravica, “Letters: Science, not profit, must lead deep water drilling,” USA Today, Updated 4/24/2012 8:43 PM , pg. http://tinyurl.com/9g8x28q

There are a few critical points not mentioned in the USA TODAY editorial on the BP oil spill that should have been addressed ("[Editorial: 2 years after BP spill, lower risks](http://www.usatoday.com/news/opinion/editorials/story/2012-04-19/BP-Deepwater-oil-spill/54419466/1" \t "popup729)"). First of all, deep water drilling represents a "brave new world" of oil exploration and novel technology as humans probe depths of water, oil and rock that sustain thousands of atmospheres of pressure. At these levels, the technology used to drill and extract oil can easily fail as we approach the yield strengths of many of the confining materials subjected to extreme conditions. There is also a high chance of significant fracture of the cean/sea floor in drilling and hole erosion from gushing, hot and high pressure oil (along with particulates and other mineral-rich fluids) that could make repair nearly impossible and could permanently poison our waters.

The greatest lesson from the BP oil spill is that politicians and businessmen cannot solve problems created by our advanced technology. Only scientists and engineers can. We must listen to them and adopt a more rational approach to drilling that places safety above profit.

#### 3. They incentivize mindless all-out exploitation that makes disaster inevitable.

Flournoy 11—Professor and Director of the Environmental and Land Use Law Program @ University of Florida Levin College of Law [Alyson C. Flournoy, “ARTICLE: THREE META-LESSONS GOVERNMENT AND INDUSTRY SHOULD LEARN FROM THE BP DEEPWATER HORIZON DISASTER AND WHY THEY WILL NOT,” Boston College Environmental Affairs Law Review, 2011, 38 B.C. Envtl. Aff. L. Rev. 281

C. How to Learn from the Context of the Disaster: United States' Energy Policy

A third meta-lesson from the BP Deepwater Horizon disaster is that the drilling of that particular offshore well is the result not just of private choice, but of a broader national policy on energy. MMS's oil leasing and permitting decisions reflect executive branch decisions about the disposition of publicly owned oil and gas resources. [n115](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095" \l "n115) BP's decisions about exploration in that area were not made in a vacuum, but in the context of a set of laws and appropriations that create a variety of incentives that affect industry's behavior. Thus, to understand why the disaster occurred, it would be wise to look at the policy context that has produced the increasing rush to develop oil resources in deepwater, and increasingly in ultra-deepwater--areas that increase the complexity, risks, and uncertainty of drilling operations and potential accidents. [n116](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095" \l "n116) The most visible leadership on this issue comes from statements of the Oil Spill Commission and its Co-Chair Bob Graham, who has repeatedly noted that the lack of an energy policy is an important issue related to the work of the Oil Spill Commission and one that must be addressed by the legislative and executive branches. [n117](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095" \l "n117)

 [\*301]  The current energy policy provides hefty subsidies for the highly profitable oil and gas industries to continue with their unwavering focus on producing more oil and gas. [n118](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095" \l "n118) Although some say that the United States lacks an energy policy, it is more accurate to say that our leaders don't clearly articulate the operative energy policy. Perhaps this is because it is not a coherent one or because on close inspection it is difficult to justify in light of other stated priorities.

A primary and often overlooked component of energy policy is the national policy on the privatization of public natural resources. U.S. policy is to give away its natural resources at bargain prices presumably to promote exploitation and development. [n119](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095" \l "n119) A 2008 report by the Government Accountability Office compared U.S. royalty rates to those of 103 other jurisdictions, and only eleven had royalty rates lower than those of the United States. [n120](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095" \l "n120) Moreover, the Government Accountability Office has made repeated reports of problems with uncollected royalties and with MMS's royalty-in-kind program that has led to underestimation of the royalties owed. [n121](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095" \l "n121)

Another significant component of the national energy policy is tax policy that directly affects investment in oil extraction. A 2005 Congressional Budget Office Report showed that many capital investments for oil extraction are taxed at a rate of nine percent, which ranks among  [\*302]  the lowest rates for any industry. [n122](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095" \l "n122) Tax deductions and credits for the oil extraction industry amount to roughly $ 4 billion per year. [n123](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095" \l "n123)

Looked at as a whole, the current energy policy strongly encourages all-out exploitation of remaining domestic fossil fuel resources, and deepwater oil reserves in particular. If the public and elected officials believe that the risks that produced the Macondo Well blowout are unacceptable, an energy policy that will move us towards a clean energy path is a logical response. This could include increased government support for lower carbon, lower-risk energy paths.

Despite the clear political opportunity provided by the Deepwater Horizon disaster for the President and Congress to focus attention on a broad clean energy policy, there have been few signs of any significant movement in that direction. [n124](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095" \l "n124) The CLEAR Act included provisions that would eliminate some of the royalty relief for deepwater drilling, eliminate the disastrous royalty-in-kind program, and require BOEMRE to study global royalty payments to inform U.S. royalty policy. [n125](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095" \l "n125) These are very positive steps that would reduce the mindless incentives for deepwater drilling and the unintended windfalls to oil companies. However, that Act has languished in the Senate. Moreover, even those proposed changes fail to address the broader question of whether policy should create incentives towards a cleaner energy path. In the wake of the November 2010 election, it seems highly unlikely that the Administration or Congress will have interest in this topic. [n126](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095" \l "n126)

CONCLUSION

There is much that can be learned from the BP Deepwater Horizon disaster. Unfortunately, even learning the most specific lessons has proved a contentious and uncertain process. This Article suggests first that both industry and government must fundamentally rethink their approaches to safety and develop a culture that encourages and facilitates learning from mistakes. Second, it identifies the phenomenon of  [\*303] hollow government, characterized by government lacking the resources and authority to protect the public interest and a policy process dominated by powerful economic interests, as a root cause of the BP disaster and a contributing factor to other recent national disasters, including the financial crisis. Hollow government also makes it unlikely that we will learn the third meta-lesson and address the longstanding need for a coherent energy policy. These lessons could help to avert future disasters and better enable government to protect public health, safety, and the environment. However, absent changes to address the underlying obstacles to learning, there seems little likelihood that the lessons will be learned.

#### 4. They weaken safety and environmental review—it green lights to the drillers to throw caution to the wind.

Goldstein 11—Director of Government Affairs @ Natural Resources Defense Council [Dr. David Goldstein (Former project director for the Bipartisan Policy Center), “Casting Oil Upon the Waters: The House Drilling Bills,” Switchboard, Posted May 2, 2011, pg. http://tinyurl.com/3syxpcl

This week, the House could vote on three bills to expand offshore oil and gas drilling.  It is remarkable enough that the House would take up such measures before Congress has done a thing to make drilling safer.  But what is truly astounding about these bills is that they would actually make the system that governs offshore drilling weaker than it was before the disaster in the Gulf of Mexico.  This is legislation that should give pause even to the most ardent proponents of offshore drilling.

These bills are more than a Big Oil wish list; they are a sort of oil utopia—and they could make sense only in a utopian world in which oil spills could never ever happen, in which there are never conflicts between the oil industry and other economic interests like fishing and tourism, and in which oil companies always take environmental and safety concerns fully into account.  It’s as if Rep. Doc Hastings (R-WA), the bills’ sponsor, set out to prove how apt it is to talk about the U.S. “addiction” to oil.  Under these bills, the U.S. would truly be acting like an addict, willing to sell out any principle, dispense with any caution, endanger any asset to get its next fix.  Again, these bills ought to be seen as irresponsible even by supporters of increased drilling.

So what would the bills actually do?  Let’s start with the most egregious one of all, H.R. 1231.  The bill is designed to ensure that oil drilling occurs off the East Coast from Maine to North Carolina, off the coast of Southern California and in the Arctic Ocean and Bristol Bay.  That sweeping decision alone is breathtaking.  But the bill does this by mandating that at least half the unleased area in each of those regions be put up for lease sales each and every time the government puts outer continental shelf territory up for lease.  (Offshore territory available for lease is identified in five-year plans; the next one will cover 2012-2017.)

Now think about that.  The bill doesn’t simply reiterate that the government could make these areas available for oil drilling.  It doesn’t just say that the government has to figure out which parts of those coastal waters would be appropriate for oil drilling and open those.  It doesn’t even say that this administration has to open up a set amount of acreage for oil drilling, regardless of the specific concerns in any region.   It says that, in perpetuity, each time waters are opened to drilling, at least half of the available acreage in each area needs to be opened up to drilling—until, presumably, every bit of acreage is being drilled.

This is replacing oil policy with a kind of oil mania.  Under this bill, neither this administration nor any future one could ever decide to limit drilling off the coast of New England, the Mid-Atlantic states, Southern California or Alaska because of economic or environmental concerns.  No administration could decide to “take a breather” before opening up more leases to see how previously permitted activities were working out, or because there had been a spill, or because there was unexpected damage to the ecology or tourism, or because a state objected, or because there was no additional capacity to respond to an emergency, or because the agency overseeing drilling was too overwhelmed to properly review proposals.   At least half the remaining unleased territory would have to be put up for leasing each and every time no matter what had happened, no matter what could happen, no matter what concerns states or scientists or fishermen or federal officials might have.

The bill goes beyond earlier proposals to open up drilling, many of which had at least limited provisions for states to opt out of drilling off their states and which were not as prescriptive.

The bill is titled “Reversing President Obama’s Offshore Moratorium Act,” demonstrating that partisan animus is behind this bill as much as any interest in energy.  But the title is a misnomer in any event.  The bill ought to be called “A bill to prevent any president or other official or the public from ever deciding not to drill for oil everywhere, no matter what the facts on the ground are.”  Not so pithy, perhaps, but it’s what the bill actually does.

The other two bills, while less sweeping—it would be just about impossible to be more sweeping—are based on the same compulsion to remove any judgment, discretion and balance from drilling decisions.

H.R. 1230 mandates that the government conduct three lease sales in the next year—for oil and gas drilling in the central and western Gulf of Mexico and off the coast of Virginia.  These are areas the administration decided not to lease after the Deepwater Horizon disaster.  But as with H.R. 1231, the problem is not just opening up areas to oil and gas drilling.  The bill short-circuits the environmental review for these sales.

Specifically, the bill blocks court review of the Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) prepared for the lease sales in the Gulf of Mexico.  It does this by having Congress deem that the EISs have met the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act.  This deeming, of course, is simply a political judgment, based on nothing more than the wish that it be so.  (The Virginia lease is treated differently, apparently because the military may have concerns with it.  For the sponsors, court reviews are only legitimate when someone they like is bringing a lawsuit.)

Shutting down the courts is particularly wrongheaded in this instance for two reasons.  First, the environmental review for these leases was done by the pre-Gulf disaster Minerals Management Service, an agency notorious for its close relationship to the oil industry.  Second, these environmental reviews did not take into account the damage caused by the Deepwater Horizon blowout (and therefore what could happen under these leases) because such a disaster was thought of as impossible at the time.

So under H.R. 1230, what is Congress’ reaction to the Gulf disaster?  It is mandating that the administration and the courts act as if it had never happened.  This ought to be a dictionary definition of irresponsibility.

H.R. 1229 is another effort to make the review of oil and gas drilling weaker than it was before the Gulf disaster.  The bill sets an arbitrary time limit of 30 days for reviewing drilling permit applications and grants automatic approvals if no action has been taken within 60 days.  Was the message of the Gulf spill to ensure that safety reviews be shorter and conducted “under the gun”?  In fact, the National Oil Spill Commission recommended that Congress extend another 30-day review limit—and that one didn’t even have an automatic approval provision.

H.R. 1229 also tries to make it harder to challenge any oil drilling decision related to the Gulf of Mexico by eliminating the ability of those who challenge the federal government successfully from having their legal fees reimbursed.  Current law does not encourage frivolous suits—the fees are only paid if the suit is successful—but it does enable citizen groups to challenge bad decisions.  And H.R. 1229 also has provisions to stack the decks against any plaintiff who still manages to sue.

So the first bills on drilling to come before the Republican-controlled House since the Gulf disaster try to wish away that catastrophic event.  They would open almost all the waters of the U.S. to oil drilling; prevent any judgments from being made about where and when and how to drill; tie the hands of this and future administrations and the courts; and weaken the system of safety and environmental review.  Quite a legacy.

As my colleagues have noted, additional drilling will have no impact on gasoline prices.  This is not a solution to our problems, it is a way to create new ones.  This is a bill written by people who are so hell-bent on drilling that they can’t even admit that there are consequences to be considered.  This is not policymaking; it’s a new kind of magical thinking.

#### 5. It will not be safe.

[**Beinecke**](http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/fbeinecke/) 11—President of NRDC [[Frances Beinecke](http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/fbeinecke/) “House Committee Promotes More Offshore Drilling with Less Oversight,” Switchboard, Posted April 14, 2011, pg. http://tinyurl.com/6jvt3j7

Despite the enormous toll that can come from drilling, Representative Doc Hasting (R-WA) and his colleagues want to make it easier for companies to drill more with less oversight.

I served on the National Commission on the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill and Offshore Drilling. After an exhaustive review of the evidence, we concluded that the root cause of the spill was systemic failure in industry management and government oversight.

Quick fixes in one company or one agency would not be enough to make offshore drilling safe. Instead, we laid out the comprehensive steps the oil industry, the government, and Congress would need to take to prevent another massive spill.

The three bills voted on yesterday disregard the commission’s safety recommendations. They would take us backward—making offshore drilling even more risky than it was before the Deepwater Horizon blowout.

Turning back the clock on offshore drilling will do little to relieve America’s oil addiction.

According to the Department of Energy’s Energy Information Administration, drilling in America’s previously closed ocean areas “would not have a significant impact on domestic crude oil and natural gas production…before 2030.” Even then, “because oil prices are determined on the international market …any impact on average wellhead prices is expected to be insignificant.”

### AT: Regulations Solve

#### Regulations not enforced

Mall 13 [Amy, Senior Policy Analyst at the NRDC, “Laws Covering Oil and Gas Wells on Public/Private Lands Poorly Enforced,” The Energy Collective, 3-4, http://theenergycollective.com/amymall/194021/enforcing-laws-oil-and-gas-wells-public-and-private-land-not-we]

In Fiscal Year 2011, the BLM conducted an Internal Control Review (ICR) of the onshore oil and gas Inspection and Enforcement (I&E) program. The ICR reviewed ten field offices with major oil and gas responsibilities in California, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, North Dakota, Louisiana, Kentucky and Arkansas. Among the findings: A number of offices have low-quality environmental inspections as they struggle to keep up with exploration and production activity. The review made me very concerned about the lack of oversight of oil and gas production on federal oil and gas leases; I got the sense that it's like a party of teenagers with no parents at home. Many rules are going without enforcement. And in some cases I felt that the BLM staff may be having a tough time, trying to enforce the laws without proper resources to do the job appropriately. Just some examples of what was found in this review: In Wyoming, “there was an overall lack of enforcement of identified issues and/or non-compliant items in many records, many conditions of approval (COA) not being followed that were not identified in the inspections as being issues, and non-compliant items requiring action.” In New Mexico, Environmental Inspection records were found to be inadequate in detail and not in accordance with the handbook, and it does not appear that non-compliance orders are issued for environmental issues or violations. The reviewers found that the inspectors telephone and ask an operator to comply with surface standards, without documenting the call as a Verbal Warning. In North Dakota: “Not all of the required inspections are being performed due to the demand from the ongoing permitting workload for drilling.” In Bakersfield, California the review found that “The drilling inspection process in Bakersfield is best summarized as a light review of drilling activity and, most importantly, exhibited a lack of proper documentation..... Bakersfield is not performing casing or cementing inspections.” In Oklahoma, the reviewer was concerned with the lack of environmental protection measures, including unfenced open reserve pits with liquids after drilling operations and erosion of pit berms without sediment traps. There is a lot more in this report, but the bottom line was that the BLM Inspection and Enforcement program has a long way to go before the public can have confidence that the agency is fulfilling its responsibilities to protect our public lands and clean air and clean water, and ensure that laws are being followed. Some problems may be solved by additional resources devoted to inspections and enforcement, but money alone won't solve the problem. Protecting the environment needs to be a much higher priority for the agency.
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## Politics

### Overview

Indo pak war – goes nuclear – their landay ev says it breaks the global nuclear taboo

Timeframe – process of the plan triggers the link – building exporting terminals takes a long time.

#### If we win a link it takes out case – turns certainty

Johnson, 11

(Sr. Correspondent-Chemical & Engineering News, Uncertainty Slows Energy Investments, 11/21, http://cen.acs.org/articles/89/i47/Uncertainty-Slows-Energy-Investments.html)

Energy economists and clean energy advocates and industries fear that confusion over U.S. government policies will curb private domestic investments in clean energy. Of particular concern are the uncertain policy implications of a congressional investigation into the Obama Administration’s clean energy loan programs. The loss of private capital is likely to financially cripple U.S. companies in a global chase for the lucrative, emerging global marketplace for clean energy. “**A murky energy policy environment scares investors**,” says Phyllis Cuttino, director of clean energy programs for the Pew Charitable Trusts, a nonprofit, nonpartisan public policy organization. A recent study by Pew and research partner Bloomberg New Energy Finance found that the once-first-place U.S. had dropped to third place, behind China and Germany, in clean energy investments for product development and manufacturing. Pew puts the size of this potential renewable energy investment market at a whopping $2.3 trillion over the next decade. Cuttino underscores that these investments translate to jobs, exports, and a growing economy, all based on private capital. Cuttino blames the drop in ranking in large part on a “climate of uncertainty” in the U.S., which drives investors to put their money in more dependable ventures and other countries, rather than investing in U.S. clean energy production. Contributing to this uncertainty has been on-again, off-again government support for renewable energy. The uncertainty will continue, Cuttino says. Instability is springing from the high-profile investigation by the House of Representatives into the Department of Energy’s loan guarantee program and the steady drumbeat of politically partisan accusations spinning from the bankruptcy of solar manufacturer Solyndra. “Money is not patriotic,” Cuttino says. “Investors have a bottom line: They want to make money, and they will go to where they can get a reliable rate of return.” Congressional criticism of federal support for clean energy has also **influenced public perceptions**, according to a recent poll by Pew Research Center and the Washington Post. The poll found a decline in public support for federal renewable energy investments, saying it is at its lowest ebb since 2006. Public support for renewable energy—wind, solar, hydrogen—still tops public backing for fossil fuels, according to the poll released on Nov. 10. But the data reveal a sharp decline from the 80% of the public who endorsed greater federal spending on clean energy a few years ago to 68% today. For much of this year, Republican House leaders have criticized DOE’s clean energy aid programs and the American Recovery & Reinvestment Act of 2009—the stimulus plan—which gave the DOE programs a two-year funding burst that is now over. In late summer, the House Energy & Commerce Committee began a series of well-publicized oversight hearings examining the DOE loan guarantee program and specifically investigating a multi-million-dollar loan guarantee to solar panel manufacturer Solyndra. The company announced its bankruptcy at the end of August. The failure is expected to cost taxpayers $535 million (C&EN, Sept. 5, page 12). In their investigation, Republican Committee members and staff have obtained—voluntarily and through subpoena—thousands of internal Administration documents and e-mails. And they have selectively leaked portions of the materials to the media, occasionally before making them available to the public, committee Democrats, or hearing witnesses. Heightening publicity, the media releases were frequently timed to generate front-page news articles on the day of the committee’s hearings. Although some 80,000 pages of material have been presented to committee Republicans, Energy & Commerce Committee Chairman Fred Upton (R-Mich.) on Nov. 4 issued a subpoena to the White House requesting all material related to the Solyndra loan guarantee going back to Jan. 1, 2009, before President Barack Obama was inaugurated. On Nov. 11, the White House released more material, which Republicans say they are reviewing. Committee Republicans charge that Obama pressed DOE to grant the guarantee to Solyndra—over the objections of department career staff. They claim the President did so at the bidding of campaign contributor and Solyndra investor George Kaiser, an allegation Kaiser, the White House, and DOE strongly dispute. The debate has broadened to raise doubts about government loans, subsidies, and other support for renewable energy. Several House members have accused DOE and Obama of making inept decisions and unsuccessfully trying to pick winners and losers. Many have urged that the government end its support of renewable energy. Rep. Cliff B. Stearns (R-Fla.), chairman of the Energy & Commerce Oversight & Investigations Subcommittee, which is leading the investigation, bluntly warned that “even [with oil] at $140 a barrel, the idea that solar will ever break even is questionable.” Other House Republicans have weighed in. Rep. F. James Sensenbrenner Jr. (R-Wis.), vice chairman of the House Science, Space & Technology Committee, has introduced legislation to require an independent assessment of all past and future renewable energy loans, grants, and direct payments. And the House Oversight Committee, led by Rep. Darrell E. Issa (R-Calif.), joined the fray with a Sept. 22 hearing titled “How Obama’s Green Energy Agenda Is Killing Jobs.” Issa too has requested a long list of internal documents related to solar loans and guarantees. Like Solyndra, 39 companies have obtained $36 billion in loan guarantees through the program, which Congress created in 2005. Originally established to guarantee private loans to fund construction of nuclear reactors, the program was expanded by Congress to cover clean energy sources, but no loans were guaranteed until the Obama Administration. The program was created to encourage private investors to back risky technologies. Congress expected some loans to fail and required funds to be set aside for failure. Solyndra was an original applicant and successfully passed examination by the George W. Bush Administration. When Energy Secretary Steven Chu was appointed, he was quizzed by several members of Congress over the loan guarantee program delays and he promised to quickly make guarantees. Using stimulus money, Chu chose Solyndra for his first approval. With much fanfare, Obama announced the selection, pointing to jobs that would be created, the profits that would occur, and the export potential. None of that happened, and the loan was lost. Solyndra made an unusual rooftop cylindrical solar energy system that was quick and simple to install. The tubular design captured a wider angular range of sunlight than did flat panels, and unlike conventional panels, it avoided using polysilicon, which in 2005 was in short supply. However, the company’s product was much more expensive than conventional panels. When polysilicon prices dropped and solar panel prices plummeted, Solyndra folded (C&EN, Oct. 3, page 28). The lost taxpayer funds also angered House Democrats, and they too question Chu’s selection process. But they opposed the Republicans’ sweeping investigation, claiming it is a partisan attack on Obama and the stimulus program. The House Solyndra hearings have resulted in intense bickering between both parties, with witness testimony often rendered irrelevant. The Senate has not followed suit. Sen. Jeff Bingaman Jr. (D-N.M.), chairman of the Senate Energy & Natural Resources Committee, is unlikely to call such hearings, says committee communications director Bill Wicker. Oversight hearings at this time, he says, would “generate more heat than light” and “devolve” into speech making. “A more thoughtful look at the financing gap for advanced energy technologies between the U.S. and its international competitors, like China, does make sense,” Wicker adds, and Bingaman hopes to look at that issue later in this Congress. Advocates of renewable energy worry that House Republican opposition to Solyndra and loan guarantees could morph into opposition of general federal support for clean energy. On the record, however, representatives of solar and wind energy trade associations C&EN contacted for this article were reluctant to speak and feared being tainted with the brush of Solyndra. **Fickle congressional support for renewable energy has long dragged down the U.S. renewable energy industry**, notes Frank Laird, associate professor of technology and public policy at the University of Denver. Particularly unhelpful, he says, is the history of on-again, off-again federal tax credits for clean energy technologies. The size of the credit matters less than keeping it in place long enough to provide consistency for investors, Laird says. “**This seesaw drives renewable industries crazy. They can’t plan.”**“We found that **policy consistency has been critical for China and Germany**,” Pew’s Cuttino adds. “The constant examination and uncertainty that is going on right now in the U.S. makes investors queasy, and of course they are going to go to a China or Germany or some other country where they have stability. The U.S. has such potential. So much investment could happen here.” Stimulus money fueled Obama’s drive for clean energy projects, and in large part it fueled Republican opposition, notes David Goldston, who was staff director from 2001 to 2006 for the House Science Committee when it was in Republican Party hands. Today, he is director of government affairs for the Natural Resources Defense Council, an environmental group.

### U

### 1nr U Wall

#### It will pass soon – political capital is a framing issue – Obama’s focus will smooth over obstacles – shifts in the GOP and public opinion generate momentum – that’s CT Post

#### And, strong bipart support is overcoming opposition – that’s Imassera.

#### Capital will win votes for immigration.

THE HILL 3 – 15 -1 3 [Obama support group off to sluggish start, <http://thehill.com/homenews/administration/288305-obama-support-group-off-to-sluggish-start>]

Obama sees the group as having the potential to reverse a pivotal mistake from his first term, when Obama feels he failed to harness the enthusiasm of his campaign to promote his policy agenda.

There’s some worry the window for OFA’s success might have already begun to close.

With slipping popularity and congressional Republicans retrenching for another round of budget fights, Obama’s once bountiful post-election political capital is being gradually depleted.

But OFA supporters argued that rather than being derailed by the political circumstances, the group was the answer to the problem.

Ben LaBolt, a spokesman for the Obama campaign who led one of the summit’s seminars, noted Thursday that “more than one million Americans have already taken action through OFA to urge members of Congress to support comprehensive immigration reform, gun safety measures, and policies that will strengthen the middle class.”

President Obama told the group that their efforts “may give space here in Washington to do the kind of work — hopefully bipartisan work — that's required.”

"This is what inside Washington doesn't get about outside Washington,” said the former administration official. “They're thinking about this strictly in terms of process. But it's about how you engage these folks. If you went on and knocked on doors because you're into climate change, you're going to do it on an off year.”

A Democratic operative also argued that the group’s nonprofit status – which prevents it from explicitly partisan, electoral activity – would actually aid the group in its mission to forward the president’s agenda.

“Four years ago we tried to construct OFA as an organization with dual missions -- electing Democrats and passing the president’s policies -- and we may have bit off more than we could chew,” he said. “There's ample need for an organization wholly dedicated to passing this ambitious agenda.”

Even donors who acknowledged the group was off to a slow start predicted that just as the campaign heated up, so will OFA.

"When the president really starts to push these issues like immigration, that's when you're going to see this operation going at full speed,” said one top Obama donor. “This is why people elected the president. It wasn't necessarily about him but what he could do."

#### AND – more warrants

#### A. House & Senate obstacles falling – avoiding unforeseen issues key

PBS NEWS 3 – 21 – 13 <http://www.pbs.org/newshour/rundown/2013/03/progress-on-immigration-reform-leaves-leading-advocate-elated-wary.html>

Rep. Luis Gutierrez, D-Ill., center at the podium, has long advocated for the comprehensive immigration reform. In November 2012, the representative stood with members of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus and announced a declaration of nine principles for comprehensive immigration reform. Photo courtesy of Rep. Luis Gutierrez/Flickr.

This week, the Republican National Committee, Sen. Rand Paul, R-Ky. and Speaker of the House John Boehner all have endorsed bipartisan work in Congress toward comprehensive immigration reform legislation.

But Rep. Luis Gutierrez, D-Ill., still worries.

"I'm not sleeping because I'm thinking about what [more] needs to be done," said the 10-term Democratic congressman from Chicago. "There are other more nefarious forces out there."

Gutierrez has made securing a path to citizenship for the estimated 11 million undocumented residents living in the U.S. -- most of them Hispanic -- a personal mission. Now that he's closer than ever to the goal, he's not letting up on his image as a tireless, vocal firebrand widely considered the preeminent voice for immigration reform in Congress.

He's led rallies against the deportation policies of President Barack Obama and challenged Mr. Obama and Democratic leaders who support immigration reform to push harder and faster for a comprehensive bill.

But Gutierrez now says the November election may have done for the cause what all his years of hectoring the political class could not.

"I said this before the election. Everybody said, what's going to change, Luis? What's going to change if we vote for Barack Obama? All these deportations, people getting arrested," Gutierrez said in an interview with PBS NewsHour. "I remember saying, oh, I'm working for Obama. I'm gonna make sure he gets elected because the victory is going to be so huge he's going to be indebted to Latinos."

Latinos voted overwhelmingly for the president and other Democrats, and that changed the calculus of Republicans as well, Gutierrez said. "That vote was so huge and numerous that Republicans, who had always wanted to either take this [immigration reform] off the table or -- many more -- who were our allies, our partners" could now support comprehensive reform, he said.

Working closely with Republicans, as he did several years ago during the last run at comprehensive immigration reform, Gutierrez is part of a small group in Congress quietly fashioning a bill. It's allowed the liberal former Chicago city council member to forge new bonds despite ideological differences.

"There are a lot of wonderful personal relationships that are being developed across the aisle between people who politically have nothing else in common, who come to this issue, this 'public policy matter,' [they] you would say, so that it would be drained of any emotion, right? - from a different perspective. I see it as a civil rights issue, as a human rights issue," Gutierrez said.

As the economic, political, and practical advantages of immigration reform get voiced by both parties, he believes potential obstacles to passing a final bill continue to fall away. And he says he's less worried than before about one such pitfall -- the demand by some conservatives that undocumented residents not be allowed to become U.S. citizens but only legalized residents. "I start from the premise that never again will we allow America to let there be a permanent second-class anything. We had a civil war over that," Gutierrez said. "We're not going to revisit it now. We're not gonna allow a permanent subclass of Americans."

Predictions are that immigration bills in the House and Senate will be unveiled formally after next week's Spring congressional recess. Legislation could arrive on the president's desk before summer's end.

But some advocates worry something they can't see now, such as the grassroots "anti-amnesty" movement that scuttled public opinion support for a law six years ago, could arise again.

Gutierrez says it's what keeps him from sleeping well.

#### B. despite skepticism and disagreements

IBT 3 – 22 – 13 International Business Tribune [<http://www.ibtimes.com/immigration-reform-bill-suddenly-close-what-made-republicans-change-their-minds-1145763>]

When President Barack Obama called on Congress to send him an immigration bill “in the next few months” during his 2013 State of the Union address in January, many were skeptical that it would actually happen.

By now it’s a tired trope that the obstructionist tactics of Republican legislators have left Washington sclerotic, all but unable to address many of the issues facing America as Obama begins his second term in the White House.

But immigration reform is turning out to be one area of policy where action is happening, and experts on the issue say that a landmark law will likely be on the books by the end of this summer.

“People want to get this done well before the August recess, and people are talking about before July 4,” David Koelsch, an attorney and law professor who runs the Immigration Law Clinic at the University of Detroit Mercy, said. “A signing ceremony on the Fourth of July looks really good, there’s nice optics around that.”

It’s almost shocking at this point to see members of Congress from both sides of the aisle coming together to support a groundbreaking piece of important legislation.

But that’s what’s happening as even Tea Party-backed Republicans like Senator Rand Paul of Kentucky are coming into the fold and endorsing a path to citizenship and other pillars of what is shaping up to be the framework for comprehensive immigration reform.

There are still some differences between even the most centrist members of Congress that must be ironed out, but in most cases they are disagreements of scale and specifics, and a consensus about what to include in the bill is taking shape.

#### C. Republicans are on board

#### Kimball, 3-30-2013.

(“Demographics Force US Immigration Reform,” <http://www.dw.de/demographics-force-us-immigration-reform/a-16699894>)

Once an issue that polarized the US, immigration reform now enjoys growing bipartisan support. Democrats and Republicans are negotiating a path to legalization, and perhaps citizenship, for 11 million illegal immigrants.

With Congress on recess for spring break, US President Barack Obama has pushed the House and Senate to finish the job of drafting comprehensive immigration reform by April, calling on both political parties to capitalize on recent bipartisan progress toward a deal.

"We are making progress. But we've go to finish the job, because this issue is not new," the president said recently during a citizenship ceremony at the White House for 28 new Americans. "Everybody pretty much knows what's broken; everybody knows how to fix it."

After years of polarization over how to deal with America's 11 million unauthorized immigrants, support for a bipartisan deal has gained momentum since President Obama's victory in the November presidential election.

Republican Senator Rand Paul - a key figure in the conservative Tea Party movement - has spoken out in favor of legalization, revealing a potential game-changing shift within the Republican Party in favor of immigration reform.

"Prudence, compassion and thrift all point us toward the same goal: bringing these workers out of the shadows and into becoming and being taxpaying members of society," Paul told the US Hispanic Chamber of Commerce.

He was just the latest member of the Republican Party, which took a hard-line toward illegal immigrants during the presidential campaign, to signal an opening for a bipartisan deal.

Both Senate Republican leader Mitch McConnell and Republican House Speaker John Boehner have expressed support for the negotiations of the so-called "Gang of Eight," a bipartisan group of senators hammering out immigration reform legislation. Meanwhile, Democratic Senator Chuck Schumer has said that the group is "very close to agreement."

"Nobody would have ever anticipated the discussion to be starting at a new starting point, that key Republicans are on board for a comprehensive overhaul and for a legalization program," Audrey Singer, an expert on immigration with the Brookings Institute, told DW.

#### D. Obstacles resolvable

AP 3 – 27 – 13 <http://www.startribune.com/politics/200291201.html>

President Barack Obama pressed for swift action on a sweeping immigration bill Wednesday, saying last-minute obstacles are "resolvable" and predicting Congress could pass historic legislation by the end of the summer.

In back-to-back interviews with Spanish-language television networks, Obama repeatedly voiced confidence in a bipartisan Senate group that appears to be on the cusp of unveiling a draft bill. And he said that while he is still prepared to step in with his own bill if talks break down, he doesn't expect that step to be necessary.

"If we have a bill introduced at the beginning of next month as these senators indicate it will be, then I'm confident that we can get it done certainly before the end of the summer," Obama told Telemundo.

While overhauling the nation's patchwork immigration laws is a top second term priority for the president, he has ceded the negotiations almost entirely to Congress. He and his advisers have calculated that a bill crafted by Capitol Hill stands a better chance of winning Republican support than one overtly influenced by the president.

In his interviews Wednesday, Obama tried to stay out of the prickly policy issues that remain unfinished in the Senate talks, though he said a split between business and labor on wages for new low-skilled workers was unlikely to "doom" the legislation.

"This is a resolvable issue," he said.

The president also spoke Wednesday with Univision. His interviews followed a citizenship ceremony conducted Monday at the White House where he pressed Congress to "finish the job" on immigration, an issue that has vexed Washington for years.

The president made little progress in overhauling the nation's fractured immigration laws in his first term, but he redoubled his efforts after winning re-election. The November contest also spurred some Republicans to drop their opposition to immigration reform, given that Hispanics overwhelmingly backed Obama.

In an effort to keep Republicans at the negotiation table, Obama has stayed relatively quiet on immigration over the last month. He rolled out his immigration principles during a January rally in Las Vegas and made an impassioned call for overhauling the nation's laws during his early February State of the Union address, then purposely handed off the effort to lawmakers.

The president has, however, privately called members of the Senate working group, and the administration is providing technical support to the lawmakers. The Gang of Eight is expected to unveil its draft bill when Congress returns from a two-week recess the week of April 8.

#### bipart support – we’re in the home stretch

NBC Latino, 3-27-2013.

(“Obama on Immigration Reform: There will be a pathway to citizenship so people can achieve their dreams,” <http://nbclatino.com/2013/03/27/obama-on-immigration-reform-there-will-be-a-pathway-to-citizenship-so-people-can-achieve-their-dreams/>)

President Obama says immigration reform is hitting the home stretch.

In an interview with Telemundo’s Lori Montenegro, Obama acknowledged a stumbling block between[labor and business over wages and guest worker programs,](http://nbclatino.com/2013/03/22/dispute-over-worker-wages-snags-immigration-reform/) but said that it would not derail introduction of legislation.

“I think we’ve seen enormous progress over the last month and a half,” Obama says. “I think both sides — Democrats and Republicans have been very serious about the negotiations.  I’m actually very optimistic that when they return in early April that we’ll see a bill ready to move through the process.”

The president also stressed once again that a [pathway to citizenship will be included in the final legislation.](http://nbclatino.com/2013/03/10/gang-of-eight-senators-quietly-crafting-immigration-bill/)

“The most important thing is that we’re seeing a strong commitment to finally solve this problem in a way that strengthens our border security, makes sure that there’s a pathway to citizenship,” he said.  ”An earned one, a tough one, but a pathway so that people can live out their dreams and make sure that they have a better life for themselves and their kids.

Obama reiterated that he sees a commitment from both parties to cross the finish line, but addressed concerns that the immigration reform timeline will be dragged on, noting that he has a fail safe.

“I’ve always said that if I see a breakdown in the process, that I’ve got my own legislation,” he said.

“I’m prepared to step in.  But I don’t think that’s gonna be necessary.”

### A2 Path to Citizenship

#### Path to citizenship won’t stop the bill – momentum building

IBT 3 – 22 – 13 International Business Tribune [<http://www.ibtimes.com/immigration-reform-bill-suddenly-close-what-made-republicans-change-their-minds-1145763>]

A Path To Citizenship

One of the biggest sticking points on immigration reform legislation in the past has always been the issue of providing a path to citizenship for the millions of immigrants already in this country.

Allowing the more than 11 million people who are in the U.S. illegally to become full-fledged citizens has long been derided by Republicans as an attempt to provide “amnesty” to people who broke the law when they entered the country.

The impetus behind the Republicans' change of heart on legalizing undocumented, or "illegal," immigrants isn't just political expediency; there are fiscal implications as well, and Republicans are sensitive to that issue.

“There are economic benefits to immigration reform. Giving people a path to citizenship or legalization will require them to pay taxes,” said New Jersey-based immigration attorney Andres Mejer. “They will come out of the shadows, they will buy homes, they will invest in education and move up the social ladder.”

A growing number of Republicans are choosing to embrace a path to citizenship, as Rand Paul did during a speech at the United States Hispanic Chamber of Commerce on March 19.

“Prudence, compassion and thrift all point us toward the same goal: bringing these workers out of the shadows and into becoming and being taxpaying members of society,” Paul said, announcing his newfound support for the policy.

Paul is the most recent high-profile Republican to publicly change his mind about the path to citizenship. He was preceded by Sen. Marco Rubio of Florida, a likely 2016 presidential candidate and a member of the “Gang of Eight,” a bipartisan cadre of senators working to create an immigration reform bill that Congress can pass.

The new gospel hasn't spread to everybody in the Republican party, though.

“What you still have is kind of a hard-core restrictionist element,” said Cooper, the Fragomen attorney. “There are a couple of members in the Senate, but probably more in the House, who are adamantly opposed to any kind of legalization or amnesty program.”

Despite remaining opposition, a path to citizenship will likely included in any comprehensive immigration reform bill that Congress brings to the floor this year, according to Gregory Chen, director of advocacy at the American Immigration Lawyers Association.

“Since the November elections, momentum has been steadily building to get immigration reform passed this year, in a way that we haven’t seen probably in the better part of a decade,” Chen said. “Significantly, we’re talking about legalization for the undocumented who are here -- providing a way for 11 or 12 million people to get a green card or citizenship.”

#### Path to citizenship will get included

NYT 3 – 22 – 13 http://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/22/us/broad-support-for-path-to-citizenship-poll-finds.html?\_r=0

Nearly two-thirds of Americans favor giving illegal immigrants in the country an opportunity for legal status with a path to citizenship, according to a poll published Thursday by the Public Religion Research Institute and the Brookings Institution. Support for an earned path to citizenship for those immigrants came from 71 percent of Democrats and also a majority, 53 percent, of Republicans, the poll found.

The option that drew the least support in the poll was legal residency for illegal immigrants with no path to citizenship: only 14 percent of Americans favored that approach. A larger minority, about 21 percent, said illegal immigrants should be identified by the authorities and deported.

As Republicans have been searching with fresh intensity in recent weeks for a new approach to the divisive issue of immigration, the poll provides potentially heartening information to lawmakers who have urged the party to support overhaul legislation that would eventually allow illegal immigrants to become citizens.

The poll is notable because of the large size of its sample. The results are based on bilingual landline and cellphone interviews between Jan. 28 and Feb. 24 with 4,465 adults in the continental United States. (The margin of error is plus or minus two percentage points.) The Public Religion Research Institute is a nonpartisan research organization that focuses on religion and politics. The Brookings Institution, which is also nonpartisan, conducts research on public policy issues.

### A2 Work Visa Fights

#### Work Visa issues will get resolved

NATIONAL JOURNAL 3 – 26 – 13 [<http://www.nationaljournal.com/congress/why-the-fight-over-work-visas-won-t-doom-the-immigration-bill-20130325>]

Make no mistake. The immigration bill being crafted by the “Gang of Eight” senators will include foreign work visas despite warnings from both business and labor that their talks over the issue have broken down.

Here’s why. The AFL-CIO, for the first time in its history, has signed off on a work-visa program that would allow employers to bring foreign workers into the United States on a temporary basis. Those visas would come with an assurance that the worker would have access to a green card, possibly as soon as one year after coming into the country. But initially, they are temporary visas.

“It would be a new kind of work-visa program. It would be dual intent,” said AFL-CIO spokesman Jeff Hauser.

This is a big deal. Previously, the AFL-CIO opposed any kind of temporary-visa program. That intransigence caused a highly public split with the Service Employees International Union in 2007. SEIU was willing to embrace some form of temporary work visas for immigrant labor if the broader immigration bill also legalized the currently undocumented population.

Now labor is speaking with one voice. They want legalization for the undocumented population and are willing to allow new foreign workers to come to the country, provided the employers pay them at the same rates they would pay an American worker. The business community has indicated it can live with those parameters.

The breakdown in talks is about degrees rather than overall principles. How much should foreign workers be paid? How should that wage rate calculated, and who decides?

The dispute between labor and business over work visas highlights the sensitivity of the effort to reshape an immigration system that doesn't work very well for anybody. Immigration reform is a top priority for President Obama and for Republicans in Congress, who are worried that without an overhaul, the Hispanic population will become permanent Democrats.

### Link

### Framing issues

1. Uniqueness determines the direction of the link – it’s a yes no question – if immigration is passing the plan can’t cause it to pass

#### 2 Obama pushing immigration – ignoring energy key

HARDER 2 – 6 – 13 National Journal Staff [Amy Harder, In Washington, Energy and Climate Issues Get Shoved in the Closet, <http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/power-play/in-washington-energy-and-climate-issues-get-shoved-in-the-closet-20130206>]

At a news conference where TV cameras in the back were nearly stacked on top of each other, an influential bipartisan group of five senators introduced legislation late last month to overhaul the nation’s immigration system. The room was so crowded that no open seats or standing room could be found.

A week later, one senator, Republican Lisa Murkowski of Alaska, was standing at the podium in the same room to unveil her energy-policy blueprint. There were several open seats and just a few cameras. At least one reporter was there to ask the senator about her position on President Obama’s choice for Defense secretary, former Republican Sen. Chuck Hagel.

“I’m doing energy right now,” Murkowski responded. “I’m focused on that.”

Almost everyone else on Capitol Hill is focused on something else. Aside from the broad fiscal issues, Congress and the president are galvanizing around immigration reform.

Four years ago, the White House prioritized health care reform above comprehensive climate-change legislation. The former will go down in history as one of Obama’s most significant accomplishments. The latter is in the perpetual position of second fiddle. “To everything,” Murkowski interjected fervently when asked by National Journal Daily whether energy and climate policy was second to other policies in Washington’s pecking order.

Murkowski, ranking member of the Senate's Energy and Natural Resources Committee, said she hoped the Super Bowl blackout would help the public understand the importance of energy policy.

“This issue of immigration: Why are we all focused on that? Well, it’s because the Republicans lost the election because in part we did not have the Hispanic community behind us,” Murkowski said this week. “What is it that brings about that motivation? Maybe it could be something like a gap in the Super Bowl causes the focus on energy that we need to have. I can only hope.”

It will take more than hope. Elections have consequences, but so far the only kind of electoral consequence climate and energy policy has instigated is one that helped some lawmakers who supported cap-and-trade legislation to lose their seats in the 2010 midterm elections. For the pendulum to swing the other way—for lawmakers to lose their seats over not acting on climate and energy policy—seems almost unfathomable right now.

Billions of dollars are invested in the fossil-fuel power plants, refineries, and pipelines that the country depends on today. The companies that own this infrastructure have a business interest in keeping things the way they are. Immigration reform doesn’t face such formidable interests invested in the status quo.

“They [businesses] have employees—real, visible people—who they value and who they want to make legal as soon as possible,” said Chris Miller, who until earlier this year was the top energy and environment adviser to Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev.

On energy and climate-change policy, Miller added, “You’re probably never going to have anything like the fence in the Southwest or the border-control issue that pushes action and debate on immigration, because climate-change impacts will likely continue to be more abstract in the public's mind until those impacts are so crystal-clear it’s too late for us to do anything.”

Another, tactical reason helps build momentum on immigration and not on other issues. Obama can capitalize on immigration as it becomes more of a wedge issue within the GOP. On energy and climate policy, Obama faces a unified Republican Party.

“The president has cracked the code on how to push his agenda items through. He learned from his victories on the payroll tax and the fiscal cliff that the key is to stake out the political high ground on issues that poll in his favor while exploiting the divisions within the GOP,” said a former Republican leadership aide who would speak only on the condition of anonymity. “With this in mind, the next logical place for him to go is immigration. Unlike issues like energy or tax reform where the GOP is united, he can claim a big win on immigration reform while striking a political blow to Republicans.”

#### 3. The onshore drilling counterplan solves their link turns – it would appease the same people

#### 4. Independently – Delaying the vote risks killing it. Plan doesn’t even have to be unpopular

ABC NEWS 3 – 27 – 13 [<http://abcnews.go.com/ABC_Univision/Politics/reasons-immigration-reform-timeline-matters/story?id=18822563#.UVO80By0fzw>]

A group of Democrats and Republicans working on an immigration reform bill in the Senate will almost certainly miss a self-imposed March deadline to produce draft legislation. And yesterday, one of the groups foremost members, Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.), cautioned that a bill might not come in early April, either.

Why does the deadline matter? Here are three reasons.

1. Momentum

The November presidential election -- where Obama housed Romney among Latinos, taking 71 percent of the vote -- got people in Washington talking about immigration reform as a way for the Republican party to win Latino voters.

But that was five months ago, and political memory can be short.

"Once the sting of the election starts to wear off a little bit, I think there's less of an impetus to act on this issue," said Marshall Fitz, immigration policy director at the liberal Center for American Progress. "You've got to act when the issue is fresh and everyone is very cognizant of the political implications...The political implications aren't going to change as we go further into this, but the calculus of the members may start to get obscured."

2. Deportations

Lots of interests groups would like to see an immigration deal inked sooner than later, but no one group feels the pressure more than immigrants who are living in the country without authorization.

Even while President Obama stumps for a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants, his administration continues to deport record numbers of people, many of them for immigration-related offenses. A recent report in The New York Times found that on any given day, about 300 people in immigration detention are kept in solitary confinement, treatment that could have lasting psychological effects.

"There is a sense that every day of delay is a day in which people continue to be deported who would otherwise be eligible for relief," Fitz said. "It's not like delay is the status quo. The delay is continued active harm on the community and on immigrant families."

3. Primaries

If the so-called Senate "Gang of Eight" working on immigration reform is able to produce a bill in April, the Senate and House could feasibly vote and pass legislation before the August recess in Congress.

But any further significant delay could jeopardize that timeline. If Congress continues to negotiate the bill in the fall, some Republican members of the House facing reelection in 2014 may be less likely to give their support, fearing a primary challenger who will use the issue as a political cudgel.

"I think the House leadership feels like they've got to get this done and behind them by [the August recess] because their guys are going to be unwilling to take a tough vote after that," Fitz said.

### Link

Plan causes massive backlash – environmental groups, industry lobbies, scientific opposition.

We don’t need to win massive backlash

Nat gas only leases don’t solve their link turns – industry opposes it because they think it’s counterproductive – that’s the 1NC solvency card.

“bipartisan just means one gop and one dem like it

#### Coal lobby fights natural gas

Krauss 9—NYT Energy Staff [Clifford Krauss, Natural Gas Hits a Roadblock in New Energy Bill, http://www.nytimes.com/2009/09/07/business/07gas.html]

The natural gas industry has enjoyed something of a winning streak in recent years. It found gigantic new reserves, low prices are encouraging utilities to substitute gas for coal, and cities are switching to buses fueled by natural gas.

But its luck has run out in Washington, where the industry is having trouble making its case to Congress as it writes an energy bill to tackle global warming.

For all its pronouncements that gas could be used to replace aging, inefficient coal-fired power plants — and reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the process — lawmakers from coal-producing states appear committed to keeping coal as the nation’s primary producer of power.

Those influential lawmakers, from both parties, say that new technologies under development to capture and bury emissions of coal are a better bet than gas for long-term solutions to climate change.

The difference of opinion is about more than what is best for the environment, of course. Industry profits are riding on the outcome of the discussion — a rich mix of politics, environment, science and business.

A climate-change bill that passed the House in June, intended to cap greenhouse gas emissions, delivered benefits to renewable fuels like wind and solar and strengthened building codes to conserve energy.

But the cost of emitting carbon dioxide emissions under the terms of the bill remained at levels that would continue to provide a price advantage for coal in many regions of the country.

The Senate is planning to begin writing its own bill later this month.

“The Senate is more open to natural gas as a transition fuel than the House was,” said Senator Charles E. Schumer, Democrat of New York, “but the senators from the coal states who are crucial votes are going to want first consideration for coal.”

The gas industry’s leaders say they will descend on Capitol Hill in coming weeks to press their case about the advantage of gas, including that it emits about half the greenhouse gases as coal.

The industry has formed a new lobbying group, and it is planning a national campaign that includes television advertising. Executives want fewer allowances for coal. They also want legislation that gives incentives for companies to convert truck fleets from diesel to natural gas.

“Never in my life have I been confronted with something so obviously easy and good to do and have such Congressional apathy,” said Aubrey McClendon, chief executive of Chesapeake Energy and a leading voice in the industry. He added that he was still hopeful the Senate can improve the House bill.

But the coal industry will also be active. Vic Svec, a senior vice president at Peabody Energy, a large coal company, said coal was still a better fuel because its price is more stable than gas.

#### Coal lobby is powerful—will fight energy fights to keep it strong—insures a fight in congress

Choma 12—money-in-politics reporter for the Center for Responsive Politics [Russ Choma, Two Years After Mine Disaster, Coal Lobby Is Still Growing, https://www.commondreams.org/view/2012/04/06-0]

Two years ago today, the Upper Big Branch mine exploded, killing 29 miners and injuring two others. In the months after the tragedy, it became clear that the mine's owner, Massey Energy, had flouted safety requirements and tried to game the system. Led by CEO Don Blankenship, the company unapologetically pursued politicians at both the state and federal levels, dumping cash into campaigns and lobbying hard for less oversight.

Investigations into the disaster found that the company had successfully skirted orders to improve the safety of the mine, despite fines and warnings from regulators. In 2010, Blankenship resigned, and a few months later the company was sold to Alpha Natural Resources.

But the departure of the pugnacious coal executive, eager to use his money to influence power, hasn't lessened the industry's investment in Washington. In fact, OpenSecrets.org data shows that the amount of money spent by the coal industry on politicians and lobbying has only grown since the disaster.

In 2011, the industry spent at least $18.1 million lobbying on the federal level - millions more than the $14.9 million in 2009. That figure includes all types of companies with interests in coal, but the mining companies spend far and away the most money on lobbying -- companies like Peabody Energy, which spent $4.9 million last year, and CONSOL Energy, which spent $3.2 million. Massey's corporate successor, Alpha Natural Resources spent just over $1 million. Safety issues and mine oversight was an issue of concern listed on lobbying disclosure forms for all three companies.

To put that in perspective, the United Mine Workers, the largest miner's union, spent just $404,419 lobbying last year.

The industry's figures overall are slightly down compared to 2010, but are significantly higher than before the accident. Although there is evidence that mine safety has improved since the explosion, Congress has failed to pass any legislation addressing it. The correlation between lobbying expenditures and legislation, or lack thereof, is never clear -- but it's clear where campaign contributions go and who's pushing or resisting new legislation.

As a recent hearing on efforts by the Mine Health and Safety Administration (the agency responsible for overseeing mine safety) showed, Democrats are the ones pushing for new laws. And the industry has given far more money to Republicans -- about $3 million to Republicans and just $385,486 to Democrats.

The OpenSecrets.org analysis of contributions by the industry also shows that overall giving to candidates is on the rise. In the 2010 campaign cycle, individuals and PACs affiliated with the industry gave far more than ever before -- $8.1 million. That is more than double than the previous high-water mark in the 2002 cycle, when when individuals and PACs affiliated with the industry gave $3.7 million. And so far this cycle, with much of this year including the general election still to come, the industry has given $4.8 million, putting it on pace to possibly surpass last cycle.

Mine safety and the aftermath of Upper Big Branch is hardly the only major issue confronting the mining industry and causing them to spend money in Washington, to be fair: climate change and the role of coal-fired power plants in the nation's energy future are huge fights in Washington. Just yesterday, the American Coalition for Clean Coal Electricity launched a major new ad campaign to push coal-fired plants back to prominence in the discussion over domestic power sources.

#### Coal lobby controls 87% of congress—more than all other energy votes

Lavelle 11—Staff, Center for Public Integrity [Marinanne, 5/13/11, The ‘clean coal’ lobbying blitz, http://www.publicintegrity.org/2009/04/21/2885/%E2%80%98clean-coal%E2%80%99-lobbying-blitz]

However one interprets ACCCE’s message, it has the power of well-heeled and politically engaged companies behind it. Amid the punishing economy of 2008, the top five U.S. coal mining companies saw their profits more than double to $1.9 billion. And the industry is determined to use a slice of those profits to deliver its message. Senate disclosure forms reveal that ACCCE spent $9.95 million on Washington lobbying last year, far more than any other group devoted to climate change — although ACCCE says the figure was inflated because it included advertising and grassroots advocacy that most groups don’t report.

Political action committees and individuals employed by ACCCE member firms, including many top executives, contributed $15.6 million to federal campaigns in the 2008 election cycle — with a reach so wide that 87 percent of Congress received money, according to data from the Center for Responsive Politics. Neither Waxman nor Markey logged contributions, but the vast majority of their Energy and Commerce Committee colleagues did. Four key panel members, Chairman Emeritus Representative John Dingell, a Michigan Democrat, Representative Rick Boucher, a Virginia Democrat, and Republican ranking and deputy ranking members Joe Barton of Texas and Roy Blunt of Missouri, were among the top 20 clean coal cash recipients. The No. 1 beneficiary was Republican Senator John McCain of Arizona, with $302,474 contributed to his presidential run. In an election that saw Democratic candidates with a 60-40 fundraising edge, ACCCE-member giving tilted 61-39 to the GOP. But President Obama was the No. 2 recipient, with $241,870—all from ACCCE company employees.

Obama’s pro-coal statements have been a particular point of pride for ACCCE. Around Inauguration Day, the group ran TV ads featuring a clip of Obama at a Virginia rally last fall touting clean coal technology. “We figured out how to put a man on the moon in 10 years; you can’t tell me we can’t figure out how to burn coal that we mine right here in the United States of America and make it work,” Obama said. It is also easy to find campaign clips of Obama remarking that “coal is really dirty,” and that cleaning it up is “going to take a major investment … because we don’t have the technology to do it right now.” But ACCCE prefers to stress the positive, and its Behind the Plug blog has kept a running catalog of remarks by Obama and administration officials expounding on coal’s role in the nation’s energy future.

#### Plan is a flip flop for Obama – he’s pushing stricter regulations

Ngai 12—Huffington Post Contributor [Catherine, May 5, “[Obama](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.liberty.edu:2048/lnacui2api/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T15171602866&returnToId=20_T15171612367&csi=334941&A=0.05990522921649877&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=Obama%20&indexType=P" \t "_parent)proposes public land fracking rules,” Lexis, d/a 7-20-12, ads]

The Obama administration released draft rules Friday that would require companies to publicly disclose what chemicals they use in hydraulic fracturing operations on public lands. Currently, operators are not required to disclose the chemicals they use on federal land, where approximately 90 percent of the wells drilled use hydraulic fracturing, or "fracking," techniques. The proposed rules would require public disclosure of chemicals used after fracturing operations have been completed.

### Environ backllah now

### Obama supports epa

#### No action on energy now – other issues are taking up Obama’s political capital

BRINKER 3 – 12 – 13 MA in the MAPSS program at U Chicago [Luke Brinker, A change in political climate, <http://chicagomaroon.com/2013/03/12/a-change-in-political-climate/>]

By 2010, Obama and the Democrats had consumed so much political capital on the stimulus and on health-care reform that there was little appetite for tackling yet another controversial issue. Fearing energy industry–funded attack ads, Democrats punted on the topic. They lost the 2010 midterms anyway. With Republicans in control of the House and Democratic ranks reduced in the Senate, the prospects for a climate deal diminished from iffy to nil.

What changed? The Obama who reclaimed the mantle of environmental protection earlier this year no longer had to worry about reelection. Not only did the President secure a second term in November, but Democrats also boosted their numbers in the House and strengthened their control of the Senate, creating more favorable conditions for a climate change accord. Finally, much as the horrific shootings in Newtown, Connecticut transformed the national debate on gun control, Hurricane Sandy forced many reluctant political players off the sidelines, lest extreme weather soon become the norm.

We’ve heard little from the President on climate change since his January address. (That said, earlier this month he did appoint Gina McCarthy, a fierce pro-environment regulator, to be the next head of the Environmental Protection Agency.) It’s not clear when or if Congress plans to take up the matter. For now, immigration reform and gun control are the two big issues dominating the political agenda. But that’s not to say there’s nothing Obama can do on the subject in the meantime.

### Ww

#### 4. Hirsh admits the agenda sometimes works that way

HIRSH 12 – 14 – 12 [Michael Hirsh, Obama Gets a Solution to His Susan Rice Problem, <http://www.nationaljournal.com/whitehouse/obama-gets-a-solution-to-his-susan-rice-problem-20121213>]

It was a classic Washington exit: stealthy and swift, with few fingerprints. President Obama didn’t want to be seen as backing down. So Susan Rice — one of his most devoted aides since 2007 — gave him the way out, seemingly all on her own.

“If nominated, I am now convinced that the confirmation process would be lengthy, disruptive, and costly — to you and to our most pressing national and international priorities,” Rice wrote on Thursday in a letter withdrawing her name from consideration as secretary of State.

In a statement in response, Obama said that “while I deeply regret the unfair and misleading attacks on Susan Rice in recent weeks,” he “accepted her decision.” He added that Rice will continue as his U.N. ambassador for the time being.

This was all the part intended for public consumption. The underlying reality is this: The president is almost certainly furious about this turn of events — which represents the first major defeat he’s suffered since his reelection — but he’s a savvy enough politician to know how to back off without seeming to back down. While floating Rice’s name for secretary of State in the media was always something of a trial balloon — she was never formally nominated or even publicly declared by the administration to be the leading candidate to replace Hillary Rodham Clinton — Obama appeared to really want to appoint her, calling her “extraordinary” and excoriating GOP attacks on her with unusual (for him) personal pique.

But as the weeks passed, it became clearer that Rice’s biggest political problem was no longer just the klatch of Republican senators, led by John McCain, who were fiercely criticizing her for allegedly misleading statements on the attack at the U.S. consulate that killed U.S. Ambassador Christopher Stevens and three other Americans in Benghazi, Libya on Sept. 11.

After a series of strikingly unsuccessful meetings on Capitol Hill in which she failed to impress even moderate Republicans such as Susan Collins of Maine, Rice also found herself facing resistance from foreign-policy elites who questioned her temperament and her record. In addition, human-rights critics were up in arms over her behavior toward African dictators, particularly her role in allegedly holding up publication of a U.N. report that concluded the government of Rwandan President Paul Kagame, with whom she has a long and close relationship, was supplying and financing a brutal Congolese rebel force known as the M23 Movement.

That may have been the tipping point, though an official on Rice's team declined to say so. As she put it herself in her letter to Obama, the president had some other “pressing national international priorities.… It is far more important that we devote precious legislative hours and energy to enacting your core goals, including comprehensive immigration reform, balanced deficit reduction, job creation, and maintaining a robust national defense and effective U.S. global leadership.”

In other words, the Obama team was quickly coming to realize that, even though it appeared he had considerable leverage over the Republicans following a more-robust-than-thought reelection victory, a Rice nomination was simply going to cost him too much political capital, especially when it came to a long-term budget deal.

#### 1. Winners Lose & capital is finite—can’t replenish

Beckmann & Kumar 11—Professor of Political Science, UC, Irvine [Matthew N. Beckmann and Vimal Kumar, How presidents push, when presidents win: A model of positive presidential power in US lawmaking, *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 2011 23: 3]

As with all lobbyists, presidents looking to push legislation must do so indirectly by pushing the lawmakers whom they need to pass it. Or, as Richard Nesustadt artfully explained:

The essence of a President’s persuasive task, with congressmen and everybody else, is to induce them to believe that what he wants of them is what their own appraisal of their own responsibilities requires them to do in their interest, not his…Persuasion deals in the coin of self-interest with men who have some freedom to reject what they find counterfeit. (Neustadt, 1990: 40) Fortunately for contemporary presidents, today’s White House affords its occupants an unrivaled supply of persuasive carrots and sticks. Beyond the office’s unique visibility and prestige, among both citizens and their representatives in Congress, presidents may also sway lawmakers by using their discretion in budgeting and/or rulemaking, unique fundraising and campaigning capacity, control over executive and judicial nominations, veto power, or numerous other options under the chief executive’s control. Plainly, when it comes to the arm-twisting, brow-beating, and horse-trading that so often characterizes legislative battles, modern presidents are uniquely well equipped for the fight. In the following we employ the omnibus concept of ‘presidential political capital’ to capture this conception of presidents’ positive power as persuasive bargaining.1 Specifically, we define presidents’ political capital as the class of tactics White House officials employ to induce changes in lawmakers’ behavior.2 Importantly, this conception of presidents’ positive power as persuasive bargaining not only meshes with previous scholarship on lobbying (see, e.g., Austen-Smith and Wright (1994), Groseclose and Snyder (1996), Krehbiel (1998: ch. 7), and Snyder (1991)), but also presidential practice.3 For example, Goodwin recounts how President Lyndon Johnson routinely allocated ‘rewards’ to ‘cooperative’ members:

The rewards themselves (and the withholding of rewards) . . . might be something as unobtrusive as receiving an invitation to join the President in a walk around the White House grounds, knowing that pictures of the event would be sent to hometown newspapers . . . [or something as pointed as] public works projects, military bases, educational research grants, poverty projects, appointments of local men to national commissions, the granting of pardons, and more. (Goodwin, 1991: 237)

Of course, presidential political capital is a scarce commodity with a floating value. Even a favorably situated president enjoys only a finite supply of political capital; he can only promise or pressure so much. What is more, this capital ebbs and flows as realities and/or perceptions change. So, similarly to Edwards (1989), we believe presidents’ bargaining resources cannot fundamentally alter legislators’ predispositions, but rather operate ‘at the margins’ of US lawmaking, however important those margins may be (see also Bond and Fleisher (1990), Peterson (1990), Kingdon (1989), Jones (1994), and Rudalevige (2002)). Indeed, our aim is to explicate those margins and show how presidents may systematically influence them.

#### 2. Health care and climate prove winners don’t win

Lashof 10—director of the National Resource Defense Council's climate center, Ph.D. from the Energy and Resources Group at UC-Berkeley (Dan, “Coulda, Shoulda, Woulda: Lessons from Senate Climate Fail.” NRDC Switchboard Blog, http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/dlashof/coulda\_shoulda\_woulda\_lessons.html)

Lesson 2: Political capital is not necessarily a renewable resource.

Perhaps the most fateful decision the Obama administration made early on was to move healthcare reform before energy and climate legislation. I’m sure this seemed like a good idea at the time. Healthcare reform was popular, was seen as an issue that the public cared about on a personal level, and was expected to unite Democrats from all regions. White House officials and Congressional leaders reassured environmentalists with their theory that success breeds success. A quick victory on healthcare reform would renew Obama’s political capital, some of which had to be spent early on to push the economic stimulus bill through Congress with no Republican help. Healthcare reform was eventually enacted, but only after an exhausting battle that eroded public support, drained political capital and created the Tea Party movement. Public support for healthcare reform is slowly rebounding as some of the early benefits kick in and people realize that the forecasted Armageddon is not happening. But this is occurring too slowly to rebuild Obama’s political capital in time to help push climate legislation across the finish line.

#### 3. Plan isn’t a win—adding issues makes it more likely winners will lose.

Pastor 91—Professor of political science at Emory University & director of the Latin American and Caribbean Program at Emory’s Carter Center [Robert A., “Congress and U.S. Foreign Policy: Comparative Advantage or Disadvantage,” *The Washington Quarterly*, Autumn]

The third dysfunction in interbranch relations is the length of time and the amount of presidential capital needed to gain approval of a major foreign policy law or treaty. When the president makes a compelling case that the national security of the United States demands the approval of a particular bill or treaty, Congress rarely rejects him. This was true for the Panama Canal treaties and the war in the Persian Gulf. But if the policy is unpopular, the president will almost certainly have to devote a much larger proportion of his time and political capital to gaining approval for it, and he will have less time for and influence on other foreign policy issues. Also, if he needs to ask Congress repeatedly to approve an unpopular policy -- such as contra aid -- he will deplete his political capital and is likely eventually to lose the votes, as Reagan did. The increasing complexity of the world and its growing interdependence with the United States means that the agenda will grow, the trade-offs between domestic and international interests will become more delicate, and the role of Congress will increase proportionately. A few difficult issues -- like the canal treaties or contra aid -- can delay consideration of the entire foreign policy agenda for prolonged periods. Given a fixed amount of time and a limited number of decision makers, this systemic delay might be among the most important problems that stem from interbranch politics. The president must be very conscious of his agenda and very selective in his approach. Carter filled his agenda with a host of controversial issues at the beginning of his administration. Although he succeeded in gaining approval of the new Panama Canal treaties and new energy legislation, both issues were costly, and ironically, his victories left him weaker politically. Reagan learned from Carter's experience and selected a smaller, more manageable agenda. His victories -- the tax cut and the defense budget -- came more easily in Congress, and he looked stronger as a result.

### 1NC Link—Picking Winners

#### Plan insures bickering – energy debates are divisive

Addison 12—Associate Editor of E & P Magazine [Velda, Logjam Between Congress, Administration Hobbles Oil Policy, http://blogs.epmag.com/rebecca/2012/06/27/logjam-between-congress-administration-hobbles-oil-policy/]

The continued bickering between Congress and the administration of President Barack Obama continues to be a major stumbling block for the industry.

The list of industry projects and initiatives that are being undermined grows on a daily basis. These projects include offshore leasing, the Keystone XL Pipeline, hydraulic fracturing, and exporting LNG. It would be nice, I suppose, to assume that this only happens with Democrats in the White House and Republicans in Congress. But given how many different administrations from both parties have tried to create a national energy policy and how all of those efforts have foundered, it is obvious that partisanship continues to impact policy to the detriment of the country — not just between political parties but also between regions of the country, and consumers and producers. During this administration, more than others, the partisanship seems to be much more bitter and divisive. How will the country be able to overcome such rancor? Why has it been so hard to generate an energy policy given the importance of energy in every country?

Those are questions we may never answer, but we at least need to come close. It is interesting to watch other countries be clear on energy policy. Perhaps being the largest energy user in the world and expecting that energy will always be there has tainted our way of looking at a policy aimed at keeping the US running.

With competition increasing for the remaining energy supplies and environmental considerations driving fuel choices, it would seem that having an energy policy would be even more important in today’s world. Given our reliance on information technology and its need for energy to keep going, we may be headed for a different kind of logjam that we may not be ready to unravel. What if the power plants were idled and the computers shut down? Would that make it important enough to finally devise an energy policy? I would be interested in hearing some solutions to this problem. We do need an energy policy, and we can’t wait for an emergency to create it.