# 1NC

## off

#### Aff must specify their agent---vital to education on energy issues

Annual Review of Energy 76

(Energy Regulation: A Quagmire for Energy Policy Annual Review of Energy, Vol. 1: 715-725, November, http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev.eg.01.110176.003435 )

The ultimate effectiveness of any policy is largely dependent on the individual efficacy and coordination of the agents or agencies that implement it. There are ample illustrations of the truth of this premise in **the recent attempts by the Administration and Congress to formulate and implement a national energy policy, as a result, that policy, irrespective of any intrinsic soundness, could inevitably become trapped in a quagmire of regulatory policies and practices**. The difficulties that energy policymakers in the United States have experienced in 1974 and 1975 arc in many respects symptomatic of the very problem that they have intended to resolve—the lack of a comprehensive and coordinated national energy policy. Decisions concerning energy supply and general policy that have been made over the years have contributed to the creation of areas of special concern and interest, institutionalized them, and nourished them through dedicated sponsorship by either the Congress, the Executive Branch, the independent federal agencies, or industry. The difficulties that stymied congressional consideration and executive implementation of an effective energy policy in 1974 and the first half of 1975 mirror this state of affairs.
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No OCS restrictions

Kathleen Gramp and Jeff LaFave, CBO Budget Analysis Division, August 2012, http://www.cbo.gov/sites/default/files/cbofiles/attachments/08-09-12\_Oil-and-Gas\_Leasing.pdf

Other than the temporary ban on leasing in the eastern Gulf of Mexico, there currently are no statutory restrictions on OCS leasing. Decisions about leasing are made administratively—in consultation with industry and the states—for five-year periods. Leases cannot be offered for areas that are not included in a five-year plan, but the available regions may change whenever a new plan is adopted. The next plan is expected to go into effect in August 2012 and will extend for five years unless a future Administration chooses to restart the process before that plan expires.

#### Restrictions on production must mandate a decrease in the quantity produced

Anell 89

Chairman, WTO panel

"To examine, in the light of the relevant GATT provisions, the matter referred to the

CONTRACTING PARTIES by the United States in document L/6445 and to make such findings as will assist the CONTRACTING PARTIES in making the recommendations or in giving the rulings provided for in Article XXIII:2." 3. On 3 April 1989, the Council was informed that agreement had been reached on the following composition of the Panel (C/164): Composition Chairman: Mr. Lars E.R. Anell Members: Mr. Hugh W. Bartlett Mrs. Carmen Luz Guarda CANADA - IMPORT RESTRICTIONS ON ICE CREAM AND YOGHURT Report of the Panel adopted at the Forty-fifth Session of the CONTRACTING PARTIES on 5 December 1989 (L/6568 - 36S/68)

http://www.wto.org/english/tratop\_e/dispu\_e/88icecrm.pdf

The United States argued that Canada had failed to demonstrate that it effectively restricted domestic production of milk. The differentiation between "fluid" and "industrial" milk was an artificial one for administrative purposes; with regard to GATT obligations, the product at issue was raw milk from the cow, regardless of what further use was made of it. The use of the word "permitted" in Article XI:2(c)(i) required that there be a limitation on the total quantity of milk that domestic producers were authorized or allowed to produce or sell. The provincial controls on fluid milk did not restrict the quantities permitted to be produced; rather dairy farmers could produce and market as much milk as could be sold as beverage milk or table cream. There were no penalties for delivering more than a farmer's fluid milk quota, it was only if deliveries exceeded actual fluid milk usage or sales that it counted against his industrial milk quota. At least one province did not participate in this voluntary system, and another province had considered leaving it. Furthermore, Canada did not even prohibit the production or sale of milk that exceeded the Market Share Quota. The method used to calculate direct support payments on within-quota deliveries assured that most dairy farmers would completely recover all of their fixed and variable costs on their within-quota deliveries. The farmer was permitted to produce and market milk in excess of the quota, and perhaps had an economic incentive to do so. 27. The United States noted that in the past six years total industrial milk production had consistently exceeded the established Market Sharing Quota, and concluded that the Canadian system was a regulation of production but not a restriction of production. Proposals to amend Article XI:2(c)(i) to replace the word "restrict" with "regulate" had been defeated; what was required was the reduction of production. The results of the econometric analyses cited by Canada provided no indication of what would happen to milk production in the absence not only of the production quotas, but also of the accompanying high price guarantees which operated as incentives to produce. According to the official publication of the Canadian Dairy Commission, a key element of Canada's national dairy policy was to promote self-sufficiency in milk production. The effectiveness of the government supply controls had to be compared to what the situation would be in the absence of all government measures.

#### The plan changes how energy is produced, rather than restricting how much is produced

#### This conflation ruins the topic:

#### 1. Including regulations is a limits disaster

Doub 76

Energy Regulation: A Quagmire for Energy Policy

Annual Review of Energy

Vol. 1: 715-725 (Volume publication date November 1976)

DOI: 10.1146/annurev.eg.01.110176.003435LeBoeuf, Lamb, Leiby & MacRae, 1757 N Street NW, Washington, DC 20036

http://0-www.annualreviews.org.library.lausys.georgetown.edu/doi/pdf/10.1146/annurev.eg.01.110176.003435

Mr. Doub is a principal in the law firm of Doub and Muntzing, which he formed in 1977. Previously he was a partner in the law firm of LeBoeuf, Lamb, Leiby and MacRae. He was a member of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission in 1971 - 1974. He served as a member of the Executive Advisory Committee to the Federal Power Commission in 1968 - 1971 and was appointed by the President of the United States to the President's Air Quality Advisory Board in 1970. He is a member of the American Bar Association, Maryland State Bar Association, and Federal Bar Association. He is immediate past Chairman of the U.S. National Committee of the World Energy Conference and a member of the Atomic Industrial Forum. He currently serves as a member of the nuclear export policy committees of both the Atomic Industrial Forum and the American Nuclear Energy Council. Mr. Doub graduated from Washington and Jefferson College (B.A., 1953) and the University of Maryland School of Law in 1956. He is married, has two children, and resides in Potomac, Md. He was born September 3, 1931, in Cumberland, Md.

FERS began with the recognition that federal energy policy must result from concerted efforts in all areas dealing with energy, not the least of which was the manner in which energy is regulated by the federal government. Energy selfsufficiency is improbable, if not impossible, without sensible regulatory processes, and effective regulation is necessary for public confidence. Thus, the President directed that "a comprehensive study be undertaken, in full consultation with Congress, to determine the best way to organize all energy-related regulatory activities of the government." An interagency task force was formed to study this question. With 19 different federal departments and agencies contributing, the task force spent seven months deciphering the present organizational makeup of the federal energy regulatory system, studying the need for organizational improvement, and evaluating alternatives. More than 40 agencies were found to be involved with making regulatory decisions on energy. Although only a few deal exclusively with energy, most of the 40 could significantly affect the availability and/or cost of energy. For example, in the field of gas transmission, there are five federal agencies that must act on siting and land-use issues, seven on emission and effluent issues, five on public safety issues, and one on worker health and safety issues-all before an onshore gas pipeline can be built. The complexity of energy regulation is also illustrated by the case of Standard Oil Company (Indiana), which reportedly must file about 1000 reports a year with 35 different federal agencies. Unfortunately, this example is the rule rather than the exception.

#### 2. Precision: Only direct prohibition is a restriction – key to predictability

Sinha 6

<http://www.indiankanoon.org/doc/437310/>

Supreme Court of India Union Of India & Ors vs M/S. Asian Food Industries on 7 November, 2006 Author: S.B. Sinha Bench: S Sinha, Mark, E Katju CASE NO.: Writ Petition (civil) 4695 of 2006 PETITIONER: Union of India & Ors. RESPONDENT: M/s. Asian Food Industries DATE OF JUDGMENT: 07/11/2006 BENCH: S.B. Sinha & Markandey Katju JUDGMENT: J U D G M E N T [Arising out of S.L.P. (Civil) No. 17008 of 2006] WITH CIVIL APPEAL NO. 4696 OF 2006 [Arising out of S.L.P. (Civil) No. 17558 of 2006] S.B. SINHA, J :

We may, however, notice that this Court in State of U.P. and Others v. M/s. Hindustan Aluminium Corpn. and others [AIR 1979 SC 1459] stated the law thus:

"It appears that a distinction between regulation and restriction or prohibition has always been drawn, ever since Municipal Corporation of the City of Toronto v. Virgo. Regulation promotes the freedom or the facility which is required to be regulated in the interest of all concerned, whereas prohibition obstructs or shuts off, or denies it to those to whom it is applied. The Oxford English Dictionary does not define regulate to include prohibition so that if it had been the intention to prohibit the supply, distribution, consumption or use of energy, the legislature would not have contented itself with the use of the word regulating without using the word prohibiting or some such word, to bring out that effect."
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#### Immigration reform likely but not guaranteed

Julian Zelizer, CNN Contributor, Ph.D, Princeton University History and Public Affairs Professor, 3/25/13, Seize the immigration deal, www.cnn.com/2013/03/25/opinion/zelizer-immigration-reform/index.html

The stars seem to be aligning for immigration reform. The election of 2012 scared many Republicans into thinking that their increasingly hardline stance on immigration is cutting against big demographic changes. These Republicans fear that they might risk writing themselves off for decades to come, if the GOP loses a vital part of the electorate to Democrats. A growing number of prominent Republicans are coming out in favor of a liberalized immigration policy, including the tea party darlings Sens. Rand Paul and Marco Rubio. During a recent speech to the U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, Paul said that "immigration reform will not occur until conservative Republicans, like myself, become part of the solution." Democratic Sen. Chuck Schumer of New York announced that an eight-person bipartisan group will soon reach a deal to move forward in the Senate. So it appears that **the opportunity for bold immigration reform has finally arrived**. But as any observer of congressional history knows, nothing is inevitable on Capitol Hill, particularly in the current Congress, where both parties remain extremely polarized and there are high costs for bucking the party orthodoxy. What needs to happen to close a deal? It is instructive to look back at history when Congress passed two landmark civil rights measures: the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Both were highly controversial; but ultimately, they went through as a result of bipartisan deals. Even though Congress is different in this era -- with both parties deeply divided internally and a closed committee system that dampens the power of party leaders to control members -- those historical struggles offer some instructive lessons for today as to how to seize a great opportunity that emerges. The news media have always been a powerful force in our society. At times, they have helped push our political system toward reform. Right now, a new generation of reporters can shine by taking on the biggest stories of the day that would have long-term impact on the direction of our country. This is what happened during the early 1960s, when a young generation of print and television reporters brought the nation vivid reports from the front lines of the civil rights struggle. In those years, reporters covered the brutal clashes that were taking place in southern cities like Birmingham and Selma, Alabama, showing the nation the reality of race relations. When presidential speechwriter Richard Goodwin watched the clashes on his television screen, he instantly understood how the media were transforming the national conversation. He noted, "For a century the violence of oppression had been hidden from the sight of white America. ... But now the simple invention of a cathode ray tube, transforming light into electrons, registering their impact on the magnetic tape, had torn the curtain away. And America didn't like what it saw." Similarly, in the new Internet age that we live in, the media can offer the nation a better understanding of the plight of immigrants who are living in this country and the kinds of problems that legislation can redress. Too often, discussions about immigration have revolved around vague and caricatured images. In the next few months, young and enterprising reporters can help politicians and voters see why the government needs to resolve this issue and how it can best do so. Another important lesson from history is the need to reach out to the other side when a rare opportunity comes along. In the civil rights debate, President Lyndon Johnson depended on the Senate minority leader, Republican Everett Dirksen of Illinois, to deliver the votes needed to end a filibuster in 1964. In order to get Dirksen on his side, Johnson told his administration team and congressional leadership to play to Dirksen's ego and sense of history. The key was to allow Dirksen to shape the bill, within certain parameters, so that he could leave his imprint on the measure. "You get in there to see Dirksen!" Johnson told Sen. Hubert Humphrey, the Democratic whip who was shepherding the bill through the Senate. "You drink with Dirksen! You talk to Dirksen! You listen to Dirksen!" Dirksen made some important changes to the bill during the negotiations but in the end, he delivered over 20 Republican votes, which killed the filibuster. Johnson got what he wanted. President Obama will need to make the same kind of moves, giving Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell some kind of a role so that he can buy into the legislation and win some amount of credit for producing a bill. The president will need to do the same in the House, where Speaker John Boehner will play a vital role as he tries to tame the radicals in his caucus. While giving either Republican such a role might frustrate Democrats who feel that their party is in command, the results could be powerful. Immigration rights activists can sit tight as the final months of the debate unfold. For all the talk about bipartisanship in the 1960s, the reality was that bipartisanship was often produced when legislators felt immense pressure from the grass roots. When the Senate debated the civil rights bill in a lengthy filibuster that lasted 60 days in the spring and summer of 1964, civil rights activists -- who had already forced Congress to deal with the issue through a mass march on Washington -- conducted protests in states and districts and gathered in Washington to lobby members. The immigration rights movement has been extremely effective in recent years, and now it must show its chops once again. It must also form alliances with other organizations, such as civil rights and gay rights groups, that have indicated they are willing to enter into a broader coalition to support this cause. The movement needs to work on legislators who are currently on the fence, especially Republicans who are thinking of joining Rubio, Paul and others. The key is to do this without stimulating some kind of backlash in their constituencies. **The moment for an immigration deal has arrived**. The political incentives for saying yes are strong in both parties, and this is an issue that needs a resolution. **The key question will be whether Congress seizes this opportunity** or whether partisanship paralyzes the institution once again, as it has done so many times before.

Expanded OCS drilling on federal land causes intense political fights

Krauss 12 (Clifford Krauss and Ashley Parker, NYT energy reporters, 8/22/2012, "Romney Energy Plan Would Expand Oil Drilling on U.S. Land and Offshore", www.nytimes.com/2012/08/23/us/politics/romney-tries-to-refocus-campaign-on-economy-and-obama-turns-to-education.html)

HOUSTON — Mitt Romney plans to unveil an energy plan Thursday morning in Hobbs, N.M., that would allow states more control over the development of energy resources on federal lands within their borders, as well as aggressively expand offshore oil and gas drilling — including along the coasts of Virginia and the Carolinas — as part of a broader effort to reach energy independence. The plan is bound to be contentious after the disastrous BP well blowout in 2010, which leaked millions of barrels of oil in the Gulf of Mexico and left 11 workers dead. The proposal may win votes in Virginia, where drilling would bring jobs and state revenues, but would be controversial in Florida, where offshore drilling has long been viewed as a threat to tourism. The Romney campaign released the proposal, complete with a 21-page white paper, Wednesday evening as part of an overall energy plan that includes granting states more regulatory power over drilling on federal lands, revitalizing the nuclear power industry, and approving the Keystone XL pipeline to carry more Canadian oil to refineries in the United States. Romney campaign officials emphasized the importance of opening more oil and gas drilling on federal lands, a theme that Mr. Romney is likely to trumpet Thursday on his visit to New Mexico, where the oil industry hopes to open more federal areas for exploration and production. “What Governor Romney is proposing is that state governments, which already control the development of energy resources on their own and private lands within their borders, would also control the development of energy resources on federal lands within their borders,” said Oren Cass, the campaign’s domestic policy director, in a conference call with reporters Wednesday. The proposal will surely be controversial among environmentalists hoping to preserve lands like desert stretches of New Mexico where threatened species roam. A campaign document, however, said the proposal would exclude “lands specially designated off-limits,” which presumably means national parks.

#### That kills Obama’s immigration push

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

At a news conference where TV cameras in the back were nearly stacked on top of each other, an influential bipartisan group of five senators introduced legislation late last month to overhaul the nation’s immigration system. The room was so crowded that no open seats or standing room could be found. A week later, one senator, Republican Lisa Murkowski of Alaska, was standing at the podium in the same room to unveil her energy-policy blueprint. There were several open seats and just a few cameras. At least one reporter was there to ask the senator about her position on President Obama’s choice for Defense secretary, former Republican Sen. Chuck Hagel. “I’m doing energy right now,” Murkowski responded. “I’m focused on that.” Almost everyone else on Capitol Hill is focused on something else. Aside from the broad fiscal issues, **Congress and the president are** galvanizing around immigration reform. Four years ago, the White House prioritized health care reform above comprehensive climate-change legislation. The former will go down in history as one of Obama’s most significant accomplishments. The latter is in the perpetual position of second fiddle. “**To everything**,” **Murkowski interjected** fervently **when asked** by National Journal Daily **whether energy** and climate policy **was second to other policies** in Washington’s pecking order. Murkowski, ranking member of the Senate's Energy and Natural Resources Committee, said she hoped the Super Bowl blackout would help the public understand the importance of energy policy. “This issue of **immigration**: Why are we all **focused on that**? Well, it’s because the Republicans lost the election because in part we did not have the Hispanic community behind us,” Murkowski said this week. “What is it that brings about that motivation? Maybe it could be something like a gap in the Super Bowl causes the focus on energy that we need to have. I can only hope.” It will take more than hope. Elections have consequences, but so far the only kind of electoral consequence climate and energy policy has instigated is one that helped some lawmakers who supported cap-and-trade legislation to lose their seats in the 2010 midterm elections. For the pendulum to swing the other way—for lawmakers to lose their seats over not acting on climate and energy policy—seems almost unfathomable right now. Billions of dollars are invested in the fossil-fuel power plants, refineries, and pipelines that the country depends on today. The companies that own this infrastructure have a business interest in keeping things the way they are. Immigration reform doesn’t face such formidable interests invested in the status quo. “They [businesses] have employees—real, visible people—who they value and who they want to make legal as soon as possible,” said Chris Miller, who until earlier this year was the top energy and environment adviser to Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev. On energy and climate-change policy, Miller added, “You’re probably never going to have anything like the fence in the Southwest or the border-control issue that **push**es action and debate **on immigration**, because climate-change impacts will likely continue to be more abstract in the public's mind until those impacts are so crystal-clear it’s too late for us to do anything.” Another, tactical reason helps build momentum on immigration and not on other issues. **Obama can capitalize on immigration** as it becomes more of a wedge issue within the GOP. On energy and climate policy, Obama faces a unified Republican Party. “The president has cracked the code on how to push his agenda items through. He learned from his victories on the payroll tax and the fiscal cliff that the key is to stake out the political high ground on issues that poll in his favor while exploiting the divisions within the GOP,” said a former Republican leadership aide who would speak only on the condition of anonymity. “With this in mind, the next logical place for him to go is immigration. Unlike issues like energy or tax reform where the GOP is united, he can claim a big win on immigration reform while striking a political blow to Republicans.”

#### Immigration reform necessary to sustain the economy and competitiveness

Javier Palomarez, Forbes, 3/6/13, The Pent Up Entrepreneurship That Immigration Reform Would Unleash, www.forbes.com/sites/realspin/2013/03/06/the-pent-up-entrepreneurship-that-immigration-reform-would-unleash/print/

The main difference between now and 2007 is that today the role of immigrants and their many contributions to the American economy have been central in the country’s national conversation on the issue. Never before have Latinos been so central to the election of a U.S. President as in 2012. New evidence about the economic importance of immigration reform, coupled with the new political realities presented by the election, have given reform a higher likelihood of passing. As the President & CEO of the country’s largest Hispanic business association, the U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce (USHCC), which advocates for the interests of over 3 million Hispanic owned businesses, I have noticed that nearly every meeting I hold with corporate leaders now involves a discussion of how and when immigration reform will pass. The USHCC has long seen comprehensive immigration reform as an economic imperative, and now the wider business community seems to be sharing our approach. It is no longer a question of whether it will pass. Out of countless conversations with business leaders in virtually every sector and every state, a consensus has emerged: our broken and outdated immigration system hinders our economy’s growth and puts America’s global leadership in jeopardy. Innovation drives the American economy, and without good ideas and skilled workers, our country won’t be able to transform industries or to lead world markets as effectively as it has done for decades. Consider some figures: Immigrant-owned firms generate an estimated $775 billion in annual revenue, $125 billion in payroll and about $100 billion in income. A study conducted by the New American Economy found that over 40 percent of Fortune 500 companies were started by immigrants or children of immigrants. Leading brands, like Google, Kohls, eBay, Pfizer, and AT&T, were founded by immigrants. Researchers at the Kauffman Foundation released a study late last year showing that from 2006 to 2012, one in four engineering and technology companies started in the U.S. had at least one foreign-born founder — in Silicon Valley it was almost half of new companies. There are an estimated 11 million undocumented workers currently in the U.S. Imagine what small business growth in the U.S. would look like if they were provided legal status, if they had an opportunity for citizenship. Without fear of deportation or prosecution, imagine the pent up entrepreneurship that could be unleashed. After all, these are people who are clearly entrepreneurial in spirit to have come here and risk all in the first place. Immigrants are twice as likely to start businesses as native-born Americans, and statistics show that most job growth comes from small businesses. While immigrants are both critically-important consumers and producers, they boost the economic well-being of native-born Americans as well. Scholars at the Brookings Institution recently described the relationship of these two groups of workers as complementary. This is because lower-skilled immigrants largely take farming and other manual, low-paid jobs that native-born workers don’t usually want. For example, when Alabama passed HB 56, an immigration law in 2012 aimed at forcing self-deportation, the state lost roughly $11 billion in economic productivity as crops were left to wither and jobs were lost. Immigration reform would also address another important angle in the debate – the need to entice high-skilled immigrants. Higher-skilled immigrants provide talent that high-tech companies often cannot locate domestically. High-tech leaders recently organized a nationwide “virtual march for immigration reform” to pressure policymakers to remove barriers that prevent them from recruiting the workers they need. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, fixing immigration makes sound fiscal sense. Economist Raul Hinojosa-Ojeda calculated in 2010 that comprehensive immigration reform would add $1.5 trillion to the country’s GDP over 10 years and add $66 billion in tax revenue – enough to fully fund the Small Business Administration and the Departments of the Treasury and Commerce for over two years. As Congress continues to wring its hands and debate the issue, lawmakers must understand what both businesses and workers already know: The American economy needs comprehensive immigration reform.

**Extinction**

**Auslin 9**

(Michael, Resident Scholar – American Enterprise Institute, and Desmond Lachman – Resident Fellow – American Enterprise Institute, “The Global Economy Unravels”, Forbes, 3-6, http://www.aei.org/article/100187)

What do these trends mean in the short and medium term? The Great Depression showed how social and **global chaos** followed hard on economic collapse. The mere fact that parliaments across the globe, from America to Japan, are unable to make responsible, economically sound recovery plans suggests that they do not know what to do and are simply hoping for the least disruption. Equally worrisome is the adoption of more statist economic programs around the globe, and the concurrent decline of trust in free-market systems. The threat of instability is a pressing concern. China, until last year the world's fastest growing economy, just reported that 20 million migrant laborers lost their jobs. Even in the flush times of recent years, China faced upward of 70,000 labor uprisings a year. A sustained downturn poses grave and possibly immediate threats to Chinese internal stability. The regime in Beijing may be faced with a choice of repressing its own people or diverting their energies outward, leading to conflict with China's neighbors. Russia, an oil state completely dependent on energy sales, has had to put down riots in its Far East as well as in downtown Moscow. Vladimir Putin's rule has been predicated on squeezing civil liberties while providing economic largesse. If that devil's bargain falls apart, then wide-scale repression inside Russia, along with a continuing threatening posture toward Russia's neighbors, is likely. Even apparently stable societies face increasing risk and the threat of internal or possibly external conflict. As Japan's exports have plummeted by nearly 50%, one-third of the country's prefectures have passed emergency economic stabilization plans. Hundreds of thousands of temporary employees hired during the first part of this decade are being laid off. Spain's unemployment rate is expected to climb to nearly 20% by the end of 2010; Spanish unions are already protesting the lack of jobs, and the specter of violence, as occurred in the 1980s, is haunting the country. Meanwhile, in Greece, workers have already taken to the streets. Europe as a whole will face dangerously increasing tensions between native citizens and immigrants, largely from poorer Muslim nations, who have increased the labor pool in the past several decades. Spain has absorbed five million immigrants since 1999, while nearly 9% of Germany's residents have foreign citizenship, including almost 2 million Turks. The xenophobic labor strikes in the U.K. do not bode well for the rest of Europe. A prolonged global downturn, let alone a collapse, would **dramatically raise tensions** inside these countries. Couple that with possible protectionist legislation in the United States, unresolved ethnic and territorial disputes in **all regions of the globe** and a loss of confidence that world leaders actually know what they are doing. The result may be a series of small explosions that coalesce **into a big bang**.
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#### Obama’s commitment to environmentalists has made Keystone possible – saving relations with Canada

Seib, 2/18

(Wall Street Journal Columnist, “How Obama Might Get to 'Yes' on Keystone Pipeline,” http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887323764804578312290010174614.html)

One of President Barack Obama's trickiest political tasks early in his second term has nothing to do with taxes, budget or the debt ceiling. Rather, it will be his decision this spring on whether to give the go-ahead to the Keystone XL pipeline. Keystone XL—the proposed new spur of a transcontinental pipeline that would carry heavy crude oil from Canada to refineries on the U.S. Gulf Coast—was splitting Mr. Obama's Democratic coalition even before it became highly politicized when a decision was put off during last year's presidential campaign. Now, the temperature is rising. Environmentalists, whose admiration for Mr. Obama is about matched by their hatred of the pipeline and the oil it would transport, were busy over the weekend protesting in Washington in an attempt to stop the pipeline. Still, unions back the idea because of the construction and refining jobs it could create, and nine Democratic senators have joined 44 Republicans in a letter asking for approval. There is ample reason to think the second-term Obama White House, seeing openings to shake America's dependence on Middle East oil, **would like to find a way to give the green light.** And if that's so, **a combination of forces are lining up in a way that should make it possible for Mr. Obama to get to a "yes" answer, while limiting the political fallout.** One argument Mr. Obama can muster for Keystone XL is that the delay in approval that he ordered last year has worked, at least as far as environmental concerns go. It bought time for a change that addresses a principal worry, which was the route of the pipeline. Initially, the pipeline was to go through Nebraska's ecologically sensitive Sand Hills region. Even within deep-red Nebraska, environmental concerns about that route ran high enough to create a roadblock. Now, the route has been changed. A Nebraska state agency said last month the environmental risks of this new route would be "minimal," and Republican Gov. Dave Heineman just gave the pipeline a green light. Environmental groups aren't concerned merely with the route of the pipeline, of course, but with its very reason for existence: its use in facilitating the further burning of oil, and specifically oil extracted from Canada's tar sands, which is dirtier than average to produce. But on this front, the pipeline's symbolic importance outstrips its practical impact. Stopping Keystone won't stop Canada from producing the oil. The Canadians have too much invested in oil-sands extraction to simply stop. One likely effect of shutting down the pipeline—aside from **deeply straining U.S.-Canadian relations**—would be to divert the same oil into exports to Asia, for use by China, a country that is doing far less on other fronts to deal with climate change and dirty auto emissions than is the U.S. More immediately, tar-sands oil still would find its way to the U.S. by other routes—rail, truck and other pipelines—meaning its use won't be extinguished, but the efficiency by which it is brought to market would be diminished. **More important**, though**, is the broader environmental backdrop of the Keystone decisions.** The U.S. is starting to make meaningful progress on reducing greenhouse-gas emissions, despite the hard reality that it can't yet shake its addition to oil. Thanks to a combination of forces—the increasing use of relatively clean natural gas, improved energy efficiency and, yes, a world-wide recession—the U.S. actually is on track to meet its goal of reducing its greenhouse-gas emissions to 17% below 2005 levels by 2020, a goal Mr. Obama laid out in late 2009. The U.S. is outpacing Europe in reducing carbon emissions. Which **opens the door to the real path** Mr. **Obama can travel in selling Keystone XL approval to his party's base**. It is possible to **combine Keystone with other environmental moves** to show that progress in cutting greenhouse gases will continue even as the pipeline is built. In his State of the Union address last week, Mr. Obama called on Congress to construct a "bipartisan, market-based solution to climate change," citing specifically an approach Republican Sen. John McCain and then-Democratic Sen. Joe Lieberman advanced several years ago. But if Congress doesn't act, Mr. Obama said, he would explore "executive actions" to reduce pollution and address climate change. That suggests the president would consider moving beyond an existing Environmental Protection Agency proposal to regulate emissions from new power plants and perhaps put new limits on emissions from existing coal-powered plants. Whatever the president has in mind specifically, it should be easier to sell Keystone XL if that decision is paired with one showing that the progress the U.S. already has made on climate change will continue, even if the U.S. can't soon kick its oil habit. That is precisely the picture Mr. Obama ought to be able to paint as the big decision point nears.

Environmentalists oppose oil

Frum, 2012

David Frum, contributing editor at Newsweek , Daily Beast, 1-12-2012, “Why Environmentalists Actually Oppose Keystone XL,” http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2012/01/12/who-s-opposed-to-north-american-oil.html

The stated grounds of environmental opposition to the Keystone project? The pipeline’s route passes through Nebraska, and local activists fret that the pipeline might crack, spill, and poison local aquifers. The impression is left that this project would despoil a virginal natural landscape.

Let’s do a reality check.

Here’s the map of the existing network of (major) oil pipelines in the United States.

As you’ll see, Nebraska is already criss-crossed by pipelines—just as you would expect from a state so near the geographic center of the country.

Here’s the natural gas pipeline network:

gas-lines

A map of the US natural gas pipeline network (eia.gov)

To look at these maps is to see instantly the speciousness of the stated objection to Keystone. The real motive is opposition to anything that might increase oil use in the United States—combined with a cowardly refusal by environmental groups to propose the one policy that might actually achieve that end: significant energy taxation.

Environmental groups are caught in a big lie: they want people to believe that green technology will lower the cost of energy. That’s pretty self-evidently false. That original falsehood tangles environmentalists in a whole series of knock-on falsehoods, including the falsehood that they only object to Keystone because of the route—rather than the truth that they oppose all new sources of oil altogether.

#### Key to Arctic cooperation

Hampson, Chancellor’s Professor and Director of the Norman Paterson School of International Affairs at Carleton University, 7/21/2012

(Fen Osler H. and Derek Burney, Senior Strategic Adviser at Norton Rose Canada, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137744/derek-h-burney-and-fen-osler-hampson/how-obama-lost-canada)

**Permitting** the construction of the **Keystone** XL pipeline **should have been an easy diplomatic** and economic **decision** for U.S. President Barack Obama. The completed project would have shipped more than 700,000 barrels a day of Albertan oil to refineries in the Gulf Coast, generated tens of thousands of jobs for U.S. workers, and met the needs of refineries in Texas that are desperately seeking oil from Canada, a more reliable supplier than Venezuela or countries in the Middle East. The project posed little risk to the landscape it traversed. But instead of acting on economic logic, the Obama administration caved to environmental activists in November 2011, **postponing until 2013** the decision on whether to allow the pipeline.

**Obama’s choice** marked a triumph of campaign posturing over pragmatism and diplomacy, and it **brought U.S.-Canadian relations to their lowest point in decades**. It was hardly the first time that the administration has fumbled issues with Ottawa. Although relations have been civil, they have rarely been productive. Whether on trade, the environment, or Canada’s shared contribution in places such as Afghanistan, time and again the United States has jilted its northern neighbor. **If the pattern of neglect continues**, Ottawa will get less interested in cooperating with Washington. Already, Canada has reacted by turning elsewhere -- namely, toward Asia -- for more reliable economic partners.

Economically, Canada and the United States are joined at the hip. Each country is the other’s number-one trading partner -- in 2011, the two-way trade in goods and services totaled $681 billion, more than U.S. trade with Mexico or China -- and trade with Canada supports more than eight million U.S. jobs. Yet the Obama administration has recently jeopardized this important relationship. It failed to combat the Buy American provision in Congress’ stimulus bill, which inefficiently excluded Canadian participation in infrastructure spending.

What’s more, by engaging in protectionism, Washington has violated the substance and spirit of the North American Free Trade Agreement, the trade bloc formed in 1994 among Canada, the United States, and Mexico. As a result, NAFTA, which was initially intended as a template for broader trade expansion by all three partners, has languished while each country has negotiated a spaghetti bowl of bilateral trade agreements with other countries. Trilateral economic summits among the NAFTA partners have become little more than photo-ops accompanied by bland communiqués. Bilateral meetings between U.S. and Canadian leaders, which were a regular feature of the Bill Clinton and George W. Bush eras, have also mostly fallen by the wayside. Meanwhile, the United States demanded upfront concessions from Canada as the price of entry to negotiations over the Trans-Pacific Partnership, a regional free-trade group, while preserving massive agriculture subsidies of its own. The protracted wrangling over a seat at the table does not augur well for meaningful progress.

After years of procrastination, Canada finally secured an agreement for a new Detroit-Windsor bridge -- over which 25 percent of trade between Canada and the United States crosses -- but only after it offered to cover all of the initial costs. The U.S. share is to be repaid over time by the tolls collected, but any shortfalls will rest with Canadian taxpayers. Canada was essentially forced to hold negotiations with Michigan; the U.S. federal government observed quietly from the sidelines.

The United States’ mistreatment of Canada extends beyond economic issues. Washington has also failed to trust and respect its loyal ally. To name one small but telling example, when Canada ran for a nonpermanent seat on the UN Security Council in 2010, the United States offered little support. For whatever reason, Portugal was a more compelling choice.

One would also think the United States and Canada could find **common ground on security**, economic, and environmental **issues in the Arctic**, an area of shared sovereignty and responsibility. Yet there has been little more than senseless bickering and public spats between Ottawa and Washington on who should attend what meeting of Arctic states. U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, for example, went out of her way to rake Canada over the coals for hosting a meeting of Arctic coastal nations in March 2010 and failing to invite other countries with “legitimate interests” in the region. But she was also taking a jab at Canada’s long-standing claims to the waters of the Arctic archipelago, including the Northwest Passage, which the United States rejects. **While Canada and the** United States **squabble**, **Russia and China are aggressively asserting their own interests in the region**.

Beginning with Obama’s visit to Ottawa in February 2009, Canada has also made repeated overtures to find consensus on climate change, pressing for common North American approaches and fuel standards to curtail carbon emissions. No representative from the Obama administration showed any interest in such a strategy; instead, the administration preferred a unilateral approach, which died in the Senate. The bilateral “clean energy dialogue” Obama touted during his 2009 visit has become a monologue.

In Afghanistan, Canada is now rapidly scaling back its substantial commitment to the military mission, thanks to the United States’ increasingly erratic, if not embarrassing, direction. Canada has spent billions on the war and lost over 150 soldiers, proportionately more than any other ally, but has received no tangible dividend for its support on bilateral or multilateral issues of concern to it. Canada also participated in NATO’s mission in Libya -- where a Canadian, Lieutenant-General Charles Bouchard, commanded military operations. Canada has no tangible interests of any kind in Afghanistan or Libya. Its participation in those countries, proportionately larger than any other ally, was intended primarily to strengthen the partnership with the United States on the theory that solid multilateral commitments would engender more productive bilateral relations. That proved not to be the case.

The only good news in U.S.-Canadian relations to come out of this White House has been the Beyond the Border declaration, a joint statement that Obama and Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper issued in February 2011. The initiative was supposed to remove much of the bureaucratic sludge that has thickened the U.S.-Canadian border since 9/11, including costly inspection and reporting requirements on virtually all cross-border shipments. Despite the initial fanfare, however, the border initiative has yet to deliver much of substance, and there has been little evidence to suggest that Obama remains engaged.

Of course, the U.S.-Canadian relationship has had its rocky moments before. In the 1970s and 1980s, in response to public concern over the United States’ economic domination of Canada, Ottawa enacted a wide variety of protectionist measures that irritated Washington. Eventually, the two countries recognized their mutual interests and resolved what differences they had, ratifying the Canada–United States Free Trade Agreement in 1987 and its successor, NAFTA, seven years later.

**Back then**, **Canada had little choice but to find a way to fix its relationship with the** United States, the only game in town. **Ottawa is in a different position now**. Today, it enjoys a respectable platform of self-confidence, having weathered the financial crisis and ensuing recession far better than the United States. And unlike in the past, Canada can now look beyond its own neighborhood for economic opportunities -- especially to the rising economies of Asia.

Indeed, Canada has made a full-court press in the Asia-Pacific region. It is wooing countries such as China, India, Japan, and South Korea, which are eager to invest and trade in Canadian minerals, energy, and agricultural products. Harper has announced Canada’s intention to explore free-trade negotiations with China, and talks with Japan, Thailand, India, and South Korea are under way. As Harper put it during a visit to China in February, “**We want to sell our energy to people who want to buy our energy**.”

To be sure, Canadian companies will never abandon the U.S. market. Nevertheless, the U.S. recession and the rise of Asia have allowed Canada to diversify its economic relations. In 2010, only 68 percent of Canadian exports were destined for the United States, down from 85 percent in 2000. Canadians are accustomed to benign neglect from a neighbor preoccupied with more urgent global flashpoints, but since that neglect has grown so much as to be malign, **they have begun to reappraise their relationship with the** United States. **As Canada develops closer ties with China and finds more receptive outlets for its exports**, **the** United States **may find itself with a less obliging partner to the north**.

#### That deters conflict

Dobransky ‘12

Steve, Adjunct Professor at Lakeland College. He is completing his Ph.D. at Kent State University and is ABD. He has an M.A. from Ohio University and a B.A. from Cleveland State University. “Military Security, Energy Resources, and the Emergence of the Northwest Passage: Canada’s Arctic Dilemma,” <http://www.unc.edu/depts/diplomat/item/2012/0106/ca/dobransky_arctic.html>, AM

If Canada is to achieve its territorial and diplomatic ambitions**,** then it likely requires a much greater civilian and military presence in the Arctic all year-round**.** Yet**,** there is no indication that Canadians are willing to sacrifice their current social system of extensive benefits for a much larger military budget and Arctic force**. And,** there is no evidence that Canadians want to pay much more in taxes or commit to a military draft. Canada has only around 70,000 active-duty military personnel, 30,000 reserve forces, and a $20 billion/year military budget. Its Arctic-ready forces and equipment are just a handful, a few thousand personnel at best who are truly specialists, mainly the Canadian Rangers. Moreover, there is no indication that Canada’s economy will greatly expand in the foreseeable future to produce the necessary surplus wealth to pay for a sizeable increase in an Arctic force. Canada’s economic growth has not been great over the last decade, let alone ever. Thus**,** Canada presents a very vocal casefor the Arctic but has been unable to completely back up its claims with the necessary increases in personnel, materials, ships, and money, which is very telling for the future. If not by now, then when?17If Canada is unwilling to shift or produce enough resources to create a sufficient Arctic force that is capable of fully securing the region over the three thousand miles of waterways, **plus above and beneath the surface, then** it opens up the possibility that other forces outside the region may move in and claim the trillions of dollars in natural resources. Russia is an obvious pursuer. The U.S. is another option. China, with its massively growing need for oil—especially when it runs out of much of its own domestic sources in approximately 10 years—will be looking everywhere for oil opportunities. Any country that can move oil rigs and mining companies into the Arctic area, operate them and maintain them, and have enough forces to possibly defend them will have trillions of reasons to act pro-actively. Hypothetical but quite possible. Can or will Canada defend this entire region on its own? Can or will Canadians risk an all-out war with Russia, China, or some other major power for control over all of the Arctic resources? Is Canada even capable of going into the ring against any of the major powers, especially if and when there is a great need and crisis in energy resources?18 Canada can make many public proclamations and scholarly materials on its claims to the Arctic, but its inability or unwillingness to move aggressively to secure the emerging Arctic regionis a signal to all that this could become an open-season area in the near future. The Arctic is increasingly looking like the grounds for a potential rivalry similar to the Western World’s colonization, **an** Oklahoma land rush**, a** California gold rush**,** and of course an Alaskan and Klondike gold rush**. Maybe** all rolled up into one.There are so many valuable resources in this Arctic area that one can only imagine how aggressively countries will act in the coming years and decades as natural resources become increasingly scarce and they become increasingly desperate for **more resources and** revenues**. The** massive amount of resources in the Arctic are there for the taking unless Canadais willing to make significant sacrifices to secure the area. Much greater taxation, a major reduction in social welfare benefits, lower wages, longer work hours, much greater economic production, and a significantly larger military that may require a draft, are all one and together necessary options if Canada is to establish fully a sizeable force to secure the entire Arctic region on its side year-round. Canadians spent years debating whether or not to spend the money for 6-8 ships for the Arctic,which is miniscule but indicative of Canadian priorities and intentions. Much greater resources and sacrifices have to be made. Ironically, Canadians may have to give up being Canadian and become more like Americans in order to make and implement the necessary policy changes and play successfully the game of power politics. So far, most Canadians do not appear willing to give up most of what it is to be Canadian. But, will this change in the future?19 Canadians can hope that other countries do not eventually move into the Arctic region, but it appears increasingly obvious that Canadiansarepassing the torch and initiative to other countries to make the final decision. Canadians, of course, willreject thisbutthe lack of major action and investment in the Arctic region over the past several decades suggest that Canada’s claims to the region rests **more** on political and legal talk thanreal power and action. There has been no indication for the last several years in which the Arctic is now being freely traversed year-round that Canadians have changed in any significant way. If Canadians have chosen to rest their claims on the hope that other countries in the future will sacrifice their wealth, power, and standard of living, let alone trillions of dollars in economic opportunities, just on their own goodwill or moral conscience**,** then it would be a truly dangerous gamble for Canadians. But, in the end, if Canadians are not willing to make the major sacrifices to protect the Arctic and all of its resources, then it is their free choice. Other countries will take note and act accordingly when the time is right and the imperative arises. Power usually trumps legal arguments and paper trails. The Arctic may be the quintessential example in the future.20

The U.S. Perspective and Future Interests and Policy

The United States may sooner or later come to the official recognition that Canada does not appear willing to commit the necessary resources to maintain adequate security in the Arctic. It may already have done so, unofficially. The U.S. has maintained some strategic forces in the region, mainly submarines, but the U.S. has yet to make anywhere near the aggressive moves and forces as Russia. The U.S. does not have a modern fleet of Arctic icebreakers, but it certainly has the capability to build one. The Russians are expanding rapidly in the Arctic region in terms of claims, exploration, and slowly but surely oil and mining activities. **The U.S. must soon determine its policy on this matter or else the Russians may make the decision for it**. **The U.S. has worked with Canada on joint security throughout the Cold War**, mainly through NORAD and the multiple layers of radar across Canada up to the Arctic. Both the U.S. and Canada have laid down many sonar devices as well. The primary threats to both countries for much of the last half century have been Russian submarines, bombers, and ICBMs. There is less of a threat now with the end of the Cold War, but the security issue remains and could emerge again **in the near future**.21 The existing international security and energy situations are precarious. Any Middle East crisis that cuts off significant amounts of oil will lead many countries to desperately search for new oil reserves to quickly replenish their lost ones. How long the Arctic will remain off the front stage of world affairs is a question that may be answered sooner rather than later. In the future, the greatest threat to U.S. interests in the Arctic may be Canada’s inability or unwillingness to develop an adequate security plan and force to the emerging economic opportunities in the Arctic. The U.S. does not recognize Canada’s claim to the waterways and, thus, cannot establish an official joint security program in areas in which it does not recognize Canadian sovereignty. Canada cannot do this as well without a major diplomatic backlash by the U.S. and others. Neither side can maintain a fiction for long without having the other renounce its claims and oppose its policy. Thus, **strategic threats to North America above and below the Arctic may continue to be addressed jointly by the U.S. and Canada** through NORAD and other existing security bodies, **but the emerging economic opportunities and subsequent security threats have yet to lead to a plausible joint policy program** or organization. This, in the end, may require multinational negotiations or bilateral and individual actions vis-à-vis other countries outside the area. But, this likely will be a very weak and limited policy option with highly questionable results.

Nuclear war

Wallace, 10

(Professor Emeritus at the University of British Columbia, March, “Ridding the Arctic of Nuclear Weapons A Task Long Overdue”, http://www.arcticsecurity.org/docs/arctic-nuclear-report-web.pdf)

The fact is, the Arctic is becoming a **zone of increased military competition**. Russian President Medvedev has announced the creation of a special military force to defend Arctic claims. Last year Russian General Vladimir Shamanov declared that Russian troops would step up training for Arctic combat, and that Russia’s submarine fleet would increase its “operational radius.” Recently, two Russian attack submarines were spotted off the U.S. east coast for the first time in 15 years. In January 2009, on the eve of Obama’s inauguration, President Bush issued a National Security Presidential Directive on Arctic Regional Policy. It affirmed as a priority the preservation of U.S. military vessel and aircraft mobility and transit throughout the Arctic, including the Northwest Passage, and foresaw greater capabilities to protect U.S. borders in the Arctic. The Bush administration’s disastrous eight years in office, particularly its decision to withdraw from the ABM treaty and deploy missile defence interceptors and a radar station in Eastern Europe, have greatly contributed to the instability we are seeing today, even though the Obama administration has scaled back the planned deployments. The Arctic has figured in this renewed interest in Cold War weapons systems, particularly the upgrading of the Thule Ballistic Missile Early Warning System radar in Northern Greenland for ballistic missile defence. The Canadian government, as well, has put forward new military capabilities to protect Canadian sovereignty claims in the Arctic, including proposed ice-capable ships, a northern military training base and a deep-water port. Earlier this year Denmark released an all-party defence position paper that suggests the country should create a dedicated Arctic military contingent that draws on army, navy and air force assets with shipbased helicopters able to drop troops anywhere. Danish fighter planes would be tasked to patrol Greenlandic airspace. Last year Norway chose to buy 48 Lockheed Martin F-35 fighter jets, partly because of their suitability for Arctic patrols. In March, that country held a major Arctic military practice involving 7,000 soldiers from 13 countries in which a fictional country called Northland seized offshore oil rigs. The manoeuvres prompted a protest from Russia – which objected again in June after Sweden held its largest northern military exercise since the end of the Second World War. About 12,000 troops, 50 aircraft and several warships were involved. Jayantha Dhanapala, President of Pugwash and former UN under-secretary for disarmament affairs, summarized the situation bluntly: “From those in the international peace and security sector, deep concerns are being expressed over the fact that two nuclear weapon states – the United States and the Russian Federation, which together own 95 per cent of the nuclear weapons in the world – converge on the Arctic and have competing claims. These claims, together with those of other allied NATO countries – Canada, Denmark, Iceland, and Norway – could, if unresolved, lead to **conflict escalating into the threat or use of nuclear weapons.**” Many will no doubt argue that this is excessively alarmist, but **no circumstance in which nuclear powers find themselves in military confrontation can be taken lightly**. The current geo-political threat level is nebulous and low – for now, according to Rob Huebert of the University of Calgary, “[the] issue is the uncertainty as Arctic states and non-Arctic states begin to recognize the geo-political/economic significance of the Arctic because of climate change.”

## off

#### The aff’s invocation of death impacts is necrophilia, a blind obsession with body counts that ends in extinction. Vote neg to reject death impacts—this is a gateway issue—if they win death impacts are good, the rest of the 1NC applies—we won’t cross-apply to prove links

Erich **Fromm 64**, PhD in sociology from Heidelberg in 1922, psychology prof at MSU in the 60’s, “Creators and Destroyers”, The Saturday Review, New York (04. January 1964), pp. 22-25

People are aware of the possibility of nuclear war; they are aware of the destruction such a war could bring with it--and yet they seemingly make no effort to avoid it. Most of us are puzzled by this behavior because we start out from the premise that people love life and fear death. Perhaps we should be less puzzled if we questioned this premise. Maybe there are many people who are indifferent to life and many others who do not love life but who do love death. There is an orientation which we may call love of life (biophilia); it is the normal orientation among healthy persons. But there is also to be found in others a deep attraction to death which, following Unamuno's classic speech made at the University of Salamanca (1938), I call necrophilia. It is the attitude which a Franco general, Millán Astray, expressed in the slogan "Long live death, thus provoking Unamuno’s protest against this "necrophilous and senseless cry." Who is a necrophilous person? He is one who is attracted to and fascinated by all that is not alive, to all that is dead; to corpses, to decay, to feces, to dirt. Necrophiles are those people who love to talk about sickness, burials, death. They come to life precisely when they can talk about death. A clear example of the pure necrophilous type was Hitler. He was fascinated by destruction, and the smell of death was sweet to him. While in the years of success it may have appeared that he wanted only to destroy those whom he considered his enemies, the days of the Götterdämmerung at the end showed that his deepest satisfaction lay in witnessing total and absolute destruction: that of the German people, of those around him, and of himself. The necrophilous dwell in the past, never in the future. Their feelings are essentially sentimental; that is, they nurse the memory of feelings which they had yesterday--or believe that they had. They are cold, distant, devotees of "law and order." Their values are precisely the reverse of the values we connect with normal life; not life, but death excites and satisfies them. If one wants to understand the influence of men like Hitler and Stalin, it lies precisely in their unlimited capacity and willingness to kill. For this they' were loved by the necrophiles. Of the rest, many were afraid of them and so preferred to admire, rather than to be aware of, their fear. Many others did not sense the necrophilous quality of these leaders and saw in them the builders, saviors, good fathers. If the necrophilous leaders had not pretended that they were builders and protectors, the number of people attracted to them would hardly have been sufficient to help them seize power, and the number of those repelled by them would probably soon have led to their downfall. While life is characterized by growth in a structured, functional manner, the necrophilous principle is all that which does not grow, that which is mechanical. The necrophilous person is driven by the desire to transform the organic into the inorganic, to approach life mechanically, as if all living persons were things. All living processes, feelings, and thoughts are transformed into things. Memory, rather than experience--having, rather than being--are what counts. The necrophilous person can relate to an object--a flower or a person--only if he possesses it; hence, a threat to his possession is a threat to himself; if he loses possession he loses contact with the world. That is why we find the paradoxical reaction that he would rather lose life than possession, even though, by losing life, he who possesses has ceased to exist. He loves control, and in the act of controlling he kills life. He is deeply afraid of life, because it is disorderly and uncontrollable by its very nature. The woman who wrongly claims to be the mother of the child in the story of Solomon's judgment is typical of this tendency; she would rather have a properly divided dead child than lose a living one. To the necrophilous person justice means correct division, and they are willing to kill or die for the sake of what they call, justice. "Law and order" for them are idols, and everything that threatens law and order is felt as a satanic attack against their supreme values. The necrophilous person is attracted to darkness and night. In mythology and poetry (as well as in dreams) he is attracted to caves, or to the depth of the ocean, or depicted as being blind. (The trolls in Ibsen's Peer Gynt are a good example.) All that is away from or directed against life attracts him. He wants to return to the darkness {23} of the womb, to the past of inorganic or subhuman existence. He is essentially oriented to the past, not to the future, which he hates and fears. Related to this is his craving for certainty. But life is never certain, never predictable, never controllable; in order to make life controllable, it must be transformed into death; death, indeed, is the only thing about life that is certain to him. The necrophilous person can often be recognized by his looks and his gestures. He is cold, his skin looks dead, and often he has an expression on his face as though he were smelling a bad odor. (This expression could be clearly seen in Hitler's face.) He is orderly and obsessive. This aspect of the necrophilous person has been demonstrated to the world in the figure of Eichmann. Eichmann was fascinated by order and death. His supreme values were obedience and the proper functioning of the organization. He transported Jews as he would have transported coal. That they were human beings was hardly within the field of his vision; hence, even the problem of his having hated or not hated his victims is irrelevant. He was the perfect bureaucrat who had transformed all life into the administration of things. But examples of the necrophilous character are by no means to be found only among the inquisitors, the Hitlers and the Eichmanns. There are any number of individuals who do not have the opportunity and the power to kill, vet whose necrophilia expresses itself in other and (superficially seen) more harmless ways. An example is the mother who will always be interested in her child's sickness, in his failures, in dark prognoses for the future; at the same time she will not be impressed by a favorable change nor respond to her child's joy, nor will she notice anything new that is growing within him. We might find that her dreams deal with sickness, death, corpses, blood. She does not harm the child in any obvious way, yet she may slowly strangle the child's joy of life, his faith--in growth, and eventually infect him with her own necrophilous orientation. My description may have given the impression that all the features mentioned here are necessarily found in the necrophilous person. It is true that such divergent features as the wish to kill, the worship of force, the attraction to death and dirt, sadism, the wish to transform the organic into the inorganic through "order" are all part of the same basic orientation. Yet so far as individuals are concerned, there are considerable differences with respect to the strength of these respective trends. Any one of the features mentioned here may be more pronounced in one person than in another. Furthermore, the degree to which a person is necrophilous in comparison with his biophilous aspects and the degree to which a person is aware of necrophilous tendencies and rationalizes them vary considerably from person to person. Yet the concept of the necrophilous type is by no means an abstraction or summary of various disparate behavior trends. Necrophilia constitutes a fundamental orientation; it is the one answer to life that is in complete opposition to life; it is the most morbid and the most dangerous among the orientations to life of which man is capable. It is true perversion; while living, not life but death is loved--not growth, but destruction. The necrophilous person, if he dares to be aware of what he feels, expresses the motto of his life when he says: "Long live death!" The opposite of the necrophilous orientation is the biophilous one; its essence is love of life in contrast to love of death. Like necrophilia, biophilia is not constituted by a single trait but represents a total orientation, an entire way of being. It is manifested in a person's bodily processes, in his emotions, in his thoughts, in his gestures; the biophilous orientation expresses itself in the whole man. The person who fully loves life is attracted by the process of life in all spheres. He prefers to construct, rather than to retain. He is capable of wondering, and he prefers to see something new to the security of finding the old confirmed. He loves the adventure of living more than he does certainty. His approach to life is functional rather than mechanical. He sees the whole rather than only the parts, structures rather than summations. He wants to mold and to influence by love, by reason, by his example--not by force, by cutting things apart, by the bureaucratic manner of administering people as if they were things. He enjoys life and all its manifestations, rather than mere excitement. Biophilic ethics has its own principle of good and evil. Good is all that serves life; evil is all that serves death. Good is reverence for life (this is the main thesis of Albert Schweitzer, one of the great representatives of the love of life--both in his writings and in his person), and all that enhances life. Evil is all that stifles life, narrows it down, {24} cuts it into pieces. Thus it is from the standpoint of life-ethics that the Bible mentions as the central sin of the Hebrews: "Because thou didst not serve thy Lord with joy and gladness of heart in the abundance of all things." The conscience of the biophilous person is not one of forcing oneself to refrain from evil and to do good. It is not the superego described by .Freud, a strict taskmaster employing sadism against oneself for the sake of virtue. The biophilous conscience is motivated by its attraction to life and joy; the moral effort consists in strengthening the life loving side in oneself. For this reasons the biophile does not dwell in remorse and guilt, which are, after all, only aspects of self-loathing and sadness. He turns quickly to life and attempts to do good. Spinoza's Ethics is a striking example of biophilic morality. "Pleasure," he says, "in itself is not bad but good; contrariwise, pain in itself is bad." And in the same spirit: "A free man thinks of death least of all things; and his wisdom is a meditation not of death but of life." Love of life underlies the various versions of humanistic philosophy. In various conceptual forms these philosophies are in the same vein as Spinoza's; they express the principle that the same man loves life; that man's aim in life is to be attracted by all that is alive and to separate himself from all that is dead and mechanical. The dichotomy of biophilia-necrophilia is the same as Freud's life-and-death instinct. I believe, as Freud did, that this is the most fundamental polarity that exists. However, there is one important difference. Freud assumes that the striving toward death and toward life are two biologically given tendencies inherent in all living substance that their respective strengths are relatively constant, and that there is only one alternative within the operation of the death instinct--namely, that it can be directed against the outside world or against oneself. In contrast to these assumptions I believe that necrophilia is not a normal biological tendency, but a pathological phenomenon--in fact, the most malignant pathology that exists in mail. What are we, the people of the United States today, with respect to necrophilia and biophilia? Undoubtedly our spiritual tradition is one of love of life. And not only this. Was there ever a culture with more love of "fun" and excitement, or with greater opportunities for the majority to enjoy fun and excitement? But even if this is so, fun and excitement is not the same as joy and love of life; perhaps underneath there is indifference to life, or attraction to death? To answer this question we must consider the nature of our bureaucratized, industrial, mass civilization. Our approach to life becomes increasingly mechanical. The aim of social efforts is to produce things, and. in the process of idolatry of things we transform ourselves into commodities. The question here is not whether they are treated nicely and are well fed (things, too, can be treated nicely); the question is whether people are things or living beings. People love mechanical gadgets more than living beings. The approach to man is intellectualabstract. One is interested in people as objects, in their common properties, in the statistical rules of mass behavior, not in living individuals. All this goes together with the increasing role of bureaucratic methods. In giant centers of production, giant cities, giant countries, men are administered as if they were things; men and their administrators are transformed into things, and they obey the law of things. In a bureaucratically organized and centralized industrialism, men's tastes are manipulated so that they consume maximally and in predictable and profitable directions. Their intelligence and character become standardized by the ever-increasing use of tests, which select the mediocre and unadventurous over the original and daring. Indeed, the bureaucratic-industrial civilization that has been victorious in Europe and North America has created a new type of man. He has been described as the "organization man" and as homo consumens. He is in addition the homo mechanicus. By this I mean a "gadget man," deeply attracted to all that is mechanical and inclined against all that is alive. It is, of course, true that man's biological and physiological equipment provides him with such strong sexual impulses that even the homo mechanicus still has sexual desires and looks for women. But there is no doubt that the gadget man's interest in women is diminishing. A New Yorker cartoon pointed to this very amusingly: a sales girl trying to sell a certain brand of perfume to a young female customer recommends it by remarking, "It smells like a new sports car." Indeed, any observer of men's behavior today will confirm that this cartoon is more than a clever joke. There are apparently a great number of men who are more interested in sports-cars, television and radio sets, space travel, and any number of gadgets than they are in women, love, nature, food; who are more stimulated by the manipulation of non-organic, mechanical things than by life. Their attitude toward a woman is like that toward a car: you push the button and watch it race. It is not even too farfetched to assume that homo mechanicus has more pride in and is more fascinated by, devices that can kill millions of people across a distance of several thousands of miles within minutes than he is frightened and depressed by the possibility of such mass destruction. Homo mechanicus still likes sex {25} and drink. But all these pleasures are sought for in the frame of reference of the mechanical and the unalive. He expects that there must be a button which, if pushed, brings happiness, love, pleasure. (Many go to a psychoanalyst under the illusion that he can teach them to find the button.) The homo mechanicus becomes more and more interested in the manipulation of machines, rather than in the participation in and response to life. Hence he becomes indifferent to life, fascinated by the mechanical, and eventually attracted by death and total destruction. This affinity between the love of destruction and the love of the mechanical may well have been expressed for the first time in Marinetti's Futurist Manifesto (1909). "A roaring motor-car, which looks as though running on a shrapnel is more beautiful than the Victory of Samothrace. … We wish to glorify war--the only health-giver of the world-militarism, patriotism, the destructive arm of the Anarchist, the beautiful Ideas that kill the contempt for woman." Briefly then, intellectualization, quantification, abstractification, bureaucratization, and reification--the very characteristics of modern industrial society--when applied to people rather than to things are not the principles of life but those of mechanics. People living in such a system must necessarily become indifferent to life, even attracted to death. They are not aware of this. They take the thrills of excitement for the joys of life and live under the illusion that they are very much alive when they only have many things to own and to use. The lack of protest against nuclear war and the discussion of our "atomologists" of the balance sheet of total or half-total destruction show how far we have already gone into the "valley of the shadow of death."1 To speak of the necrophilous quality of our industrial civilization does not imply that industrial production as such is necessarily contrary to the principles of life. The question is whether the principles of social organization and of life are subordinated to those of mechanization, or whether the principles of life are the dominant ones. Obviously, the industrialized world has not found thus far an answer, to the question posed here: How is it possible to create a humanist industrialism as against the bureaucratic mass industrialism that rules our lives today? The danger of nuclear war is so grave that man may arrive at a new barbarism before he has even a chance to find the road to a humanist industrialism. Yet not all hope is lost; hence we might ask ourselves whether the hypothesis developed here could in any way contribute to finding peaceful solutions. I believe it might be useful in several ways. First of all, an awareness of our pathological situation, while not yet a cure, is nevertheless a first step. If more people became aware of the difference between love of life and love of death, if they became aware that they themselves are already far gone in the direction of indifference or of necrophilia, this shock alone could produce new and healthy reactions. Furthermore, the sensitivity toward those who recommend death might be increased. Many might see through the pious rationalizations of the death lovers and change their admiration for them to disgust. Beyond this, our hypothesis would suggest one thing to those concerned with peace and survival: that every effort must be made to weaken the attraction of death and to strengthen the attraction of life. Why not declare that there is only one truly dangerous subversion, the subversion of life? Why do not those who represent the traditions of religion and humanism speak up and say that there is no deadlier sin than love for death and contempt for life? Why not encourage our best brains--scientists, artists, educators--to make suggestions on how to arouse and stimulate love for life as opposed to love for gadgets? I know love for gadgets brings profits to the corporations, while love for life requires fewer things and hence is less profitable. Maybe it is too late. Maybe the neutron bomb, which leaves entire cities intact, but without life, is to be the symbol of our civilization. But again, those of us who love life will not cease the struggle against necrophilia.

## off

1. The United States Federal Government should establish that the penalty for violating **restrictions on the production of crude oil in Florida’s Outer Continental Shelf, with the exeption of Eglin Air Base training areas**, is entry into a Supplemental Environmental Project.

Implementation of the Supplemental Environmental Program should nullify additional legal penalties from the violating action, and any conflicting federal laws and regulations should be modified to provide a narrow exemption for the above penalty.

#### Penalties determine regulatory compliance—restrictions are irrelevant if penalties are marginal

Center for Progressive Regulation, 2008, Environmental Enforcement, progressiveregulation.org/perspectives/environEnforce.html

Effective enforcement is key to ensuring that the ambitious goals of our environmental statutes are realized. Enforcement refers to the set of actions that the government can take to promote compliance with environmental law. . Currently, rates of noncompliance with environmental laws remain disturbingly high; experts believe that as many as twenty to forty percent of firms regulated by federal environmental statutes regularly violate the law. Tens of millions of citizens live in areas out of compliance with the health based standards of the Clean Air Act, and close to half of the water bodies in the country fail to meet water quality standards set by the Clean Water Act. In communities burdened by multiple sources of pollution, noncompliance has particularly serious health consequences for affected residents.

As in virtually every other area of government regulation, environmental enforcement traditionally has been based on the theory of deterrence. This theory assumes that persons and businesses act rationally to maximize profits, and will comply with the law where the costs of noncompliance outweigh the benefits of noncompliance. The job of enforcement agencies is to make both penalties and the probability of detection high enough that it becomes irrational– unprofitable-- for regulated firms to violate the law.

EPA’s enforcement policies traditionally have reflected these principles. EPA has emphasized the importance of regular inspections and monitoring activity to detect noncompliance, and has responded to violations with swift and appropriate sanctions. EPA’s policies also mandate that the agency recover the economic benefit firms realize through noncompliance, since if a firm is able to profit from illegal activity, it has little incentive to comply in the first place.

#### The CP’s SEP penalty is just that—it causes the same industry response as the aff, without lifting the restriction

David Dana, Professor of Law, Boston University School of Law, 1998, ARTICLE: THE UNCERTAIN MERITS OF ENVIRONMENTAL ENFORCEMENT REFORM: THE CASE OF SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, 1998 Wis. L. Rev. 1181, Lexis

The previous analysis illustrates that the inclusion of SEPs in an enforcement regime may lead to negotiated settlements that cost violators substantially less than the standard monetary penalty. The particular implications of this insight for a deterrence analysis depend on whether the standard monetary penalty represents "an optimal penalty" or instead a sub- or super-optimal penalty. As a preliminary matter, a brief discussion of the concept of optimal penalty (PEN<opt>) thus may be in order. Economists typically regard the goal of an enforcement regime as the achievement of "optimal deterrence." The phrase optimal deterrence, of course, implies that absolute or complete deterrence of regulatory violations should not be the goal of an enforcement regime. Rather, the regime should act to prevent violations which will generate social costs in excess of social benefits. Conversely, of course, the regime should not discourage violations that produce net social benefits. In settings involving perfect detection and prosecution of regulatory violations by government agencies, a penalty equalling the social harm of a violation will produce optimal deterrence. Where detection and prosecution are imperfect, a penalty equalling the harm of a violation will result in underdeterrence because potential violators will discount the nominal penalty to take account of the probability that they will evade detection and/or prosecution. To achieve optimal deterrence, therefore, [\*1206] nominal penalties must equal the social harm divided by the probability of detection and prosecution. The standard monetary penalty for any particular regulatory violation - the penalty that would be imposed in the absence of any SEP settlement options - logically can have only one of three relations to the optimal penalty: The standard monetary penalty can be less than the optimal penalty, equal to the optimal penalty, or greater than the optimal penalty. In all three of these cases, the introduction of SEP settlement options into an enforcement regime is troublesome from an optimal deterrence perspective. Each case will be taken in turn. 1. pen[in'mon.std'] < pen<opt> Where the standard monetary penalty is less than the optimal penalty, regulators' exclusive reliance on monetary penalties will produce underdeterrence. n77 That is, some violations will occur even though the social costs of the violations exceed the social benefits. The introduction of SEPs into such regimes will only make matters worse: SEPs will lower regulated entities' expected penalties for regulatory violations n78 and [\*1207] hence produce more underdeterrence and more socially costly violations. For example, imagine that the harm from a particular regulatory violation has a dollar equivalent value of $ 400, and the perceived probability of detection is 0.1. The optimal penalty thus would be $ 400/0.1 or $ 4000. Assume, however, that the standard monetary penalty is only $ 3000 and regulated entities' expected penalty for violating the regulation is thus only $ 300. Profit-maximizing regulated entities will take the risk of violating the regulation if they expect to gain more than $ 300 by doing so. Now assume that a regulatory agency adds SEP settlements to the enforcement regime. The regulated entity in question now believes that there is a fifty percent probability that it could successfully negotiate a SEP in the event government regulators detect its regulatory noncompliance. n79 Assume also that the regulated entity estimates that the SEP discount or savings off the standard monetary penalty would be thirty-three percent, so that the expected cost of a SEP would be $ 2000. The total expected penalty thus would be 0.1[(0.5)($ 3000) + (0.5)(0.66)($ 3000)], or approximately $ 250. This reduction in the expected penalty from $ 300 to $ 250 could translate into real differences in regulated entities' behavior. Under the pre-SEP regime, regulated entities at least would avoid socially undesirable violations offering them less than $ 300 in savings. The addition of SEPs to the regime eliminates deterrence for violations offering between $ 250 and $ 300 in savings. 2. pen[in'mon.std'] = pen<opt> Where the standard monetary penalty equals the optimal penalty, the enforcement regime will achieve optimal deterrence. Regulated entities will be deterred from committing all of the potential violations that result in greater social loss than social gain, but they will not be deterred from [\*1208] committing any potential violations that are, on net, socially beneficial. The introduction of SEPs into the penalty regime will lower expected penalties and thus produce a shift from this state of optimal deterrence to one of underdeterrence.
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#### Florida should fund disaster preparedness, infrastructure, and higher education and give incentives to the Florida biotechnology industry and reinstate a state-wide rebate program for solar power and provide financial incentives for solar power.

## off

#### Interior resourcing sufficient now—offshore drilling oversight is the key issue

GAO, July 2012, OIL AND GAS MANAGEMENT: Interior’s Reorganization Complete, but Challenges Remain in Implementing New Requirements, www.gao.gov/assets/600/593110.pdf

Interior officials told us that Interior had planned to increase its oversight capacity—including hiring additional staff and improving support service— through a multiyear expansion plan, with full staffing anticipated in fiscal year 2013. As of September 2011, Interior officials expressed concern that current and potential future budgetary constraints may prevent Interior from increasing its capacity as anticipated. In particular, Gulf of Mexico regional office officials expressed concerns that they may not receive the anticipated increases in resources for staffing and helicopter operating costs, which would hinder their ability to review permits and conduct inspections. Without the resources initially anticipated, officials said that they will not be able to fully develop their programs as planned, potentially hindering their ability to manage oil and gas activities in the Gulf of Mexico. However, in March 2012, officials told us that the fiscal year 2012 appropriations bill included an inspection fee of $62 million, allowing BSEE to receive most of the resources needed to increase its inspection and permitting capacity. Despite these new fees, Interior officials expressed concern that attention to oversight of offshore oil and gas drilling may diminish over time and that future budget appropriations may be limited, hindering their ability to provide effective oversight.

The Department of the Interior is charged with the critical role of ensuring that the country’s oil and gas resources on the OCS in the Gulf of Mexico are developed in a manner that is protective of both human health and the environment. The April 20, 2010, Deepwater Horizon incident raised serious questions about Interior’s management of oil and gas activities in the Gulf of Mexico. Since the incident, Interior has fundamentally reorganized its oversight of offshore oil and gas activities through the creation of BSEE and BOEM. Interior has also enacted numerous policy changes intended to improve its oversight of offshore oil and gas activities. Moreover, Interior has taken and continues to take steps to reform its oversight. However, the ultimate effectiveness of Interior’s reorganization and recent policy changes remains uncertain.

#### Plan triggers overstretch but leasing reform solves—impact is DOI oversight and revenue collection

Frank Rusco, GAO Director Natural Resources and Environment, 3/17/2011, Past Work Identifies Numerous Challenges with Interior’s Oversight, http://www.gao.gov/assets/130/125795.pdf

While this reorganization may eventually lead to more effective operations, we have reported that organizational transformations are not simple endeavors and require the concentrated efforts of both leaders and employees to realize intended synergies and accomplish new organizational goals.2 In that report, we stated that for effective organizational transformation, top leaders must balance continued delivery of services with transformational activities. Given that, as of December 2010, Interior had not implemented many recommendations we made to address numerous weaknesses and challenges, we are concerned about Interior’s ability to undertake this reorganization while (1) providing reasonable assurance that billions of dollars of revenues owed to the public are being properly assessed and collected and (2) maintaining focus on its oil and gas oversight responsibilities.

We have reported that Interior has experienced several challenges in meeting its obligations to make federal oil and gas resources available for leasing and development while simultaneously meeting its responsibilities for managing public lands for other uses, including wildlife habitat, recreation, and wilderness. In January 2010, we reported that while BLM requires oil and gas operators to reclaim the land they disturb and post a bond to help ensure they do so, not all operators perform such reclamation.3 In general, the goal is to plug the well and reclaim the site so that it matches the surrounding natural environment to the extent possible, allowing the land to be used for purposes other than oil and gas production, such as wildlife habitat. If the bond is not sufficient to cover well plugging and surface reclamation, and there are no responsible or liable parties, the well is considered “orphaned,” and BLM uses federal dollars to fund reclamation. For fiscal years 1988 through 2009, BLM spent about $3.8 million to reclaim 295 orphaned wells, and BLM has identified another 144 wells yet to be reclaimed.

In addition, in a July 2010 report on federal oil and gas lease sale decisions in the Mountain West, we found that the extent to which BLM tracked and made available to the public information related to protests filed during theleasingprocessvariedbystateandwasgenerallylimitedinscope.4 We also found that stakeholders—including environmental and hunting interests, and state and local governments protesting BLM lease offerings—wanted additional time to participate in the leasing process and more information from BLM about its leasing decisions. Moreover, we found that BLM had been unable to manage an increased workload associated with public protests and had missed deadlines for issuing leases. In May 2010, the Secretary of the Interior announced several department wide leasing reforms that are to take place at BLM that may address these concerns, such as providing additional public review and comment opportunity during the leasing process.
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We've hit global peak farmland - it's an environmental game-changer

Tucker 12

William Tucker, veteran journalist. Educated at Amherst College, his work has appeared in Harper’s, the Atlantic Monthly, the American Spectator, the Weekly Standard, National Review, Reason, the New Republic, Reader’s Digest, the Wall Street Journal, and many other publications. His articles have won the John Hancock Award, the Gerald Loeb Award, the Amos Tuck Award, and he was a finalist for the National Magazine Award, Real Clear Energy, December 26, 2012, "The Farmland Required to Feed Humanity Has Peaked", http://www.realclearenergy.org/articles/2012/12/26/the\_farmland\_required\_to\_feed\_humanity\_has\_peaked.html

Usually the environmental news is bad. We're running out of fossil fuels or room to put their exhausts or water or space to put our garbage or what have you. This time, however, the news from the Rockefeller University's Program for the Human Environment is good. Due to improved yields, slowing population growth, growing affluence and changing consumer habits, the world appears to have hit "peak farmland," meaning that the land required to feed humanity has hit a maximum. The result is that much land now used for agricultural may eventually be returned to its natural state. The only wild card in the deck is biofuels, which accounts for almost all the additional land put under cultivation over the last two decades. The authors of the study - Jesse Ausubel (Ausubel), Iddo Wernick and Paul Waggoner - are not enthusiastic about biofuels and believe that if supporters take a second look, they may tone down their support. Then the world would be on a downward slope in the agricultural consumption of land. The report, entitled "Peak Farmland and the Prospect of Land Sparing," appears in the current issue of Population and Development Review. It chronicles the extraordinary progress made by India and China in the last several decades in feeding their populations while at the same time actually returning some land to forestation. "[Since 1960,] India's population rose over two and a half times, while national income rose 15 times. By 2010 the average Indian ate a sixth more calories than in 1960." Nonetheless, "[t]he 5MHa [million hectares] added to forests from the 1960s to 2000 exceeds the size of the state of Iowa in the US. The reversal of deforestation hints at an associated peak in farmed land." So too, in China, "[w]hile the area of harvested Chinese corn doubled during the half- century, each harvested hectare became more than four and a half times more productive. The 120MHa of land spared is the equivalent of 2 Frances or 8 Iowas." As a result, "the extent of Chinese forests reportedly expanded 30 percent from 1990 to 2010." Their conclusion - which runs against the grain of much environmental thought - is that the Green Revolution and its introduction of advanced agricultural techniques into the developing world was a success. "Unlike some other revolutions of that era, this one has proven enduring and provides the continuing benefit of reducing cropland expansion to feed ever more mouths." Ausubel, Wernick and Waggoner separate out five qualities they say account for the impact of agricultural activity on the available land. They are: 1) Population 2) Affluence, as measured in GDP per capita 3) Consumption 1, which tracks how people change their diet in response to affluence 4) Consumption 2, which tracks the proportion of land used for non-food crops 5) Technological improvements, measured by the amount of land farmers use versus the value of their crop. The authors find that while the rate of world population growth started falling in 1970, the biggest impact has come from technological improvements, plus people's response to growing affluence. Surprisingly, the demand for food turns out to be fairly inelastic. Above a certain level of affluence, people do not increase their caloric intake. Ausubel, Wernick and Waggoner call this "dematerialization" and say it plays a significant role in reducing the demand for farmland. Also encouraging is that China and particularly India are NOT increasing their meat consumption to the same level as Western nations. "As the Chinese grew more affluent after about 1970, their meat consumption grew rapidly with little dematerialization. By the 1990s, however, the FAO reported Chinese meat consumption rising less than half as fast as affluence and dematerializing 6 percent per year from 1995 to 2007. As Indian consumers grew more affluent, they behaved differently. They scarcely increased their meat consumption during the half-century to 2010, causing rapid dematerialization and even exhibiting income elasticities below zero. Globally, average meat consumption dematerialized little from 1980 to 1995, but then as in China, it rose only half as fast as affluence from 1995 to 2007." The result is that "the battle to feed humanity" does not appear destined to outrun the world's land resources. Granted, much of this has been achieved through the application of fossil fuel resources to agriculture, both through intensive use of fertilizers and the mechanization of processes. But even here the inputs seem to be leveling off to a sustainable level. During the first years of the Green Revolution, for instance, consumption of nitrogen fertilizers sometimes outraced crop production by as much as 10 percent. But this trend slowed to between 0.5 and 2.5 percent in the 1980s so that over the last 40 years fertilizer use per unit has risen at an annual rate of only 0.72 percent. Instead, most improvements in crop production now come through a cluster of advances known as "precision agriculture." Water consumption has also leveled off. In the United States, the withdrawal of water for irrigation actually peaked in 1980 and has since declined relative to crop production at an average rate of 2.0 percent per year. All those small improvements in drip irrigation and drought-resistant varieties eventually add up. The only surprise has been a reversal of an improving trend in the C2 factor, which measures agricultural output per calory in the food supply. With the decline in demand for cotton and tobacco, this tend had been improving. But a reversal has come with the growth of crops-for-fuel. Ironically, in trying to stretch oil resources, environmentalists have ended up stressing an even more important resource, fertile land. The authors write: "As the shortcomings of biofuels become evident to governments and champions of the environment alike, we conservatively project C2 as slowing to 0.4 percent annually, slightly less than half the 1995-2010 level. . . . A biofuels bust would lead to a negative value." The overall result is that, even if the dubious effort to turn corn into ethanol continues to consume almost half the American corn crop, world trends are moving in the right direction. As Ausubel, Wernick and Waggoner conclude: "Another 50 years from now, the Green Revolution may be recalled not only for the global diffusion of high-yield cultivation practices for many crops, but as the herald of peak farmland and the restoration of vast acreage to Nature."
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No risk of space weapons

Rosen 13

Armin Rosen, an Atlantic Media fellow, The Atlantic, January 16, 2013, "Give Peace a Chance—in Space", http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2013/01/give-peace-a-chance-in-space/267223/

"The wars of the future will not be fought on the battlefield or at sea," a military academy commandant voiced by Willem Dafoe intones toward the end of a now-classic 1997 episode of The Simpsons. "They will be fought in space, or possibly on top of a very tall mountain." This was meant as a joke, but the latter half of that statement would soon prove eerily prescient when India and Pakistan battled over Kashmir's Siachen glacier -- a strategically irrelevant ice field sitting over 18,000 feet above sea level -- during the Kargil War in 1999. For now, the prospect of military conflict in outer space still resides in the realm of dystopia or absurdity, to the point that a White House petition demanding the construction of a Star Wars-style "Death Star" could be treated as a harmless prank. In rejecting the petition this week, the White House rightly wondered why a debt-strapped U.S. government would spend $850 quadrillion on a weapons system "with a fundamental flaw that can be exploited by a one-man starship." Thankfully, the prospect of an orbital space-to-earth battlestation doesn't even need to be treated seriously.

But it wasn't always this way. In 1952, the eminent rocket scientist Werner Von Braun imagined that a future space station would function as an orbital nuclear platform. Space historians believe that Russia's Salyut 3 space station, which was launched in June of 1974, had a cannon on board, in case a craft or satellite from an enemy country attempted to disrupt its mission. The Soviet Union experimented with Fractional Orbital Bombardment Systems in the 1960s and 70s -- basically nuclear delivery systems that were capable of orbiting the earth. The U.S. even detonated a nuclear weapon over 200 miles above the Pacific Ocean in July of 1962, an incident known as Starfish Prime that, according to Harvard University astrophysicist Jonathan McDowell, halved the useful lifetime of all satellites then in orbit, knocked out power in Hawaii, created an artificial Van Allen Belt that persisted for five years, and released radiation into the atmosphere that wouldn't fully dissipate until the end of the decade. For a time, it was all but taken for granted that space would not only be militarized, but weaponized -- used as a venue or staging area for violent clashes between space-faring nations, or attacks on the surface of the earth. Space war wasn't a punch line, but a possibility that nuclear-armed powers didn't think they could afford to ignore.

The results of the Starfish event hint at one reason why that changed. "This is a great weapon. It does a lot of damage -- but it also killed everything you had yourself," McDowell says of the results of the high-altitude nuclear test. War in space was sure to have a cataclysmic effect on the country with the most space assets, regardless of the end result.

But what about war from space? For powerful space-faring countries, space-to-earth or earth-to-space combat is about as practical as it is desirable -- which is to say, not very. "Space is incredibly useful for the military for a lot of things," McDowell explains. "It's great for intelligence, communication and navigation. The natural thing is to ask, 'where are my X-Wing fighters?' The fact is that it's hard to find a rationale for them."

Laura Grego, a senior scientist in the global security program at the Union of Concerned Scientists, explained why an orbital weapons platform -- the kind of big-ticket military asset that you might want a fleet of X-Wing-type vehicles to protect -- is impractical for attacking targets on earth. "Everything in space is moving at rapid speeds. At the same time, the earth is rotating underneath it....as it's going around, you can't hold [the weapon] above your target. You might be over one country for 15 minutes and then you're gone." This tiny orbital window is called the absentee ratio, and an ICBM, which can hit any target on earth within minutes, isn't constrained by one. McDowell added that in order to reach atmospheric velocity, a rocket needs to reach a breakneck seven kilometers-per-second, far faster than the four to five kilometers-per-second an ICBM must travel. From a purely strategic standpoint, orbiting a weapon for space-to-ground use is more expensive and far less useful than existing, more earth-bound capabilities.

Simply orbiting a nuke, while possible, is good for little other than blackmail, or, at best, a Dr. Strangelove or Dead Hand-style insurance policy for a paranoid and heavily-armed space-faring state. The space nuke would be a means of ensuring that someone (or some thing) has the capability of effectively wiping out most or perhaps all of the 1,016 satellites that currently orbit the earth, while rendering their orbits so debris-strewn as to be totally and perhaps permanently useless. Such dangerous and cavalier behavior is the stuff of cinematic super-villainy -- not statecraft.

But there's another, more idealistic reason humanity is safe from the scourge of space war. And ironically, it suggests that we might not be safe forever.

The ban on Death Star-like orbital weaponry is one of the more robust norms in international law. A prohibition on stationing weapons of mass destruction in space, as well as the total demilitarization of the Moon, is enshrined in article 4 of the Outer Space Treaty of 1967, which 126 countries have signed. As University of Nebraska law professor and space law expert Frans von der Dunk notes, the treaty bans the stationing of weapons of mass destruction in space without banning their actual use in space. The stationing and use of kinetic or conventional weaponry is also allowed. Yet the most worrying aspect of the current legal regime is that the laws of war extend to the heavens as well. "The general international law on the law of force and the prohibition on the use of military force also applies in outer space," says von der Dunk. "If, as part of your self-defense you need your satellite to shoot down the satellite of your aggressor...that is perfectly allowed."

Even so, the 1967 treaty demonstrates that in space, the peaceniks seem to be winning, at least for now. Joan Johnson-Freese of the Naval War College explained that there are two ways that, at the most schematic level, there are two ways the international legal regime could conceive of outer space: "On one end you put the view that space is a common heritage of mankind," she says. "The other end of the spectrum is that air, land and sea are all environments, and all those environments have been weaponized and therefore it's inevitable that space too will also become weaponized." The latter formulation raises a number of chilling possibilities: most people probably don't expect a war to break out in space, but the soldiers at Siachen probably didn't expect to be fighting atop an 18,000 mountain pass either. Humanity has proven willing to fight over literally anything, so long as the capability exists. Why should we assume space will be different?

Space hasn't been weaponized, and the general anti-weaponization tilt of the 1967 treaty is part of the reason why. That tilt has gained the status of a respected legal norm, one arguably strengthened by the fact that the treaty itself was founded on a bedrock of mutual self-interest. "In the 1960s, the superpowers were able to agree that there was more of a benefit in keeping the other party from doing it than they saw a drawback in themselves being forced to abstain from it," von der Dunk says of the U.S. and Soviet Union's view towards stationing weapons of mass destruction in space. In other words, each side believed that preventing their opponent from weaponizing space was worth the potential strategic cost of foreclosing on their own ability to weaponize space. Even after the Cold War, the norm has endured.

#### Data disproves hegemony impacts

Fettweis, 11

Christopher J. Fettweis, Department of Political Science, Tulane University, 9/26/11, Free Riding or Restraint? Examining European Grand Strategy, Comparative Strategy, 30:316–332, EBSCO

It is perhaps worth noting that there is no evidence to support a direct relationship between the relative level of U.S. activism and international stability. In fact, the limited data we do have suggest the opposite may be true. During the 1990s, the United States cut back on its defense spending fairly substantially. By 1998, the United States was spending $100 billion less on defense in real terms than it had in 1990.51 To internationalists, defense hawks and believers in hegemonic stability, this irresponsible “peace dividend” endangered both national and global security. “No serious analyst of American military capabilities,” argued Kristol and Kagan, “doubts that the defense budget has been cut much too far to meet America’s responsibilities to itself and to world peace.”52 On the other hand, if the pacific trends were not based upon U.S. hegemony but a strengthening norm against interstate war, one would not have expected an increase in global instability and violence.

The verdict from the past two decades is fairly plain: The world grew more peaceful while the United States cut its forces. No state seemed to believe that its security was endangered by a less-capable United States military, or at least none took any action that would suggest such a belief. No militaries were enhanced to address power vacuums, no security dilemmas drove insecurity or arms races, and no regional balancing occurred once the stabilizing presence of the U.S. military was diminished. The rest of the world acted as if the threat of international war was not a pressing concern, despite the reduction in U.S. capabilities. Most of all, the United States and its allies were no less safe. The incidence and magnitude of global conflict declined while the United States cut its military spending under President Clinton, and kept declining as the Bush Administration ramped the spending back up. No complex statistical analysis should be necessary to reach the conclusion that the two are unrelated.

Military spending figures by themselves are insufficient to disprove a connection between overall U.S. actions and international stability. Once again, one could presumably argue that spending is not the only or even the best indication of hegemony, and that it is instead U.S. foreign political and security commitments that maintain stability. Since neither was significantly altered during this period, instability should not have been expected. Alternately, advocates of hegemonic stability could believe that relative rather than absolute spending is decisive in bringing peace. Although the United States cut back on its spending during the 1990s, its relative advantage never wavered.

However, even if it is true that either U.S. commitments or relative spending account for global pacific trends, then at the very least stability can evidently be maintained at drastically lower levels of both. In other words, even if one can be allowed to argue in the alternative for a moment and suppose that there is in fact a level of engagement below which the United States cannot drop without increasing international disorder, a rational grand strategist would still recommend cutting back on engagement and spending until that level is determined. Grand strategic decisions are never final; continual adjustments can and must be made as time goes on. Basic logic suggests that the United States ought to spend the minimum amount of its blood and treasure while seeking the maximum return on its investment. And if the current era of stability is as stable as many believe it to be, no increase in conflict would ever occur irrespective of U.S. spending, which would save untold trillions for an increasingly debt-ridden nation.

It is also perhaps worth noting that if opposite trends had unfolded, if other states had reacted to news of cuts in U.S. defense spending with more aggressive or insecure behavior, then internationalists would surely argue that their expectations had been fulfilled. If increases in conflict would have been interpreted as proof of the wisdom of internationalist strategies, then logical consistency demands that the lack thereof should at least pose a problem. As it stands, the only evidence we have regarding the likely systemic reaction to a more restrained United States suggests that the current peaceful trends are unrelated to U.S. military spending. Evidently the rest of the world can operate quite effectively without the presence of a global policeman. Those who think otherwise base their view on faith alone.

US space leadership inevitable

Ferster 12

Warren Ferster, the Editor-in-Chief of Space News, Harvard International Review, May 30, 2012, "Leadership By Default", http://hir.harvard.edu/a-new-empire/leadership-by-default

The United States’ leadership in space is a natural result of its high standing among the world’s democracies and its vast wealth, which enables it to spend more than US$35 billion annually on civil and national security space activity, far surpassing all other nations. NASA’s manned space shuttle, representing tens of billions of dollars of investment, embodied US leadership in space. It was the foundation on which the International Space Station, the largest and most complex undertaking in space, was built. The shuttle’s retirement, while leaving the Space Station partners entirely dependent on Russia for crew access in the short term, has not fundamentally changed the United States’ position in the partnership, nor has it left a leadership void that another nation is eager or in a position to fill. Contrary to what many casual observers seem to believe, the United States is not abandoning human spaceflight. Rather, it is between astronaut-launching systems with NASA continuing to drive this activity.

Commercial efforts lock in US space leadership

Chacos 12

Brad Chacos, freelance technology and business writer, Digital Trends, August 31, 2012, "NASA vs. the free market: Which is better for American space dominance?", http://www.digitaltrends.com/cool-tech/nasa-vs-the-free-market-which-is-better-for-american-space-dominance/

Are Neil and his cohorts correct? Does an increasing reliance on commercial shuttles leave the United States “on a long downhill slide to mediocrity”? Actually, increasing the role of private spaceflight ventures should only enhance America’s dominance in the sky… and like it or not, the NASA of the past is not the NASA of the future. Staring at the past through rose-tinted visors With all due respect to Armstrong, Lovell and Cernan, relying on the government to propel humankind into space carries too much uncertainty. After America won the space race, enthusiasm seemed to fizzle out; Cernan’s final journey to the moon took place all the way back in 1972. That was a full 40 years ago. Four. Zero. Exploring the final frontier simply isn’t a high priority for politicians in a time when economic uncertainty runs rampant and unemployment rates remain floating at high levels. That’s not to say that NASA should be neglected, but its budget ebbs and flows with the public whim. NASA’s funds have been (mostly) shrinking since the 1960s and currently stand at around 0.05 percent of the overall Federal budget. Taking inflation into account, the agency’s 2012 budget is only half of what it was in Apollo’s heyday. Or, to put dwindling government focus on space exploration another way: funding the Curiosity rover cost $2.5 billion. The 2012 Olympics cost $15 billion. Despite its monetary pains, NASA still holds a vital leadership role, and opening the door to commercial ventures could actually thrust us into space much faster we could reach the stars through government-funded initiatives alone. Commercial space experts chime in While Armstrong and co. see the shutdown of the space shuttle program as a major blow against U.S. interests, others say that shifting basic logistics to private ventures frees up NASA to do what it does best. Bob Richards is the co-founder of the International Space University and Moon Express, a company that hopes to win the Google Lunar X Prize and one day mine the moon for rare-earth resources. “The commercial space industry stand on the shoulders of a giant called NASA,” Richards told me via email. “All of us in entrepreneurial space companies were and continue to be awed and inspired by NASA’s accomplishments on new frontiers, and its research at the boundaries of human knowledge. That’s where NASA excels. “Moon Express is not only inspired, but enabled by NASA’s technology and its willingness to partner with the private sector in areas of mutual value and economic development. Transportation is the low-hanging fruit for NASA’s innovative partnerships with private industry; not meaning that it’s easy, (but) meaning that it makes the most sense because it’s a repetitive need better done by industry. As a first order rule, if it needs to be done once, that’s a government opportunity; if it needs to be done repetitively, that’s a business opportunity.” Christopher Altman, the Chief Science Officer of Astronauts for Hire and an alumnus of Starlab, a deep future research institute, agrees. “National space programs are a more natural fit to spearhead long-term exploration, where profits aren’t yet realistic or viable for commercial endeavors,” he says. “A coherent national program can advance the frontier for companies to step in once the field is robust enough to support their development.” The invisible hand in undiscovered land The open market drives innovation in a way that the government can never hope to mimic. Untapped deep-space mineral riches and the willingness of NASA and large private companies to pay big dollars for private space ferries has led to an explosion of space-related ventures that are innovating at a rapid rate, hoping to hit the great big payoff in the sky. Elon Musk’s SpaceX may have a $1.6 billion Commercial Resupply Services contract with NASA, but that’s just the tip of the iceberg. The competitiveness of the free market and the need for spaceflight companies to actually, you know, make money spurs private space ventures to succeed at building spaceships faster and cheaper than NASA ever has. If it weren’t for commercial spaceflight, everyday people like you and me would probably never reach the stars in our lifetime. Yet thanks to private ventures, you can already buy tickets on suborbital space flights, albeit for an (appropriately) astronomical amount. Elon Musk has already announced he plans to have men in space by 2015 and on Mars in the next 10 to 20 years. Of course, when private ventures like SpaceX do end up landing a man on Mars, they’ll be following a trail already blazed by NASA. With companies stepping up to the plate and starting to handle the galactic busy work, the U.S. space agency is free to focus on cutting-edge endeavors — like landing a rover on Mars using a mixture of a massive parachute, powerful downward thrusters and a hell of a lot of precise timing. Private Spaceflight and NASA: Leading humanity into the final frontier Neil Armstrong’s concerns of national dominance are overblown. “Most of the commercial space companies are American, so the US will lead the next generation of exploration whether it’s spearheaded by government or by commercial initiatives,” Altman notes. StratoLaunch Systems hails from Alabama; Planetary Resources and Blue Origin call Washington home; and both Moon Express and SpaceX are headquartered in California, along with a number of other Lunar X Prize competitors. The list goes on and on. Why? It’s as Richards and Altman said: Even with a reduced budget, NASA’s role as a guiding light and influence in space exploration cannot be understated. People want to be where the role model is. Armstrong may be a hero, but in this case, he was wrong. With U.S.-based private companies handling the busywork and striving to make spaceflight more accessible than ever before while NASA focuses its efforts on the bigger picture, the nation’s future among the stars has never looked brighter.

All previous human spaceflight is insignificant – long term colonization is still infeasible

Launius 10 – (2010, Roger, PhD, Curator, Planetary Exploration Programs, National Air and Space Museum, expert on Aerospace history, fellow and board member of the American Astronautical Society, “Can we colonize the solar system? Human biology and survival in the extreme space environment,” Endeavour Volume 34, Issue 3, September 2010, Pages 122-129, science direct, )

Although microbial life might survive the extreme conditions of space, for Homo sapien sapiens the space environment remains remarkably dangerous to life. One space life scientist, Vadim Rygalov, remarked that ensuring human life during spaceflight was largely about providing the basics of human physiological needs. From the most critical – meaning that its absence would cause immediate death, to the least critical – these include such constants available here on Earth of atmospheric pressure, breathable oxygen, temperature, drinking water, food, gravitational pull on physical systems, radiation mitigation, and others of a less immediate nature. As technologies, and knowledge about them, stand at this time, humans are able to venture into space for short periods of less than a year only by supplying all of these needs either by taking everything with them (oxygen, food, air, etc.) or creating them artificially (pressurized vehicles, centrifugal force to substitute for gravity, etc.).10 Spaceflight would be much easier if humans could go into hibernation during the extremes of spaceflight, as did the Streptococcus mitis bacteria. Resolving these issues has proven difficult but not insurmountable for such basic spaceflight activities as those undertaken during the heroic age of space exploration when the United States and the Soviet Union raced to the Moon. Overcoming the technological hurdles encountered during the Mercury, Gemini, and Apollo programs were child's play in comparison to the threat to human life posed by long duration, deep space missions to such places as Mars. Even the most sophisticated of those, the lunar landings of Project Apollo, were relatively short camping trips on an exceptionally close body in the solar system, and like many camping trips undertaken by Americans the astronauts took with them everything they would need to use while there. This approach will continue to work well until the destination is so far away that resupply from Earth becomes highly problematic if not impossible if the length of time to be gone is so great that resupply proves infeasible. There is no question that the U.S. could return to the Moon in a more dynamic and robust version of Apollo; it could also build a research station there and resupply it from Earth while rotating crews and resupplying from Earth on a regular basis. In this instance, the lunar research station might look something like a more sophisticated and difficult to support version of the Antarctic research stations. A difficult challenge, yes; but certainly it is something that could be accomplished with presently envisioned technologies.11 The real difficulty is that at the point a lunar research station becomes a colony profound changes to the manner in which humans interact with the environment beyond Earth must take place. Countermeasures for core challenges – gravity, radiation, particulates, and ancillary effects – provide serious challenges for humans engaged in space colonization (Figure 4).

Extinction Unlikely – Only Humans can cause extinction

Viegas 9

(Jennifer Viegas, Wellesley College Bachelor of Arts with Honors in English); University of California at Berkeley (coursework in the Department of Forestry and Natural Resources "Human Extinction: How Could it Happen," 2009 pg online @ news.discovery.com/human/human-extinction-doomsday.html)

Humans could become extinct, a new study concludes, but no single event, aside from complete destruction of the globe, could do us in, and all extinction scenarios would have to involve some kind of intent, either malicious or not, by people in power. The determinations suggest that the human race itself will ultimately determine its fate. "I think the ability to adapt very quickly is singular to humanity," project leader Tobin Lopes told Discovery News. "Species progress and evolve to enhance their chances, but it's done over a very long period of time." "Instinct guides a lot of what we do early in our lives, but the capacity to learn different behaviors as a result of different environments makes humanity capable of survival," added Lopes, who is associate director of global energy management programs at the University of Colorado Denver. For the study, accepted for publication in the journal Futures, Lopes and his team used a standardized approach for scenario planning called "intuitive logics," which is normally applied to predict business, economic and certain other outcomes. "The intuitive logics approach, and scenario planning as a practice, starts with the present and works forward to an unknown future," he explained. Co-authors served as "stakeholders," just as they would in planning a business, and identified key concerns that may adversely affect them. WATCH VIDEO: The Earth is in the middle of its sixth mass extinction. Kasey-Dee Gardner finds out why they happen in the first place, and how we can save our planet. The concerns were ranked according to possible impact and uncertainty before being plugged into the model, which also incorporated known outcomes, such as attack response times, prior pandemic death percentages, and detection-to-cure time frames. Related Content: Top 10 Reasons Why the World Won't End in 2012 Top 5 Ways to Ensure Humans Survive HowStuffWorks.com: How Extinction Works More Discovery News The result was three scenarios in which humans could go extinct. Each consists of multiple events, such as pandemic, warfare, global warming-related occurrences and a meteor strike, which occur in relative succession and result in equally destructive domino effects, such as societal breakdowns leading to economic decline and escalated terrorism. While any number and combination of doom-and-gloom happenings could destroy the human race, the researchers outlined four, more general types of events that may also serve as "signposts," or events that may signal the unfolding of a defined scenario. In this case, that defined scenario is human extinction. "The types were non-war human-caused -- whether accidental or intended or purposeful, natural-viral, natural-environmental, and finally nuclear or near nuclear war/engagement between any two nations," Lopes said. Should a launch of nuclear weapons, an outbreak of disease, an unforeseen side effect of technical and medical advancements, or unusual environmental changes occur, the researchers believe "serious consideration throughout the globe" is warranted. Side effects of technology and environmental changes "are slow to present themselves, and that's what makes those signposts the most dangerous, in my opinion," Lopes said. "Unfortunately, as we've seen with the impassioned discussion regarding global warming, not everyone can agree on what it is they are seeing or what the data reveal, and that's where a great deal of danger lies." In yet another paper, accepted for publication in the journal Medical Hypotheses, researcher Sergio Dani of Brazil's Medawar Institute for Medical and Environmental Research, explored the fate of human societies. A prior theory, formulated by UCLA's Jared Diamond, hypothesized that guns, germs and steel strongly affect our outcome. Dani instead proposed that "gold, coal and oil account for not only the fate of human societies but also for the fate of mankind through the bodily accumulation of anthropogenic arsenic, an invisible weapon of mass extinction and evolutionary change." Dani explained that exploitation of the named resources is causing rises of arsenic concentrations in the biosphere and "humans are among the least arsenic-resistant organisms." Nevertheless, "the human race is unlikely to become extinct without a combination of difficult, severe and catastrophic events," Lopes and his team concluded, adding that they "were very surprised about how difficult it was to come up with plausible scenarios in which the entire human race would become extinct."

## adv 3

Drill doesn’t solve – not enough production and energy isn’t key

Rusnak 12 (Karl is a writer for Economyincrisis.org, 5/9/2012, "Drilling Won’t Fix Our Trade Deficit", economyincrisis.org/content/drilling-cant-solve-our-trade-deficit)

In a recent post on Forbes.com, contributor Tim Worstall put forth the dubious idea that we may be able to turn our trade deficit into a trade surplus through the exploitation of America’s fossil fuels. Drilling our way out of high gas prices and dependence on OPEC is popular in right wing circles, but the idea that we can restore our balance of trade with oil and gas takes the delusion to a new level. Worstall claims that “[i]t’s not inconceivable that the U.S. will start to run a sustained trade surplus for the first time in [his] adult lifetime.” There are certainly ways to make this happen, but short-sighted thinking and reliance on fossil fuels will not make this prediction a reality. Oil imports currently account for approximately half of our nation’s $560 billion trade deficit. U.S. oil and gas production has increased recently with advances in drilling technology that have allowed us to access new sources of energy, but we are still net importers of both oil and natural gas. We are closing the gap between production and consumption in natural gas, but the disparity in oil is still much larger. The United States consumes 19,150,000 barrels of oil a day while currently producing only about 5.5 million barrels per day. Even with the new sources of oil, the U.S. Energy Information Administration estimates that we will only be producing 6.7 million barrels per day by 2020, while consumption is expected to rise. It is clear that fossil fuel production will not save us in the short term, and depending on fossil fuels for our economic well-being in the future would be foolhardy. While we are learning to harness more of our available reserves, the world will inevitably move away from oil and gas. Many countries have set specific goals for the move away from fossil fuels. For instance, the European Union has set a target of obtaining 20 percent of its energy from renewable sources by 2020, up from the 9 percent it achieved in 2009. With power grids shifting to alternative energy sources and increasingly efficient cars and buses hitting the market regularly, the idea that oil and gas will be the area of energy production that is most profitable in the future is questionable. Drilling our way to energy independence is partisan rhetoric, not a real solution to either our energy or economic problems. If we want to think about energy independence and the trade deficit, we should be concerned with things such as the fact that China is subsidizing its solar industry to undercut the pricing of our domestic manufacturers. Domestic fossil fuel production may make a dent in our trade deficit, but it will not eliminate it and a focus on drilling over innovation in renewable sources may hurt the United States long term. There are much better ways to fix our economy than pretending that we can drill our way to prosperity.

#### Doesn’t deter conflict

Clodfelter 6 (Mark, professor of military history at the National War College, “The limits of air power: the American bombing of North Vietnam”, Google Books, Page xi)

Unfortunately, precision bombing may not be the answer. Despite being several technological generations ahead of the capability displayed in Vietnam, smart munitions still do not guarantee zero collateral damage. Many of the precision air attacks against insurgent leaders have produced claims by insurgents—as well as by Iraqis who do not support the insurgency—that Iraqi civilians have been killed in the raids. Whether true or not, such accusations grab headlines in the Islamic press and on Al Jazeera, providing the perception among many in the Muslim world that such attacks display a callous disregard for Muslim civilian lives. In the type of war that America now faces, those perceptions have become reality to many opposing the United States**. In such conflicts, even with such advantages as Predator drones and Hellfire missiles, the long-term harm of applying lethal air power is likely to eclipse its short-term benefit**. As long as negative political goals remain substantial, the limits of air power displayed in Vietnam will continue to restrict its utility in the twenty-first century.

#### Doesn’t solve air power

Mark Thompson, TIME, 2/25/13, The Most Expensive Weapon Ever Built, www.time.com/time/printout/0,8816,2136312,00.html

While debate swirls around how to build the F-35 right, there's a more important question: Is it the right kind of plane for the U.S. military in the 21st century? The F-35 is a so-called fifth-generation fighter, which means it is built from the ground up to elude enemy radar that could be used to track and destroy it. Stealth was all the rage in military circles when the Pentagon conceived the F-35. But that was well before the drone explosion, which makes the idea of flying a human through flak and missiles seem quaint. "The Air Force," Aboulafia says, "eagerly drank gallons of the fifth-generation purple liquid."

Improved sensors and computing are eroding stealth's value every day, says Admiral Jonathan Greenert, the chief of naval operations. Eventually, he warns, they will give potential foes "actionable target information" on stealth platforms.

The Air Force feared "additional fourth-generation fighter acquisition as a direct threat to fifth-generation fighter programs," Air Force Lieut. Colonel Christopher Niemi, a veteran F-22 pilot, wrote in the November-December 2012 issue of the service's Air & Space Power Journal. Its refusal to reconsider buying new fourth-generation F-15s and F-16s in lieu of some F-35s "threatens to reduce the size of the Air Force's fielded fighter fleet to dangerously small numbers, particularly in the current fiscal environment."

A stealthy jet requires sacrifices in range, flying time and weapon-carrying capability--the hat trick of aerial warfare. All those factors have played a role in the fate of the Air Force's F-22 fighter, the nation's only other fifth-generation warplane. It has been sitting on runways around the globe for seven years, pawing at the tarmac as the nation waged wars in Afghanistan, Iraq and Libya. Yet the F-22, built to fight wars against enemies that have yet to materialize, has yet to fly a single combat mission.

#### No escalation—assumes their warrants

Xudong ‘12

Han, professor at the PLA University of National Defense, “Risk of armed Asian conflict on the rise, but trade links rule out war,” <http://www.globaltimes.cn/content/735653.shtml>

Island sovereignty and maritime interest disputes in the Asia-Pacific region have attracted an increasing amount of global attention recently. With external powers ready to intervene, conflicts among the relevant parties have intensified and the unrest has gotten worse. If the trend cannot be curbed, armed conflicts are more likely. With the US pivot to the Asia-Pacific region and the global economic focus moving toward the region, the region has gradually entered into a troubled period. The US has set the region as the focus of its overseas military deployment and is taking advantage of the unrest in the region so as to adjust the power structure. Moreover, the US has carried out military exercises with relevant countries to create unrest and instigated them to confront neighboring countries. For example, over the Huangyan Island dispute, the US backs the Philippines through holding joint military exercises on island defense, as it has done with Japan over the Diaoyu Islands dispute. This is the usual tactic by the US to back relevant countries' confront actions with China. As the territorial disputes among relevant countries are closely related to core national interests, no involved parties will compromise easily. Relevant countries usually use comprehensive national strength, especially military strength, as a lever to adjust their interests. Take the dispute over the South Kuril Islands between Russia and Japan. Russia has increased its military presence on the islands and used military power to deal with Japanese provocations. Similarly, South Korea has begun to deploy its forces on Dokdo Islands, where it has disputes with Japan. At present, while China has repeatedly advocated a peaceful settlement of the Diaoyu Islands dispute, the nation has sufficient confidence and courage to face up to the challenges and safeguard its sovereignty and interests. All those conflicts mentioned above have the potential to further deteriorate. After all, international politics is the continuation and manifestation of domestic politics. Since the beginning of this year, key players in hot issues of the Asia-Pacific region all have been confronted with the sensitivity of domestic power transition. Russia had its presidential election in March. And South Korea, Japan, the US and China will soon see elections or leadership change. At such a critical moment, attitudes on safeguarding the core interests of the nation had been used as a stake to gain support, as particularly seen in Japan. Currently, the right-wing forces in Japan are promoting the campaigners to form a consistent approach over the Diaoyu Islands dispute, that is, to take an increasingly tough stance and policy. Japan hasn't made a full reflection on its war crimes. The right-wing frequently blusters about the use of force to solve the territorial disputes. This adds to the uncertainty of the security situation in the Asia-Pacific region. But one certain thing is that a war is unlikely in the Asia-Pacific. Even if the parties in a dispute had a collision of forces, it wouldn't develop into full-blown war. The use of force is the highest means but the last resort to maintain core interests of nations. The current situation is totally different from other periods in history. With global economic integration, the expanding of armed conflicts will be no good to any country involved. Therefore, the relevant countries all hope the scale of conflicts could be restrained. Besides, the US is not willing to see a regional war in the Asia-Pacific. A turbulent situation without war is in its best interests. From this perspective, the Asia-Pacific region does face the potential danger of low intensity conflicts and operations. The possibility of an armed collision is on the rise, but the scale will be limited

Food shortage doesn’t cause war – best studies

Allouche 11, research Fellow – water supply and sanitation @ Institute for Development Studies, frmr professor – MIT, ‘11

(Jeremy, “The sustainability and resilience of global water and food systems: Political analysis of the interplay between security, resource scarcity, political systems and global trade,” Food Policy, Vol. 36 Supplement 1, p. S3-S8, January)

The question of resource scarcity has led to many debates on whether scarcity (whether of food or water) will lead to conflict and war. The underlining reasoning behind most of these discourses over food and water wars comes from the Malthusian belief that there is an imbalance between the economic availability of natural resources and population growth since while food production grows linearly, population increases exponentially. Following this reasoning, neo-Malthusians claim that finite natural resources place a strict limit on the growth of human population and aggregate consumption; if these limits are exceeded, social breakdown, conflict and wars result. Nonetheless, it seems that most empirical studies do not support any of these neo-Malthusian arguments. Technological change and greater inputs of capital have dramatically increased labour productivity in agriculture. More generally, the neo-Malthusian view has suffered because during the last two centuries humankind has breached many resource barriers that seemed unchallengeable.

Lessons from history: alarmist scenarios, resource wars and international relations

In a so-called age of uncertainty, a number of alarmist scenarios have linked the increasing use of water resources and food insecurity with wars. The idea of water wars (perhaps more than food wars) is a dominant discourse in the media (see for example Smith, 2009), NGOs (International Alert, 2007) and within international organizations (UNEP, 2007). In 2007, UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon declared that ‘water scarcity threatens economic and social gains and is a potent fuel for wars and conflict’ (Lewis, 2007). Of course, this type of discourse has an instrumental purpose; security and conflict are here used for raising water/food as key policy priorities at the international level.

In the Middle East, presidents, prime ministers and foreign ministers have also used this bellicose rhetoric. Boutrous Boutros-Gali said; ‘the next war in the Middle East will be over water, not politics’ (Boutros Boutros-Gali in Butts, 1997, p. 65). The question is not whether the sharing of transboundary water sparks political tension and alarmist declaration, but rather to what extent water has been a principal factor in international conflicts. The evidence seems quite weak. Whether by president Sadat in Egypt or King Hussein in Jordan, none of these declarations have been followed up by military action.

The governance of transboundary water has gained increased attention these last decades. This has a direct impact on the global food system as water allocation agreements determine the amount of water that can used for irrigated agriculture. The likelihood of conflicts over water is an important parameter to consider in assessing the stability, sustainability and resilience of global food systems.

None of the various and extensive databases on the causes of war show water as a casus belli. Using the International Crisis Behavior (ICB) data set and supplementary data from the University of Alabama on water conflicts, Hewitt, Wolf and Hammer found only seven disputes where water seems to have been at least a partial cause for conflict (Wolf, 1998, p. 251). In fact, about 80% of the incidents relating to water were limited purely to governmental rhetoric intended for the electorate (Otchet, 2001, p. 18).

As shown in The Basins At Risk (BAR) water event database, more than two-thirds of over 1800 water-related ‘events’ fall on the ‘cooperative’ scale (Yoffe et al., 2003). Indeed, if one takes into account a much longer period, the following figures clearly demonstrate this argument. According to studies by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), organized political bodies signed between the year 805 and 1984 more than 3600 water-related treaties, and approximately 300 treaties dealing with water management or allocations in international basins have been negotiated since 1945 (FAO, 1978 and FAO, 1984).

The fear around water wars have been driven by a Malthusian outlook which equates scarcity with violence, conflict and war. There is however no direct correlation between water scarcity and transboundary conflict. Most specialists now tend to agree that the major issue is not scarcity per se but rather the allocation of water resources between the different riparian states (see for example Allouche, 2005, Allouche, 2007 and [Rouyer, 2000] ). Water rich countries have been involved in a number of disputes with other relatively water rich countries (see for example India/Pakistan or Brazil/Argentina). The perception of each state’s estimated water needs really constitutes the core issue in transboundary water relations. Indeed, whether this scarcity exists or not in reality, perceptions of the amount of available water shapes people’s attitude towards the environment (Ohlsson, 1999). In fact, some water experts have argued that scarcity drives the process of co-operation among riparians (Dinar and Dinar, 2005 and Brochmann and Gleditsch, 2006).

In terms of international relations, the threat of water wars due to increasing scarcity does not make much sense in the light of the recent historical record. Overall, the water war rationale expects conflict to occur over water, and appears to suggest that violence is a viable means of securing national water supplies, an argument which is highly contestable.

The debates over the likely impacts of climate change have again popularised the idea of water wars. The argument runs that climate change will precipitate worsening ecological conditions contributing to resource scarcities, social breakdown, institutional failure, mass migrations and in turn cause greater political instability and conflict (Brauch, 2002 and Pervis and Busby, 2004). In a report for the US Department of Defense, Schwartz and Randall (2003) speculate about the consequences of a worst-case climate change scenario arguing that water shortages will lead to aggressive wars (Schwartz and Randall, 2003, p. 15). Despite growing concern that climate change will lead to instability and violent conflict, the evidence base to substantiate the connections is thin ( [Barnett and Adger, 2007] and Kevane and Gray, 2008).

#### No food scarcity

**Jalsevac 4** (Paul, Life site news a division of Interim Publishing, “The Inherent Racism of Population Control”, <http://www.lifesite.net/waronfamily/Population_Control/Inherentracism.pdf>)

The pattern continues today. Economist Dennis Avery explained in 1995 that, food production was more than keeping pace with population growth since the world had, “more than doubled world food output in the past 30 years. We have raised food supplies per person by 25 percent in the populous Third World.”4 The United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (UNFAO) also dispelled fears of shortages in the food supply when, in preparation for the World Food Summit in Rome in November of 1995 it reported that, “Globally food supplies have more than doubled in the last 40 years…at a global level, there is probably no obstacle to food production rising to meet demand.”5 The UNFAO also later estimated that, simply with the present available technologies fully employed, the world could feed 30 to 35 billion people, i.e. roughly six times the present world population.6 It also reported that the number of people considered malnourished has declined from 36 percent in 1961-1970 to 20 percent in 1988-90 and later proclaimed that “earlier fears of chronic food shortages over much of the world proved unfounded.”7 The World Bank joined in to predict in 1993 that the improvement in the world food supply would continue, while pointing out that in developing countries grain production has grown at a faster rate than population since 1985. Grain production has slowed in the United States, but that is because stocks have grown so large that additional production could not be stored.8 A further wealth of evidence is available to remove any concerns about resource shortage in the modern world.
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## Drilling Accidents

#### Interior efficacy critical to prevent catastrophic oil spills

Anu K. Mittal, Director Natural Resources and Environment, 2011, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR Major Management Challenges, http://www.hsdl.org/?view&did=9487

Interior’s oversight of oil and gas operations is critically important. **The** explosion onboard the Deepwater Horizon and oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico in April 2010 **emphasized the importance of Interior’s management of permitting and inspection processes to ensure operational and environmental safety**. The National Commission on the BP Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill and Offshore Drilling reported in January 2011 that this disaster was the product of several individual missteps and oversights by BP, Halliburton, and Transocean, which government regulators lacked the authority, the necessary resources, or the technical expertise to prevent.

#### Defense presumes industry complies with safety regulations—they don’t—that means inspections key

Kate Sheppard, Mother Jones, 6/4/2010, The Next Deepwater Horizon?, www.motherjones.com/politics/2010/06/next-deepwater-horizon

"It's clear to us that while there are problems with the entire industry, BP is probably the worst actor in terms of cutting corners, not having safety procedures, not having the necessary safety tech for operating platforms," said Wenonah Hauter, executive director of Food & Water Watch. "**There should be a review** by MMS **of all the operating platforms to make sure safety documents and procedures are in place**." (A spokesperson for Abbott could not be reached for comment.) The Center for Biological Diversity has also filed suit against the Department of Interior for granting waivers to the National Environmental Protection Act for Gulf leases, and has signaled that it intends to sue over non-enforcement of both the Marine Mammals Protection Act and Endangered Species Act in the Gulf.

## Link Ext

#### Tradeoff from expanded drilling causes drilling accidents and undermines environmental protection

Frank Rusco, GAO Director Natural Resources and Environment, 3/17/2011, Past Work Identifies Numerous Challenges with Interior’s Oversight, http://www.gao.gov/assets/130/125795.pdf

In conclusion, as concerns rise over the recent increase in oil prices and as demands are made for additional drilling on federal lands and waters, it is important that Interior meet its current oversight responsibilities. Interior is now in the midst of a major reorganization, which makes balancing delivery of services with transformational activities challenging for an organization. Managing this change in a fiscally constrained environment only exacerbates the challenge. If steps are not taken to improve Interior’s oversight of oil and gas leasing, we are concerned about the department’s ability to manage the nation’s oil and gas resources, ensure the safe operation of onshore and offshore leases, provide adequate environmental protection, and provide reasonable assurance that the U.S. government is collecting the revenue to which it is entitled.

## bats impact

#### Drilling revenue collection key to battery development

Jim Snyder, 2/14/13, Obama Clean-Energy Fund Would Gain If Oil Drilling Expanded, www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-02-14/obama-s-clean-energy-fund-seen-gaining-if-oil-drilling-expanded.html

President Barack Obama’s proposal to fund clean-energy research with fees paid by oil and gas producers is renewing a debate over whether the promise of innovation tomorrow is worth expanding drilling today.

Obama’s “Energy Security Trust” -which he announced this week in the State of the Union address -would redirect about $200 million in royalties for drilling on federal lands to pay for the development of biofuels, electric batteries and cars and trucks powered by natural gas, the White House said yesterday. The trust would operate for 10 years and spend a total of $2 billion.

While Obama’s plan doesn’t open new areas to producers, clean-energy advocates say the idea of an oil-backed fund could ensure further support for fossil fuel alternatives even in an era of austerity and federal budget cuts.

“There is a lot of logic to it,” said Mark Muro, a cleanenergy expert at the Brookings Institution in Washington. “It resonates to a broad segment of the population that we should make the best of fossil fuels while accelerating the effort to transform our energy system.”

#### Key to survival

Farhad Manjoo, 6/21/11, Better Batteries Will Save the World, www.slate.com/articles/technology/technology/2011/06/better\_batteries\_will\_save\_the\_world.single.html

This is how it goes in the battery business. As Seth Fletcher, a senior editor at Popular Science, recounts in his engaging new book Bottled Lightning: Superbatteries, Electric Cars, and the New Lithium Economy, scientists have been trying to build a better battery since before the days of Thomas Edison (who was a major battery tinkerer himself). (Disclosure: Fletcher and I share the same literary agent.) If we had batteries that matched the price and performance of fossil fuels, we would not only have cleaner cars, but we might be able to remake much of the rest of the nation's energy infrastructure, too. Wind and solar power are generated intermittently—sometimes the wind doesn't blow and the sun doesn't shine—and batteries can moderate that volatility. Stores of batteries placed in the electric grid could collect energy when the sun shines or when the wind blows and then discharge it when we need it. Not to put too fine a point on it, but you might say that the future of the world depends on better batteries—a better battery would alter geopolitics, mitigate the disasters of climate change, and spur a new economic boom.

## 1

## 2nc no impact

#### Their laundry list of vague impacts is academic junk – conflicts can’t just emerge

Fettweis, 11

Christopher J. Fettweis, Department of Political Science, Tulane University, 9/26/11, Free Riding or Restraint? Examining European Grand Strategy, Comparative Strategy, 30:316–332, EBSCO

Assertions that without the combination of U.S. capabilities, presence and commitments instability would return to Europe and the Pacific Rim are usually rendered in rather vague language. If the United States were to decrease its commitments abroad, argued Robert Art, “the world will become a more dangerous place and, sooner or later, that will redound to America’s detriment.”53 From where would this danger arise? Who precisely would do the fighting, and over what issues? Without the United States, would Europe really descend into Hobbesian anarchy? Would the Japanese attack mainland China again, to see if they could fare better this time around? Would the Germans and French have another go at it? In other words, where exactly is hegemony is keeping the peace? With one exception, these questions are rarely addressed.

That exception is in the Pacific Rim. Some analysts fear that a de facto surrender of U.S. hegemony would lead to a rise of Chinese influence. Bradley Thayer worries that Chinese would become “the language of diplomacy, trade and commerce, transportation and navigation, the internet, world sport, and global culture,” and that Beijing would come to “dominate science and technology, in all its forms” to the extent that soon the world would witness a Chinese astronaut who not only travels to the Moon, but “plants the communist flag on Mars, and perhaps other planets in the future.”54 Indeed China is the only other major power that has increased its military spending since the end of the Cold War, even if it still is only about 2 percent of its GDP. Such levels of effort do not suggest a desire to compete with, much less supplant, the United States. The much-ballyhooed, decade-long military buildup has brought Chinese spending up to somewhere between one-tenth and one-fifth of the U.S. level. It is hardly clear that a restrained United States would invite Chinese regional, must less global, political expansion. Fortunately one need not ponder for too long the horrible specter of a red flag on Venus, since on the planet Earth, where war is no longer the dominant form of conflict resolution, the threats posed by even a rising China would not be terribly dire. The dangers contained in the terrestrial security environment are less severe than ever before.

Believers in the pacifying power of hegemony ought to keep in mind a rather basic tenet: When it comes to policymaking, specific threats are more significant than vague, unnamed dangers. Without specific risks, it is just as plausible to interpret U.S. presence as redundant, as overseeing a peace that has already arrived. Strategy should not be based upon vague images emerging from the dark reaches of the neoconservative imagination.

Overestimating Our Importance

One of the most basic insights of cognitive psychology provides the final reason to doubt the power of hegemonic stability: Rarely are our actions as consequential upon their behavior as we perceive them to be. A great deal of experimental evidence exists to support the notion that people (and therefore states) tend to overrate the degree to which their behavior is responsible for the actions of others. Robert Jervis has argued that two processes account for this overestimation, both of which would seem to be especially relevant in the U.S. case.55 First, believing that we are responsible for their actions gratifies our national ego (which is not small to begin with; the United States is exceptional in its exceptionalism). The hubris of the United States, long appreciated and noted, has only grown with the collapse of the Soviet Union.56 U.S. policymakers famously have comparatively little knowledge of—or interest in—events that occur outside of their own borders. If there is any state vulnerable to the overestimation of its importance due to the fundamental misunderstanding of the motivation of others, it would have to be the United States. Second, policymakers in the United States are far more familiar with our actions than they are with the decision-making processes of our allies. Try as we might, it is not possible to fully understand the threats, challenges, and opportunities that our allies see from their perspective. The European great powers have domestic politics as complex as ours, and they also have competent, capable strategists to chart their way forward. They react to many international forces, of which U.S. behavior is only one. Therefore, for any actor trying to make sense of the action of others, Jervis notes, “in the absence of strong evidence to the contrary, the most obvious and parsimonious explanation is that he was responsible.”57

It is natural, therefore, for U.S. policymakers and strategists to believe that the behavior of our allies (and rivals) is shaped largely by what Washington does. Presumably Americans are at least as susceptible to the overestimation of their ability as any other people, and perhaps more so. At the very least, political psychologists tell us, we are probably not as important to them as we think. The importance of U.S. hegemony in contributing to international stability is therefore almost certainly overrated.

In the end, one can never be sure why our major allies have not gone to, and do not even plan for, war. Like deterrence, the hegemonic stability theory rests on faith; it can only be falsified, never proven. It does not seem likely, however, that hegemony could fully account for twenty years of strategic decisions made in allied capitals if the international system were not already a remarkably peaceful place. Perhaps these states have no intention of fighting one another to begin with, and our commitments are redundant. European great powers may well have chosen strategic restraint because they feel that their security is all but assured, with or without the United States.

#### No plausible scenario

Goldstein, professor emeritus of IR – American University, ‘11

(Joshua S, “WORLD PEACE COULD BE CLOSER THAN YOU THINK,” Foreign Policy, Iss. 188, Sept/Oct)

Nor do shifts in the global balance of power doom us to a future of perpetual war. While some political scientists argue that an increasingly multipolar world is an increasingly volatile one - that peace is best assured by the predominance of a single hegemonic power, namely the United States - recent geopolitical history suggests otherwise. Relative U.S. power and worldwide conflict have waned in tandem over the past decade. The exceptions to the trend, Iraq and Afghanistan, have been lopsided wars waged by the hegemon, not challenges by up-and-coming new powers. The best precedent for today's emerging world order may be the 19th-century Concert of Europe, a collaboration of great powers that largely maintained the peace for a century until its breakdown and the bloodbath of World War I.

What about China, the most ballyhooed rising military threat of the current era? Beijing is indeed modernizing its armed forces, racking up double-digit rates of growth in military spending, now about $100 billion a year. That is second only to the United States, but it is a distant second: The Pentagon spends nearly $700 billion. Not only is China a very long way from being able to go toe-to-toe with the United States; it's not clear why it would want to. A military conflict (particularly with its biggest customer and debtor) would impede China's global trading posture and endanger its prosperity. Since Chairman Mao's death, China has been hands down the most peaceful great power of its time. For all the recent concern about a newly assertive Chinese navy in disputed international waters, China's military hasn't fired a single shot in battle in 25 years.

## 3

## f35

#### F35 cuts coming

Australian Aviation, 3/13/13, F-35 gets improved marks, could still face deep cuts, australianaviation.com.au/2013/03/f-35-gets-improved-marks-could-still-face-deep-cuts/

Even as a US government report has given the beleaguered F-35 Joint Strike Fighter program **improved marks**, the next-generation fighter has emerged as a prime target of Pentagon planners looking for ways to slash the defence budget, according to reports in the US media.

With the Pentagon needing to find some $46 billion in savings under mandatory cuts known as the sequester, the $396 billion F-35 program — the most expensive in Pentagon history — looms an obvious target. Yet even as the Obama administration publicly works to avert cuts it describes as clumsy and indiscriminate, senior officials quietly view the sequester as an opportunity to scale back bloated “Cold War-era” weapons systems such as the F-35, according to a report in The New York Times.

According to The Times, which quoted unnamed defense officials, planners believe cuts to such programs could save significantly more than $43 billion, freeing up money to expand efforts now seen as more critical, such as building more drones, developing cyberwarfare capabilities, and expanding Special Forces units.

#### Death spiral now

Andrea Shalal-Esa, Reutrs, 3/15/13, Insight: Expensive F-35 fighter at risk of budget "death spiral", www.reuters.com/article/2013/03/15/us-usa-fighter-f35-insight-idUSBRE92E10R20130315

It's called the "death spiral," and America's newest warplane, the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter, is in danger of falling into it before the plane has even gone into service.

The term - recently invoked by top brass involved in the F-35 program - refers to a budgeting Catch-22 that plagues the defense industry. To keep the cost per airplane low, you need to build and sell a lot of planes. But in tough economic times, governments cut orders to save money. That pushes up the cost per plane, leading to more cancellations, pushing up the cost, leading to more cancellations. And so on.

The U.S. military is in the process of making tough decisions due to mandatory budget cuts from sequestration which went into effect March 1 and could lop off $46 billion of Pentagon spending this fiscal year.

Earlier this year, Pentagon budgeteers crunched the numbers on Lockheed Martin Corp's F-35 in an exercise that spoke volumes about the troubles facing the world's most expensive weapons system and the Navy's uncertain commitment to it.

Postponing orders for about 40 of the 260 Navy models of the plane, which will take off from and land on aircraft carriers, would save money in the short-term, according to several defense officials familiar with the analysis, which has not been made public.

But it would also add from $1 billion to $4 billion to the eventual price of the F-35 program, already at a record-setting $396 billion.

Seven years behind schedule and 70 percent over early cost estimates, the stealthy F-35 "Lightning II" appears to have overcome myriad early technical problems only to face a daunting new question: is it affordable in an era of shrinking defense budgets?

According to a congressional watchdog agency, the average price per plane has already almost doubled from $69 million to as much as $137 million since the F-35 program began in 2001. **Any further price rise could scare off potential buyers -including vital foreign customers.**

"It's a house of cards," said one senior defense official who is familiar with the F-35 program, but was not authorized to speak publicly. "We have finally started improving performance on the program and efficiency in testing, and bang, we get this budget challenge."

#### Sequestration kills the F35

Dave Majumdar, Flight Global, 2/12/13, Lockheed F-35 programme may have to be restructured under sequestration, www.flightglobal.com/news/articles/lockheed-f-35-programme-may-have-to-be-restructured-under-sequestration-382243/

The entire Lockheed Martin F-35 Joint Strike Fighter programme may have to be restructured if the Pentagon budget undergoes the full 10 year effects of sequestration.

Under the Congressional sequestration budgetary maneuver, the US Department of Defense's coffers would be automatically cut across the board by 10% every year for 10 years. That is on top of the $487 billion that has already been cut from the spending plan.

If the full sequestration were to take effect, "we're going to have to look completely at the [F-35] programme," US Air Force chief of staff Gen Mark Welsh told the Senate Armed Services Committee on 12 February. "It's going to be impossible to modernize."

The consequences operationally would mean that the US Air Force would not be able to operate as effectively in contested airspace as it had planned. "Our kick in the door capability would be impacted," Welsh says.

For the US Navy, the consequences of the full sequestration are as dire. Adm Mark Ferguson, vice chief of naval operations, told the Congress that if the USN had to suffer the effects of nine additional years of sequestration, the service would lose two carrier strike groups and a "proportional" number of amphibious strike groups.

The US Marine Corps may also have to "cancel major multi-year procurements such as the [Bell-Boeing] MV-22 and incur greater cost and program delay in future program buys," USMC commandant Gen James Amos says in his prepared testimony.

#### F35 can’t solve—it’s a mess

Rajiv Chandrasekaran, Washington post, 3/9/13, F-35’s ability to evade budget cuts illustrates challenge of paring defense spending, www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/f-35s-ability-to-evade-budget-cuts-illustrates-challenge-of-paring-defense-spending/2013/03/09/42a6085a-8776-11e2-98a3-b3db6b9ac586\_print.html

Pentagon officials accepted Lockheed’s claim that computer simulations would be able to identify design problems, minimizing the need to make changes once the plane actually took to the sky. That, in turn, led to an aggressive plan to build and test the aircraft simultaneously.

Cautioning that **all** of those **assumptions were flawed**, Spinney and other defense analysts urged the Pentagon to see the plane in flight before committing to buy it. But senior Defense Department officials in the George W. Bush administration did not heed the warnings.

Within months, **the program began veering off course.**

The Air Force, Marines and Navy all sought additional modifications to meet their needs, reducing commonality among the three models. A bigger problem was the fundamental concept of building one plane, with stealth technology, that could fly as far and fast as the Air Force wanted while also being able to land on the Navy’s carriers and take off vertically from Marine amphibious assault ships.

Instead of meeting the original plan of being about 70 percent similar, the three versions now are 70 percent distinct, which has increased costs by tens of billions and led to years-long delays. “We have three airplane programs running in parallel,” Bogdan said. “They are very, very different airplanes.”

Even with three variants, the plane’s design has forced serious compromises. To remain stealthy, bombs and missiles must be placed inside a weapons bay, which limits the volume of munitions that can be carried. The use of a single engine, required for the Marine version, restricts speed.

With an even more complex engineering challenge than initially envisioned, Lockheed and the Pentagon took a hands-off approach to managing the program, according to several people involved in the process.

An electrical engineer who worked as a manager at Lockheed’s F-35 program headquarters in Fort Worth beginning in 2001 said the development effort was beset with “tremendous organizational inadequacies” and “schedule and cost expectations that never were achievable.” In his unit, he said, there were no firm development timetables and no budgets. “It was all on autopilot,” he said. “**It was doomed from the beginning.”**

In 2005, the engineer, who spoke on the condition of anonymity because of concerns he will risk job opportunities in the close-knit aviation industry, participated in a two-week-long assessment of the program.“There were reds and yellows across the board,” he recalled. But when he briefed his superiors, “nobody was interested,” he said. And when he gave a copy of the assessment to those at the Pentagon office responsible for the plane, he said, “they didn’t want to hear it.”

A senior Defense Department official acknowledged the office “didn’t have the capacity or the understanding to manage such a complicated program” at the time. Lockheed executives also make little excuse for those years. “It was a very different program from what we are executing today,” said Steve O’Bryan, Lockheed’s vice president of F-35 business development.

With wars raging in Iraq and Afghanistan, and military budgets growing year over year, Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld paid little attention to the program. His successor, Robert M. Gates, took the same approach during his first few years on the job. In 2007, the Defense Department permitted Lockheed to begin producing the fighter — before the first flight tests had even begun. Frank Kendall, who is now the Pentagon’s chief weapons buyer, has called that decision “acquisition malpractice.”

Early tests uncovered flaws unnoticed by the computer simulations. Key engineering tasks, including the vertical takeoff and landing system, were taking much longer to complete. All the while, costs were rising at supersonic speeds.

In 2009, Gates grasped the dysfunction. The following year, he withheld $614 million in fees from Lockheed, fired the two-star Marine general in charge of the program and brought in a Navy vice admiral, David Venlet, to clean house. In 2011, Gates placed the Marine plane on probation, warning that it would be killed if problems with its propulsion system were not fixed quickly.

Bogdan, who served as Venlet’s deputy until December, when he took charge of the development effort, was astounded by what he found when he delved into the program.

“It was an unimaginable mess,” he said.

#### Failing

Eyder Peralta, NPR, 2/22/13, Pentagon Grounds Fleet Of F-35 Fighter Jets Because Of Engine Problems, www.npr.org/blogs/thetwo-way/2013/02/22/172724878/pentagon-grounds-fleet-of-f-35-fighter-jets-because-of-engine-problems

The Pentagon has halted the testing of its entire fleet of F-35 Joint Strike Fighters. At an estimated cost of $400 billion, it is the Pentagon's most expensive weapons program. Defense News reports: "The move came nine days after the Pentagon cleared the F-35B jump-jet variant, designed for the U.S. Marines, to resume tests after a monthlong suspension. Both suspensions are due to problems with the engines. It also comes at a time when the program is facing increased scrutiny from lawmakers and senior DoD officials. "Unlike the last suspension, which was only for the B variant, this suspension affects all three variants: the F-35A Air Force conventional takeoff version, the F35-B for the Marines, and the F35-C carrier variant for the Navy." The AP reports that Kyra Hawn, Joint Program Office spokeswoman, said a routine inspection "revealed a crack on a low pressure turbine blade of an F135 engine..." "Unprecedented in scale and ambition, the Lockheed Martin-run F-35 program has been beset by cost overruns, delays and design problems," Wired's Danger Room reports. "The Pentagon has steadily downgraded the plane's performance specs. Even so, it struggles to match its required blend of stealth, maneuverability, speed and range."

## AT: Asian War

#### No risk of Asia war – Peaceful China and multilateral institutions

Bitzinger and Desker, 9

[Richard, Senior Fellow at the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies, Barry, Dean of the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies and Director of the Institute of Defense and Strategic Studies, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore, “ Why East Asian War is Unlikely,” Survival | vol. 50 no. 6 | December 2008–January 2009

The Asia-Pacific region can be regarded as a zone of both relative insecurity and strategic stability. It contains some of the world’s most significant flashpoints – the Korean peninsula, the Taiwan Strait, the Siachen Glacier – where tensions between nations could escalate to the point of major war. It is replete with unresolved border issues; is a breeding ground for transnational terrorism and the site of many terrorist activities (the Bali bombings, the Manila superferry bombing); and contains overlapping claims for maritime territories (the Spratly Islands, the Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands) with considerable actual or potential wealth in resources such as oil, gas and fisheries. Finally, the Asia-Pacific is an area of strategic significance with many key sea lines of communication and important chokepoints. Yet despite all these potential crucibles of conflict, the Asia-Pacific, if not an area of serenity and calm, is certainly more stable than one might expect. To be sure, there are separatist movements and internal struggles, particularly with insurgencies, as in Thailand, the Philippines and Tibet. Since the resolution of the East Timor crisis, however, the region has been relatively free of open armed warfare. Separatism remains a challenge, but the break-up of states is unlikely. Terrorism is a nuisance, but its impact is contained. The North Korean nuclear issue, while not fully resolved, is at least moving toward a conclusion with the likely denuclearisation of the peninsula. Tensions between China and Taiwan, while always just beneath the surface, seem unlikely to erupt in open conflict any time soon, especially given recent Kuomintang Party victories in Taiwan and efforts by Taiwan and China to re-open informal channels of consultation as well as institutional relationships between organisations responsible for cross-strait relations. And while in Asia there is no strong supranational political entity like the European Union, there are many multilateral organisations and international initiatives dedicated to enhancing peace and stability, including the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum, the Proliferation Security Initiative and the Shanghai Co-operation Organisation. In Southeast Asia, countries are united in a common geopolitical and economic organisation – the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) – which is dedicated to peaceful economic, social and cultural development, and to the promotion of regional peace and stability. ASEAN has played a key role in conceiving and establishing broader regional institutions such as the East Asian Summit, ASEAN+3 (China, Japan and South Korea) and the ASEAN Regional Forum. All this suggests that war in Asia – while not inconceivable – is unlikely. This is not to say that the region will not undergo significant changes. The rise of China constitutes perhaps the most significant challenge to regional security and stability – and, from Washington’s vantage point, to American hegemony in the Asia-Pacific. The United States increasingly sees China as its key peer challenger in Asia: China was singled out in the 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review as having, among the ‘major and emerging powers … the greatest potential to compete militarily with the United States’.1 Although the United States has been the hegemon in the Asia-Pacific since the end of the Second World War, it will probably not remain so over the next 25 years. A rising China will present a critical foreign-policy challenge, in some ways more difficult than that posed by the Soviet Union during the Cold War.2 While the Soviet Union was a political and strategic competitor, China will be a formidable political, strategic and economic competitor. This development will lead to profound changes in the strategic environment of the Asia-Pacific. Still, the rise of China does not automatically mean that conflict is more likely; the emergence of a more assertive China does not mean a more aggressive China. While Beijing is increasingly prone to push its own agenda, defend its interests, engage in more nationalistic – even chauvinistic – behaviour (witness the Olympic torch counter-protests), and seek to displace the United States as the regional hegemon, this does not necessarily translate into an expansionist or warlike China. If anything, Beijing appears content to press its claims peacefully (if forcefully) through existing avenues and institutions of international relations, particularly by co-opting these to meet its own purposes. This ‘soft power’ process can be described as an emerging ‘Beijing Consensus’ in regional international affairs. Moreover, when the Chinese military build-up is examined closely, it is clear that the country’s war machine, while certainly worth taking seriously, is not quite as threatening as some might argue.

## AT: Asia War

#### Doesn’t escalate

Washburn 3/10/13

Taylor, a lawyer studying Northeast Asia at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, “a lawyer studying Northeast Asia at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies.,” http://journal.georgetown.edu/2013/03/10/averting-asias-great-war-by-taylor-washburn/

In a recent Financial Times essay, “The Shadow of 1914 Falls Over the Pacific,” Gideon Rachman compares the current situation in East Asia to that in Europe a century ago. Like Germany in the early 20th century, China is a country on the rise, concerned that status quo powers will seek to block its ascent. In prewar Europe, a German military buildup and growing nationalism around the region helped create a dynamic in which the assassination of an obscure Austrian noble could trigger a devastating multinational war. The parallels with East Asia today are clear, Rachman says, and “the most obvious potential spark is the unresolved territorial dispute between Japan and China over the islands known as the Diaoyu to the Chinese and the Senkaku to the Japanese.” There is no denying the gravity of the danger posed by this row. Violent anti-Japanese riots erupted across China last fall after Japan’s government purchased the islands from a private owner, and Tokyo has recently claimed that a Chinese frigate locked its missile-guidance radar on a Japanese destroyer in the East China Sea. With ships and planes from both nations mingling in the vicinity of the islands, peace depends not only on the prudence of politicians in Beijing and Tokyo, but also the temperament and skill of a handful of sailors and pilots. The U.S.-Japan security treaty has played a pivotal role in ensuring Asia’s postwar stability, and will help deter Chinese aggression going forward, but as Rachman observes, the pact also recalls the alliance network that contributed to the expansion of World War I. Nevertheless, it is important to remember that major powers have often clashed without escalation. The example of 1914, in which a seemingly insignificant event forced all of Europe’s great military machines to shudder to life, is the exception rather than the rule. Since the bloody aftermath of their 1947 partition, India and Pakistan have skirmished repeatedly–and even engaged in several limited wars–without descending into full-scale conflict. In the 1960s, China fought with first India and then the Soviet Union over land, yet on neither occasion did combat spread beyond the frontier. Indeed, large interstate wars since World War I have not generally begun with a trigger akin to an assassination or a scuffle between forces on a remote perimeter, but rather with a major attack or colonial collapse.

## Adv 2

## AT: Environment

**No extinction**

Easterbrook 3(Gregg, senior fellow at the New Republic, “We're All Gonna Die!”, <http://www.wired.com/wired/archive/11.07/doomsday.html?pg=1&topic=&topic_set>=)

If we're talking about doomsday - the end of human civilization - many scenarios simply don't measure up. A single nuclear bomb ignited by terrorists, for example, would be awful beyond words, but life would go on. People and machines might converge in ways that you and I would find ghastly, but from the standpoint of the future, they would probably represent an adaptation. Environmental collapse might make parts of the globe unpleasant, but considering that the biosphere has survived ice ages, it wouldn't be the final curtain. Depression, which has become 10 times more prevalent in Western nations in the postwar era, might grow so widespread that vast numbers of people would refuse to get out of bed, a possibility that Petranek suggested in a doomsday talk at the Technology Entertainment Design conference in 2002. But Marcel Proust, as miserable as he was, wrote *Remembrance of Things Past* while lying in bed.

#### Apocalyptic environmental predictions are empirically wrong

Ronald Bailey, adjunct scholar at the Cato Institute, May 2k,http://reason.com/0005/fe.rb.earth.shtml

Earth Day 1970 provoked a torrent of apocalyptic predictions. “We have about five more years at the outside to do something,” ecologist Kenneth Watt declared to a Swarthmore College audience on April 19, 1970. Harvard biologist George Wald estimated that “civilization will end within 15 or 30 years unless immediate action is taken against problems facing mankind.” “We are in an environmental crisis which threatens the survival of this nation, and of the world as a suitable place of human habitation,” wrote Washington University biologist Barry Commoner in the Earth Day issue of the scholarly journal Environment. The day after Earth Day, even the staid New York Times editorial page warned, “Man must stop pollution and conserve his resources, not merely to enhance existence but to save the race from intolerable deterioration and possible extinction.” Very Apocalypse Now. Three decades later, of course, the world hasn’t come to an end; if anything, the planet’s ecological future has never looked so promising. With half a billion people suiting up around the globe for Earth Day 2000, now is a good time to look back on the predictions made at the first Earth Day and see how they’ve held up and what we can learn from them. The short answer: The prophets of doom were not simply wrong, but *spectacularly wrong*. More important, many contemporary environmental alarmists are similarly mistaken when they continue to insist that the Earth’s future remains an eco-tragedy that has already entered its final act. Such doomsters not only fail to appreciate the huge environmental gains made over the past 30 years, they ignore the simple fact that increased wealth, population, and technological innovation don’t degrade and destroy the environment. Rather, such developments preserve and enrich the environment. If it is impossible to predict fully the future, it is nonetheless possible to learn from the past. And the best lesson we can learn from revisiting the discourse surrounding the very first Earth Day is that passionate concern, however sincere, is no substitute for rational analysis.

## 2NC OV - Their Authors Biased

Their authors have a personal incentive to exaggerate the impact

Spencer 08

Roy Spencer, climatologist and a Principal Research Scientist for the University of Alabama in Huntsville, Ph.D. in meteorology at the University of Wisconsin-Madison in 1981, former Senior Scientist for Climate Studies at NASA’s Marshall Space Flight Center, where he and Dr. John Christy received NASA’s Exceptional Scientific Achievement Medal for their global temperature monitoring work with satellites, Climate Confusion, 2008

The media can always find an expert who is willing to provide some juicy quotes regarding our imminent environmental doom. Usually there is a grain of truth to the story which helps sell the idea. Like a science fiction novel, a somewhat plausible weather disaster tale captures our imagination, and we consider the possibility of global catastrophe. And some of the catastrophic events that are predicted are indeed possible, or at least not impossible. Catastrophic global warming—say by 10° Fahrenheit or more over the next century—cannot be ruled out with 100 percent certainty. Of course, neither can the next extraterrestrial invasion of Earth. But theoretical possibilities reported by the media are far from competent scientific predictions of the future. The bias contained in all of these gloom-and-doom news stories has a huge influence on how we perceive the health of the Earth and our effect on it. We scientists routinely encounter reporters who ignore the uncertainties we voice about global warming when they write their articles and news reports. Sometimes an article will be fairly balanced, but that is the exception. Few reporters are willing to push a story on their editor that says that future global warming could be fairly benign. They are much more interested in gloom and doom. A scientist can spend twenty minutes describing new and important research, but if it can’t be expressed in simple, alarmist language, you can usually forget about a reporter using it. It has reached the point where the minimum amount of necessary alarm amounts to something like, “we have only ten years left to avert catastrophic global warming.” A reporter will probably run with that. After all, which story will most likely find its way into a news-paper: “Warming to Wipe out Half of Humanity,” or “Scientists Predict Little Warming”? It goes without saying that, in science, if you want to keep getting funded, you should find something Earth-shaking. And if you want to get your name in the newspaper, give a reporter some material that gives him hope of breaking the big story.

## 2NC - No Impact

No extinction - tech has decoupled humanity for the environment

Science Daily 10

Science Daily, reprinted from materials provided by American Institute of Biological Sciences, September 1, 2010, "Human Well-Being Is Improving Even as Ecosystem Services Decline: Why?", http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2010/09/100901072908.htm

Global degradation of ecosystems is widely believed to threaten human welfare, yet accepted measures of well-being show that it is on average improving globally, both in poor countries and rich ones. A team of authors writing in the September issue of BioScience dissects explanations for this "environmentalist's paradox." Noting that understanding the paradox is "critical to guiding future management of ecosystem services," Ciara Raudsepp-Hearne and her colleagues confirm that improvements in aggregate well-being are real, despite convincing evidence of ecosystem decline. Three likely reasons they identify -- past increases in food production, technological innovations that decouple people from ecosystems, and time lags before well-being is affected -- provide few grounds for complacency, however. Raudsepp-Hearne and her coauthors accept the findings of the influential Millennium Ecosystem Assessment that the capacity of ecosystems to produce many services for humans is now low. Yet they uncover no fault with the composite Human Development Index, a widely used metric that incorporates measures of literacy, life expectancy, and income, and has improved markedly since the mid-1970s. Although some measures of personal security buck the upward trend, the overall improvement in well-being seems robust. The researchers resolve the paradox partly by pointing to evidence that food production (which has increased globally over past decades) is more important for human well-being than are other ecosystem services. They also establish support for two other explanations: that technology and innovation have decoupled human well-being from ecosystem degradation, and that there is a time lag after ecosystem service degradation before human well-being will be affected.

## ocean

#### B. massive size of oceans checks snowball and ensures slow timeframe.

Bjørn Lomborg, Director, Environmental Assessment Institute, THE SKEPTICAL ENVIRONMENTALIST, ‘1 p. 189

But the oceans are so incredibly big that our impact on them has been astoundingly insignificant - the oceans contain more than 1,000 billion liters of water. The UN’s overall evaluation of the oceans concludes: “The open sea is still relatively clean. Low levels of lead, synthetic compounds and artificial radionuclides, though widely detectable, are biologically insignificant. Oil slicks and litter are common among sea leans, but are, at present, a minor consequences to communities of organisms living in ocean waters.

## 2nc ov

#### Death debating causes mass violence and genocide – over 80 studies prove.

Solomon, Psych – Brooklyn Clg, Greenberg, Psych – U Ariz, & Pyszczynski, Psych – U Colorado, 2K

(*Current Directions in Psychological Science* 9.6, Sheldon, Jeff, and Tom, “Fear of Death and Social Behavior”)

Terror management theory posits that awareness of mortality engenders a potential for paralyzing terror, which is assuaged by cultural worldviews: humanly created, shared beliefs that provide individuals with the sense they are valuable members of an enduring, meaningful universe (self-esteem), and hence are qualified for safety and continuance beyond death. Thus, self-esteem serves the fundamental psychological function of buffering anxiety. In support of this view, studies have shown that bolstering selfesteem reduces anxiety and that reminders of mortality intensify striving for self-esteem; this research suggests that self-esteem is critical for psychological equanimity. Cultural worldviews serve the fundamental psychological function of providing the basis for death transcendence. To the extent this is true, reminders of mortality should stimulate bolstering of one’s worldview. More than 80 studies have supported this idea, most commonly by demonstrating that making death momentarily salient increases liking for people who support one’s worldview and hostility toward those with alternative worldviews. This work helps explain human beings’ dreadful history of intergroup prejudice and violence: The mere existence of people with different beliefs threatens our primary basis of psychological security; we therefore respond by derogation, assimilation efforts, or annihilation.

Why has history been plagued by a succession of appalling ethnic cleansings? Archaeologists have found bas-reliefs from 1100 B.C. depicting Assyrian invaders’ practice of killing indigenous people by sticking them alive on stakes from groin to shoulder. These xenophobic propensities reached their zenith in the 20th century, when Hitler’s Nazi regime perpetuated the most extensive effort at genocide in history, and have continued to resurface throughout the world in places such as Cambodia, Rwanda, Yugoslavia, and the United States— where in 1999 A.D. at Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado, two Nazi-influenced teenagers massacred schoolmates, seemingly provoked by threats not to material well-being, but to the abstract entity known as self-esteem.

## at: fear good – 2nc offense

#### \*Death impacts decrease our fear of death.

Heather Anne Harder, Ph.D. in Education, 1993

(*Exploring Life's Last Frontier*, http://www.innerself.com/Miscellaneous/afraid\_dying.htm)

One of the most important things to know is that you can prepare now for death and you can even enjoy the preparation process. Preparing for death can enrich your living experiences. Once you can look death in the eye and feel nothing but pleasant, yet mild, anticipation, then life becomes much more enjoyable.

This epitaph taken from a headstone in Ashby, Massachusetts, describes the basic truth.

Remember, friends, as you pass by,

as you are now, so once was I.

As I am now, so you must be.

Prepare yourself to follow me.

You are well-advised to prepare yourself for death. But whether you are ready or not, when your self-determined hour arrives you will pass to the next dimension. Your hour is determined by you and your council -- not the little you that operates in the conscious mind, but the greater You that operates in harmony with Divine Source. This higher self, as it is often referred to, maintains the direct connection to the Divine Source.

A little preparation can make the death experience more pleasant and thus more peaceful for you as well as those you leave behind. Here are some suggestions for this preparation.

TALKING ABOUT DEATH

Allow yourself to talk about death as a part of life. I assure you, you do not bring death closer to you by talking about it, and you may make yourself more comfortable with the concept. By avoiding the topic you shroud it in mystery and shame. It becomes one of those topics that we don't talk about in polite society.

Upon death you will create your own death experience based on what you believe. Therefore, the clearer you are about what you want and expect to happen, the better off you will be. Read and examine the near-death experiences of others. Discuss with friends what you read. Do these books and articles describe a hell? Do you want one? Play with the concepts and words involved with death. This allows you and others to adjust to a death reality. Talking about your thoughts and concepts helps you to clarify your own views. It forces you to synthesize and articulate your reality. It is at this point that you are able to revise or adjust your own faulty thinking. Even if you do not, at first, have an accurate reality of death, the process of open forum allows you to open to a variety of possibilities.

While Mom was in the hospital, she and I had an opportunity to discuss death. Although she was very confused and scared of death, she listened to my views and shared her own. She talked about what she wanted to happen (and how) if she died. At this point no one believed that she would be dead in less than two months. The conversation was one I shall always remember and treasure.

A colleague at the university, Don, and I discussed the recent death of a co-worker. We talked about death -- his beliefs and mine. It was to be our last conversation, for he died just a few days later.

These conversations help to acclimate people to the transition process. Neither Don or Mom knew consciously that they were soon to die. Yet both felt the need to discuss death. It is important to be comfortable enough with the topic to discuss it when the conversation arises. Often there is an inner knowing and a need to discuss death as the hour approaches, much like the impending birth of a child is discussed.

People have taken the topic of death, and even the words associated with it, and made them naughty -- something we don't speak aloud in public. Children are shushed or quickly diverted if they bring up the topic. Our society is "death-a-phobic" and it's time this is changed.

By becoming comfortable with the words and concepts, when the magic moment arrives and you discover that you are dead, you won't be so shocked. Many people have a difficult time accepting their own death simply because of the shock value of the word. Ignoring and suppressing the idea of death throughout your life actually empowers the word. So take the power away from the words and concept of death by verbalizing and getting comfortable with them. Make the words "death" and "dead" as familiar as the word "birth" and "life".

Birth and death are both times of transition. They imply a change from one dimensional form to another. You don't see people going to pieces because someone gave birth like you do when people (especially themselves) die. Yet birth is much more traumatic and generally unpleasant to the one experiencing it. Death is a much easier transition.

A WORKING REALITY OF DEATH

Take a minute to imagine the following scene.

You find yourself inside a large cube or box. It can be of any material you choose. You are completely enclosed in this box. There are no doors or windows, no way to get in or out. You do not know how you got in or how to get out.

As you imagine yourself in this box, what are your reactions? What thoughts or feelings do you have? Remain in this imaginary state for a minute or so to fully experience your feelings.

STOP! DON'T READ ANY FURTHER UNTIL YOU HAVE TAKEN A MINUTE TO EXPERIENCE THIS SENSATION!

Good. Did you feel panic? How about curiosity? There are a multitude of reactions, and yours are perfectly normal regardless of what they were.

Your reactions to this exercise are similar to those you might experience as you pass into death. Now reexamine your reactions to the box, only apply these to death. How do you feel about death? Don't judge yourself, simply examine. You now have a starting point from which to examine your current death beliefs.

For our second exercise, imagine yourself walking down a path. Create your path; notice the details. Is it wide, narrow, smooth, rough, beautiful, not-so-beautiful, straight, or winding? You decide. After you walk for awhile you come to a wall. The wall can be any form you like, but it must run across your path and stretch so far that you cannot walk around it. Create the wall now!

Now move beyond the wall. What do you see? Take a minute to experience this vision. Relax and play with the images. Don't read on until you have experienced this!

No fudging!

This path represents your view of your life. Was your life easy or rough? Was your path well worn, or are you blazing new trails? Was your path straight or winding? If you did not like your path, know that you have full power to change it any time you choose. You can add plants, flowers -- in short, create any path you choose whenever you choose.

Examine the wall. Was it high and solid or low and insubstantial? What kind was it? How did you move beyond the wall? Was it hard? What were your reactions to moving beyond the wall? What did you find on the other side?

The wall represents the separation of life and death. Beyond the wall is your symbolic subconscious view of the afterlife. Now reexamine your images. If you do not like what you experienced, simply choose a new creation and construct new images.

There are no right answers, yet, at the same time, all answers are right. Your answers represent a combination of what you have been conditioned to believe about death and your personal reality of death. If you are happy with your subconscious death reality, that's great. If you are uncomfortable with your symbolic representation of death, then create a new one as you read on.

Death need not be scary. In fact, in many ways death can be compared to going away to college. It may cause a little apprehension at first. The change may even produce some stress. But after awhile you can actually become excited about the prospect of going away to your great new adventure. There are many who would even say you are lucky to be going. Death is even easier than college because there is no packing to do, no tuition to pay, nor written exams to take.

As you get comfortable with the concept of death, then you can begin to let go of any fearful notions of death. Allow yourself to have a variety of death options, all pleasant. This allows you to stay open and receptive to your own unique death adventure when it occurs, which may be different from the one you have created.

If, however, the concept of death still makes you tremble with fear, and you can't leave it in such an unformed and unpleasant condition, then take a few moments to create your own picture of what death will be like for you. Play this image over and over until it becomes your new reality of death. Thus, when you die you will automatically create this familiar reality. Eventually the actual reality will pierce your awareness, but this created reality will be a pleasant first encounter, certainly much better than fear or panic.

## at: fear good – nuclear

#### \*The more we talk about nuclear war the less we fear it – the turn is linear.

Carol Cohn, Senior Fellow, CGO and Wellesley College, ‘87

(*Bulletin of Atomic Scientists*, June, 43, “Slick Ems, Glick Ems, Christmas Trees, and Cookie Cutters”)

MY CLOSE ENCOUNTER with nuclear strategic analysis started in the summer of 1984. I was one of 48 college teachers attending a summer workshop on nuclear weapons, strategic doctrine, and arms control that was held at a university containing one of the nation's foremost centers of nuclear strategic studies, and that was cosponsored by another institution. It was taught by some of the most distinguished experts in the field, who have spent decades moving back and forth between academia and governmental positions in Washington. When at the end of the program I was afforded the chance to be a visiting scholar at one of the universities' defense studies center, I jumped at the opportunity.

I spent the next year immersed in the world of defense intellectuals--men (and indeed, they are virtually all men) who, in Thomas Powers's words, "use the concept of deterrence to explain why it is safe to have weapons of a kind and number it is not safe to use." Moving in and out of government, working sometimes in universities and think tanks, they create the theory that underlies U. S. nuclear strategic practice.

[Continues]

In other words, what I learned at the program is that talking about nuclear weapons is fun. The words are quick, clean, light, they trip off the tongue. You can reel off dozens of them in seconds, forgetting about how one might interfere with the next, not to mention with the lives beneath them. Nearly everyone I observed--lecturers, students, hawks, doves, men, and women--took pleasure in using the words; some of us spoke with a self-consciously ironic edge, but the pleasure was there nonetheless. Part of the appeal was the thrill of being able to manipulate an arcane language, the power of entering the secret kingdom. But perhaps more important, learning the language gives a sense of control, a feeling of mastery over technology that is finally not controllable but powerful beyond human comprehension. The longer I stayed, the more conversations I participated in, the less I was frightened of nuclear war.

How can learning to speak a language have such a powerful effect? One answer, discussed earlier, is that the language is abstract and sanitized, never giving access to the images of war. But there is more to it than that. The learning process itself removed me from the reality of nuclear war. My energy was focused on the challenge of decoding acronyms, learning new terms, developing competence in the language--not on the weapons and the wars behind the words. By the time I was through, I had learned far more than an alternate, if abstract, set of words. The content of what I could talk about was monumentally different.

# 1NR

## impact overview

#### Reform key to STEM – that’s aerospace

Jones 13

(Richard M. Jones Government Relations Division American Institute of Physics, “Immigration Reform Would Enhance STEM Workforce” FYI: The AIP Bulletin of Science Policy News, Number 20 - January 31, 2013, American Institute of Physics)

Momentum is increasing on both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue to change the way in which visas would be provided to recent college graduates and professionals in science, technology, engineering and mathematics fields. There have been three significant events this week related to the reform of immigration law, all of which are intended to strengthen the STEM workforce in the United States.

During a January 29 speech on immigration, President Obama stated “the time has come for common-sense, comprehensive immigration reform.” Stressing that by doing so “we can strengthen our economy and strengthen our country’s future,” he said:

“There’s another economic reason why we need reform. It’s not just about the folks who come here illegally and have the effect they have on our economy. It’s also about the folks who try to come here legally but have a hard time doing so, and the effect that has on our economy.

“Right now, there are brilliant students from all over the world sitting in classrooms at our top universities. They’re earning degrees in the fields of the future, like engineering and computer science. But once they finish school, once they earn that diploma, there’s a good chance they’ll have to leave our country. Think about that.

“Intel was started with the help of an immigrant who studied here and then stayed here. Instagram was started with the help of an immigrant who studied here and then stayed here. Right now in one of those classrooms, there’s a student wrestling with how to turn their big idea - their Intel or Instagram - into a big business. We’re giving them all the skills they need to figure that out, but then we’re going to turn around and tell them to start that business and create those jobs in China or India or Mexico or someplace else? That’s not how you grow new industries in America. That’s how you give new industries to our competitors. That’s why we need comprehensive immigration reform.”

The White House released a Fact Sheet regarding the President’s proposal that includes the following:

“’Staple’ green cards to advanced STEM diplomas. The proposal encourages foreign graduate students educated in the United States to stay here and contribute to our economy by ‘stapling’ a green card to the diplomas of science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) PhD and Master’s Degree graduates from qualified U.S. universities who have found employment in the United States. It also requires employers to pay a fee that will support education and training to grow the next generation of American workers in STEM careers.”

The U.S. Department of Homeland Security defines a “green card” as follows: "A Green Card holder (permanent resident) is someone who has been granted authorization to live and work in the United States on a permanent basis. As proof of that status, a person is granted a permanent resident card, commonly called a ‘Green Card.’"

Also in the President’s proposal:

“Create a new visa category for employees of federal national security science and technology laboratories. The proposal creates a new visa category for a limited number of highly-skilled and specialized immigrants to work in federal science and technology laboratories on critical national security needs after being in the United States for two years and passing rigorous national security and criminal background checks.”

#### Immigration key to ag

Abou-Diwan 1/28

(Antoine, “Bipartisan immigration proposal acknowledges agriculture's needs” January 28, 2013, Imperial Valley Press)

Bipartisan immigration proposal acknowledges agriculture's needs

The bipartisan proposal unveiled Monday paves the way to legalization of the nation’s 11 million undocumented immigrants with a program described as “tough but fair.”

It also addresses the concerns of the agricultural industry, whose labor pool by some estimates is composed of some 50 to 70 percent unauthorized workers.

“Agricultural workers who commit to the long-term stability of our nation’s agricultural industries will be treated differently than the rest of the undocumented population because of the role they play in ensuring that Americans have safe and secure agricultural products to sell and consume,” states the proposal.

Total farmworkers in Imperial County fluctuated between 8,000 and 11,000 in 2012, according to data from the Employment Development Department.

“There’s definitely recognition that agriculture will be taken care of,” said Steve Scaroni, a Heber farmer who has lobbied Washington extensively on immigration reform.

The proposal is based on four broad principles: a path to citizenship for unauthorized immigrants living in the United States, reform of the system to capitalize on characteristics that strengthen the economy, the creation of an effective employment verification system and improving the immigration process for future workers.

The principles are broad and many details need to be worked out.

“The principles acknowledge that the situation in agriculture is distinct and requires different treatment,” said Craig Regelbrugge, chairman of the Agricultural Coalition for Immigration Reform, a group that represents the landscape and nursery industry.

Access to a legal and stable work force is vital, Regelbrugge said, as is a workable program that eliminates or reduces hurdles for a future work force.

“We would like to see the agriculture legalization program attractive so there are incentives for them to work in the sector,” Regelbrugge noted.

The proposals also acknowledge that the United States immigration system is broken, and address criticism that not enough is being done to enforce existing immigration laws. To that end, Monday’s proposals are contingent on secure borders.

But, the acknowledgement of the agriculture sector’s needs allows for some optimism.

“As long as the labor supply solutions are there, we can support the enforcement solutions,” Regelbrugge said.

**Extinction**

**Auslin 9**

(Michael, Resident Scholar – American Enterprise Institute, and Desmond Lachman – Resident Fellow – American Enterprise Institute, “The Global Economy Unravels”, Forbes, 3-6, http://www.aei.org/article/100187)

What do these trends mean in the short and medium term? The Great Depression showed how social and **global chaos** followed hard on economic collapse. The mere fact that parliaments across the globe, from America to Japan, are unable to make responsible, economically sound recovery plans suggests that they do not know what to do and are simply hoping for the least disruption. Equally worrisome is the adoption of more statist economic programs around the globe, and the concurrent decline of trust in free-market systems. The threat of instability is a pressing concern. China, until last year the world's fastest growing economy, just reported that 20 million migrant laborers lost their jobs. Even in the flush times of recent years, China faced upward of 70,000 labor uprisings a year. A sustained downturn poses grave and possibly immediate threats to Chinese internal stability. The regime in Beijing may be faced with a choice of repressing its own people or diverting their energies outward, leading to conflict with China's neighbors. Russia, an oil state completely dependent on energy sales, has had to put down riots in its Far East as well as in downtown Moscow. Vladimir Putin's rule has been predicated on squeezing civil liberties while providing economic largesse. If that devil's bargain falls apart, then wide-scale repression inside Russia, along with a continuing threatening posture toward Russia's neighbors, is likely. Even apparently stable societies face increasing risk and the threat of internal or possibly external conflict. As Japan's exports have plummeted by nearly 50%, one-third of the country's prefectures have passed emergency economic stabilization plans. Hundreds of thousands of temporary employees hired during the first part of this decade are being laid off. Spain's unemployment rate is expected to climb to nearly 20% by the end of 2010; Spanish unions are already protesting the lack of jobs, and the specter of violence, as occurred in the 1980s, is haunting the country. Meanwhile, in Greece, workers have already taken to the streets. Europe as a whole will face dangerously increasing tensions between native citizens and immigrants, largely from poorer Muslim nations, who have increased the labor pool in the past several decades. Spain has absorbed five million immigrants since 1999, while nearly 9% of Germany's residents have foreign citizenship, including almost 2 million Turks. The xenophobic labor strikes in the U.K. do not bode well for the rest of Europe. A prolonged global downturn, let alone a collapse, would **dramatically raise tensions** inside these countries. Couple that with possible protectionist legislation in the United States, unresolved ethnic and territorial disputes in **all regions of the globe** and a loss of confidence that world leaders actually know what they are doing. The result may be a series of small explosions that coalesce **into a big bang**.

## at: altman

#### Passage likely because of Obama’s leverage—key to bipartisan negotiations

Sara Murray, and Judy Woodruff, PBS, 3/25/13, Obama Pushes Immigration Reform at White House Ceremony for New Citizens, www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/politics/jan-june13/immigration\_03-25.html

JUDY WOODRUFF: In fact, bipartisan efforts are under way in both the House and Senate to craft immigration overhaul plans. Details are still being hammered out, but the president today restated his goals. PRESIDENT OBAMA: We know that really form means continuing to strengthen our border security and holding employers accountable. We know that real reform means providing a responsible pathway to earned citizenship for the 11 million undocumented immigrants who are currently living in the shadows. We know that real reform requires modernizing the legal immigration system, so that our citizens don't have to wait years before their loved ones are able to join them in America. JUDY WOODRUFF: The Senate's so-called gang of eight negotiators had hoped to have agreement last week on a plan that is close to the president's priorities. But a dispute arose over wages and visas for lower-skilled guest workers. If that can be resolved, lawmakers could introduce a plan after Congress returns from a two-week recess. To walk us through the political state of play, we're joined by reporter Sara Murray. She has been following the issue for the Wall Street Journal. Welcome to the NewsHour. SARA MURRAY, Wall Street Journal: Thanks for having me. JUDY WOODRUFF: So, the president calling on Congress to finish the job. Why did he make this statement now, Sara? SARA MURRAY: Well, look, I think that it's clear that the Senate kind of missed their mark by not having a deal before they went on a two-week recess. And so I think this is the president is saying, hey, look I'm encouraged by what you have been doing. I am giving you the space to kind of hash out your own bill, but I'm also watching you. And everyone knows the president has his own bill. And **he wants this** stuff **to** kind of **move speedily along**. I think this is a warning that says, hey, guys, make sure you're still doing that. JUDY WOODRUFF: So, where do things stand? As we reported, they were -- we thought it -- it was thought they were getting close, but then it didn't happen. Where does everything stand right now? SARA MURRAY: Well, Friday was a really interesting day, because you talk to people who are negotiating this, at around 3:00 p.m., a lot of people who are familiar with these talks, we can get a deal, it will be great, we will all got off on recess, everything will go off fine. And then a few hours later, things just completely fell apart. There was an issue with how you set the wages, not for the current people who are -- the current immigrants who are in the U.S., but people who want to come here in the future and be hotel workers, maids, janitors, that kind of thing. And negotiations really fell apart between the unions and the business groups. JUDY WOODRUFF: So, they were literally discussing wages for future workers? SARA MURRAY: Yes. And this is the last sort of big part that hasn't fallen into place. A guest-worker program is how we refer to it. It's this future flow of workers. JUDY WOODRUFF: These are the, as you said, lower-skilled workers who would work in hotels, restaurants, doing landscaping and so forth. SARA MURRAY: Right, absolutely. And in some of these cases, I mean, people who are familiar with said, we're talking about a couple dollars an hour. That's where talks fell apart at, the difference between paying, say, a housekeeper $10 dollars an hour or eight dollars an hour. JUDY WOODRUFF: And we also know, Sara, from your reporting and others that there are huge interests on the outside watching all this very closely, business interests, organized labor. What role are they playing in all this? SARA MURRAY: Well, they originally tried to be in the same room, business and labor, and kind of try to hash out a future guest-worker program. That pretty much fell apart. So, what we have are, we have these eight senators in a room with their staffers hashing out a deal and then taking parts back to labor and taking parts back to business and saying, well, what do you think about this? Will you guys get on board with this? And that's really where they have been hitting these difficult parts. They just can't get everyone on board. JUDY WOODRUFF: How is this different, Sara, from what happened in 2006 and 2007, when the Senate worked, did pass a bill, it went to conference with the House, and nothing ever came of it? SARA MURRAY: Well, I think **the big difference is just the climate**. You know, we don't hear people running around saying -- well, at least not as frequently -- saying, let's round up these 11 million people and deport them. I think that rhetoric kind of died with the 2012 presidential campaign. Republicans got a big wakeup call that they weren't doing themselves any favors with Hispanics. So, we have really seen the opposition to immigration reform among Republicans die down. And that's been a big change. JUDY WOODRUFF: **But** it's still not enough **to push** them -- **the two sides together** to an agreement in the Senate? SARA MURRAY: Right. I mean, the fact is this is a really difficult and complex issue. So, we're not saying that there won't be any agreement. I think you will still see a bill that comes out of the Senate. But I think it's proving a lot more difficult, even among the most well-intentioned people, to come up with an agreement that works for business, that works for labor and that the senators can then go out and sell. I mean, these guys have to go back to their districts and convince a bunch of people who still might not be in favor of immigration reform that this is the right thing for the country. And that is a tough sell. JUDY WOODRUFF: And what about the role of the House of Representatives in all this? SARA MURRAY: The House has a similar track going on. They also have a bipartisan group of eight. And apparently **that's the big thing**. And they're working on their own bill. They are also saying that they could have something come out right after the recess. They seem to have been OK with letting the Senate take the lead and kind of let the focus be on the Senate and let these guys be under the scrutiny. We will see if that still holds up when they get back from recess. JUDY WOODRUFF: You mentioned earlier the White House has language. They have a bill. They have been holding it back. They haven't put it out there. What is the leverage that the White House has? Do they really believe if they -- if the Senate and the House can't come together, that the White House puts its own language out? SARA MURRAY: Well, look, I think we saw the president's bill was leaked. Parts of it were leaked earlier this year. So, we do know he has a bill. And I think the leverage that the president has **is**, he's basically saying, look**, I want this to be a bipartisanship solution**. He gets to rise above it all, rise above the politics and say, if there's a bipartisan solution to be had, then great. And Republicans can kind of get their little bit of political capital. But the truth is, if you guys fumble on this issue, if it doesn't seem like Republicans and business can come to the table, then, hey, I'm stepping in and taking over. JUDY WOODRUFF: And, finally, **there is** some **urgency to all of this**. If you listen to the president, he's saying they have -- you have got to do this next month or get to it.

#### Anti-reform groups haven’t coalesced but they could

Benjy Sarlin, 3/20/13, Is Immigration Reform At The Tipping Point?, tpmdc.talkingpointsmemo.com/2013/03/is-immigration-reform-at-the-tipping-point.php

Republicans can now count the leading tea party senator, their brightest 2016 prospect, the speaker of the House, and the chairman of their party as supportive of immigration reform. Meanwhile, **anti-reform** — even just anti-citizenship — politicians can’t seem to find any oxygen. Among the party’s elites at least, the battle over whether to support the basic planks of comprehensive immigration reform looks like it’s over. There’s still plenty that can go wrong for reformers: negotiations could get bogged down in the details of a guest worker plan or border security or rank-and-file Republicans could get spooked by a revolt in their home districts. Already, a handful of GOP senators are asking to slow the legislative process down (which is itself a sign of reform’s current momentum), and if it languishes too long its opponents could take the opportunity to organize more effectively. But if immigration reform does pass, this week may mark the tipping point. Let’s review: • Rand Paul Backs A Path To Citizenship Paul had flirted with immigration reform before, but he delivered a more detailed speech on Tuesday pledging to play a constructive role in passing a bill. For whatever reason, Paul is still spooked by the phrase “path to citizenship,” which caused some confusion, but he made crystal clear in a call with reporters later in the day that he supports the concept. The senator’s backing is a big boost to passing a bill. Not only is he revered by tea party activists, but he’s a legitimate presidential contender on the GOP side in his own right. Fellow 2016ers Sen. Marco Rubio (R-FL) and Rep. Paul Ryan (R-WI) are already strongly pro-reform, meaning there are fewer big names left who could frighten the rest of the presidential hopefuls into backing down if they decide to go full nativist. Jeb Bush flirted with a plan to the right of Rubio, Ryan, and Paul in his book that would explicitly bar illegal immigrants from citizenship only to find little support on the right for the idea and a backlash from everyone else. He walked back his position within days. • The RNC Cries Uncle It’s very rare for the Republican National Committee to delve into policy, so it’s a genuinely big deal that their official report on the 2012 election concluded that immigration reform was critical to rebuilding the party’s brand with Latinos. RNC chairman Reince Priebus hedged on whether he supports a path to citizenship when asked for details on reform, but the more significant takeaway is that the GOP’s leadership has decided that passing a bill is an absolute must on political grounds alone. As a sign of how far the GOP has come since their November loss, Priebus told CNN he was shocked by Mitt Romney’s prescription of “self-deportation,” saying the remark was “not our party’s position” — apparently forgetting that the same concept was in the GOP platform that Priebus’ RNC approved just months earlier. • Speaker Boehner Moves Closer To Reform A bipartisan group in the House is getting close to a deal on immigration reform, and one of the participants, Rep. Luis Gutierrez (D-IL), told reporters on Tuesday that it will include a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants. Gutierrez represents the House’s left pole on immigration, so it’s significant that the closer his group gets to a final agreement, the closer Speaker John Boehner (R-OH) associates himself with their efforts. On Tuesday, he said the House group’s plan “is frankly a pretty responsible solution.” On budget issues, Boehner has been prevented from drifting too far to the center by Majority Leader Eric Cantor (R-VA), who is close with the conservative wing of the House. But Cantor has been moving left on immigration himself. The No. 3 Republican in the House, Majority Whip Kevin McCarthy (R-CA), predicted earlier this month on CNN that **there would be enough Republican votes to pass** some version of **reform**.

#### Obama’s leaving past fights strengthened—he tactically retreated from budget fights to husband capital and time for immigration

John Ford, PolicyMic, 3/28/13, Why Obama Signing Sequestration Into Law Was a Strategic Move , www.policymic.com/articles/31012/why-obama-signing-sequestration-into-law-was-a-strategic-move/421387

President Barack Obama finally signed the Sequester into law, locking the infamous spending cuts into place, at least until this September. It is rare for a president to sign into a law a program that he actively opposes – President Obama called them "dumb" – so why did this one allow these cuts with relatively little confrontation?

At the risk of seeming weak, President Obama is engaging in a tactical withdrawal here, not a retreat. The president sees that no more can be done on the budget stalemate at this time; **with public opinion favoring him, and a popular mandate still only four months fresh,** he is better off using his political capital on other reforms.

With over half of his term gone, and a huge laundry list of initiatives still tabled, **every move Obama makes is a** time management puzzle. And with another inevitable fight on the budget scheduled for the summer, it **is time for him to focus on other things for the spring**.

What is next for the president now that the budget is, for the moment, a settled issue? According to the White House, he is going to emphasize projects that do not require budgetary support: a raise to the minimum wage, immigration, and housing, for example.

#### Immigration is right around the corner – its at the top of the agenda – discussions are finishing

Julie Pace, Associated Press White House correspondent, 3/26 [“Overhaul immigration laws now, Obama tells Congress,” Boston Globe, 2013, http://www.bostonglobe.com/news/nation/2013/03/25/obama-calls-for-speedy-debate-immigration-bill/1iFS3WuovsEw0Vj626WTXK/story.html]

A bipartisan group of eight senators **is close to finishing** draft work on a bill that would dramatically reshape the US immigration and employment landscape, putting 11 million illegal immigrants on a path to citizenship. The measure also would allow tens of thousands of new high- and low-skilled workers into the country.¶ The president applauded the congressional effort so far**, but pressed lawmakers to wrap up their discussions** quickly.¶ ‘‘We’ve got a lot of white papers and studies,’’ Obama said. ‘‘We’ve just got to, at this point, work up the political courage to do what’s required.’’¶ **Immigration** shot to the forefront **of Obama’s domestic agenda following the November election**. Hispanics made up 10 percent of the electorate and overwhelmingly backed Obama, in part because of the tough stance on immigration that Republicans took during the campaign.¶ The election results spurred Republicans to tackle immigration reform for the first time since 2007 in an effort to increase the party’s appeal to Hispanics and keep the GOP competitive in national elections.¶ Obama and the bipartisan Senate group are in agreement on the key principles of a potential immigration bill, including a pathway to citizenship, strengthening the legal immigration system, and cracking down on businesses that employ illegal immigrants.¶ The White House has largely backed the Senate process but says **it has its own immigration bill ready if the debate on Capitol Hill stalls.**
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#### PC solves delay

Carrie Dann, Political Reporter, 3/27 [“Obama optimistic on immigration legislation,” NBC News, 2013, http://firstread.nbcnews.com/\_news/2013/03/27/17490075-obama-optimistic-on-immigration-legislation?lite]

As a bipartisan group of senators chips away at the remaining obstacles to an immigration deal, President Barack Obama says he is optimistic that – if lawmakers release a draft bill early next month – he will be able to sign comprehensive immigration reform into law before autumn.¶ “If we have a bill introduced at the beginning of next month -- as these senators indicate it will be -- then I'm confident that we can get it done certainly before the end of the summer,” Obama said in an interview with Telemundo on Wednesday.¶ Alfonso Aguilar, the Executive Director for the Latino Partnership for Conservative Principles, Democratic pollster Margie Omero, and Nathan Gonzales, the Deputy Editor of the Rothenberg Political Report and contributing writer for Roll call, join The Daily Rundown to talk about immigration legislation.¶ **The president repeated that he could still introduce a White House-drafted version of the legislation if the “Gang of Eight” Senate group is not able to put forward a bill**. But he said he’s confident that lawmakers will be able to work out the final snags in the negotiations in time to unveil their proposal when they return from a two-week Easter recess next month.¶ Advertise | AdChoices¶ “I'm optimistic,” he said. “ I've always said that if I see a breakdown in the process, that I've got my own legislation. **I'm prepared to step in**. But I don't think that's going to be necessary. I think there's a commitment -- among this group of Democratic and Republican senators to get this done.”¶ The negotiations have been held up in part by continuing disputes between business and labor groups about the conditions of a guest-worker program, particularly the wages and treatment ensured to temporary workers compared to those for American workers pursuing similar jobs.¶ But the president said he doesn’t believe that the dispute could scuttle the whole reform framework.¶ “There are still some areas about … the future flow of guest workers,” he said. “Labor and businesses may not always agree exactly on how to do this. But this is a resolvable issue.”¶ White House Spokesman Josh Earnest expresses optimism over the ongoing negotiations of the Gang of 8 relating to immigration reform.¶ While he expressed optimism that a final bill will contain a path to citizenship for those currently in the country illegally, Obama would not offer specifics on how long the process of obtaining citizenship should take.¶ And he declined to outline how the security of the nation’s border should be assessed, saying only that there should be no border security “trigger” that must be met before undocumented persons are eligible to begin the process of seeking legal status.¶ “We don't want to make this earned pathway to citizenship a situation in which it's put off further and further into the future,” he said. “There needs to be a certain path for how people can get legal in this country, even as we also work on these strong border security issues.”¶ While the White House has deferred to the Senate group on the legislative language, the **president has used the bully pulpit** in recent days to urge lawmakers to action and remind the public of the general framework for reform that he supports – including a path to citizenship.¶ In addition to the Telemundo interview, he also sat down with Spanish-language channel Univision on Wednesday. Earlier this week, the president urged Congress to show “political courage” on the issue during remarks at a naturalization ceremony at the White House.¶ President Barack Obama signs a bill creating the Charles Young Buffalo Soldiers National Monument in Ohio during a ceremony in the Oval Office of the White House March 25, 2013 in Washington, DC.¶ Earlier Wednesday, Republican Sens. John McCain and Jeff Flake of Arizona held a joint press conference with Democrats Chuck Schumer of New York and Michael Bennet of Colorado. The lawmakers traveled to Arizona’s southern border to survey the state of security there, a tour that offered a very real illustration of the illegal immigration issue when they spotted a woman scaling a border fence. (She was later apprehended by border security officers, McCain said.)¶ Advertise | AdChoices¶ At a press conference, Schumer told reporters there that negotiators are “90 percent of the way there” on a compromise bill, adding that the trip offered a glimpse into what further resources are needed to ensure full border security.

#### He’s pushing from behind the scenes, which solves oppposition

Julie Pace, Associated press white house correspondent, 3/27/13, Obama: Immigration bill could pass by summer, www.timesunion.com/news/politics/article/Obama-back-at-forefront-of-immigration-debate-4389183.php

President Barack Obama pressed for swift action on a sweeping immigration bill Wednesday, saying last-minute obstacles are "resolvable" and predicting Congress could pass historic legislation by the end of the summer. In back-to-back interviews with Spanish-language television networks, Obama repeatedly voiced confidence in a bipartisan Senate group that appears to be on the cusp of unveiling a draft bill. And he said that while he is still prepared to step in with his own bill if talks break down, he doesn't expect that step to be necessary. "If we have a bill introduced at the beginning of next month as these senators indicate it will be, then I'm confident that we can get it done certainly before the end of the summer," Obama told Telemundo. While overhauling the nation's patchwork immigration laws is a top second term priority for the president, he has ceded the negotiations almost entirely to Congress. He and his advisers have calculated that a bill crafted by Capitol Hill stands a better chance of winning Republican support than one overtly influenced by the president. In his interviews Wednesday, Obama tried to stay out of the prickly policy issues that remain unfinished in the Senate talks, though he said a split between business and labor on wages for new low-skilled workers was unlikely to "doom" the legislation. "This is a resolvable issue," he said. The president also spoke Wednesday with Univision. His interviews followed a citizenship ceremony conducted Monday at the White House where he pressed Congress to "finish the job" on immigration, an issue that has vexed Washington for years. The president made little progress in overhauling the nation's fractured immigration laws in his first term, but he redoubled his efforts after winning re-election. The November contest also spurred some Republicans to drop their opposition to immigration reform, given that Hispanics overwhelmingly backed Obama. In an effort to keep Republicans at the negotiation table, Obama has stayed relatively quiet on immigration over the last month. He rolled out his immigration principles during a January rally in Las Vegas and made an impassioned call for overhauling the nation's laws during his early February State of the Union address, then purposely handed off the effort to lawmakers. The president has, however, privately called members of the Senate working group, and the administration is providing technical support to the lawmakers. The Gang of Eight is expected to unveil its draft bill when Congress returns from a two-week recess the week of April 8. Obama and the Senate group are in agreement on some core principles, including a pathway to citizenship for most of the 11 million illegal immigrants already in the country, revamping the legal immigration system and holding businesses to tougher standards on verifying their workers are in the country legally. But they're at odds over key issues. The Senate group wants the citizenship pathway to be contingent on securing the border, something Obama opposes. The president has also sidestepped the contentious guest-worker issue, which contributed to derailing immigration talks in 2007. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the AFL-CIO have reached significant agreements on a new visa program that would bring up to 200,000 lower-skilled workers to the country each year. But they reached a stalemate Friday over wages for the workers, with the labor union pushing for higher wages than the chamber has agreed to so far. Since then, talks have resumed and negotiators are "back on the right track," Ana Avendano, a lead AFL-CIO negotiator, said Wednesday. Avendano declined to offer specifics but said the chamber had moved off what she termed its insistence on "poverty-level wages" for the new workers. "We're very hopeful that we're moving," Avendano told reporters after a briefing for congressional staff on temporary-worker programs. While **Obama tries to keep the pressure on lawmakers** this week, four members of the Senate immigration group toured Arizona's border with Mexico to inspect the conditions there. Arizona's Republican Sens. John McCain and Jeff Flake were joined by Democratic Sens. Chuck Schumer of New York and Michael Bennet of Colorado for the border tour.
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#### Border security won’t kill the bill

Julia Preston, NYTimes, 3/21/13, Officials Concede Failures on Gauging Border Security, www.nytimes.com/2013/03/22/us/officials-still-seek-ways-to-assess-border-security.html?pagewanted=all&\_r=2&

Amid contentious discussions in Congress over immigration, one **point of wide agreement** is that an evaluation of border security will be a central piece of any comprehensive bill. A bipartisan group in the Senate is working to write legislation that includes a “trigger,” which would make the path to citizenship for more than 11 million illegal immigrants in the country contingent on measurable advances in security at the borders.

## links

#### Their drucker card says Rubio is “almost” the most important player, but he’s already been pushing the current bill and Dems backlash means they attach social provisions to the bill that cause him to withdraw that support – this is a new link

David **Drucker** and Kyle Trygstad, "Rubio Must Sell Immigration Changes to GOP, Grass Roots," ROLL CALL, 1--30--**13**, www.rollcall.com/news/rubio\_must\_sell\_immigration\_changes\_to\_gop\_grass\_roots-222044-1.html

**The fate of** an **immigration** overhaul **rests** almost **exclusively with** Sen. Marco **Rubio**, the Florida Republican **whose star power with conservatives is crucial to moving a bill through Congress**. President Barack Obama retains veto power, and Democrats hold the Senate floor. But **no** comprehensive immigration **changes are likely to pass** Congress **without** the healthy support ofHouse **Republicans. And Florida’s junior senator,** perhaps more than any other Republican serving in Washington today, **has the** political **credibility** and communication skills **to sell such** complicated, sensitive **legislation to** skeptical **conservative** member**s**, grass-roots voters and influential media commentators. Rubio’s position is all the more unique because congressional Democrats and Obama need him, too, and appear to realize his importance to the legislative endgame. Republicans warn that Obama and congressional Democrats could sink Washington’s immigration policy rewrite by attaching controversial social provisions or watering down the border enforcement and security measures included in the bipartisan Senate framework that Rubio helped negotiate. The Florida lawmaker has said he’ll pull his support from any bill if that occurs, and Republicans say comprehensive policy changes will fail to garner meaningful GOP support without Rubio’s backing. “**If Rubio signals any** mistrust or **misgivings, the whole thing collapses**,” GOP pollster Brock McCleary said.

#### Their bipart ev is about one committee, was written in 2010, and also says there’s backlash to any bill that doesn’t also include renewables

**Soraghan 10** – Mike Soraghan, “Gulf Spill Changes Few Senators' Minds on Offshore Drilling,” NYT, 5-7-10. http://www.nytimes.com/gwire/2010/05/07/07greenwire-gulf-spill-changes-few-senators-minds-on-offsh-26242.html?pagewanted=all. LAP

Drilling in Senate bills **Udall**, **like most of his fellow Democrats** on the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, **voted for a** committee **bill** last June **that would have expanded drilling** in the eastern Gulf of Mexico **to within 45 miles of Florida**, and within 10 miles in some areas. The bill would also have required utilities to start using more renewable energy. Sen. Bob Menendez (D-N.J.) was the only senator to vote against it because of the drilling expansion. Sen. Mary **Landrieu** (D-La.) **ardently supports drilling** but voted against the bill because it wouldn't share the royalties with state governments. Sen. Maria **Cantwell** (D-Wash.) **also voted for the bill**, after pushing for anti-drilling amendments. She pledged to continue the fight against offshore drilling on the floor.

#### Dems tank the bill

Alex Mooney, CNN White House Producer, 2/6/13, Unions could again be key to immigration reform, www.cnn.com/2013/02/05/politics/immigration-reform-unions

It should come as no surprise that prominent union leaders are among the first group President Barack Obama courts as he seeks support for overhauling immigration policy. It was organized labor that helped **ensure defeat** of a bipartisan effort to reform the nation's immigration laws five years ago. At that time, the AFL-CIO and other prominent union groups came out against the initiative, fearing a proposal for a temporary guest worker program for seasonal workers would weaken union membership and bargaining clout. That led to a handful of liberal-leaning Democrats to vote against the bill, including Sens. Sherrod Brown, Tom Harkin and Debbie Stabenow. Mindful that a potential split in the Democratic coalition this time around could again prove fatal to the passage of an immigration bill, Obama met on Tuesday with more than a dozen labor leaders.

#### It’s the only scenario for bill failure—Obama’s ability to persuade Dems key

Julie Hirschfeld Davis, Bloomberg, 3/22/13, Guest-Worker Visas Sticking Point on Immigration Rewrite, www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-03-22/guest-worker-visas-sticking-point-on-immigration-rewrite.html

With Senate Republicans and Democrats **moving closer to an agreement** to grant a chance at U.S. citizenship to 11 million undocumented immigrants, a long- simmering dispute between organized labor and the business lobby risks sapping the measure’s momentum. The two constituencies are at odds over a new program to provide U.S. work visas to low-skilled foreign workers, placing pressure on lawmakers poised for a compromise. Unions are pressing for a limited visa system that guarantees better wages for future immigrant workers, while businesses seek a broader program more responsive to their hiring needs. It’s the thornier side of what is otherwise a broadening consensus in both parties around an immigration plan, whose centerpiece is a path to U.S. citizenship for undocumented immigrants. A bipartisan group of eight senators is nearing a deal to bolster border security and workplace verification while revamping the legal immigration system. Republican Senator Marco Rubio of Florida, a member of the group, called the guest-worker issue “one of the more difficult parts” of the negotiations. “I’m not going to be part of a bill that doesn’t create a process whereby people can come to this country temporarily in the future if we need them,” Rubio said yesterday. “**There’s no secret that the broader labor movement**, with some exceptions, **would rather not even have an immigration bill.”** Political Consequences The disagreement carries significant political consequences for Republicans and Democrats alike, essentially making them choose between their strongest constituencies -- organized labor for Democrats and big business for Republicans -- and achievement of an overriding policy goal that both parties increasingly see as an electoral imperative. Hispanics accounted for 10 percent of voters in the 2012 presidential election. President Barack Obama won 71 percent of their votes, and just 27 percent backed Republican nominee Mitt Romney, who had proposed “self-deportation” for undocumented immigrants. Since then, a growing chorus of Republicans has publicly backed legal status for undocumented immigrants. Meanwhile, a group of Republican officials who unveiled a top-to-bottom review this week called for the party to back “comprehensive immigration reform” or see its appeal shrink. “It is in neither party’s interest for one group within a party to stop this, because it is bad for the economy if we don’t have immigration reform,” former Mississippi Governor and Republican National Committee Chairman Haley Barbour said this week, referring to labor unions’ objections to a guest-worker program. Worker Program Former Pennsylvania Governor Ed Rendell, a Democrat co- chairing an immigration task force with Barbour at the Bipartisan Policy Center in Washington, said it is ultimately up to Obama to persuade Democrats not to abandon the bill if the immigrant-worker program doesn’t match the unions’ agenda. “If we don’t get guest-worker provisions that are exactly in line with what labor wants, we can’t hold up the bill because of that,” Rendell said. “We’ve got to do the best we can to preserve and protect the interests of organized labor, but in the end you can’t always get what you want.” **Obama**, he added, **has “his work cut out for him.”**

And Dem collapse undermines the guest worker compromise—that’s necessary for GOP support

Anna Palmer, Politico, 3/21/13, GOP: Unions to blame if immigration reform fails, dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=60BCCBB9-D87E-4242-B5CA-B90F1F45A594

An immigration reform bill hasn’t even been unveiled, but key Republican lawmakers are already singling out unions as the reason why a deal could fail. The GOP offensive taps into long-simmering disagreement between the business community and unions over how to handle visas for low-skilled workers, which was **one** key reason **why comprehensive immigration reform failed in 2007**, the last time the issue was debated seriously in Washington. Sen. Marco Rubio told POLITICO the guest worker program is key to his supporting immigration reform. “I don’t think it’s any secret that in the past, unions killed immigration reform,” Sen. Marco Rubio said. “I think because of pressure from some of their members, they’ve at least publicly changed their stance on this. But I don’t think they are doing cartwheels over this.” Republicans are walking a fine line on immigration reform, trying not to alienate their base while hoping to attract millions of Latino voters that supported Democrats in the 2012 election. An immigration package without a guest worker program is almost guaranteed to fail. “I’m not going to be a part of a bill that doesn’t create a process so people can come temporarily to work if we need them,” Rubio said. “They can’t undercut American workers, but if we don’t have a system for foreign workers to come temporarily when we need them, we’re going to have an illegal immigration problem again.” Unions take issue with Rubio’s position that they aren’t working in good faith to find a compromise for how visas for low-skilled workers should be regulated. AFL-CIO’s Ana Avendaño said that Republicans trying to cast unions as the reason for immigration reform to fail “reek of desperation.” “It is their last gasp of trying to rewrite the rules of future flow to undermine the wages of local workers,” Avendaño said, arguing that constituents and the Latino population wouldn’t be swayed by Rubio’s argument that a plan for low-wage workers held up citizenship for 11 million people. But Rubio is hardly alone. Other Republican leaders on immigration reform like Rep. Raul Labrador are also sounding the alarm against unions. An amendment that President Barack Obama backed in 2007 would have stripped out the guest worker provision and was one of the issues that thwarted immigration reform happening last time. Republican opposition to immigration reform at the time was well-documented. “It’s the labor unions who do not want a guest worker program that’s viable, that’s functional,” the Idaho Republican said. “They’re fighting right now in the Senate to make the guest worker program so unwieldy, so expensive that no one will use it.” He added: “**There’s no way that a Republican would vote for immigration without a workable guest worker program.** I think the unions know that, and if you see any break apart in this immigration reform thing that we’re doing, it’s going to be because the unions and the Democratic senators are unwilling to do what the American people want because they are willing to put the labor unions ahead of the American people.”

Link turn is empirically wrong

Hobson 12 (Margaret, Writer for E&E, the leading source for comprehensive, daily coverage of environmental and energy politics and policy., "Obama's development plans gain little political traction in years since Gulf spill", [www.eenews.net/public/energywire/2012/04/18/1](http://www.eenews.net/public/energywire/2012/04/18/1))

President Obama is embracing the offshore oil and gas development policies he proposed in early 2010 but were sidelined in the shadow of the Deepwater Horizon oil spill. Two years after the BP PLC oil rig exploded, killing 11 people and causing the worst oil spill in U.S. history, Obama's "all of the above" energy policy includes offshore drilling provisions that are nearly identical to his aggressive March 2010 drilling plan. Since the moratorium on offshore oil drilling ended in late 2010, the administration expanded oil and gas development in the western and central Gulf of Mexico and announced plans for lease sales in the eastern Gulf. The White House appears poised to allow Royal Dutch Shell PLC to begin exploring for oil this summer in Alaska's Beaufort and Chukchi seas and to open oil industry access to the Cook Inlet, south of Anchorage. The administration is also paving the way for oil and gas seismic studies along the mid- and south Atlantic coasts, the first such survey in 30 years. While opening more offshore lands to oil and gas development, the Obama administration has also taken steps to make offshore oil drilling safer, according to a report card issued yesterday by Oil Spill Commission Action, an oversight panel formed by seven members of President Obama's oil spill commission. That report criticized Congress for failing to adopt new oil spill safety laws but praised the Interior Department and industry for making progress in improving offshore oil development safety, environmental protection and oil spill preparation. An environmental group was less complimentary. A report yesterday by Oceana charged that the measures adopted by government and industry are "woefully inadequate." As the 2012 presidential campaign heats up and gasoline prices remain stuck near $4 per gallon, Obama's offshore oil development policies aren't winning him any political capital. The environmental community hates the drilling proposals. The Republicans and oil industry officials complain that the White House hasn't gone far enough. And independent voters are confused by the president's rhetoric. According to the GOP political firm Resurgent Republic, independent voters in Colorado and Virginia don't understand what Obama's "all of the above" energy mantra means. The report said, however, that once the policy was "described as oil, gas, coal, nuclear power, solar and other alternative energies, participants became enthusiastic and view such a strategy as credible and necessary to becoming more energy independent." A recent Gallup poll indicated that American voters are polarized on energy issues. The survey found that 47 percent of the public believes energy development is more important than environmental protection, while 41 percent of the public ranks protecting the environment as a bigger priority. In that political climate, Obama's offshore oil development policies are not likely to affect the nation's most conservative or liberal voters, noted Larry Sabato, director of the University of Virginia's Center for Politics. "The environmentalists have no place to go except Obama, and Obama isn't going to convince any conservatives or Republicans to back him" based on his oil and gas proposals, Sabato said. "He's obviously aiming at swing independents," Sabato added. "He's trying to show that he's pursuing a middle path, the one many independents like. Maybe it will work." Back to the original plan, minus 2 pieces Obama's all-of-the-above energy policy is in keeping with his pre-oil-spill offshore oil and gas development proposal. After the Deepwater Horizon disaster, the White House slapped a six-month moratorium on all new oil and gas development. Since the moratorium ended, Obama has systematically reintroduced most of the early oil development proposals. Two pieces of the old plan are missing. Obama backtracked on his proposal to allow oil exploration off Virginia's coast. The new East Coast offshore plan lays the groundwork for seismic studies, but not drilling, along the mid- and south Atlantic. The White House also dropped a proposal to allow exploration in the eastern Gulf of Mexico within 125 miles of Florida, an area off limits due to a congressional moratorium. During 2010 negotiations, the administration offered to allow oil leasing in the region if Congress lifted the moratorium and passed a global warming bill. When the climate change legislation died, however, the drilling provision lost White House favor. Since the Republicans took control of the House in 2011, GOP leaders have advanced a series of bills that would go far beyond Obama's offshore oil drilling policies, essentially allowing development along all U.S. shores. But those measures have been thwarted by the Democrat-controlled Senate.

Oil spoils destroy any support

Joyce 10 (Christopher Joyce is a correspondent on the science desk at NPR. His stories can be heard on all of NPR's news programs, including NPR's Morning Edition, All Things Considered, and Weekend Edition., 5/1/2010, "Offshore Drilling Loses Support After Gulf Oil Spill", www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=126511355)

Days into the oil spill, President Obama said he still supports offshore drilling so long as it's done responsibly and doesn't damage the environment. That view is becoming increasingly unpopular. For California Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger, the Gulf spill fails on both counts. Schwarzenegger recently announced that he's yanking approval of an offshore drilling project along his coastline because he no longer believes the assurances of the oil industry. "Despite those studies and support," the governor says, "all of you have seen, when you turn on the television, the devastation in the Gulf. And I'm sure that they also were assured that it was safe to drill. That will not happen here in California." It was in California in 1969 that the mother of all U.S. rig spills occurred, just off the coast of Santa Barbara. Images of oil-soaked birds and beaches helped launch Earth Day and the modern environmental movement. Another hotspot in the offshore drilling debate is Florida. The state Legislature is weighing a measure to open up new areas for offshore drilling. Some Floridians had come around to the idea because of the country's dependence on foreign oil, says Susan Glickman, a consultant for the Southern Alliance for Clean Energy. But the spill appears to have trumped that concern: "There has been a definite switch in positions for some and a hardening of positions for others against drilling, which for a brief period of time was enjoying some increase in public support and political support. But that is evaporating rather quickly," Glickman says. Among the converts who've turned against offshore drilling is Florida Gov. Charlie Crist. He flew over the oil spill and decided Florida wasn't ready for new drilling. Debating Offshore Drilling In The Climate Bill In Washington, expanded offshore drilling has won backing from quite a few stalwart environmentalists in the Senate, who are pushing a new energy and climate bill up a very steep hill. The bill offers support for more offshore drilling and new nuclear power plants as a sweetener to win votes from skeptics, who say the bill will raise consumers' energy costs. Former Colorado Sen. Tim Wirth, who now heads the United Nations Foundation, says he expects the oil spill to upset the political apple cart in the Senate. "I think that there will be a number of coastal people who were previously supporting the bill who will want provisions related to aggressive drilling taken out of the bill," says Wirth. Wirth says other senators who were on the fence are now likely to jump off and not support any new drilling.

Dems hate the plan and conservatives won’t give Obama credit

Bryan Walsh, TIME Senior editor, 11/9/11, Why Obama’s Offshore Drilling Plan Isn’t Making Anyone Happy, http://science.time.com/2011/11/09/why-obamas-offshore-drilling-plan-isnt-making-anyone-happy/#ixzz26snhDbbI

Nonetheless, Obama has set a target of reducing U.S. oil imports by a third by 2025, and greater domestic oil production is going to have to be a part of that—including oil from the Arctic. Unfortunately for the President, no one’s likely to cheer him. Conservatives and the oil industry won’t be happy until just about every square foot of the country is available for drilling—though it is worth noting that oil production offshore has actually increased under Obama—and environmentalists aren’t going to rally to support any sort of expanded drilling. With energy, as with so many other issues for Obama, it’s lonely at the center.
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#### Obama’s key to momentum

Justin Sink, The Hill, 3/25/13, Obama: 'The time has come' to move immigration bill in Congress, thehill.com/video/administration/290129-obama-the-time-has-come-to-move-immigration-reform

President Obama used a naturalization ceremony at the White House on Monday to declare “the time has come” to move immigration reform through Congress. Obama said expects debate on an immigration bill to “begin next month” at a ceremony where 28 people, including 13 armed servicemembers, became citizens. Bipartisan groups in both the House and Senate are moving closer to unveiling separate immigration reform proposals, and the president is hoping to build momentum for a deal. “We've known for years that our immigration system is broken, that we're not doing enough to harness the talent and ingenuity of all those who want to work hard and find a place in America,” Obama said. “And after avoiding the problem for years, the time has come to fix it once and for all. The time has come for comprehensive, sensible immigration reform.” Speaking from the East Room, Obama argued that immigration strengthens the country. “It keeps us vibrant, it keeps us hungry, it keeps us prosperous. It is what makes us such a dynamic country,” he said. “If we want to keep attracting the best and the brightest, we've got to do a better job of welcoming them.” Advocates for immigration reform see a **real chance for legislation to pass Congress this year**, despite opposition from some House GOP lawmakers, many of whom have said they will oppose measures that grant “amnesty” to illegal immigrants and have questioned proposed protections for gay or lesbian couples. Immigration reform is a potent political issue for Obama, who won more than 70 percent of the Hispanic vote in 2012. Since that showing, a growing number of conservative lawmakers have signaled they would back immigration reform, including measures to provide a pathway to citizenship. Groups aligned with Obama have signaled their intention of **pressuring Congress**.

#### He’s engaging in an all-out push – it’s working

Gary Martin, Connecticut Post, 3/28/13, Immigration reform gaining support in Congress, www.ctpost.com/local/article/Immigration-reform-gaining-support-in-Congress-4393187.php

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Public opinion is behind them.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

"You do the math," Beck said.

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

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

Still, it won't be easy.

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

## at: border security

#### The Senate bill has border protections, Obama’s backing it, and only forcing him to go it alone means he strips them out

Associated Press, 3/25/13, Obama calls for April debate on immigration bill, www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/03/25/obama-calls-for-april-debate-on-immigration-bill/

President Obama challenged Congress Monday to "finish the job" of finalizing legislation aimed at overhauling the nation's immigration system. With members of the House and Senate away on spring break, Obama made his most substantive remarks on the difficult issue in more than a month, saying he expects lawmakers to take up debate on a quicklyand that he hopes to sign it into law as soon as possible.= "We've known for years that our immigration system is broken," the president said at a citizenship ceremony at the White House. "After avoiding the problem for years, the time has come to fix it once and for all." The president spoke at a ceremony for 28 people from more than two dozen countries, including Afghanistan, China and Mexico. Thirteen of the new citizens are active duty service members in the U.S. military. The oath of allegiance was administered by Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano. While Obama has hosted citizenship ceremonies in previous years, Monday's event was laced with politics, given the ongoing debate over immigration reform on Capitol Hill. A bipartisan group of eight senators is close to finishing draft work on a bill that would dramatically reshape the U.S. immigration and employment landscape, putting 11 million illegal immigrants on a path to citizenship. The measure also would allow tens of thousands of new high- and low-skilled workers into the country. The president applauded the congressional effort so far, but pressed lawmakers to wrap up their discussions quickly. "We've got a lot of white papers and studies," Obama said. "We've just got to, at this point, work up the political courage to do what's required." Immigration shot to the forefront of Obama's domestic agenda following the November election. Hispanics made up 10 percent of the electorate and overwhelmingly backed Obama, in part because of the tough stance on immigration that Republicans took during the campaign. The election results spurred Republicans to tackle immigration reform for the first time since 2007 in an effort to increase the party's appeal to Hispanics and keep the GOP competitive in national elections. Obama and the bipartisan Senate group are in lockstep on the key principles of a potential immigration bill, including a pathway to citizenship, strengthening the legal immigration system, and cracking down on businesses that employ illegal immigrants. The White House has largely **backed the Senate process,** but says it has its own immigration bill ready if the debate on Capitol Hill stalls.

#### Their CSM

**CSM** (Christian Science Monitor), **3--27**, www.csmonitor.com/USA/DC-Decoder/2013/0327/How-border-security-trigger-could-stop-immigration-reform

So what do lawmakers propose to do this time around? Mr. Obama’s answer appears to be scrap the trigger altogether.

**CARD ENDS**

His immigration statements have notably left out any linkage between border security and permanent legal status for the undocumented, noting in his immigration reform plan that if an undocumented person meets certain criteria including paying fines, learning English, and waiting until all other current prospective immigrants have passed through the immigration system, “there will be no uncertainty about their ability to become US citizens.”

However, White House spokesman Jay Carney told reporters something far short of “no triggers” when asked directly about the subject on Tuesday: “There are a variety of metrics by which you can measure, and we do measure, progress on border security.… We're working with Congress on this, with the Senate on this. Progress has been made.”

In the Senate, the Gang of Eight requires that a future group of Southwest border leaders, including governors, attorneys general, and community figures, would certify that the border is secure before any undocumented immigrants could receive green cards. Essentially, the undocumented would, after meeting eligibility steps similar to the president’s, be allowed to receive legal status in the country. Then, when the group of border leaders certified the border secure, those immigrants could begin the path to citizenship.

#### Security disputes scuttle any deal

Fawn Johnson, 3/21/13, Border Triggers Could Sink Immigration Deal, www.nationaljournal.com/daily/border-triggers-could-sink-immigration-deal-20130321

Republicans' insistence that border-security benchmarks be met before legalizing 11-12 million illegal immigrants could sink an emerging compromise measure that is expected to be unveiled in a few weeks. The “Gang of Eight” senators negotiating a sweeping immigration bill are on track to unveil draft legislation at the beginning of April, according to congressional aides. Similarly, a bipartisan group of House members is honing its own version. The cornerstone of both measures is a mass probationary legalization of noncriminal undocumented immigrants. Legalization is a significant concession from Republicans, who are reluctant to give breaks to immigrants who violated the law. They acknowledge, however, that mass deportation is not possible and that millions of illegal residents are bad for national security. Conservatives are worried that once a bill passes, legalization will take the pressure off immigration authorities to stop further illegal entry and to find and deport those who manage to make it in without authorization. To keep that from happening, the negotiators are discussing a variety of enforcement-related benchmarks, or “triggers,” that would need to be met before the population of undocumented immigrants can move toward citizenship. But some lawmakers worry that forestalling citizenship in the name of border security may not be enough of an incentive for the authorities. After all, only half of legal immigrants in the country now go to the trouble of becoming U.S. citizens. Once the illegal population is given provisional legal status, they might not be clamoring as hard for government action that would allow them to become full-fledged citizens. Rep. Raul Labrador, R-Idaho, a leading voice for tea-party conservatives on immigration, has suggested that even the probationary legalization of illegal immigrants should wait until some enforcement mechanisms are in place. “We have to have enforcement triggers happen before anyone receives any kind of legal status,” he said Wednesday. “Certain objective triggers that we can measure.” Labrador is walking a tightrope between the tea-party House members who follow his lead on immigration and the immigrant-friendly lawmakers with whom he is trying to strike a deal. The two groups don’t speak the same language. For hardcore conservatives, only tough enforcement benchmarks could give them enough comfort to support the legislation. “We cannot simply legalize 12 million people and enforce the laws later,” Senate Judiciary Committee ranking Republican Chuck Grassley, R-Iowa, said Wednesday. But Labrador’s suggestion is a deal-breaker for immigrant advocates and Democrats. “Whoever’s saying that, they’re trying to kill the bill before it even gets started,” said Alison Reardon, legislative consultant for the Service Employees International Union, which represents thousands of immigrant workers. “We should continue to work to secure our borders, but there’s no way to do that and wait for legalization. Border security is an ongoing thing.” The Obama administration isn’t helping on this front, because it has been more aggressive than any previous administration in deporting and detaining illegal immigrants. Almost half of those in deportation proceedings have committed no other crimes.

## at: labor disputes

#### Labor compromise likely

Fawn Johnson, National Journal, 3/25/13, Why the Fight Over Work Visas Won't Doom the Immigration Bill, www.nationaljournal.com/congress/why-the-fight-over-work-visas-won-t-doom-the-immigration-bill-20130325

**Make no mistake. The immigration bill** that is being crafted by the “Gang of Eight” senators **will include foreign work visas despite warning from** both **business and labor** that their talks over the issue have broken down. Here’s why. The AFL-CIO, for the first time in its history, has signed off on a work visa program that would allow employers to bring foreign workers into the United States on a temporary basis. Those visas would come with an assurance that the worker would have access to a green card, possibly as soon as one year after coming into the country. But initially, they are temporary visas. “It would be a new kind of work visa program. It would be dual intent,” said AFL-CIO spokesman Jeff Hauser. This is a big deal. Previously, the AFL-CIO opposed any kind of temporary visa program. That intransigence caused a highly public split with the Service Employees International Union in 2007. SEIU was willing to embrace some form of temporary work visas for immigrant labor if the broader immigration bill also legalized the currently undocumented population. Now labor is speaking with one voice. They want legalization for the undocumented population and are willing to allow new foreign workers to come to the country, provided the employers pay them at the same rates they would pay an American worker. The business community has indicated **it can live with those parameters**. The breakdown in talks is about **degrees rather than overall principles**. How much should foreign workers be paid? How should that wage rate calculated, and who decides? The dispute between labor and business over work visas highlights the sensitivity of the effort to reshape an immigration system that doesn't work very well for anybody. Immigration reform is a top priority for President Obama and for Republicans in Congress, who are worried that without an overhaul, the Hispanic population will become permanent Democrats. Obama, just back from a trip to the Middle East, put a spotlight on the issue at a naturalization ceremony for 28 legal immigrants where he urged Congress to press ahead with reform. "The time has come for a comprehensive, sensible immigration reform," he said. "We are making progress but we’ve got to finish the job." The eight Senate negotiators are hoping to unveil a draft of their immigration bill when Congress returns from its break in early April. The Judiciary Committee then will spend several weeks debating it and voting on it, preparing it for the Senate floor--a debate that is also expected to take several weeks. If all goes according to plan, the legislation will receive a final Senate vote in June.