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#### Immigration is the top issue – has momentum to pass

THE HILL 2 – 5 – 13 [Hoyer favors Obama's immigration plan over Senate's, <http://thehill.com/homenews/house/281209-hoyer-favors-obamas-immigration-plan-over-senates>]

Hoyer's position aligns him with President Obama as lawmakers tread carefully into the immigration-reform debate that's sure to consume a great deal of Capitol Hill's political oxygen this year.

"It's somewhat a subject[ive] judgment whether the borders are secure or not secure," Hoyer told reporters in the Capitol. "Nobody believes that the borders in a democratic, open country are ever going to be totally non-porous.

"I think the two [citizenship and security] are related," he added, "but ought not to be contingent upon the other."

Often a third rail in Washington, the issue of immigration reform has moved near the top of Congress's priority list this year largely as a result of November's elections, in which more than 70 percent of Hispanic voters chose Obama over GOP contender Mitt Romney.

Hoping to undercut that trend, Republicans – long opposed to comprehensive reform, particularly so-called "amnesty" provisions that would carve a pathway to citizenship for the nation's estimated 11 million illegal immigrants – have appeared much more open to an overhaul since the election.

Last week, a bipartisan group of influential senators unveiled a sweeping package that would bolster border security and guest worker programs – both desired by Republicans – while creating a pathway to citizenship for those living in the country illegally, a demand from the Democrats.

The Senate's plan would make the citizenship benefits “contingent upon securing the border" – a step Obama rejected when he outlined a similar plan a few days later.

The House Judiciary Committee held its first hearing on the thorny subject Tuesday, with the Senate vowing to follow later this month.

Hoyer said Tuesday that he's hopeful Congress will send a comprehensive reform bill to Obama this year.

"The Democrats want to see a comprehensive immigration bill, [and] I think the Republicans, frankly, think they need to be supportive of a comprehensive immigration bill," he said. "So combine the wants and the needs [and] I think there are good prospects."

#### Obama’s role as broker is key

FOLEY 1 – 15 – 13 reporter for the Huffington Post in Washington, D.C. She previously worked at The Washington Independent [Elise Foley, Obama Gears Up For Immigration Reform Push In Second Term, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/15/obama-immigration-reform_n_2463388.html>]

Obama has repeatedly said he will push hard for immigration reform in his second term, and administration officials have said that other contentious legislative initiatives -- including gun control and the debt ceiling -- won't be allowed to get in the way. At least at first glance, he seems to have politics on his side. GOP lawmakers are entering -- or, in some cases, re-entering -- the immigration debate in the wake of disastrous results for their party's presidential nominee with Latino voters, who support reform by large measures. Based on those new political realities, "it would be a suicidal impulse for Republicans in Congress to continue to block [reform]," David Axelrod, a longtime adviser to the president, told The Huffington Post.

Now there's the question of how Obama gets there. While confrontation might work with Republicans on other issues -- the debt ceiling, for example -- the consensus is that the GOP is serious enough about reform that the president can, and must, play the role of broker and statesman to get a deal.

It starts with a lesson from his first term. Republicans have demanded that the border be secured first, before other elements of immigration reform. Yet the administration has been by many measures the strictest ever on immigration enforcement, and devotes massive sums to policing the borders. The White House has met many of the desired metrics for border security, although there is always more to be done, but Republicans are still calling for more before they will consider reform. Enforcing the border, but not sufficiently touting its record of doing so, the White House has learned, won't be enough to win over Republicans.

In a briefing with The Huffington Post, a senior administration official said the White House believes it has met enforcement goals and must now move to a comprehensive solution. The administration is highly skeptical of claims from Republicans that immigration reform can or should be done in a piecemeal fashion. Going down that road, the White House worries, could result in passage of the less politically complicated pieces, such as an enforcement mechanism and high-skilled worker visas, while leaving out more contentious items such as a pathway to citizenship for undocumented immigrants.

#### Removing drilling restrictions unpopular

Ratafia-Brown et al. 10 [EXECUTIVE SUMMARY, ANALYSIS OF THE SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF MAINTAINING OIL AND GAS EXPLORATION AND PRODUCTION MORATORIA ON AND BENEATH FEDERAL LANDS, Assessment of the Combined Relative Impacts of Maintaining Moratoria and Increased Domestic Onshore and Offshore Oil and Gas Resource Estimates, Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC), Gas Technology Institute (GTI), Jay Ratafia-Brown, SAIC, Rick Irby, SAIC, Kent Perry, GTI, February 15, 2010, http://www.naruc.org/resources.cfm?p=353]

2.1.3 Brief Overview of the Debate on Whether to Remove or Maintain the Moratoria

As noted, debate between pro- and anti-development concerns has been part of the OCS development and moratoria equation. Opposition to offshore development originated and still exists in many coastal communities, particularly in California, Florida, and some Atlantic coastal states. Opposition stems from concerns about potential environmental effects from oil spills, drilling discharges and seismic surveys to fish and other marine life and the potential effects to coastal areas, coastal wetlands and salt marshes.14 Opposition also includes concerns about potential economic impacts on other industries (such as the tourism, recreation and fishing industries) and social damage to coastal communities.15 In a statement by President Clinton on the U.S. House of Representatives action to lift the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) moratoria in 1995, he noted that “America's coastlines are simply too important to our economy and our way of life.”16 (MMS has developed a table summarizing the oil and gas exploration and production activities and their potential to impact environmental and socioeconomic resources).17

#### Key to High-Skilled – Current items don’t thump

PRESTON 1 – 12 – 13 NYT Staff [Julia Preston, Obama Will Seek Citizenship Path in One Fast Push, <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/13/us/politics/obama-plans-to-push-congress-on-immigration-overhaul.html?_r=0>]

Even while Mr. Obama has been focused on fiscal negotiations and gun control, overhauling immigration remains a priority for him this year, White House officials said. Top officials there have been quietly working on a broad proposal. Mr. Obama and lawmakers from both parties believe that the early months of his second term offer the best prospects for passing substantial legislation on the issue.

Mr. Obama is expected to lay out his plan in the coming weeks, perhaps in his State of the Union address early next month, administration officials said. The White House will argue that its solution for illegal immigrants is not an amnesty, as many critics insist, because it would include fines, the payment of back taxes and other hurdles for illegal immigrants who would obtain legal status, the officials said.

The president’s plan would also impose nationwide verification of legal status for all newly hired workers; add visas to relieve backlogs and allow highly skilled immigrants to stay; and create some form of guest-worker program to bring in low-wage immigrants in the future.

A bipartisan group of senators has also been meeting to write a comprehensive bill, with the goal of introducing legislation as early as March and holding a vote in the Senate before August. As a sign of the keen interest in starting action on immigration, White House officials and Democratic leaders in the Senate have been negotiating over which of them will first introduce a bill, Senate aides said.

“This is so important now to both parties that neither the fiscal cliff nor guns will get in the way,” said Senator Charles E. Schumer of New York, a Democrat who is a leader of the bipartisan discussions.

A similar attempt at bipartisan legislation early in Mr. Obama’s first term collapsed amid political divisions fueled by surging public wrath over illegal immigration in many states. But both supporters and opponents say conditions are significantly different now.

Memories of the results of the November election are still fresh here. Latinos, the nation’s fastest-growing electorate, turned out in record numbers and cast 71 percent of their ballots for Mr. Obama. Many Latinos said they were put off by Republicans’ harsh language and policies against illegal immigrants.

After the election, a host of Republicans, starting with Speaker John A. Boehner, said it was time for the party to find a more positive, practical approach to immigration. Many party leaders say electoral demographics are compelling them to move beyond policies based only on tough enforcement.

Supporters of comprehensive changes say that the elections were nothing less than a mandate in their favor, and that they are still optimistic that Mr. Obama is prepared to lead the fight.

“Republicans must demonstrate a reasoned approach to start to rebuild their relationship with Latino voters,” said Clarissa Martinez de Castro, the director of immigration policy at the National Council of La Raza, a Latino organization. “Democrats must demonstrate they can deliver on a promise.”

Since the election, Mr. Obama has repeatedly pledged to act on immigration this year. In his weekly radio address on Saturday, he again referred to the urgency of fixing the immigration system, saying it was one of the “difficult missions” the country must take on.

#### High skilled workers key to biotech

**Mowad 7** [Michelle, Doctor, “Cap on Visas for Skilled Foreign Workers Stifling Biotech, Tech”, San Diego Business Journal, 4-23, http://www.allbusiness.com/legal/immigration-law-passports-visas-employment/10582800-1.html]

The local biotechnology and technology industries, highly dependent on very highly skilled workers, are waiting to see if their foreign job applicants have been awarded work visas. U.S. immigration officials received twice the maximum number of applications for H-1B visas given to foreign individuals holding advanced degrees on the first day of the application process. The U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services opened the application process on April 2 for granting visas for the new fiscal year that starts Oct. 1. Because the "cap" was exceeded the first day, the USCIS will hold a lottery to select from the applicants who applied on the first and second days. There are enormous economic and health benefits to opening up employment to international candidates, said Kristie Ford with Biocom, a life sciences industry association representing 530-plus member companies in Southern California. "Biotech is an industry that is going to continue to boom, and we need a work force that fits the industry needs," she said. Domestic businesses use the H-1B program so they can hire foreign workers In occupations that require theoretical or technical expertise in specialized fields, such as accounting, architecture, education, engineering, law, mathematics, medicine and health, physics, social sciences and theology. Kevin Carroll, executive director of the San Diego chapter of the American Electronics Association, said technology businesses have a history of welcoming the best and brightest workers. He said there is a need to raise the cap. "We need more (H-1B visas) and we need them now," said Carroll, whose AeA chapter consists of 150 technology-based member businesses. He said that demand for technology employers is extremely high. The unemployment rate for engineers is significantly low at 2 percent, according to Carroll. "This has an impact on the ability of San Diego to stay competitive," he said. Carroll added that a limited number of work visas forces companies to go to extraordinary lengths for recruiting. Each year, the USCIS processes 65,000 H-1B visas. This year, the agency received 124,000 applications in the first two days. In addition, the USCIS will issue an additional 20,000 H-1B visas to foreigners who hold advanced degrees from U.S. universities. USCIS received 13,000 applications for this type of visa within the first two days of the processing period. Individuals who applied for the work visa earlier this month will now have to wait up to four weeks after April 12 before they know if they have been approved or need to leave the country. The wait and importance of H-1B visas to San Diego is at the forefront of many minds. Attorneys from the San Diego office of Duane Morris LLP will host a seminar on the current trends in employment, benefits and immigration law on April 26. Topics to be covered include H-1B visas and the caps being met so early. Lisa Spiegel, an immigration and nationality attorney with Duane Morris, said two years ago applications reached the cap amount in August. Last year, the applications reached the cap amount in May and this year on the first day. "It is a sign of the economy growing," she said. "Companies need more high-tech workers." She said highly skilled jobs in the computer and biotechnology industries are driving the need for a higher cap number. "Companies need employees with a certain level of education and skill set, and they can't find enough in the U.S. so they are willing to hire top talent from around the world, but the problem is that they can't get them into the U.S.," she said. She added that domestic companies often resort to opening foreign satellite offices because it is so difficult to bring professionals here. "The U.S. is losing out on attracting foreign workers and top talent to come here, we are losing their taxes, we are losing the company's tax base and we are losing the ability to make the U.S. a place where the top talent wants to come for graduate school," she said. And if foreigners can't be certain they can obtain a work visa after graduation from a U.S. university, they may be reluctant to attend school here, she said. "These are not people coming in illegally, these are people coming in and contributing to our country," she said. The economy of California will suffer as a result of this cap, said Spiegel. "Companies are losing workers and losing the ability to remain competitive because they cannot get enough people to staff their projects," she said. The San Diego office of Mintz Levin Cohn Ferris Glovsky and Popeo PC hosted an immigration strategies conference April 19 at Estancia La Jolla Hotel & Spa. William L. Coffman, an attorney with Mintz Levin's Boston office, was a speaker at the event. Coffman reviewed alternative visa options for foreigners who may not be awarded an H-1B visa. Biocom offers several programs aimed to attract a local and national work force. The association created a Life Sciences Success program to facilitate student internships, teacher externships and a summer life sciences boot camp to connect students and teachers with leading companies in San Diego's life sciences community. Last year, 34 students attended boot camp, 44 participated in summer internships and 18 educators carried out externships. "Bottom line is that life sciences companies need a skilled work force," said Ford, associate director of Workforce Development for Biocom. "Biocom is trying to help it two ways - we are trying to grow our homegrown work force, but then we also support raising the H-1B visa cap as well." While many companies are not optimistic applicants will receive these coveted H-1B visas, talk of immigration reform has permeated the market. For now, industry associates including Biocom and local businesses are attempting to garner support for reform to make life easier for biotechnology and technology.

#### Extinction

**Trewavas 00** [Anthony, Institute of Cell and Molecular Biology – University of Edinburgh, “GM Is the Best Option We Have”, AgBioWorld, 6-5, http://www.agbioworld.org/biotech-info/articles/biotech-art/best\_option.html]

But these are foreign examples; global warming is the problem that requires the UK to develop GM technology. 1998 was the warmest year in the last one thousand years. Many think global warming will simply lead to a wetter climate and be benign. I do not. Excess rainfall in northern seas has been predicted to halt the Gulf Stream. In this situation, average UK temperatures would fall by 5 degrees centigrade and give us Moscow-like winters. There are already worrying signs of salinity changes in the deep oceans. Agriculture would be seriously damaged and necessitate the rapid development of new crop varieties to secure our food supply. We would not have much warning. Recent detailed analyses of arctic ice cores has shown that the climate can switch between stable states in fractions of a decade. Even if the climate is only wetter and warmer new crop pests and rampant disease will be the consequence. GM technology can enable new crops to be constructed in months and to be in the fields within a few years. This is the unique benefit GM offers. The UK populace needs to much more positive about GM or we may pay a very heavy price. In 535A.D. a volcano near the present Krakatoa exploded with the force of 200 million Hiroshima A bombs. The dense cloud of dust so reduced the intensity of the sun that for at least two years thereafter, summer turned to winter and crops here and elsewhere in the Northern hemisphere failed completely. The population survived by hunting a rapidly vanishing population of edible animals. The after-effects continued for a decade and human history was changed irreversibly. But the planet recovered. Such examples of benign nature's wisdom, in full flood as it were, dwarf and make miniscule the tiny modifications we make upon our environment. There are apparently 100 such volcanoes round the world that could at any time unleash forces as great. And even smaller volcanic explosions change our climate and can easily threaten the security of our food supply. Our hold on this planet is tenuous. In the present day an equivalent 535A.D. explosion would **destroy** much of our **civilisation**. Only those with agricultural technology sufficiently advanced would have a chance at **survival**. Colliding asteroids are another problem that requires us to be forward-looking accepting that **technological advance may be the only buffer between us and annihilation**.

### 1NC—CP

#### Text: The United States federal government should repeal the Helium Privatization Act. The United States federal government should ratify the Law of the Sea Treaty. The United States Federal Government should host a summit of the leaders of the eight Arctic countries.

#### Holding an Arctic summit solves leadership

Hobson 12 - Energy and Environmental Correspondent for the National Journal White House candidates for polar summit, Iceland president tells Alaskans, Margaret Kriz Hobson, August 27, 2012, Warrant Cites Rubenstein – Co-Founder of Carlyle Group & Energy, Politics & Economics Expert, [www.eenews.net](http://www.eenews.net); and, http://www.arcticimperative.com/?page\_id=2078

The outspoken leader of the world’s smallest Arctic nation, Grimsson urged Alaskans yesterday to lobby the presidential candidates to promise to hold an Arctic summit in Alaska if they win the election in November.

“All of you in Alaska should get together and make a united effort to commit both candidates to calling a summit of the leaders of the eight Arctic countries in Alaska in the next two years,” Grimsson said at the Arctic Imperative Summit.

“That has never been done before,” he noted. “I believe that would be a very strong signal that the United States has arrived in a significant way in its proper and objective leadership role in this part of the world. … As Richard Nixon said, nothing concentrates the minds of the departments and the bureaucracies like a summit.”

#### We encourage companies to capture helium

[**Ross**](http://www.caseyresearch.com/our-staff/robert-ross) **12** - Junior Analyst@ Casey Research [[Robert Ross](http://www.caseyresearch.com/our-staff/robert-ross), “Where Has All the Helium Gone?,” Casey Research, May 3, 2012 8:02pm GMT, pg. http://www.caseyresearch.com/articles/where-has-all-helium-gone

Despite its commercial viability, the price of helium has remained at artificially low rates since the mid-1990s. Much of the supply glut is attributed to a measure passed by the US government entitled the Helium Privatization Act, which stipulated that the amount of helium sold off each year from the National Helium Reserve should follow a straight line, with the same amount being sold each year irrespective of the global demand for it.

A basic supply and demand model will tell you that when the government sets the price of any good below the market price, shortages are soon to follow. As a Boston Herald article explains, local companies that depend on helium are [already noticing rising prices and shortages](http://bostonherald.com/news/regional/view/20220426helium_prices_ballooning_gas_shortage_brings_pinch_of_inflation_to_the_party).

The federal government's involvement in the helium market began soon after helium mining developed at the turn of the century, and eventually prompted the US government to establish the National Helium Reserve in 1925. The reserve holds about one billion cubic meters – or about half of the world's helium reserves – underground in the porous rock of an unused natural gas field 30 miles north of Amarillo, TX.

This strategic reserve came in handy during World War II, since helium was a major component of military airships. The National Helium Reserve became even more important during the Cold War, since helium is used to purge rocket fuel in intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Once the government decided to sell off the strategic reserves in 1996, the market was flooded with cheap helium, causing the price of helium – which is non-renewable, like oil and natural gas – to fall through the floor. The artificially low prices were exacerbated by the government's insistence on selling off the entire reserve by 2015, regardless of price.

"The basic problem is that helium is too cheap," says Nobel laureate Robert Richardson, professor of physics at Cornell University. "The Earth is 4.7 billion years old and it has taken that long to accumulate our helium reserves, which we will dissipate in about 100 years. One generation does not have the right to determine availability forever."

In fact, helium is so cheap right now that one of its largest consumers, NASA, makes no attempt to recycle the helium used to clean its rocket fuel tanks. Why would they if it's cheaper to just buy more helium?

Professor Richardson, who believes the price of helium should rise between 20- to 50-fold to make recycling more worthwhile, cochaired an inquiry convened by the US National Research Council. The council, which is a part of the National Academy of Science, concluded that the federal government should reconsider its policy of selling off the US national helium reserve irrespective of the market price.

As of 2011, the US Geological Survey estimated that the total worldwide volume of extractable helium amounts to 51.9 billion m3, with supply concentrated in seven countries: US, Algeria, Canada, China, Qatar, Poland, and Russia. The US is by far the world's leading helium producer, with over 77% of the world's helium extracted in 2011. The US is also the largest consumer, using roughly 56 million m3 of helium (or 2.0 billion ft3) in 2011.

Much of the helium( as radioactive by-product formed in the Earth's crust) collects in natural gas deposits. But these trace amounts of helium are not worthwhile to recover at current prices; miners typically let the gas escape into the atmosphere. Only a large concentration – usually 0.3% or higher – is economically viable to retrieve.

Companies that specialize in the sale of helium and other industrial gases, such as Praxair, Inc. (NYSE.PX) and Airgas Inc. (NYSE.ARG), could reap lucrative profits if the price of helium starts to skyrocket. Further, companies involved in the exploration of natural gas, including Chesapeake Energy (NYSE.CHK) and Devon Energy Corp. (NYSE.DVN), would likely start capturing helium that escapes when harvesting natural gas.

However, private industry will have trouble keeping up with the government's basement prices: [according to the US Geological Survey](http://minerals.usgs.gov/minerals/pubs/commodity/helium/mcs-2012-heliu.pdf), the price the government charged in 2011 for crude helium was $2.70 per m3, while private industry had to charge nearly $6 per m3.

As with any commodity, when the government ignores  price signals and sets the price of a good below its market value, shortages are inevitable. Similar to the government's reaction to high gas prices in the 1970s when Nixon decreed that companies could not charge the market rate for oil, shortages followed. Allowing the government to dictate price only solves the demand problem, pushing the issue of limited supply onto businesses.

By ignoring the role of price signals in the helium market, the US government is squandering a non-renewable resource that took billions of years to develop in just a few decades. Although the market will eventually readjust to higher prices, much of our finite helium supply will be wasted until the federal government alters its policy.

### 1NC—DA 2

#### Obama’s inaugural promise to fight climate change has energized the EPA’s regulatory machine

**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.

**Obama’s signal of support for fossil fuels will curtail the EPA’s regulatory assertiveness**

**Kerpen 11** – President of American Commitment [[Phil Kerpen](http://energy.nationaljournal.com/contributors/phil-kerpen.php), “End the EPA Power Grab Completely,” National Journal, June 6, 2011 10:33 AM, pg. http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2011/06/should-epa-delay-its-airpollut.php#2006821

The day after the election President Obama said:

“Cap and trade was just one way of skinning the cat; it was not the only way. It was a means, not an end. And I’m going to be looking for other means to address this problem.”

Obama’s words were a **green light** for the EPA to pretend cap-and-trade emissions levels are law and regulate away. In fact, the abatement schedule from the failed Waxman-Markey bill was written into the president FY2012 budget request for the EPA.

Beyond the greenhouse gas regulations, the other elements of the **regulatory train** wreck only pretend to be about mercury and other traditional air pollutants. They are actually all about driving up the price of coal and oil and forcing Americans to use less energy. Consider the justification given by the Center for American Progress (CAP) for the mercury rule, listed under greenhouse gas reductions in its blueprint for the president to disregard Congress and move forward in defiance of the American people:

“Despite the rule being directed at toxics—and not greenhouse gas emissions—the new pollution-control requirements could lead to many old inefficient plants being shut down rather than attempt to achieve compliance.”

CAP is run by Obama transition team chairman John Podesta, and employed Carol Browner both before and after her stint as the White House climate czar, where she was the strategic lead on this issue.

[As I show in my new book](http://amzn.to/kx0shO), under Article I, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution, the power to make these decisions resides in Congress, not the EPA. If the EPA refuses to recognize that fact and back off, the political consequences could be severe for members of Congress who refuse to do their job and stand up to the EPA, as well as for Obama himself.

It is likely the **perception** of that political downside that is driving EPA backing off on Boiler MACT and now greenhouse gas NSPS. But if the White House really wants to avoid the political consequences for themselves and their allies, they need to call off the **power grab completely** and send a **clear public signal** that none of these regulations will ever move forward without the express authorization of Congress.

#### EPA staffers are highly sensitive—the internal link is strong and immediate.

Andreen 7—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

#### Activist EPA is needed to block the Keystone pipeline and sure-up Obama’s climate leadership

**Song 1/31**/13 [Lisa Song, “Obama's Climate Vow Elevates EPA Role in Keystone XL Review,” Bloomberg, Jan 31, 2013 10:05 AM CT, pg. http://tinyurl.com/ay4ujlm

Because the Canada-to-Nebraska oil pipeline crosses an international border, the [State Department](http://www.keystonepipeline-xl.state.gov/), not the [EPA](http://epa.gov/), will decide whether to give the project the federal permit it needs. But the EPA will weigh in during the review, and its opinion will carry new weight now that the Obama administration has vowed to make climate change a national priority.

The EPA's position will become clearer when the State Department releases its Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for the project, which it is expected to do any day now. Under the Clean Air Act, the EPA [is required](http://www.epa.gov/Compliance/basics/nepa.html) to review and comment publicly on the SEIS, and the agency has not been shy about criticizing earlier drafts.

"The EPA actually could assert a fair amount of power depending on, basically, how much they want to stick their necks out," said Jim Murphy, senior counsel at the [National Wildlife Federation](http://www.nwf.org/), which opposes the pipeline. "The level of scrutiny this is going to get is pretty intense. With each iteration this goes through, the number of eyes increases."

In 2010, the EPA [gave the first draft](http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/563143-epa-letter-1.html) its lowest rating of "inadequate," in part because the State Department [failed to estimate](http://insideclimatenews.org/news/20100727/epa-slams-state-department-proposed-oil-pipeline?page=show) the increased greenhouse emissions that would result from producing and burning the thick Canadian crude oil that would be shipped through the pipeline.

In 2011, the EPA [said a second draft](http://insideclimatenews.org/news/20110609/epa-smacks-state-department-again-oil-sands-pipeline-analysis-insufficient-keystone-Transcanada?page=show) showed improvement, but criticized it for underestimating the project's climate impacts. "We will be carefully reviewing the Final EIS to determine if it fully reflects our agreements and that measures to mitigate adverse environmental impacts are fully evaluated," EPA assistant administrator Cynthia Giles wrote [in a memo](http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/370358-epa-letter-2.html).

Oil extracted from Canada's tar sands region has an average carbon footprint that's [20 percent higher](http://insideclimatenews.org/news/20120522/adam-brandt-tar-oil-sands-canada-europe-low-carbon-fuel-directive-greenhouse-gases) than conventional oil—a point that environmentalists have repeatedly emphasized as they push for the Obama administration to reject the project.

"In terms of the future of climate change, [the use of] more and more exotic fossil fuels is a disaster," said [David Driesen](http://www.law.syr.edu/deans-faculty-staff/profile.aspx?fac=12), a law professor at Syracuse University. Driesen is an environmental law expert who has followed the Keystone XL debate from afar. He has also represented then-Senators Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton in Clean Air Act litigation.

"This is really a good opportunity early on in [Obama's second term] to send a strong signal that he's very serious about addressing climate."

If the EPA says the pipeline is "really bad for the climate," that will make it harder for Obama to let the State Department approve the project, Driesen said. "Especially after the second inaugural address where he pledged to take [climate change] seriously."

#### Keystone is game over for climate stabilization – it is the biggest carbon bomb on the planet

**Pierrehumbert 11** - Professor in the Geophysical Sciences @ University of Chicago [Raymond T. Pierrehumbert, “Keystone XL: Game over?,” Real Climate: Climate Science by Climate Scientist, 2 November 2011, pg. http://www.realclimate.org/index.php/archives/2011/11/keystone-xl-game-over/

The impending Obama administration decision on the Keystone XL Pipeline, which would tap into the Athabasca Oil Sands production of Canada, has given rise to a [vigorous grassroots opposition movement](http://www.thenation.com/blog/164082/stop-pipeline-rise-against-keystone-xl), leading to the arrests so far of over a thousand activists. At the very least, the protests have increased awareness of the implications of developing the oil sands deposits. Statements about the pipeline abound.

Jim Hansen has said that if the Athabasca Oil Sands are tapped, it’s [“essentially game over”](http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/06/27/idUS323166223820110627) for any hope of achieving a stable climate. The same news article quotes Bill McKibben as saying that the pipeline represents “the fuse to biggest carbon bomb on the planet.” Others say the pipeline is no big deal, and that the brouhaha is sidetracking us from thinking about bigger climate issues. David Keith, energy and climate pundit at Calgary University, expresses that sentiment [here](http://www.technologyreview.com/energy/38870/), and [Andy Revkin says](http://dotearth.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/09/05/can-obama-escape-the-alberta-tar-pit/) “it’s a distraction from core issues and opportunities on energy and largely insignificant if your concern is averting a disruptive buildup of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere”. There’s something to be said in favor of each point of view, but on the whole, I think Bill McKibben has the better of the argument, with some important qualifications. Let’s do the arithmetic.

There is no shortage of environmental threats associated with the Keystone XL pipeline. Notably, the route goes through the environmentally sensitive Sandhills region of Nebraska, a decision [opposed even by some supporters of the pipeline](http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2011-10-26/transcanada-s-keystone-pipeline-threatened-by-proposed-nebraska-re-routing.html). One could also keep in mind the vast areas of Alberta that are [churned up by the oil sands mining process itself](http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2007/oct/30/energy.oilandpetrol). But here I will take up only the climate impact of the pipeline and associated oil sands exploitation. For that, it is important to first get a feel for what constitutes an “important” amount of carbon.

That part is relatively easy. The kind of climate we wind up with is largely determined by the total amount of carbon we emit into the atmosphere as CO2 in the time before we finally kick the fossil fuel habit (by choice or by virtue of simply running out). The link between cumulative carbon and climate was discussed at RealClimate [here](http://www.realclimate.org/index.php/archives/2009/04/hit-the-brakes-hard/) when the papers on the subject first came out in Nature. A good introduction to the work can be found in [this National Research Council report](http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=12877) on Climate Stabilization targets, of which I was a co-author. Here’s all you ever really need to know about CO2 emissions and climate:

* The peak warming is linearly proportional to the cumulative carbon emitted
* It doesn’t matter much how rapidly the carbon is emitted
* The warming you get when you stop emitting carbon is what you are stuck with for the next thousand years
* The climate recovers only slightly over the next ten thousand years
* At the mid-range of IPCC climate sensitivity, a trillion tonnes cumulative carbon gives you about 2C global mean warming above the pre-industrial temperature.

This graph gives you an idea of what the Anthropocene climate looks like as a function of how much carbon we emit before giving up the fossil fuel habit, without even taking into account the possibility of carbon cycle feedbacks leading to a release of stored terrestrial carbon The graph is from the NRC report, and is based on simulations with the U. of Victoria climate/carbon model tuned to yield the mid-range IPCC climate sensitivity. Assuming a 50-50 chance that climate sensitivity is at or below this value, we thus have a 50-50 chance of holding warming below 2C if cumulative emissions are held to a trillion tonnes. Including deforestation, we have already emitted about half that, so our whole future allowance is another 500 gigatonnes.

The geological literature generally puts the amount of bitumen in-place at 1.7 trillion barrels (e.g. see the numbers and references quoted [here](http://aapgbull.geoscienceworld.org/cgi/content/abstract/93/2/203)). That oil in-place is heavy oil, with a density close to a metric tonne per cubic meter, so the associated carbon adds up to about 230 gigatonnes — essentially enough to close the “game over” gap. But oil-in-place is not the same as economically recoverable oil. That’s a moving target, as oil prices, production prices and technology evolve. At present, it is generally figured that only 10% of the oil-in-place is economically recoverable. However, continued development of in-situ production methods could bump up economically recoverable reserves considerably. For example [this working paper](http://www.realclimate.org/index.php/archives/2011/11/keystone-xl-game-over/www.npc.org/Study_Topic_Papers/22-TTG-Heavy-Oil.pdf) (pdf) from the National Petroleum Council estimates that Steam Assisted Gravity Drainage could recover up to 70% of oil-in-place at a cost of below $20 per barrel \*.

Aside from the carbon from oil in-place, one needs to figure in the additional carbon emissions from the energy used to extract the oil. For in-situ extraction this increases the carbon footprint by 23% to 41% (as reviewed [here](http://iopscience.iop.org/1748-9326/4/1/014005) ) . Currently, most of the energy used in production comes from natural gas (hence the push for a pipeline to pump Alaskan gas to Canada). So, we need to watch out for double-counting here, because our “game-over” estimate already assumed that the natural gas would be used for one thing or another. A knock-on effect of oil sands development is that it drives up demand for natural gas, displacing its use in electricity generation and making it more likely coal will be burned for such purposes. And if high natural gas prices cause oil sands producers to turn from natural gas to coal for energy, things get even worse, because coal releases more carbon per unit of energy produced — carbon that we have not already counted in our “game-over” estimate.

Are the oil sands really the “biggest carbon bomb on the planet”? As a point of reference, let’s compare its net carbon content with the Gillette Coalfield in the Powder river basin, one of the largest coal deposits in the world. There are 150 billion metric tons left in this deposit, according to the [USGS](http://pubs.usgs.gov/of/2008/1202/). How much of that is economically recoverable depends on price and technology. The USGS estimates that about half can be economically mined if coal fetches $60 per ton on the market, but let’s assume that all of the Gillette coal can be eventually recovered. Powder River coal is sub-bituminous, and contains only 45% carbon by weight. (Don’t take that as good news, because it has correspondingly lower energy content so you burn more of it as compared to higher carbon coal like Anthracite; Powder River coal is mined largely because of its low sulfur content). Thus, the carbon in the Powder River coal amounts to 67.5 gigatonnes, far below the carbon content of the Athabasca Oil Sands. So yes, the Keystone XL pipeline does tap into a very big carbon bomb indeed.

But comparison of the Athabaska Oil Sands to an individual coal deposit isn’t really fair, since there are only two major oil sands deposits (the other being in Venezuela) while coal deposits are widespread. [Nehring (2009)](http://rstb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/364/1532/3067.abstract) estimates that world economically recoverable coal amounts to 846 gigatonnes, based on 2005 prices and technology. Using a mean carbon ratio of .75 (again from Table 6 [here](http://cdiac.ornl.gov/pns/convert.html)), that’s 634 gigatonnes of carbon, which all by itself is more than enough to bring us well past “game-over.” The accessible carbon pool in coal is sure to rise as prices increase and extraction technology advances, but the real imponderable is how much coal remains to be discovered. But any way you slice it, coal is still the 800-gigatonne gorilla at the carbon party.

Commentators who argue that the Keystone XL pipeline is no big deal tend to focus on the rate at which the pipeline delivers oil to users (and thence as CO2 to the atmosphere). To an extent, they have a point. The pipeline would carry 500,000 barrels per day, and assuming that we’re talking about lighter crude by the time it gets in the pipeline that adds up to a piddling 2 gigatonnes carbon in a hundred years (exercise: Work this out for yourself given the numbers I stated earlier in this post). However, building Keystone XL lets the camel’s nose in the tent. It is more than a little disingenuous to say the carbon in the Athabasca Oil Sands mostly has to be left in the ground, but before we’ll do this, we’ll just use a bit of it. It’s like an alcoholic who says he’ll leave the vodka in the kitchen cupboard, but first just take “one little sip.”

So the pipeline itself is really just a skirmish in the battle to protect climate, and if the pipeline gets built despite Bill McKibben’s dedicated army of protesters, that does not mean in and of itself that it’s “game over” for holding warming to 2C. Further, if we do hit a trillion tonnes, it may be “game-over” for holding warming to 2C (apart from praying for low climate sensitivity), but it’s not “game-over” for avoiding the second trillion tonnes, which would bring the likely warming up to 4C. The fight over Keystone XL may be only a skirmish, but for those (like the fellow in [this arresting photo](http://www.rollingstone.com/politics/blogs/national-affairs/nasa-scientist-hansen-arrested-at-tar-sands-protest-a-grim-sign-of-the-times-20110831) ) who seek to limit global warming, it is an important one. It may be too late to halt existing oil sands projects, but the exploitation of this carbon pool has just barely begun. If the Keystone XL pipeline is built, it surely smooths the way for further expansions of the market for oil sands crude. Turning down XL, in contrast, draws a line in the oil sands, and affirms the principle that this carbon [shall not pass](http://www.realclimate.org/images//balrog.jpg) into the atmosphere.

#### Failure risks a planetary die-off – Geologic history is on our side

**Bushnell 10** - Chief scientist at the NASA Langley Research Center [Dennis Bushnell (MS in mechanical engineering. He won the Lawrence A. Sperry Award, AIAA Fluid and Plasma Dynamics Award, the AIAA Dryden Lectureship, and is the recipient of many NASA Medals for outstanding Scientific Achievement and Leadership.) “Conquering Climate Change,” The Futurist, May-June, 2010

Carbon-dioxide levels are now greater than at any time in the past 650,000 years, according to data gathered from examining ice cores. These increases in CO2 correspond to estimates of man-made uses of fossil carbon fuels such as coal, petroleum, and natural gas. The global climate computations, as reported by the ongoing Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) studies, indicate that such man-made CO2 sources could be responsible for observed climate changes such as temperature increases, loss of ice coverage, and ocean acidification. Admittedly, the less than satisfactory state of knowledge regarding the effects of aerosol and other issues makes the global climate computations less than fully accurate, but we must take this issue very seriously.

I believe we should act in accordance with the precautionary principle: When an activity raises threats of harm to human health or the environment, precautionary measures become obligatory, even if some cause-and-effect relationships are not fully established scientifically. As paleontologist Peter Ward discussed in his book Under a Green Sky, several “warming events” have radically altered the life on this planet throughout geologic history. Among the most significant of these was the Permian extinction, which took place some 250 million years ago. This event resulted in a decimation of animal life, leading many scientists to refer to it as the Great Dying. The Permian extinction is thought to have been caused by a sudden increase in CO2 from Siberian volcanoes. The amount of CO2 we’re releasing into the atmosphere today, through human activity, is 100 times greater than what came out of those volcanoes.

During the Permian extinction, a number of chain reaction events, or “positive feedbacks,” resulted in oxygen-depleted oceans, enabling overgrowth of certain bacteria, producing copious amounts of hydrogen sulfide, making the atmosphere toxic, and decimating the ozone layer, all producing species die-off. The positive feedbacks not yet fully included in the IPCC projections include the release of the massive amounts of fossil methane, some 20 times worse than CO2 as an accelerator of warming, fossil CO2 from the tundra and oceans, reduced oceanic CO2 uptake due to higher temperatures, acidification and algae changes, changes in the earth’s ability to reflect the sun’s light back into space due to loss of glacier ice, changes in land use, and extensive water evaporation (a greenhouse gas) from temperature increases.

The additional effects of these feedbacks increase the projections from a 4°C–6°C temperature rise by 2100 to a 10°C–12°C rise, according to some estimates. At those temperatures, beyond 2100, essentially all the ice would melt and the ocean would rise by as much as 75 meters, flooding the homes of one-third of the global population. Between now and then, ocean methane hydrate release could cause major tidal waves, and glacier melting could affect major rivers upon which a large percentage of the population depends. We’ll see increases in flooding, storms, disease, droughts, species extinctions, ocean acidification, and a litany of other impacts, all as a consequence of man-made climate change. Arctic ice melting, CO2 increases, and ocean warming are all occurring much faster than previous IPCC forecasts, so, as dire as the forecasts sound, they’re actually conservative. Pg. 7-8

### 1NC Solvency

#### The plan is a nat gas only drilling policy—no company will take the risk

MarEx 11 [Maritime Executive, “Gas-Only Drilling in Offshore Moratorium Areas Suggested,” January 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."

### 1NC Offshore Development

#### Squo solves their shipbuilding internal – Our ev is predictive

SF Chronicle 2/8/13 [“Global Military Shipbuilding and Submarines Industry Market Research Report from IBISWorld has Been Updated,” Published 9:00 am, Friday, February 8, 2013 <http://www.sfgate.com/business/prweb/article/Global-Military-Shipbuilding-and-Submarines-4262420.php#ixzz2Kb40wAn7>

Despite the massive effect of the global recession on builders of commercial aircraft and ships, companies primarily involved in the building of their military equivalents fared considerably better. The national security considerations of governments and long-term planning undertaken for military expenditure have ensured that revenue for the [Global Military Shipbuilding and Submarines industry](http://www.ibisworld.com/industry/global/global-military-shipbuilding-submarines.html?partnerid=prweb) has been relatively stable. IBISWorld expects that industry revenue will increase at an annualized 1.2% in the five years through 2012 to reach $38.9 billion. “This growth is primarily attributed to the demand for military ships and boats to protect coastal waters and to expand and renew navy fleet sizes,” says IBISWorld industry analyst [Antonio Danova](http://www.sfgate.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=business%2Fprweb&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Antonio+Danova%22). “The contributions to industry revenue are particularly strong from North America, Europe and North Asia.” Government military budget cuts are forecast to lead to slower revenue growth of 0.3% in 2012.

Profit margins have been relatively stable over the past five years, stemming from the contractual and long-term nature of ship builds. Nonetheless, profit margins declined slightly in the aftermath of the global downturn. Customer countries burdened with high levels of government debt started cutting defense spending, which put pressure on industry margins. “The [Global Military Shipbuilding and Submarines industry](http://www.ibisworld.com/industry/global/global-military-shipbuilding-submarines.html?partnerid=prweb) was able to reclaim previous profitability levels through capacity cuts,” adds Danova. “Profit margins are expected to remain stable over the next five years due to the stability of military demand and naval spending.” The industry has a medium level of market share concentration; the primary reasons for this concentration are the relatively high barriers to entry and a few buyers dominating the market. For example, the dominant buyer, the [US Department of Defense](http://www.sfgate.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=business%2Fprweb&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22US+Department+of+Defense%22), accounts for about half of worldwide naval product purchases. Other large markets include Europe, the Middle East and Asia. In addition, the costs associated with manufacturing military ships, boats and components are very high. Therefore, customers usually award contracts to existing players with proven experience, such as major companies [General Dynamics Corporation](http://www.sfgate.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=business%2Fprweb&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22General+Dynamics+Corporation%22), [Huntington Ingalls Industries](http://www.sfgate.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=business%2Fprweb&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Huntington+Ingalls+Industries%22), Direction des [Construction Navales and Thales Group](http://www.sfgate.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=business%2Fprweb&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Construction+Navales+and+Thales+Group%22). Concentration is expected to remain at this level as significant research and development is required to develop new products and innovation in the defense area.

Revenue is projected to continue growing in the five years through 2017. The increase in revenue will stem from stable growth in defense budgets, particularly in the United States, and a focus on advanced electronics and information systems capabilities. An increase in naval manufacturing in emerging countries is also anticipated. For more information, visit IBISWorld’s [Global Military Shipbuilding and Submarines industry](http://www.ibisworld.com/industry/global/global-military-shipbuilding-submarines.html?partnerid=prweb) report page.

#### Their NLUS evidence lists 9 necessary policy responses – the AFF does none of them—we’ll insert this into the debate

**NLUS 12** [a nonprofit organization dedicated to educating our citizens about the importance of sea power to U.S. national security and supporting the men and women of the U.S. Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard and U.S.-flag Merchant Marine and their families (Navy League of the United States, “Maritime Primacy & Economic Prosperity: Maritime Policy 2012-13”, Navy League of the United States, 1/21/12, http://www.navyleague.org/files/legislative\_affairs/maritime\_policy20122013.pdf]

**Their Evidence Ends**

The Navy League of the United States supports:

■ The Maritime Security Act that provides the foundation to support the U.S. commercial fleet in international trade and an economically viable U.S.-flag Merchant Marine for national defense and economic security.

■ The Jones Act and Passenger Vessel Act, which are important to economic and national security because they protect critical national infrastructure and provide added sealift capacity through the VISA, an expanded pool of trained and experienced mariners to crew U.S. government-owned sealift assets and help sustain the U.S. shipbuilding and repair industrial base that is vital to the U.S. Navy and Coast Guard.

■ Full compliance with the U.S. Cargo Preference Laws by government agencies and shippers, as a necessary and critical component to the long-term sustainability of the U.S.-flag fleet. Without this commercial capability, the U.S. government will be required to provide significantly more funds to build a replacement fleet and infrastructure while losing the pool of highly qualified Mariners needed to sail these vessels. These laws include the Jones Act, Passenger Vessel Act, DoD and Foreign Aid cargoes.

16 NLUS MARITIME POLICY 2012–13U.S. commercial and government- owned vessels, manned by 5,000 U.S. Mariners, played a significant and indispensable role in strategic sealift support for Iraq operations and continue to supply operations in Afghanistan.

The guided-missile cruiser USS Cape St. George and the Nimitz-class aircraft carrier USS Abraham Lincoln conduct a replenishment at sea on Jan. 21, 2012, with the Military Sealift Command fleet replenishment oiler USNS Guadalupe. Abraham Lincoln and Cape St. George were deployed in the Arabian Sea as part of the Abraham Lincoln Carrier Strike Group.

■ Budgetary and legislative measures, including capital and operations- related changes in U.S. tax laws, Mariner income tax exclusion and the harmonization of domestic and international regulations to improve the competitive position of the U.S.-flag fleet in the world marketplace.

■ GrowingtheMSPfleet,asrequirementswarrant,forbothsurgeandsus- tainment operations. Also, full, long-term funding for the program. Replacing the lift capability of this fleet would cost the DoD $9 billion.

■ Fullfunding,atauthorizedlevels,formeetingtheoperationalandmainte- nance requirements and capital improvements at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy and federal assistance at the six state maritime academies for the Student Incentive Program and Training Ships. This will ensure the long- term availability of licensed Mariners to serve the nation’s needs.

■ A strong strategic sealift Merchant Reserve component in the U.S. Navy to ensure that critical Mariner skills and experience are retained to sup- port Navy and strategic sealift transportation.

■ The combined government and industry efforts to counter piracy by placing armed guards aboard ships and introducing new technologies to prevent hijacking.

■ Legislation for the Department of Veterans Affairs to treat Merchant Marine veterans of World War II as they do all other veterans.

#### Empirical studies prove the navy is not capable of deterring threats

Daniel 2 [Donald C.F. “The Future of American Naval Power: Propositions and Recommendations,” Globalization and American Power. Chapter 27. Institute for National Strategic Studies National Defense University, http://www.ndu.edu/inss/Books/Books\_2002/Globalization\_and\_Maritime\_Power\_Dec\_02/0 1\_toc.htm]

In sum, there would seem to be a special role for the U.S. Navy in contingency response along littorals, but, outside the context of a specific crisis, constant day-to-day presence does not do much to deter unwanted behavior. Thus, it would seem a raising of false expectations to argue, for example, that the “gapping of aircraft carriers in areas of potential crisis is an invitation to disaster—and therefore represents culpable negligence on the part of America’s defense decision-makers.”33 In the early 1960s, the United States maintained three aircraft carrier battlegroups in the Mediterranean Sea but later gradually found that it needed to scale back. Currently, a single battlegroup operates there for less than 9 months of the year on average. This is a significant reduction, but no one can prove that the Mediterranean region became less stable. Conversely, the Navy began to maintain a regular presence in the Arabian Gulf in 1979, but this did not prevent Iran or Iraq from attacking ships during their war. In the 1980s, attacks generally increased in number over the 8 years of the war. As for deterring the initiation of a crisis in the first place, it is essentially impossible for an outsider to prove that such deterrence was successful except in the rare case in which a deterred party admits that he was deterred and states the reasons. Adam Siegel, John Arquilla, Paul Huth, Paul Davis, and a Rutgers Center for Global Security and Democracy team led by Edward Rhodes have each attempted to study the effects of forward presence and general deterrence. The deficiency of such study is always in making the definitive link between them. The majority of these studies suggest that “[h]istorically seapower has not done well as a deterrent” in preventing the outbreak of conflicts, principally because land-based powers not dependent on overseas trade are relatively “insensitive” to the operations of naval forces.

### 1NC Artic

#### 3. Arctic coop is high – The risk of war is low

**Grätz 12** - Researcher @ Center for Security Studies [Jonas Grätz, “[The Arctic: Thaw With Conflict Potential](http://www.isn.ethz.ch/isn/Digital-Library/Articles/Special-Feature/Detail/?lng=en&id=157901&tabid=1453469894&contextid774=157901&contextid775=157922),” International Relations and Security Network, July 2012, Pg. http://www.isn.ethz.ch/isn/Digital-Library/Articles/Special-Feature/Detail/?lng=en&id=157901&contextid774=157901&contextid775=157922&tabid=1453469894

Prospects for cooperation

Against the background of the changes in the Arctic, this region is occasionally identified as a potential area of future conflict. However, it is important first to point out that there is much scope for cooperation. This is particularly apparent when considering “soft” security concerns such as environmental pollution resulting from the extraction of raw materials. The threats that arise for humans from the exceptional climatic situations are pushing actors towards cooperative approaches, too. Many of these issues are taken on by the Arctic Council. Founded in 1996, the Council is a forum to promote coordination among the eight Arctic countries. Representatives of indigenous peoples have a consultative role. One concrete result of the Arctic Council is a binding agreement on maritime search and rescue activities. For 2013, an agreement on standards for oil spill preparedness and response is expected, which will reinforce the current non-binding offshore oil and gas guidelines.

Cooperation among the littoral states is also advancing in the sensitive area of national sovereign rights. The 2010 border treaty between Russia and Norway indicates that bilateral agreements are possible – even though the power asymmetry between the two countries is reflected in a deal advantageous to Russia. International maritime law and the pressure of non-Arctic countries are also fostering multilateral cooperation, at least in areas where all parties can still gain further sovereign rights. The United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) allows for the extension of the continental shelf towards the North Pole, which would extend the mining privileges of the coastal states at the expense of the interests of non-Arctic states. The water column and the animals living in it, by contrast, would continue to enjoy international status. In the Ilulissat Declaration adopted in 2008, the coastal states declared their intention to settle any territorial conflicts within the framework of UNCLOS. By signing the declaration, the US – which has not ratified UNCLO S – has signalled its willingness to observe it within the Arctic. What is more, the coastal states have been collaborating for a long time in the exploration of the sea bed. Provided that there are no major conflicts among these countries, non- Arctic players will hardly be able to assert themselves in this context. Potential for conflict The scope of sovereign rights in the maritime area around the Svalbard archipelago, believed to be rich in oil and gas, is a question that is not easy to resolve. On the one hand, the archipelago and the surrounding 200-mile zone are an undisputed part of Norwegian territory. On the other hand, Norwegian sovereignty over the archipelago is substantially limited by the Svalbard Treaty of 1920. All 40 signatory countries have the right to exploit natural resources and to conduct research. The treaty also states that the archipelago must not be used for offensive military purposes. Likewise, the right to levy taxes is limited to the administrative requirements of Svalbard. It was only later under UNCLO S that the EEZ emerged as an institution. Hence, it remains unclear whether the Svalbard Treaty also applies to this zone. Countries such as Russia, Iceland, and the UK assume this to be the case. Norway takes the opposite view. Nevertheless, Oslo has not declared a full EEZ in this area, but established a fisheries protection zone instead. It concedes fishing privileges to Russia, Iceland, and other nations. This has never been explicitly acknowledged by these countries, but is usually accepted in practice.

The modus vivendi has so far provided stability as it has served Russian interests too, with the fisheries protection zone granting privileges to Russian fishing interests over other signatory states. Moreover, Russia has sufficient oil and gas reserves at its disposal on its own territory. Norway, by contrast, has a strong interest in opening up the area for oil and gas exploration. Such an opening, however, would undermine the current fragile balance and encourage other signatory states to question openly the scope of the Treaty. Even if Norway were to take no action, other nations could try to push for an opening of the area for exploration with reference to the Treaty. Due to the variety of the players concerned and the absence of international rules, the issue can ultimately only be resolved at a political level.

Interests and positions diverge concerning the issue of sovereignty over the new sea routes as well. Again, even the Arctic coastal states do not agree on the legal status: Russia and Canada regard the routes as internal waterways in what is a very broad interpretation of UNCLO S. This implies that ships flying foreign flags must request permission for transit. Other coastal nations, such as the US, and non-Arctic players like the EU and presumably China, however, consider these to be international waterways for which no authorisation for transit is necessary.

For the time being, no escalation of this conflict is to be expected, since the commercial navigation routes are competing with non-Arctic sea routes and the use of these routes will correlate with the extent of their opening and the stability of the agreed arrangements. In addition, Russia and Canada depend on the cooperation of foreign non-state and state-owned players in order to attract investments in their inadequate coastal infrastructures. Also, the International Maritime Organisation is working on a binding Polar Code, which will establish clear rules for polar navigation. This will weaken the case for additional national regulations and approval procedures.

Defensive and offensive military capabilities

Following the disarmament of the 1990s, new military capabilities are again being deployed in the Arctic. In many instances, these capabilities are defensive in nature and linked to intensified activities concerning either the extraction of raw materials or new “soft” security issues. Due to the weather conditions, only military or coast guard assets tend to be able to safely operate under Arctic conditions. In light of the new possibilities, there is also a growing awareness of the lack of surveillance capabilities for the territory and the enforcement of sovereignty. Particularly for countries like Canada and Denmark, building up policing and military capabilities serves to avoid the impression that the Arctic is of little national interest.

However, offensive capabilities are also being built up in the Arctic, reflecting global ambitions rather than changing regional dynamics. Since the Arctic Ocean provides Russia’s best access to the world’s main oceans, two thirds of its navy are already stationed in the Arctic. Instead of upgrading border protection capabilities, Moscow so far has focused on modernising its offensive capabilities for the purpose of power projection. What is more, Russia has resumed patrol flights over the Arctic and submarine patrols previously carried out during the Cold War, albeit at a lower frequency. This testifies to the persistence of a rather traditional Russian threat perception.

Today, the Arctic is characterised by a mixture of cooperation, competition, and conflicts of interest. There are indications that the growing presence of non-Arctic players prompts more cooperation among the coastal states. Open conflicts are unlikely to break out in the foreseeable future: While existing mechanisms for cooperation may be too weak to resolve some conflicts of interest, the costs of military conflict will likely be considered too high in light of uncertain gains. If conflicts were to occur, they would probably be limited in both time and space, aiming at the enforcement of interpretations of international law. Having said that, as the involvement of all key political players increases, the Arctic is also the scene of overarching geo-strategic competition and conflict. The extent to which the thawing of the Arctic means conflict or rapprochement and cooperation will therefore also depend on the shape of the future world order and the relationships between the different power centres.

#### 4. Lack of a US military presence prevents a great power war. Drilling removes that impediment

**Wezeman 12** - Senior Researcher with the SIPRI Arms Transfers Programme [Siemon T. Wezeman, “MILITARY CAPABILITIES IN THE ARCTIC,” SIPRI Background Paper, March 2012

VI. The United States One of George W. Bush’s final acts as US President was the presentation in January 2009 of an Arctic Policy, replacing the previous policy from 1994. It lists security as the first of six policy priorities.73 Later in 2009 the US Navy published an ‘Arctic roadmap’ as a guide for its policy, strategy and investments in the Arctic.74 However, Arctic security concerns play only a minor role in overall US defence policy. The US National Security Strategy, issued in 2010 by the administration of President Barack Obama, and the US National Military Strategy, issued in 2011, define the goals of US security and military policies but mention the Arctic only in passing.75 The Arctic is not mentioned at all in a January 2012 document outlining security priorities for the 21st century.76 Because of the increased commercial activity in the Arctic, Admiral Robert Papp, commandant of the US Coast Guard since May 2010, has expressed the need to begin preparing, with partners, for operations in the Arctic, including establishing bases. However, he also recognizes that US ‘strategic interests’ in the region are not yet prominent enough to support anything but ‘outreach, planning, and small-scale summer deployments’.77 The USA has not yet announced plans for a separate command to super- vise military operations in the Arctic. Currently, the Northern Command (USNORTHCOM), the Pacific Command (USPACOM) and the European Command (USEUCOM) all have responsibilities in the Arctic region.78 However, from 2011 USNORTHCOM has been assigned responsibility for Arctic planning and for coordination with other US and foreign government agencies.79 US forces in Alaska fall under the Alaskan Command (ALCOM), which is part of USPACOM.80 ALCOM consists of 16 000 regular personnel and 3700 National Guard and reserve personnel. The USA also has a presence in Antarctica and experiences from there, such as for example supply by air, are applicable in the Arctic region.81 pg. 11

#### 5. US will militarize the Arctic to protect the drillers’ interest – They are on the wrong side of the link debate

**Backus 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" \l "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" \l "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.

#### 7. EU solves the environment component of the advantage – It is already taking the lead

[**Ralli**](http://www.neurope.eu/author/elena-ralli) **1/21**/13 - Journalist @ New Europe [[Elena Ralli](http://www.neurope.eu/author/elena-ralli), “EU to enhance contribution to Arctic cooperation,” | New Europe, January 21, 2013 - 2:50pm Pg. http://www.neurope.eu/article/eu-enhance-contribution-arctic-cooperation

European Commissioner for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries, Maria Damanaki spoke today at the Arctic Frontiers Conference taking place between 20-25 January in Tromsø, Norway, addressing the issues of protection and economic development of the Arctic.

As Commissioner Damanaki stated: “We cannot limit ourselves to listening and exchanging views: I think it is time for us to take action. The Arctic is heating up, literally and figuratively. It is urgent that we agree on an appropriate course of action together.”

In addition, she highlighted EU’s contribution to the Arctic region, which includes granting €20 million per year for research. The results of these research projects are used by policymakers as to make strategic choices on climate change adaptation. Also the EU has put over one billion euros into the region's economic development since 2007.

Furthermore, she stated that the EU is planning to enhance its contribution to the Arctic cooperation. In particular, it will promote knowledge sharing and scientific excellence by establishing closer links with researchers from all over the world and setting up joint research stations in the region.

Commissioner Damanaki also added that the countries directly surrounding the Arctic and indigenous people should decide whether to exploit the region or not. Moreover, she stressed that EU is already working closely with mining companies and researchers to come up with safe practices for the environmentand that aregulatory framework is necessary to guarantee the conservation and appropriate management of fish stocks.

She also underlined that EU wants to cooperate with its Arctic partners to address any challenges, such as environmental protection, greener technologies, research cooperation and economic development. Finally, she concluded that EU is discussing Arctic research cooperation with Canada, the US and the Arctic Council working groups and opening dialogue on the matter with Norway and Iceland.

### 1NC—Helium

#### 1. We have a 300 years supply

Worstall 8/27/12—Fellow @ Adam Smith Institute in London [Tim Worstall, “What Great Helium Shortage?,” Forbes 8/27/12, pg. http://www.forbes.com/sites/timworstall/2012/08/27/what-great-helium-shortage/

We’re being regaled again with stories about how the world is running out of a resource. This time it’s helium and as ever, the story is driven by people not really understanding what a resource [actually is](http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2194060/Is-party-helium-balloons-Fears-global-shortage-gas-send-prices-sky-high.html).

The party could soon be over for the balloon industry as a global shortage of helium sends prices sky high.

Industry experts have warned that the floating balloon could be a thing of the past by the end of the decade as demand for the gas continues to outstrip supply capabilities.

Sounds scary, eh? The thing is there’s a confusion here between the current extraction infrastructure and the total amount of the element available to us.

Helium is usually generated as a byproduct of natural gas mining, the shortage could also be attributed in part to the recession which has slowed natural gas production.

The US provides 75 per cent of the six billion cubic feet of helium used worldwide every year.

A pipeline in Texas which provided 30 per cent of the global supply was closed for maintenance in July, with a major Wyoming plant running below capacity since June.

Production shortfalls and repairs at plants in Algeria, Poland and Australia have also hit supplies.

It is absolutely true that prices are currently tight. That parts of the current production system are closed down and thus supplies are lower than usual. However, this is not the same as stating that we’re actually running out of the stuff. The source for the real numbers is, for an element, always the US Geological Survey. Their [helium note](http://minerals.usgs.gov/minerals/pubs/commodity/helium/mcs-2012-heliu.pdf) tells us that current global consumption is around 180 million cubic metres a year. There’s something like 50 billion cubic metres lying around out there. That’s a near 300 year supply at current usage rates.

Another way of putting this is that sure, party balloons are a bit more expensive right now but there’s no worry over whether our great great grandchildren will still be able to have them.

#### 3. No interest in helium production

Popular Mechanic 6/25/12 [“Why Is There a Helium Shortage?,” June 25, 2012 12:06 PM, pg. http://www.popularmechanics.com/science/health/med-tech/why-is-there-a-helium-shortage-10031229]

Where Congress once mandated that the federal government keep a reserve of this crucial gas, it reversed course several decades later. In 1996, Congress moved to privatize the federal helium program, requiring all of the government’s helium supplies to be sold off by 2015. "The legislation in 1996 says we were supposed to get out of the helium business," says Joe Peterson, the Bureau of Land Management’s assistant field manager for helium in Amarillo. "The hope was by 2015, by the time the reserve was sold down, that new sources of helium would be online and take up the demand. However, it has not happened yet."   
Though new private helium production plants are set to come online in the coming years—including a Wyoming plant expected to open later this year—private industry hasn’t been as interested in producing helium as Congress hoped. Until more companies begin producing helium on their own, consumers are left with spiking prices and tightening supplies.

## \*\*\* 2NC

### 2NC Overview—Warming

#### Second is disease—warming causes it by causing overgrowth of bacteria, that’s Bushnell—impact is extinction.

Dorit 6—Professor of Biological Sciences @ Smith College [Robert L. Dorit, “Something Wicked This Way Comes,” American Scientist, January-February 2006, http://www.americanscientist.org/bookshelf/pub/something-wicked-this-way-comes]

The H5N1 strain now causing concern worldwide is present in domesticated and wild birds and has seldom been seen in the human population. Thus exposure to, or vaccination against, previous strains of flu confers no protection against it. The current H5N1 strain is also unusually virulent, with mortality rates approaching 50 percent. But neither its novelty nor its virulence guarantees an epidemic. So far, H5N1 does not appear to have cracked the code for human-to-human transmission; all but a few cases are clearly the result of bird-to-human transmission. But how many mutations away is the virus from acquiring the ability to move from one person to another?

Davis points out that previous epidemics offer tantalizing but inconclusive clues to the answer. The recently reconstituted genome of the 1918 strain bears a troubling resemblance to the genome of the current H5N1 strain, although it also differs subtly from H5N1 at virtually every gene. The keys to the lethality and transmissibility of the 1918 strain lie somewhere in those differences. But no single genetic change appears to turn an ordinary flu strain into a lethal killer. We can take some small measure of comfort from the fact that multiple mutations must be present simultaneously to set the conditions for a human pandemic.

We know little about the evolutionary trajectory that results in human-to-human transmission. Genetic changes may have to occur in a specific order for the virus to survive every step of its metamorphosis into an aggressive killer. But the specter looms in the background that in one fell swoop H5N1 could undergo antigenic shift: It could acquire a genomic fragment from a strain already adapted for survival and movement in a human host and be effectively catapulted into the role of widespread killer.

Davis does an exemplary job of guiding readers through the intricacies of viral genetics, but he reminds us that the molecular basis of virulence and transmissibility is but one part of the story. We can do little to control the evolutionary excursions of the influenza genome, but we can alter the human ecology that makes pandemics possible. The Monster at Our Door is a call for human solidarity and for the internationalization of monitoring and prevention efforts.

As Davis emphasizes, the notion that the influenza pandemic can be stopped at our country's borders and the belief that American medicine is a sufficient bulwark against such a threat are unsupportable. Ultimately, the irony of the early 21st century could turn out to be the return of infectious diseases, old and new, as the prevailing threats to human survival. It will take what is best in our species—solidarity, inventiveness and cooperation—to keep the past from becoming the future.

### U: EPA cracking heads

#### Obama’s moving forward with EPA regs

**Politico 2/9**/13 [A[NDREW RESTUCCIA](http://www.politico.com/reporters/AndrewRestuccia.html) | “State of the Union 2013: On climate, which Obama will show up Tuesday night?,” 2/9/13 4:42 PM EST, pg. http://tinyurl.com/bc7dt2y

Now, past his reelection worries, Obama put climate back atop the agenda in last month’s inaugural address. Supporters say they’re expecting much of the same in Tuesday’s State of the Union speech, with more focus on actions the administration is preparing to pursue.

“You’re going to like what you hear,” White House aides have told green groups, according to an official at one environmental organization who expects the president to publicly commit to moving forward with EPA climate regulations.

### I Lk: EPA Solves

#### EPA action restores US climate leadership and facilitates a global response

**Elver 1/29/**13 - Research Professor @University of California Santa Barbara, and the co-director of the Climate Change, Human Security and Democracy Project. [Hilal Elver, “How serious is Obama about climate change?,” Al Jazeera, Last Modified: 29 Jan 2013 11:38, pg. http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2013/01/20131281401715581.html

During the 2012 presidential campaign, Obama's silence about climate change was troublesome, and his several trips to coal mining states seemed hardly reassuring. Environmentalists lost confidence in Obama on climate change policy, and for that reason, the emphasis in his inaugural speech came as something of a surprise. Perhaps, it should have been expected.

Just a few days before election day in early November of last year, superstorm Sandy devastated a portion of the East Coast of the United Sates, and thanks to public officials in New York and New Jersey, Obama was given a fresh opportunity to show leadership and bipartisanship in relation to an environmental crisis. This catastrophic event that comes with more than an $80 billion price tag affected a region that was already struggling to get out of an economic recession. It convinced many Americans, at least briefly, about the seriousness of climate change and its responsibility in the rising frequency of extreme weather events.

Right after Sandy, a nationwide poll conducted by Rasmussen showed that 68 percent of American voters see global warming as a serious problem, an increase from 46 percent in 2009. Moreover, just a few days before the inauguration, the "2013 Draft National Climate Assessment Report" - a domestic version of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) reports - was released by the Federal Advisor Committee, and supported through the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) setting forth a bleak account of the adverse impacts of climate change in the United States. According to the report, July 2012 was the hottest month of more than 1,400 measured since 1895.

These impacts take the form of drought, flood, extreme weather, and as a consequence, cause significant damage to American agriculture and the overall economy.

Backed up by convincing scientific evidence and the fact that the American public now expects reasonable attention to climate change from its government, Obama's emphasis on climate change as a growing threat to "future generations", might be interpreted as nothing very special. Many Americans and the international public now expect Obama to take some concrete steps, and only then will they will be truly impressed with his willingness to assume the mantle of environmental leader. In effect, Obama must now convince the world that he is not only talking the talk but walking the walk.

Battling the naysayers

Conservative media, sectors of the political establishment, and climate change deniers have been quick to respond, calling Obama an "environmental extremist", which while wildly off the mark, may be a tad closer to reality than were the earlier attacks that labelled him a "socialist".

The conservative bloc promised its followers that they will never allow Obama to sacrifice jobs or cause the American economy to decline due to his irresponsible proposals put forward to deal with climate change. Moreover, these critical voices immediately raised doubts about the validity of claims about the alleged cau This highly proposed controversial pipeline carrying shale oil has a route that would run the length of North America starting in Alberta, Canada and passing through several states until it ends up in Texas. The approval of the pipeline is being ardently promoted by many members of Congress, including some who belonging to Obama's political party. Environmental activists are organising major demonstrations scheduled to take place on February 14.

The prominent environmentalist, writer and activist, Bill McKibben insists that if Obama is serious about a commitment to climate change he must demonstrate it by rejecting the Keystone Pipeline Project.

Restoring environmental leadership

This pipeline controversy is a clear example of the clash of competing economic and environmental interests: on one side, the promise of job creation, cheaper oil and natural gas, and energy supplies that will free the United States from its dependence on Middle Eastern sources of oil; on the other side, environmental destruction, a heightened risk of destructive oil spills, and more importantly, an increase in GHG emissions. There is intense countervailing political pressures being directed at Obama by advocates of these two opposing positions.

At the national level, members of Congress, who are long known for their environment friendly agenda, have recently announced the formation of a "Bicameral Climate Change Task Force". They urged the President to focus on three priority areas: (1) fulfilling the 2009 pledge made at Copenhagen to reduce GHG emissions by the pledged amount; (2) support the development of innovative clean energy technology; (3) give priority to the protection of the most vulnerable regions in the country  that are being most harmed by and at risk due to climate change. The first issue is the most controversial for anti-globalist Republicans and oil and gas company lobbyists.

This agenda needs significant regulatory action. This will help Obama to take over global environmental leadership in November 2013 at the important Warsaw Conference of the Parties meeting of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

Considering the Republican allergy to climate change related regulations, Obama most likely will have to rely on executive actions to circumvent Congressional resistance to his environmental agenda. This is not going to be an easy path, as Democrats harshly criticised reliance on such executive powers during the Bush presidency in relation to contested measures taken on behalf of the war on terror. This new confrontation over presidential authority threatens now to turn into a war over climate change.

The Federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is already one of the public institutions that Republicans do not miss any opportunity to attack, even planning to shut it down completely if their candidate had been elected last November. The EPA was given the legal responsibility following the 2007 US Supreme Court decision to regulate carbon emissions under the Clean Air Act. Implementation of this decision was put on hold during the Bush presidency, but now the EPA seems ready, and politically able, to take on the job.

Besides the EPA, the State Department role on global climate change policy and the Energy Department approach to energy related issues are likely to be subjected to harsh attacks from anti-environmental true believers, starting at the confirmation hearings for each of the appointed heads of these organs of government. At the end of the day, Obama is likely to have a tough time whichever path he decides to follow as recourse for the promotion of environmental goals to either executive power or legislative authorisation is likely to encounter strong resistance.

There are sure to be stumbling blocks on the path to the kind of global environmental leadership that the international community has long needed. Arguably ever since the historic 1972 Stockholm Conference on Human Environment, the US lost the legitimacy of its effort to provide environmental leadership in global level. It will not be easy to reclaim it, but if Obama succeeds on this environmental battlefield first in the national level, and then pursues environmental protection goals at global level, the reputation of his presidency will rise significantly, and the prospects for a meaningful response to the challenge of climate change will greatly improve.

#### And, domestic regulatory politics are key – They restore US environmental leadership and boost support for multilateral environmental agreements

**Kelemen & Vogel 09** – Professor of Poli Sci @ Rutgers University & Professor of Poli Sci @ UC-Berkeley [Dr. R. Daniel Kelemen & Dr. David Vogel, “Trading Places: The Role of the United States and the European Union in International Environmental Politics,” Comparative Political Studies, November 2009 43(4) pg. 427–456

A “regulatory politics” model (DeSombre, 2005; Raustiala, 1997) that¶ synthesizes the effects of domestic politics and international regulatory competition provides the most powerful explanation of why the United States and¶ European Union have traded places in international environmental politics. Domestic politics shapes governments’ positions on questions of international¶ environmental policy through two channels. First, and most directly, the stronger¶ the domestic political influence of environmentalists, the more likely they¶ will be successful in pressuring their government to support new international¶ environmental policy agreements. Thus, just as a government’s commitment¶ to domestic environmental policy fluctuates along with the political influence of proenvironment forces, so too will its support for international environmental¶ policies. The second causal path is more indirect: the stronger the¶ domestic political influence of environmentalists, the more likely that stringent domestic standards will be adopted. The existence of these more stringent¶ domestic standards in turn reduces the economic costs (or generates positive incentives) for domestic producers to support international agreements that impose similar standards on foreign jurisdictions. Alternatively, when domestic standards are laxer, or nonexistent, the dynamics of international regulatory competition provide governments and domestic firms with a stronger interest in opposing international agreements that would impose additional burdens on them.

In the early 1970s, environmentalists wielded considerable political power in the United States, prompting the adoption of the world’s most ambitious domestic environmental regulations. With strict and costly domestic rules in place, the United States then sought to spread similar standards to other jurisdictions by taking on a leadership role in international affairs and supporting multilateral environmental agreements (DeSombre, 2000, 2005; Hopgood, 1998; Jacobson, 2002). Meanwhile, environmentalists wielded far less power across Western Europe, and European regulations were generally less stringent than those established in the United States (Vogel, 2003). Governments of EU member states did eventually sign on to the treaties proposed in this period, but they did not play a leadership role and in some cases worked to impede or weaken them.2 The European Union, as an actor in its own right, was only beginning to play an active role in environmental regulation—within Europe or internationally.

Since around 1990, the United States and European Union have traded places. Environmentalists have wielded substantial influence within the European Union, and the European Union has adopted many environmental regulations that are among the world’s strictest and most ambitious. As a result, it became in both the political and the competitive interests of the European Union to support expanding the scope of international environmental governance. Meanwhile, the power of environmentalists in the United States had waned: The development of major domestic environmental policy initiatives slowed down significantly after 1990. With fewer new domestic regulations being adopted, it was no longer in the competitive interest of the United States to take on a leadership role in international environmental affairs; rather, it was now more likely to be in the competitive interests of the United States to oppose the spread of environmental regulations championed by the European Union. pg. 432

### I Lk: Obama key

#### Credible Obama commitment provides a political boost for international climate negotiations

**AP 1/24**/13 [Associated Pres, “How Obama's Climate Focus Encourages Leaders Worldwide,” Published: Jan 24, 2013, 7:23 PM EST Associated Press, pg. http://www.weather.com/news/climate/davos-economic-climate-talk-20130124

Top political and financial leaders at the World Economic Forum in Davos say recent natural disasters, along with Obama's [inauguration announcement](http://www.weather.com/news/obama-climate-change-20130122) this week that he's making the battle against rising temperatures a pillar of his second term, could rev up the glacially slow climate pact negotiations and revive fundraising for global action to cool the planet.

"Unless we take action on climate change, future generations will be roasted, toasted, fried and grilled," International Monetary Fund Managing Director Christine Lagarde told participants at Davos.

The U.N.'s climate chief, Christiana Figueras, told The Associated Press in an interview Thursday that Obama's emphasis on climate "definitely is a political boost." She said Hurricane Sandy and drought in the Midwest last year helped push climate change back onto the U.S. political debate.

"We also need to see clearly much more engagement from the United States, we need to a confirmation from the new leadership in China that they remain on course and are willing to engage further. From the Europeans, we need to see that they also remain on course," Figueras said. "And then all of the emerging economies, in addition to China, need to begin to explore the opportunities that they have."

The U.N. climate talks, now two decades in the making, have so far failed to reduce carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions that most scientists say are warming the Earth.

Participants at the Davos forum - which identifies extreme weather as one of the top three risks to the global economy - called for global action.

Until now, rich and poor countries have accused U.S. leaders of hampering the global fight against climate change, which scientists say is causing a rise in temperatures and sea levels, threatening island nations and other low-lying areas, and shifting weather patterns to produce more droughts, floods and devastating storms. Figueras, the daughter of a former Costa Rican president, and Costa Rican President Laura Chinchilla both said their country could serve as an example.

"Costa Rica is already producing 90 percent of the energy we are consuming from renewable sources," Chinchilla told AP. "We are encouraging the policies of many different companies - many are already adopting the right policies. For example, in the agricultural sector, we already have coffee which is certified carbon-neutral coffee."

European Union Climate Commissioner Connie Hedegaard called the battle against global warming the greatest economic challenge of this century.

Several CEOs of major banks and businesses said there have been robust discussions at Davos on potential private financing for "green" technologies to produce cleaner sources of energy.

So far, nations have ponied up about $30 billion toward the $100 billion a year goal by 2020 set at Copenhagen's U.N. climate talks in 2009.

A U.N. climate conference in Doha, Qatar, agreed in December to extend the Kyoto Protocol, a treaty that limits the greenhouse gas output of some rich countries, and agreed to adopt a new global climate pact by 2015. But hopes for stronger U.S. leadership in the ongoing U.N. climate talks were dimmed when legislation to cap emissions stalled in Congress.

"We're coming out of two years of climate silence," said Fred Krupp, president of the U.S.-based Environmental Defense Fund. "The impacts of extreme weather are now affecting everybody in the wallet."

Krupp said while no one is going to invest in unprofitable new technologies, a growing number of clean-energy investments are highly profitable.

Nations also agreed at the U.N. climate talks in Copenhagen to set a goal of limiting global warming to 2 degrees Celsius (3.6 degrees Fahrenheit). But because of inaction, Figueras said, the world is now on "somewhere between a 4 and 6 degree (Celsius) trajectory."

"But the door is not closed," she quickly added. "We have the technology, we have the capital. We have the possibility."

U.N. Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon says one of his top hopes for 2013 is to reach a new agreement on climate change.

"Slowly but steadily, we are coming to realize the risks of a carbon-based economy," he told the forum Thursday. "Those supposedly longer-term issues are actually silent crises with us today: the death of children from preventable diseases; the melting of the polar ice caps because of climate change. ... Let not our inaction today lead to harsh judgment tomorrow."

Prince Albert II of Monaco, whose foundation focuses on climate change and other environmental issues, said Obama's inauguration speech gave a welcome lift toward collective action.

"That can only be positive, because we need to have the U.S. on board," he told the AP.

But Thomas Donohue, president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, said despite Obama's speech there would still be resistance.

"While the president and his colleagues will pursue what we believe is an aggressive climate change policy, they're not going to get it through the Congress," Donahoe predicted. "It's going to be done on a regulatory basis ... and that's going to create a different approach to dealing with this very important but controversial subject."

### AT: China

#### US reductions are key to get China on board – They will not make reductions unless the US moves first

**Herberg 10** – Senior Research Fellow for International Energy @ Pacific Council on International Policy [Dr. Mikkal E. Herberg (Senior lecturer on international and Asian energy @ University of California- San Diego), “China’s “Energy Rise”, the U.S., and the New Geopolitics of Energy,” CHINA’S “ENERGY RISE”, THE U.S., AND THE NEW GEOPOLITICS OF ENERGY, Edited By: Mikkal E. Herberg & David Zweig, Pacific Council on International Policy, April 2010

The outcome of the Copenhagen meeting is perhaps the most powerful example of how China and the U.S. are increasingly joined at the hip as the two central global energy powers whose cooperation is indispensible to address many of today’s global energy challenges. But this suggests prospects for an effective new global climate agreement are highly uncertain. The Obama administration’s efforts to join in global efforts to address the problem remain deeply uncertain in the face of serious opposition on Capitol Hill to potentially costly climate change efforts and tightening 2010 electoral pressures. If meaningful cap-and-trade legislation to cut future U.S. emissions is to pass it seems likely to be severely watered-down. Perhaps more importantly, if China does not move in a much more forceful way to support a pact to reduce global emissions, there is likely to be little real progress in the aftermath of Copenhagen. As chief U.S. climate negotiator Todd Stern suggested in a Washington D.C. speech in June, “China may not be the alpha and omega of the international negotiations, but it is close.” Conversely, Beijing is also very unlikely to tackle its domestic energy consumption pressures unless the U.S. moves more decisively to reduce its own emissions and join in a global consensus to adequately fund reductions in the developing world. In short, if the U.S. and China fail to come to a consensus that each is doing its fair share in reducing emissions, neither is likely to move enough to salvage a new global emissions deal. Pg. 27 //AT: International actor CP

### 2AC—at: adaptation (biological)

#### 1. too fast and different from past warming

Washington and Cook, 11—\*an environmental scientist of 35 years’ experience. His PhD ‘The Wilderness Knot’ was in social ecology. \*\* the Climate Communication Fellow for the Global Change Institute at the University of Queensland. He studied physics at the University of Queensland, Australia. After the graduating, he majored in solar physics in his post-grad honors year and created the website skepticalscience.com (Haydn and John, Climate Change Denial: Heads in the Sand, Published in 2011 by Earthscan, Page 34)

The next concern is the *speed of change* involved in human-caused climate change, which is thought to be happening at a much faster rate than that of previous climate changes, some of which took thousands of years (Houghton, 2008). The difference between the last ice age and today was about five degrees Celsius, and this warming happened over 10,000 years. This is 0.05 degrees per century. In contrast, the observed rate of warming over the last 50 years is .7 degrees Celsius (and another .6 degrees is in the pipeline, making this 1.3 degrees) and the estimated rate for the next century is more than five degrees, **which is 100 times faster than the last glaciations** (Pittock, 2009). It is one thing to adapt to changed climate over 10,000 years, but a **very different thing** to adapt over 100 years. Most plant species cannot migrate faster than one kilometer a year (Houghton, 2008). It is this fast speed of change on the world’s already stressed ecosystems (MA, 2005) that is likely to lead to major species extinction. The IPCC (2007) considered the effects of what increased temperature might be. Mark Lynas (2007) has also considered the effect of rising temperature in his book *Six Degree*s.Hansen (2009) concludes we ‘really do have a planet in peril’.

### 2AC—at: warming inevitable

#### 1. The magnitude of the aff internal link indicates we solve warming a sufficient amount to solve our impact

#### 2. Overshooting is possible

Washington and Cook, 11—\*an environmental scientist of 35 years’ experience. His PhD ‘The Wilderness Knot’ was in social ecology. \*\* the Climate Communication Fellow for the Global Change Institute at the University of Queensland. He studied physics at the University of Queensland, Australia. After the graduating, he majored in solar physics in his post-grad honors year and created the website skepticalscience.com (Haydn and John, Climate Change Denial: Heads in the Sand, Published in 2011 by Earthscan, Page 30-31)

It has been suggested that warming the world by more than two degrees could push us into the area where we may cause runaway climate change. It may then take thousands of years to get back to current world temperatures. The world has already warmed by .7 degrees Celsius (Houghton, 2008; Pittock, 2009) and another .6 degrees is in the pipeline (Hansen, 2009). Runaway climate change means that human actions would then be unlikely to stop the temperature increase (short of massive government engineering). Hansen et al. (2008) define the ‘tipping point’ as the climate forcing threat that, if maintained for a long time, gives rise to a specific consequence. They define the ‘point of no return’ as a climate state beyond which the consequence is inevitable, even if climate forcings are reduced. A point of no return can be avoided, even if the tipping level is temporarily exceeded. This has been called an ‘overshoot’ scenario, where one exceeds the ‘safe’ CO2 level but then removes CO2 to return to that level (Pittock, 2009). Ocean and ice sheet inertia permit overshoot ‘provided the climate forcing is returned below the tipping level before initiating irreversible dynamic change’ (Hansen et al, 2008). Points of no return are difficult to define. We may be at a tipping level already at 387 ppm CO2, and it will require strong action to reduce CO2 levels so that we don’t pass the point of no return and can return CO2 levels below 350 ppm. Hansen et al (2008) note we may been to drop CO2 below 325 ppm to restore sea ice to the area it had 25 years ago (and so remove this positive feedback).

### 2NC Gas Only Fails

#### Oil restrictions make it uneconomical

Cole 12 [Benjamin, Director of Communications for IER, former policy adviser and investigative analyst for the Republican staff of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform under Chairman Darrell Issa, 5/8/12, “Obama’s Offshore Plan: One Giant Leap Backwards” Institute for Energy Research) http://www.instituteforenergyresearch.org/2012/05/08/obamas-offshore-plan-one-giant-leap-backwards/]

After oil prices reached new highs in 2008, the Bush administration and Congress moved to open almost all of the outer continental shelf to oil and gas exploration and development. But in November 2011, the Obama administration released an offshore drilling plan that closes much of the offshore United States to oil and gas drilling that had been opened by President Bush and Congress. The Obama administration’s plan closes those offshore areas to energy exploration and production through at least 2017. The plan allows lease sales to occur in the portions of the Gulf of Mexico and Alaska that were already open to leasing, leaving the entire Atlantic and Pacific coasts off-limits.[i]

But, not only does the plan revert backward in time to limit offshore areas for lease, it also calls for a decrease in the number of offshore lease sales. In the past, lease plans for outer continental shelf development averaged five lease sales a year. The 2012 to2017 plan cuts those lease sale offerings in half.[ii] And, it contains higher minimum bids and shorter lease periods. Bonus bids are likely to go up by a factor of two for some deepwater tracts and lease terms are reduced to 5 or 7 years. Because developing offshore leases takes a long time, additional costs can make marginal properties subeconomic.[iii]

### OCS Dev

#### The Navy concedes that there is not an impact

**Axe 2/4**/13 [David Axe, “Navy Plans to Build Fewer Ships, Right as It’s About to Get Busier,” The Wired, 02.04.13 4:15 PMPg. http://tinyurl.com/axd2783

The U.S. Navy has finally and officially given up on long-standing plans to expand the fleet from today’s 285 major warships to 313 sometime in the next couple decades. Instead, the expansion will halt at 306 large ships, according to the latest [Navy planning document](http://blogs.defensenews.com/saxotech-access/pdfs/usn-force-structure-13013.pdf), obtained by Defense News.

Officially, the lower goal is a result of careful analysis of U.S. strategy, the needs of regional commanders, ship service-life and the capabilities of the shipbuilding industry. (Navy officials [anticipated the shrinkage](http://www.wired.com/dangerroom/2012/03/congress-navy/) last year.) “A 306-ship combatant force [is] the current requirement to enable [the] Navy to deter and respond to crises and war,” the sailing branch asserted. As the Navy sees it, it can do that by buying fewer surface warfare ships and more logistics vessels, as well as by pre-positioning warships in allied ports.

Unofficially, there is another huge factor: money. For all the talk inside the Pentagon about strategy driving budgets and not the other way around, the Navy is anticipating shrinkage right as it also anticipates playing a larger role in U.S. national security.

The seven-ship reduction is a “reflection of budget realities,” Eric Wertheim, author of the definitive [Combat Fleets of the World](http://www.amazon.com/Naval-Institute-Guide-Combat-Fleets/dp/159114955X), tells Danger Room. Pentagon budgets have been steadily flattening for two years. And automatic spending cuts, [known as sequestration](http://www.wired.com/dangerroom/2013/01/defense-cash-chaos/) and mandated by the 2011 Budget Control Act, could slice another 10 percent off the military’s top-line starting in March — assuming the White House and lawmakers don’t reach a deficit-reduction agreement to avert sequestration.

### 2NC—Helium Now

#### Massive global helium reserves—Supply is not the issue

Kammerzell 11—Rigzone Staff [Jaime Kammerzell, “Helium to Move from Byproduct to Primary Drilling Target,” Rigzone, Friday, November 18, 2011, pg. http://rigzone.com/news/article.asp?a\_id=112735

A new helium plant is due to come online near Big Piney, Wyo., soon. The Air Products and Matheson Tri-Gas helium purifier and liquefaction plant will process 0.6 percent (0.006) helium content out of a constituent gas stream of roughly 20 percent methane, 65 percent CO2, 5 percent H2S and 7 percent nitrogen from the Riley Ridge field. The plant is designed to produce 200 MMcf of helium per year at start up with possible expansion capacity to 400 MMcf per year.

Nevertheless, international helium plants are more likely future sources. There are currently seven international helium plants and more are planned. Most recently, the Darwin, Australia, plant came online in March 2010 and more are planned in Algeria, Qatar, and Russia during the next three years.

"Production from these sources should be sufficient to meet worldwide demand for the next five years," Garvey wrote.  
"Substantial worldwide helium reserves in North America, the Middle East, Africa, and Russia could sustain the helium industry for hundreds of years," Garvey wrote, "but those reserves are typically more difficult and costly to develop, which is why they have remained undeveloped to date."

### 2NC—No interest

#### Gas drillers are not interested in Helium—it must be the primary target to solve

Kammerzell 11—Rigzone Staff [Jaime Kammerzell, “Helium to Move from Byproduct to Primary Drilling Target,” Rigzone, Friday, November 18, 2011, pg. http://rigzone.com/news/article.asp?a\_id=112735

The future of the U.S. Helium Reserve is uncertain, Bo Sears said. The reserve has a short life span and new reserves need to be found so that the U.S. is not importing the gas from Qatar and Algeria in the near future.

"Besides Cliffside and Riley Ridge, there are no other domestic helium projects currently online. All of the industrial gas company helium assets (ie, large cryogenic facilities) are on the Hugoton field … and there they will sit until there is no more gas to run through them. There has been no push by any industrial gas company to locate and secure new sources."

"If we are going to secure our domestic helium supply, we need to find new sources and these will have to come from smaller fields. Those new sources are going to have to come from areas where helium is the primary target as opposed to secondary or tertiary. Our company is focused on exploiting these new sources."

\* Quote by Maura D. Garvey. Director of Market Research @ Cryogas

#### No market incentives to capture Helium

ScienceDaily 8 [“Helium Supplies Endangered, Threatening Science And Technology,” Jan. 5, 2008, pg. http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2008/01/080102093943.htm

"The government had the good vision to store helium, and the question now is: Will industry have the vision to capture it when extracting natural gas, and consumers the wisdom to capture and recycle?" Sobotka said. "This takes long-term vision because present market forces are not sufficient to compel prudent practice."

Helium plays second fiddle to marketing oil and natural gas, and much of it is lost in a process that removes noncombustible nitrogen and helium from the product of prime interest.

"When they stick that straw into the ground to suck out oil and gas, the helium comes out, and if it doesn't get captured it drifts into the atmosphere and is lost," Sobotka said. "Helium production is a side industry to oil and natural gas, an endeavor that nobody wants to lose money on."

## \*\*\* 1NR

**1NR—Ship Build**

**Korean war won’t escalate**

**Cohn 10** [Martin Regg Cohn is Deputy Editorial Page Editor. A foreign correspondent for 11 years, he was Chief of the Star's Middle East and Asia bureaus and most recently Foreign Editor, “Pyongyang’s mind games make perfect sense,” Dec 7, 2010, http://www.thestar.com/opinion/editorialopinion/article/902495--cohn-pyongyang-s-mind-games-make-perfect-sense]

The war drums are beating louder over North Korea this week — exactly as Pyongyang had planned. South Korea’s new defence chief has vowed to launch fighter jets if Pyongyang attacks again, the Americans still have an aircraft carrier in the region for war games, and Beijing is calling for talks — with no takers. It looks like a crisis and feels like a crisis. But it is a manufactured crisis — a North Korean specialty. Think of it as a carefully scripted drama — a narrative plotted, contrived and acted out by North Korea with its own people as pawns, the South Koreans as targets and the Americans as foils. Perennial brinkmanship born of chronic desperation. Whenever Pyongyang feels spurned or isolated, it conjures up an international incident to raise the stakes — so as to be bought off again with foreign aid or denuclearization subsidies. Neighbouring countries indulge these military tantrums because their hands are tied by the human and economic costs of confrontation. **It’s diplomatic blackmail with no political solution or military resolution**. The West is always fighting a losing battle, because its war games can’t compete with the mind games of the North. South Koreans are apoplectic over the unprovoked shelling of a small island that killed four people last month. The country is still mourning the loss of 46 sailors after the North torpedoed one of its frigates in March. But the carnage from any escalation would be incalculable. If North Korea deployed its 5,000 multiple-launch rockets pointed at the Seoul area’s 25 million people from just across the heavily fortified border, thousands could perish instantly. That’s why most **South Koreans know better than to hit back hard. They have too much to lose**. As suicidal as escalation seems for the South, outright **war would also be a death wish for the North**. For while Pyongyang has nothing to lose, it also has everything to lose. The North’s enfeebled military would be crushed almost immediately by South Korean forces, backed by nearly 30,000 Americans who form a human tripwire along the border. Like the doctrine of Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD) that argued for a stable Cold War dynamic since the 1950s, the two Koreas are locked in an embrace of Mutual Assured Carnage, which has sustained them since their civil war wound down in the early 1950s. **Neither side is interested in a mutual suicide pact**.

**African wars don’t escalate**

**Porteous 4** (Tom, London director of Human Rights Watch and syndicated columnist, writer and analyst who has worked for the BBC and the U.K. Foreign & Commonwealth Office, October. “Resolving African Conflicts.” http://www.crimesofwar.org/africa-mag/afr\_01\_porteos.html)

It would be futile to search for a single explanation for what appears for now to be a trend towards the resolution of African conflicts. Africa’s wars are as heterogeneous as its many nations and communities. The reasons why Angola’s conflict came to end are quite different from the reasons why the belligerents in Sudan’s civil war have been willing to engage seriously in peace talks. However some of the successes of the past three years can be attributed in part to a mixture of fatigue on the part of those fighting African wars and to the fact that both Africans and non-Africans are learning lessons from the many failures of the past fifteen years, are coming up with more creative proposals and solutions to tackle the problem of conflict, and are readier to take risks in implementing them. Although the details vary widely from conflict to conflict, the basic ingredients of resolution remain the same – a combination of military, diplomatic, humanitarian, and economic action delivered by a more or less complex coalition of local, regional and international actors.

### 1NR—Impact

**No impact to bioterrorism.**

**Mueller 10** [John, Woody Hayes Chair of National Security Studies at the Mershon Center for International Security Studies and a Professor of Political Science at The Ohio State University, A.B. from the University of Chicago, M.A. and Ph.D. @ UCLA, Atomic Obsession – Nuclear Alarmism from Hiroshima to Al-Qaeda, Oxford University Press]

Properly developed and deployed, biological weapons could potentially, if thus far only in theory, kill hundreds of thousands, perhaps even millions, of people. The discussion remains **theoretical** because biological weapons have scarcely ever been used. For the most destructive results, they need to be **dispersed** in very **low-altitude** aerosol clouds. Since aerosols do not appreciably settle, pathogens like anthrax (which is not easy to spread or catch and is not contagious) would probably have to be sprayed **near nose level**. Moreover, **90 percent** of the microorganisms are likely to **die** during the process of aerosolization, while their effectiveness could be reduced still further by **sunlight**, **smog**, **humidity**, and **temperature changes**. Explosive methods of dispersion may destroy the organisms, and, except for anthrax spores, long-term **storage** of lethal organisms in bombs or warheads is difficult: even if refrigerated, most of the organisms have a **limited lifetime**. Such weapons can take days or **weeks** to have **full effect**, during which time they can be **countered** with medical and civil defense measures. In the summary judgment of two careful analysts, delivering microbes and toxins over a wide area in the form most suitable for inflicting mass casualties-as an aerosol that could be inhaled-requires a delivery system of **enormous sophistication**, and **even then** effective dispersal could **easily be disrupted** by unfavorable environmental and meteorological conditions.

### 1NR—UQ

**Set the bar high for arctic militarization – nuclear subs and coast guard ships – cites best study, indicts the media.**

**Wezeman 12** - Senior Researcher with the SIPRI Arms Transfers Programme [Siemon T. Wezeman, “MILITARY CAPABILITIES IN THE ARCTIC,” SIPRI Background Paper, March 2012

While some media, politicians and researchers have portrayed the changes in the capabilities of the Arctic littoral states as significant military build- ups and potential threats to security, the overall picture is one of limited modernization and increases or changes in equipment, force levels and force structure. Some of these changes—for example, the strengthening of the Canadian Rangers, the move of the main Norwegian land units to the north of Norway or the new Russian Arctic units—have little or nothing to do with power projection into the areas of the Arctic with unclear ownership; rather they are for the patrolling and protecting of recognized national territories that are becoming more accessible, including for illegal activities. Others changes—such as new but unarmed navy or coastguard icebreakers—may have more to do with civilian research in support of national claims to an ‘extended continental shelf’ under the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS).100 While aircraft and ships play a much more important role for Arctic secur- ity than land forces, most of the extensive changes—such as the acquisitions by Canada and Norway of new combat aircraft or large surface combat vessels—have a much more general background than increasing worries about potential threats in the Arctic region. Russia’s expansion of its fleet in the Arctic also appears more a matter of providing protection for its SSBNs, as the Soviet Union did during the 1970s and 1980s, than a programme building up for a military struggle over Arctic resources. Some of the large military acquisitions announced have little prospect of being completely realized. It is unlikely that Russia will be able to fund the envisaged expan- sion of its navy and even the Canadian and Norwegian plans for the F-35 combat aircraft may be curtailed for financial reasons. This review of current and projected military forces in the Arctic region points to a process of modernization and the creation of new capacity to address challenges associated with the environmental, economic and polit- ical changes anticipated in the region, rather than as a response to major threat perceptions. Conventional military forces specially adapted to the harsh Arctic environment are projected to remain small scale, especially given the size of the Arctic region, and will remain in some cases considerably below cold war levels. This notwithstanding, an increase of military forces in a region where several states claim maritime zones that are expected to contain extensive natural resources does give some reasons for concern, including for unexpected incidents between claimants. In order to help mitigate negative perceptions about security policies in the region as well as the possibility of misunderstandings, the Arctic littoral states need to be clear about their military policies, doctrines and operational rules and should include mili- tary confidence-building measures in their bilateral or multilateral relations associated with the Arctic. 100 pg. 13-14

**They are wrong about Russia**

**Eide 1/21/**13 - Norway minister of foreign affairs [Espen Barth Eide, “Norway and Sweden to cooperate with Russia in Arctic,” The voice of Russia, Jan 21, 2013 17:13 Moscow Time Pg. <http://english.ruvr.ru/2013_01_21/Norway-and-Sweden-to-cooperate-with-Russia-on-the-development-of-the-Arctic-region/>

Q: What ways of cooperation with Russia do you see in the Arctic?

A: “We’ve been working well with Russia for many years. We have several institutional frameworks. We have originally the Barents cooperation which has just celebrated its first 20 years. We have the Arctic Council which is circumpolar. And I think more important than any of it is the fact that Russia and Norway both agree that UNCLOS applies, which means that if there are any disputes – they will be solved as is stipulated in UNCLOS.

And again, as I said in the previous answer, the question is not whether countries agree on everything because that never happens. I’m the Foreign Minister and I’m dealing with disagreements every day. The point is – whether we have an agreement on how we find a solution. And I think we do have an agreement on the way of how we find solutions in the Arctic.”

Are there any projects with Russia?

“Many, I mean we for decades had a fisheries commission between Russia and Norway that settled quotas in quite advanced way. We for instance allow Russians to fish, fish which we see as Russian, because it was born in Russia but to fish it in Norwegian areas because we know how they migrate, and vice versa. So, that is ongoing. We have good cooperation between our coast guards. We have very good cooperation with our border guards. And we have mutual, two way investments in each of these projects. So, there is quite a lot of cooperation with Russia in the Arctic.”

### 1NR—Link

**Corporate interests.**

**Backus & Strickland 08** - Principal member of technical staff @ Sandia National Laboratories and uses behavioral and physical simulation methods to access security risks associated with climate change & Manager of the Exploratory Simulation Technologies Department @ Sandia National Laboratories [George Backus (Director of environmental and energy research at Cambridge Econometrics) & James H. Strickland (PhD in Mechanical Engineering from Southern Methodist University), “Climate-Derived Tensions in Arctic Security,” SANDIA REPORT , SAND2008-6342, September 2008

As noted at the beginning of this section, nations, military forces, and corporations have overlapping interests and relationships. Nations could feel the need to intervene for corporations with armed forces for protecting what they see as national or sovereignty interests. Conversely, corporations could (and have) asked nations for protection. In the Arctic, natural resource companies and shipping companies from many nations, which are serving the strategic supply chain of other nations, will routinely “cross paths” and cross sovereignty boundaries (actual and legal). Simple accidents, routine asset/personnel protection, or the enforcement of shipping controls may lead to confrontations among corporations and nations. It is very easy to imagine a normally benign situation that becomes a worsening and convoluted security concern.

Corporations themselves are often associated with private security forces that protect their assets and affect broader military conflict. There is little evidence any corporation has ever considered military force outside of its self-directed protection, but the consequence of their activities do often spill over to security tensions previously considered the sole domain of nations and their adversaries.105 For example, Amnesty International urges boardrooms to consider the hazards with…

“…the use of security forces to protect foreign installations and the dilemmas of operating under corrupt regimes or in war zones. All those factors, it argues, have become more relevant as multinational corporations play an increasingly dominant role in economic development.”106

“Multinational corporations, especially involved in the extraction of raw materials, frequently collaborate closely with local security forces. … Internal armed conflicts may be prolonged where warring factions discover how remunerative control of territory containing valuable minerals can be…”107

The combination of private security forces and corporate protection needs can lead to conditions that engage broader conflict susceptibilities.108,109,110 Within the Arctic, the physical protection of off-shore assets and shipping resources, in combination with the host government or unilaterally by the corporations, can only complicate the dynamics of any security tensions that do occur. Pg. 32-33

**Russian perception.**

**Weitz 1/29**/13 - Senior fellow @ Hudson Institute and a World Politics Review senior editor [Richard Weitz, “Global Insights: Oil Sector a Challenge for Russia, Opportunity for U.S.,” World Politics Review, 29 Jan 2013, Pg. <http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/12672/global-insights-oil-sector-a-challenge-for-russia-opportunity-for-u-s>

The United States would also benefit from a newly cooperative energy arrangement. [In a recent paper](http://us-russiafuture.org/2013/01/11/us-russia-relations-and-the-hydrocarbon-markets-of-eurasia/), Rawi Abdelal of Harvard Business School and Tatiana Mitrova of the Moscow School of Management highlighted the fact that, despite their comprehensive bilateral relationship and the large role Russia and the United States play in global energy issues, the two countries cooperate very little in the hydrocarbon sector.   
In the view of Russians interviewed by the authors, this paucity of cooperation results from perceived impediments erected by the U.S. government. Similarly, Russian officials see the shale gas revolution as a conspiracy on the part of the United States to undermine Russia’s role in energy markets.  
Absent forward momentum, the Russia-U.S. energy relationship might even deteriorate. The United States could soon become a major energy exporter again, which would lead to direct energy sales competition between Russia and the United States for the first time in history. One major opportunity for enhanced partnership, as opposed to competition, is the deal reached last August between Exxon Mobil and Rosneft. The project has only recently begun the preliminary seismic surveys, technical assessments and environmental studies that would allow any substantial drilling to start.   
Bringing the project to fruition, and augmenting it with near-term cooperation on tight oil and other energy projects, is important for both sides. Concrete Russia-U.S. energy collaboration could help dispel mutual misconceptions and perhaps spur U.S. and Russian economic cooperation in other areas. That in turn could help to increase the number of stakeholders in both countries that share an interest in maintaining good relations. These kinds of private-sector ties, as much as political will in Washington and Moscow, will contribute to the health of bilateral ties moving forward.