# 1NC

### 1NC

#### 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.
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#### Immigration will pass, but status quo is goldilocks—Obama’s behind-the-scene PC is key

Sink 3-26 (Justin, Correspondent, “After Taking Hit in the Polls, Obama Pivots Back to Immigration Reform,” The Hill, 2013, http://thehill.com/homenews/administration/290249-after-taking-hit-in-the-polls-obama-pivots-back-to-immigration)

The White House hopes to bolster President Obama’s political standing by shifting attention from the bruising budget battles of the last month to immigration reform and gun control. Democrats welcome the pivot after watching Obama’s standing in polls fall amid fights with Congress over the budget and the automatic spending cuts known as the sequester. They see immigration and gun reform as a better playing field for Obama that could provide political wins for the president. “What the public wants to see right now is him achieving things, leading,” said Tad Devine, a former strategist to Secretary of State John Kerry and former Vice President Gore. “For him, there's real opportunity on all these fronts, and… realistically in the next six months, he can have progress he can bring back to the American people.” On gun control, Obama will travel the country to bolster the case for strengthening background checks on gun purchases. Obama is expected to play an active role in the looming Senate fight over what Sen. Charles Schumer (D-N.Y.) has described as the “sweet spot” of legislation. A poll released Friday from Quinnipiac University shows that 88 percent of respondents support an expansion of background checks on new weapons purchases. Other provisions banning straw sales and improving gun research programs and school security funding garner similarly commanding poll advantages. "There actually is a lot of strong support for the proposals that the president has put forward, whether it's universal background checks, whether it is, you know, outlawing gun trafficking or straw purchasers," White House spokesman Josh Earnest said. "There's even some support out there in the public for the assault weapons ban." Yet, the assault weapons ban doesn't have the votes to pass the Senate, and neither does background checks — unless a bipartisan deal is reached. Immigration is a better issue for the president, partly because a growing number of Republicans want to pass a bill in the 113th Congress. While Republicans in Congress had little reason to negotiate with Obama on preventing the sequester, they do have reason to offer concessions on immigration. "Immigration reform in particular is something clearly that Latinos and the American public as a whole signaled they wanted in the last election, and Republicans ought to get on the right side of that issue," said Democratic strategist Jamal Simmons. "It doesn't seem like complicated math, and Republicans are basically deciding, do they want to be a House-based party, or do they want to be a national party that competes for the presidency and competes for the control of the Senate?" Moreover, immigration reform — which failed in the George W. Bush administration — would be Obama's most significant legislative achievement behind healthcare reform. “If the administration were able to get an immigration bill that looked anything like comprehensive immigration reform after President Bush had failed on it, President Clinton had failed on it, every president back to Reagan had failed, it would be a big deal,” said Cal Jillson, a political science professor at Southern Methodist University. Democrats are worried that Obama hasn't had a lot of signing ceremonies in 2013 as unresolved budget battles have hit the president's approval ratings. Obama's healthy post-election advantage on the economy has dwindled into a virtual tie with congressional Republicans. Voters equally blame Obama and the GOP for the sequester, which is expected to hit in full force in the coming weeks. “It goes back to a sense in Washington that things aren't getting done,” Devine said. “No matter whose fault that is, when you're president, the buck stops here.” Obama faces a delicate high-wire act on guns and immigration: Claim too much ownership for an issue, and swing-state Republicans who had been considering working with the White House might buck; Sit too far back, and risk losing steam on policy initiatives — or allowing Republicans to take credit. “In both of those policy areas, the president is involving himself carefully, allowing what appears to be some momentum in Congress to manage the issues,” Jillson said. “The president's involvement is modest, if not behind the scenes, because there is still enough post-election bad blood among the House GOP that direct presidential involvement drives away support.”

#### OCS drilling drains capital

Orth 11 (Derek Orth, J.D. expected May 2012, Rutgers School of Law (Newark, N.J.); Managing Articles Editor for the Rutgers Computer and Technology Law Journal, 2011 University of Oregon, Journal of Environmental Law and Litigation, 26 J. Envtl. L. & Litig. 509, Lexis, 2011)

NAME: DEREK ORTH\*

The Deepwater Horizon was constructed in 2001 and was "capable of operating in water up to 8,000 feet deep and able to drill down to 30,000 feet." n6 The disaster occurred while Halliburton Energy Services, Inc. (Halliburton) was mounting production casing and [\*512] cement on a 5,000 feet deep exploratory well in the Macondo Prospect. Ironically, integrity tests were due to be performed on the Macondo well at the time the explosion occurred, after which the well would have been capped until BP was prepared to begin extraction operations. n7¶ Tragically, the fiery explosion that occurred onboard the Deepwater Horizon threw BP's plans into disarray, resulting in eleven deaths, n8 millions of barrels of spewing oil, n9 and immense damage to the Gulf Coast. n10 The subsequent proliferation of monetary claims, lawsuits, and legislation n11 has raised numerous issues that stand to forever alter the regulatory structure of the offshore oil industry n12 as well as the liability schemes of international oil companies operating in the United States' coastal waters. n13¶ A bill's passage through Congress is fraught with danger at every turn. In general, most bills are submitted by individual members of Congress, examined and voted upon by specialized committees, presented to both the House and Senate for approval, and, finally, submitted to the President for his signature. Thus, a well-meaning and complex bill can often only gain approval through an expenditure of serious political capital by at least one party or the occurrence of an event that exerts public pressure on both political parties to react expediently and deal with the crisis. n14

#### New controversy causes Obama to over-correct – he’ll introduce his own version – thwarts the bill

Dann 3-27 (Carrie, Political Reporter – NBC News, “Obama optimistic on immigration legislation,” <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. “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.”

#### Immigration reform generates an effective base of IT experts – solves cyber terror

**McLarty 9** (Thomas F. III, President – McLarty Associates and Former White House Chief of Staff and Task Force Co-Chair, “U.S. Immigration Policy: Report of a CFR-Sponsored Independent Task Force”, 7-8, http://www.cfr.org/ publication/19759/us\_immigration\_policy.html)

We have seen, when you look at the table of the top 20 firms that are H1-B visa requestors, at least 15 of those are IT firms. And as we're seeing across industry, much of the hardware and software that's used in this country is not only manufactured now overseas, but it's developed overseas by scientists and engineers who were educated here in the United States. We're seeing a lot more activity around cyber-security, certainly noteworthy attacks here very recently. It's becoming an increasingly dominant set of requirements across not only to the Department of Defense, but the Department of Homeland Security and the critical infrastructure that's held in private hands. Was there any discussion or any interest from DOD or DHS as you undertook this review on the security things about what can be done to try to generate a more effective group of IT experts here in the United States, many of which are coming to the U.S. institutions, academic institutions from overseas and often returning back? This potentially puts us at a competitive disadvantage going forward. MCLARTY: Yes. And I think your question largely is the answer as well. I mean, clearly we have less talented students here studying -- or put another way, more talented students studying in other countries that are gifted, talented, really have a tremendous ability to develop these kind of technology and scientific advances, we're going to be put at an increasingly disadvantage. Where if they come here -- and I kind of like Dr. Land's approach of the green card being handed to them or carefully put in their billfold or purse as they graduate -- then, obviously, that's going to strengthen, I think, our system, our security needs.

#### Cyberterrorism will cause accidental launch that triggers the Dead Hand and nuclear war

**Fritz 9** (Jason, BS – St. Cloud, “Hacking Nuclear Command and Control”, Study Commissioned on Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament, July, www.icnnd.org/Documents/Jason\_Fritz\_Hacking\_NC2.doc)  
*Direct control of launch*   
The US uses the two-man rule to achieve a higher level of security in nuclear affairs. Under this rule two authorized personnel must be present and in agreement during critical stages of nuclear command and control. The President must jointly issue a launch order with the Secretary of Defense; Minuteman missile operators must agree that the launch order is valid; and on a submarine, both the commanding officer and executive officer must agree that the order to launch is valid. In the US, in order to execute a nuclear launch, an Emergency Action Message (EAM) is needed. This is a preformatted message that directs nuclear forces to execute a specific attack. The contents of an EAM change daily and consist of a complex code read by a human voice. Regular monitoring by shortwave listeners and videos posted to YouTube provide insight into how these work. These are issued from the NMCC, or in the event of destruction, from the designated hierarchy of command and control centres. Once a command centre has confirmed the EAM, using the two-man rule, the Permissive Action Link (PAL) codes are entered to arm the weapons and the message is sent out. These messages are sent in digital format via the secure Automatic Digital Network and then relayed to aircraft via single-sideband radio transmitters of the High Frequency Global Communications System, and, at least in the past, sent to nuclear capable submarines via Very Low Frequency (Greenemeier 2008, Hardisty 1985). The technical details of VLF submarine communication methods can be found online, including PC-based VLF reception. Some reports have noted a Pentagon review, which showed a potential “electronic back door into the US Navy’s system for broadcasting nuclear launch orders to Trident submarines” (Peterson 2004). The investigation showed that cyber terrorists could potentially infiltrate this network and insert false orders for launch. The investigation led to “elaborate new instructions for validating launch orders” (Blair 2003). Adding further to the concern of cyber terrorists seizing control over submarine launched nuclear missiles; The Royal Navy announced in 2008 that it would be installing a Microsoft Windows operating system on its nuclear submarines (Page 2008). The choice of operating system, apparently based on Windows XP, is not as alarming as the advertising of such a system is. This may attract hackers and narrow the necessary reconnaissance to learning its details and potential exploits. It is unlikely that the operating system would play a direct role in the signal to launch, although this is far from certain. Knowledge of the operating system may lead to the insertion of malicious code, which could be used to gain accelerating privileges, tracking, valuable information, and deception that could subsequently be used to initiate a launch. Remember from Chapter 2 that the UK’s nuclear submarines have the authority to launch if they believe the central command has been destroyed. Attempts by cyber terrorists to create the illusion of a decapitating strike could also be used to engage fail-deadly systems. Open source knowledge is scarce as to whether Russia continues to operate such a system. However evidence suggests that they have in the past. Perimetr, also known as Dead Hand, was an automated system set to launch a mass scale nuclear attack in the event of a decapitation strike against Soviet leadership and military. In a crisis, military officials would send a coded message to the bunkers, switching on the dead hand. If nearby ground-level sensors detected a nuclear attack on Moscow, and if a break was detected in communications links with top military commanders, the system would send low-frequency signals over underground antennas to special rockets. Flying high over missile fields and other military sites, these rockets in turn would broadcast attack orders to missiles, bombers and, via radio relays, submarines at sea. Contrary to some Western beliefs, Dr. Blair says, many of Russia's nuclear-armed missiles in underground silos and on mobile launchers can be fired automatically. (Broad 1993) Assuming such a system is still active, cyber terrorists would need to create a crisis situation in order to activate Perimetr, and then fool it into believing a decapitating strike had taken place. While this is not an easy task, the information age makes it easier. Cyber reconnaissance could help locate the machine and learn its inner workings. This could be done by targeting the computers high of level official’s—anyone who has reportedly worked on such a project, or individuals involved in military operations at underground facilities, such as those reported to be located at Yamantau and Kosvinksy mountains in the central southern Urals (Rosenbaum 2007, Blair 2008) Indirect Control of Launch Cyber terrorists could cause incorrect information to be transmitted, received, or displayed at nuclear command and control centres, or shut down these centres’ computer networks completely. In 1995, a Norwegian scientific sounding rocket was mistaken by Russian early warning systems as a nuclear missile launched from a US submarine. A radar operator used Krokus to notify a general on duty who decided to alert the highest levels. Kavkaz was implemented, all three chegets activated, and the countdown for a nuclear decision began. It took eight minutes before the missile was properly identified—a considerable amount of time considering the speed with which a nuclear response must be decided upon (Aftergood 2000). Creating a false signal in these early warning systems would be relatively easy using computer network operations. The real difficulty would be gaining access to these systems as they are most likely on a closed network. However, if they are transmitting wirelessly, that may provide an entry point, and information gained through the internet may reveal the details, such as passwords and software, for gaining entrance to the closed network. If access was obtained, a false alarm could be followed by something like a DDoS attack, so the operators believe an attack may be imminent, yet they can no longer verify it. This could add pressure to the decision making process, and if coordinated precisely, could appear as a first round EMP burst. Terrorist groups could also attempt to launch a non-nuclear missile, such as the one used by Norway, in an attempt to fool the system. The number of states who possess such technology is far greater than the number of states who possess nuclear weapons. Obtaining them would be considerably easier, especially when enhancing operations through computer network operations. Combining traditional terrorist methods with cyber techniques opens opportunities neither could accomplish on their own. For example, radar stations might be more vulnerable to a computer attack, while satellites are more vulnerable to jamming from a laser beam, thus together they deny dual phenomenology. Mapping communications networks through cyber reconnaissance may expose weaknesses, and automated scanning devices created by more experienced hackers can be readily found on the internet. Intercepting or spoofing communications is a highly complex science. These systems are designed to protect against the world’s most powerful and well funded militaries. Yet, there are recurring gaffes, and the very nature of asymmetric warfare is to bypass complexities by finding simple loopholes. For example, commercially available software for voice-morphing could be used to capture voice commands within the command and control structure, cut these sound bytes into phonemes, and splice it back together in order to issue false voice commands (Andersen 2001, Chapter 16). Spoofing could also be used to escalate a volatile situation in the hopes of starting a nuclear war. “ \*\*[they cut off the paragraph]\*\* “In June 1998, a group of international hackers calling themselves Milw0rm hacked the web site of India’s Bhabha Atomic Research Center (BARC) and put up a spoofed web page showing a mushroom cloud and the text “If a nuclear war does start, you will be the first to scream” (Denning 1999). Hacker web-page defacements like these are often derided by critics of cyber terrorism as simply being a nuisance which causes no significant harm. However, web-page defacements are becoming more common, and they point towards alarming possibilities in subversion. During the 2007 cyber attacks against Estonia, a counterfeit letter of apology from Prime Minister Andrus Ansip was planted on his political party website (Grant 2007). This took place amid the confusion of mass DDoS attacks, real world protests, and accusations between governments.
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#### The United States Department of Interior should impose escalating surcharges on land in the United States that oil companies are leasing but not using and prohibit companies from obtaining additional leases unless they demonstrate that they are producing or diligently developing leases they already hold.

#### Idle leases contain a vast amount of oil- solves the aff and avoids the NB

Weiss, 12 -- Center for American Progress Action Fund senior fellow

[Daniel, “The American Energy Initiative,” congressional testimony, 9-13-12, www.americanprogressaction.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/WeissTestimony.pdf, accessed 1-31-13, ]

Despite their demand to open **fragile**, previously protected places for oil and gas production, oil and gas companies are not developing many of the leases that they already hold. A **huge portion** of leases held for public lands and waters lack exploration or development plans according to Department of Interior data. The department found that 56 percent of the leased acres onshore in the lower 48 states are not in production or exploration. The percentage is even larger offshore, where **72 percent** of leased acres are dormant. 87 This simply means that big oil companies currently hold the keys to **vast amounts** of publicly owned resources but have chosen not to develop them right now. As of the end of fiscal year 2011, there were more than 38 million onshore acres under lease, but the industry was only actively producing on just more than 12 million acres. 88 The story holds true down the line, given that as of the end of fiscal year 2011, the industry was holding more than 7,000 authorized permits to drill with parcels that were unexplored or undeveloped. 89 Idle leases in the Gulf of Mexico contain large amounts of oil. The tracts that are not producing oil or subject to pending or approved exploration and development plans are estimated to contain 17.9 billion barrels of “undiscovered technically recoverable resources” oil and 49.7 trillion cubic feet of UTRR natural gas. 90 According to the same report from the Department of Interior, “More than 70 percent of the tens of millions of offshore acres under lease are inactive.” This includes almost 24 million acres that do not have “approved exploration or development plans” in the Gulf of Mexico. This area has an estimated 11.6 billion barrels of oil and **50 trillion** cubic feet of natural gas. 91

#### Counterplan solves and avoids politics

**Mufson, 12** – Washington Post chief economic policy writer

[Steven, staff writer covering energy and other financial news, "Study: 20 million acres of federal oil, gas leases in Gulf of Mexico idle," Washington Post, 10-22-12, articles.washingtonpost.com/2012-10-22/business/35501614\_1\_gas-leases-oil-companies-massive-oil-spill, accessed 1-18-13, ]

Oil and natural gas companies are not exploring, developing or producing on more than **20 million acres** of federal leases in the Gulf of Mexico, 40 percent of them owned by the five biggest private oil giants, according to a study by the office of Rep. Edward J. Markey (D-Mass.), the ranking member of the House Natural Resources Committee. The study is the latest salvo in a politicized election year battle over whether the Obama administration should be blamed for what Republican presidential nominee Mitt Romney has called a slow pace of leasing or whether the oil industry owns more drilling leases than it can handle. The study found that 131 oil and gas companies hold about 3,700 leases in the Gulf of Mexico that are not undergoing exploration, development or production. BP has 2.5 million acres of idle leases in the Gulf of Mexico, the report said. BP is followed by Chevron, Exxon Mobil and Shell, each of which own 1.4 million to 1.5 million acres of idle leases. Markey’s study added that about half of the leases have been idle for at least five years and that 80 percent of the idle leases were purchased for less than $300 an acre. Many Democratic lawmakers have pressed in recent years for “use it or lose it” legislation to compel oil companies to exploit their federal leases. But major oil companies have argued that the current system, which already uses a “use it or lose it” structure, works fine. Oil companies bid for federal leases and generally have 10 years to explore a lease or let the acreage revert to the federal government, which can then put the leases up for auction again. The companies, especially those exploring deep-water offshore leases, say they need time to carry out surveys and contract for a rig. Recently, BP has been the company most actively drilling in the Gulf of Mexico. It would not comment on the study. Some members of Congress, including Markey, want to push companies harder to develop their leases by imposing a system of escalating surcharges as idle leases get older.
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#### Saudi production is stable now – no devastating cuts

Mahdi 13

[Wael, Bloomberg, Saudi Arabia Stabilizes Oil Output as OPEC Maintain Cap, 2/7/13, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-02-07/saudi-arabia-stabilizes-oil-output-as-opec-maintain-cap.html]

Saudi Arabia kept production near 9 million barrels for a second month, according to a Gulf official with knowledge of the country’s oil policy, helping to maintain OPEC output at close to the group’s official ceiling. The world’s largest crude exporter produced 9.05 million barrels a day in January, little changed from last month when output reached the lowest in 20 months, the Persian Gulf official said on condition of anonymity. Brent futures rose today to $117.72 a barrel, the highest level in four months. The kingdom, while keeping its production stable, supplied 9.26 million barrels a day to the market compared to 9.15 million a month ago, he said. The difference of 210,000 barrels between supply to market in January and production figures is made up for by deliveries from inventories, he said. The Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries trimmed output by 465,000 barrels a day in December to 30.4 million as budget wrangles in the U.S., speculation about stimulus measures in Japan and Europe’s struggle to boost growth clouded the outlook for fuel demand. Cuts were led by a reduction in Saudi Arabia, the group said last month in its monthly report, citing secondary sources. That’s 800,000 a day more than the 29.6 million the group estimates it will need to provide this year. Saudi Arabia started producing at about 9 million barrels a day in December after pumping at 9.9 million for most of the second half of 2012, according to data compiled by Bloomberg. Output reached 10.1 million barrels in April and again in June, the highest in three decades, according to data the government submitted to Joint Organization Data Initiatives.

#### Saudi Arabia has hit a floor now, but the plan results in further cuts

Jakob 13

[Oliver, Managing Director at Petromatrix ,Swiss-based independent research group specialized in the oil markets, January 2013,Is Saudi Arabia cutting output in answer to increased US production?, http://www.cmegroup.com/education/files/petromatrix-saudi-output-oil-boom-2013-01-25.pdf]

We think that it has mainly to do with the increased US crude oil production, where Saudi Arabia is cutting production to offset the US increase. The big increase of US crude oil production in 2012 came during the fourth quarter and that is also when Saudi Arabia started to reduce its production in step with the surge of US production. Furthermore the DOE weekly data on US imports of crude oil from Saudi Arabia clearly shows that the main Saudi exports cuts during the fourth quarter were to the US. Current US crude oil imports from Saudi Arabia are down -0.5 myn b/d versus a year ago and are at the lowest level since the fourth quarter of 2011. Therefore it does seem that Saudi Arabia has been cutting production to offset the increase in US production but its exports to the US have now reached a low level that will be difficult to cut further. With the US production continuing to increase further in 2013, Saudi Arabia will very probably have to start cutting exports to other destinations (Europe or Asia) to allow other crude flows to be redirected away from the US. Increased production from Iraq will however be a challenge to that and any increased leakage in the sanctions against Iran as well. Saudi Arabia was supposed to replace for other countries some of the Iranian barrels lost to the sanctions but if the exports of Iranian crude oil collapsed during the summer they have somewhat rebounded since then. After a full stop in August and September, South Korea is back to importing steady flows from Iran and China has increased its imports of Iranian crude oil during December back to the levels of a year ago. The P5+1 and Iran are due to meet soon and if some improvement is made during these negotiations it should result in greater leakage in the sanctions against Iran. That would become an additional challenge for Saudi Arabia as it would need the help of other OPEC countries reducing production to balance the market at the 100 $/bbl target. However, Iraq and Libya will not cut due to their lost production during their wars, Algeria will not cut, Iran will obviously not cut, etc… OPEC has not been challenged on production cuts since early 2009, the continued increase in US production is likely to bring that challenge back to front stage in 2013.

#### Any further production cuts destroys Saudi Arabia’s geopolitical influence and internal stability

Cala 13

[Andres, Energy Tribune, Saudi Arabia’s New Oil Balancing Act, 1/31/13, http://www.energytribune.com/72109/saudi-arabias-new-oil-balancing-act]

Saudi Arabia is facing a tough oil balancing act in 2013 and the remainder of the decade to preserve its geopolitical and economic clout, as it adapts to increasing global supply -mainly from US and Iraq- and increasing government spending and energy demand. Saudi global clout and internal stability lies in its ability to regulate global oil prices through its unrivalled production spare capacity. This leverage is illustrated by Saudi Arabia’s current ability to offset stagnant OPEC supply (with the exception of Iraq) and falling non-OPEC supply (with the exception of North America), on top of an oil embargo on Iran, all while keeping oil prices at a comfortable level for both consumers and producers. But as the world emerges from its worst economic crisis in decades and policy makers start changing gears, the US resurgence as an oil power and the expected Iraqi production gains are blunting the Saudi’s ability to open and close the oil tap at its convenience. Additionally, rising domestic consumption from a heavily subsidized and rapidly growing population, on top of **internal political stability concerns, are increasing the Kingdom’s public spending** and the need to burn more of its oil for power generation and desalination. Indeed, Saudi Arabia naturally will remain the top oil market regulator as its biggest supplier, but its de facto monopoly on influencing prices **will diminish** in coming years. Put simply, Saudi Arabia relies heavily on a subsidized economy to achieve the political stability that is vital in this juncture and on its oil market leverage to gain geopolitical clout, but rising domestic oil demand and global output gains will undermine its ability to wield the same power. Riyadh has tough decisions ahead. As global output and downward price pressure increase, it will see its global clout diminish, but it’s politically hamstrung domestically to implement unpopular policies to reduce domestic energy demand. The Kingdom will have to factor the new landscape to balance its domestic political concerns with the need to cut production in order to keep global prices at a range it’s comfortable with. Global supply The biggest game changer for Saudi Arabia is rapidly rising oil production in the US as new technologies allow for the development of massive shale oil reserves. In fact, the IEA forecasts the US will replace Saudi Arabia as the world’s biggest oil producer by 2020. Its output will continue increasing, while its imports fall, while Canada, as expected, will continue developing its own oil sands. Meanwhile, emerging economies –including those in the Middle East- will continue to increase demand rapidly, led by China. But US oil production has reversed years of insufficient net loss and for the first time in years global production gains will outpace demand gains in 2013 and inventories will build. “The mounting pressure of accelerated stock-building will probably force Saudi Arabia to trim output to pull stock-building back to seasonally normal levels and prevent a sharp drop in prices, possibly with some cooperation with other Gulf Arab producers,” according to risk consultancy Eurasia Group. As the economy strengthens, demand will pick up, but new North America and Iraqi supplies will boost output significantly throughout the decade and space capacity will increase. Prices won’t plummet as they have support from the higher costs of production associated with the new output that will gradually come online over this decade, whether its shale oil, unconventional oil, or deepwater. And energy demand will inevitably pick up and bring oil markets back into synch. Most other Opec nations are already pumping at maximum levels, but there could be unexpected production gains from Venezuela and Africa, which would further pressure Saudi output reductions to prevent prices from falling. That means Saudi Arabia will carry most of the burden of Opec production cuts as the cartel struggles to protect its price-fixing ability. Iraq will not accept a quota below its potential; Iran will eventually find markets for its oil and a diplomatic solution to lift sanctions on its energy sector is inevitable, even if not forthcoming. “There is the looming prospect of Saudi Arabia having to absorb output cuts to offset gains in production capacity elsewhere in OPEC, particularly Iraq,” Eurasia Group said. And “any reversal of sanctions against Iran which would put substantial additional Iranian volumes on the market would serve to intensify and accelerate this effect,” Eurasia Group said.

#### Causes Saudi –Iran conflict

Indyk 11 (Martin, Vice president and director of the Brookings Institution’s foreign policy program and convener of the U.S.-Islamic World Forum, “Amid the Arab Spring, Obama’s dilemma over Saudi Arabia”, April 7, Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/amid-the-arab-spring-obamas-dilemma-over-saudi-arabia/2011/04/07/AFhILDxC\_story.html)

And the Saudi system is fragile. Power is concentrated in the hands of the king and his brothers, who are old and ailing. The Saud family’s legitimacy depends in significant part on its pact with a fundamentalist Wahhabi clergy that is deeply opposed to basic political reforms, such as equal rights for women. The deep structural tensions generated by a 21st-century Westernized elite existing within a 15th-century Saudi social structure have been papered over for decades by oil wealth. If this strange social contract begins to fray**, it might tear completely**. And over in the eastern quarter, adjacent to Bahrain, where most of Saudi Arabia’s oil reserves are located, sits a restive Shiite minority who have been treated as second-class citizens for decades. Even if the Obama administration were understandably inclined to leave well enough alone, it cannot afford to do so for other reasons. The Saudis are attempting to erect the wall beyond their borders not only by suppressing the revolt in Bahrain but also by insisting that Jordan’s king not pursue the reform agenda he has promised his people. In effect, Abdullah intends to carve out an exception for all the kings and sheiks — Sunni to a man — in Saudi Arabia’s neighborhood. It might work for a time. But should this dam break, it could generate a sectarian Sunni-Shiite, Arab-Iranian conflict on one side and an Arab-Israeli conflict on the other. **It could spell the end of Pax Americana in the Middle East.**

#### Goes Nuclear

London 10 (Herbert, President Emeritus of Hudson Institute and Professor Emeritus of New York University, ““The Coming Crisis in the Middle East”, June, <http://www.hudson.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=publication_details&id=7101&pubType=HI_Opeds>

The gathering storm in the Middle East is gaining momentum. War clouds are on the horizon and like conditions prior to World War I all it takes for explosive action to commence is a trigger. Turkey’s provocative flotilla - often described in Orwellian terms as a humanitarian mission - has set in motion a flurry of diplomatic activity, but if the Iranians send escort vessels for the next round of Turkish ships, it could present a casus belli. It is also instructive that Syria is playing a dangerous game with both missile deployment and rearming Hezbollah. According to most public accounts Hezbollah is sitting on 40,000 long, medium and short range missiles and Syrian territory has served as a conduit for military material from Iran since the end of the 2006 Lebanon War. Should Syria move its own scuds to Lebanon or deploy its troops as reinforcement for Hezbollah, a wider regional war with Israel could not be contained. In the backdrop is an Iran with sufficient fissionable material to produce a couple of nuclear weapons. It will take some time to weaponize missiles, but the road to that goal is synchronized in green lights since neither diplomacy nor diluted sanctions can convince Iran to change course. Iran is poised to be the hegemon in the Middle East. It is increasingly considered the “strong horse” as American forces incrementally retreat from the region. Even Iraq, ironically, may depend on Iranian ties in order to maintain internal stability. From Qatar to Afghanistan all political eyes are on Iran. For Sunni nations like Egypt and Saudi Arabia regional strategic vision is a combination of deal making to offset the Iranian Shia advantage and attempting to buy or develop nuclear weapons as a counter weight to Iranian ambition. However, both of these governments are in a precarious state. Should either fall, **all bets are off in the Middle East neighborhood**. It has long been said that the Sunni “tent” must stand on two legs, if one, falls, the tent collapses. Should that tent collapse and should Iran take advantage of that calamity, it could incite a Sunni-Shia war. Or feeling its oats and no longer dissuaded by an escalation scenario with nuclear weapons in tow, war against Israel is a distinct possibility. However, implausible it may seem at the moment, the possible annihilation of Israel and the prospect of a second holocaust could lead to a nuclear exchange.

### 1NC

#### The United States executive branch should offer to the United States Congress to substantially reduce its restrictions on the production of crude oil on federal lands if, and only if, the Congress agrees to establish an Energy Security Trust fund, including support for advanced battery technology, that is funded by a portion of the drilling revenues generated by the plan

#### The plan is key leverage to get the EST fund --- Congress says yes.

**Hannah**, 2/19/**2013** (John – senior fellow at the Washington Institute, In Obama's waning America, a glimmer of hope on energy security, Foreign Policy, p. <http://shadow.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2013/02/19/in_obamas_waning_america_a_glimmer_of_hope_on_energy_security?wp_login_redirect=0>)

The weight of the argument certainly favors Republicans. Economically, expanding oil production will serve as a huge boon to a still faltering U.S. economy. Strategically, it can play a vital role in stabilizing nervous global markets, especially in light of the looming showdown over Iran's nuclear weapons program. And politically, the reality is that no deal on an energy security trust is likely to get done unless Republicans get something significant on expanded drilling. Addressing that central pillar in the GOP's energy platform is probably an essential trade-off if Republicans are expected to overcome their deep-seated skepticism and go along with yet more funding for the Democrats' favorite hobby horse of green energy research. Of course, it was the prospect of a win-win compromise that represented the genius of the SAFE/ESLC proposal in the first place. Republicans get expanded drilling. Democrats get more money for green energy. And in a single package, the sometimes competing goals of economic growth, reducing oil dependence, and lowering carbon emissions could all be addressed in a reasonable way. Something for everyone. That's the basis for broad consensus on a bipartisan energy deal that might actually do the country considerable good. If President Obama turns out to be truly serious about it, Republicans should be prepared to meet him half way.

#### EST Fund solves oil volatility, competitiveness, and increases funding for battery R&D.

Securing America’s Future Energy, 12/3/**2012** (Energy Security Leadership Council, Establish a federal Energy Security Fund seeded with revenues from new Outer Continental Shelf and Alaskan oil and natural gas production, p. http://secureenergy.org/sites/default/files/ESTF.pdf)

Commercialization of advanced technology vehicles powered by non-petroleum fuels, including electricity and natural gas, represents a critical long-term strategy for increasing U.S. energy security and reducing the exposure of the economy to high and volatile oil prices. The federal government has a role to play in supporting development of these technologies through research and development (R&D) directed toward specific drivetrain components—such as batteries and compressed natural gas (CNG) storage tanks—as well as targeted efforts to develop a localized approach to deployment of vehicles and infrastructure. Federal funding for energy technology R&D totaled $2.9 billion in 2012, while funding for deployment reached $132 million. Adjusted for inflation, these figures equate to less than half of the comparable investment level of the late 1970s, and the United States continues to spend a smaller share of its GDP on energy technology research than our major global competitors in Europe and Asia. Increased investment is critical if the United States wants to compete successfully with other major players in an increasingly global energy-innovation marketplace. As the Department of Energy noted in its 2011 Quadrennial Technology Review, “DOE is underinvested in the transportation sector relative to the stationary sector (energy efficiency, grid, and electric power). Yet, reliance on oil is the greatest immediate threat to U.S. economic and national security…” To this end, and to provide additional, more consistent funding for energy technology R&D, the ESLC has recommended that the federal government establish an Energy Security Trust Fund designed specifically to invest in technologies whose long-term success would improve energy security. In order to minimize the budgetary effect of the fund, the ESLC has recommended that it be seeded with revenues from the development of oil and natural gas resources held in currently inaccessible federal lands and waters.

#### R&D funding for advanced batteries is key to clean tech and manufacturing leadership

**Cuttino**, 12/1/**2012** (Phyllis, - Director of the Pew Clean Energy Program, EVs Strengthen U.S. Competitiveness, National Journal, p. <http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/10/whats-holding-back-electric-ca.php>)

In his 2007 State of the Union Address, President George W. Bush declared that America was addicted to oil. He was not alone in this view, because presidents, national security experts, economists, and others have asserted the same. Dependence on foreign oil requires our military to protect oil shipping routes, forces us to deal with regimes that may not share our national security interests, and has cost the U.S. economy more than $5 trillion on expenditures for foreign oil and related GDP reductions since the 1970s, according to Oak Ridge National Laboratory. One way to reduce this dependence is to deploy vehicles that are powered in other ways. Developing and producing advanced-technology vehicles will help the United States maintain leadership in the global clean energy race and enhance its national security. The transportation sector accounts for 70 percent of petroleum consumed in the United States and provides significant opportunities to reduce our dependence on foreign oil. Close attention has been paid to the progress of plug-in electric vehicles (PEVs), including hybrid electric vehicles, in the United States, and we believe the future remains bright despite some challenges endemic with any emerging technology. More than 1,270 electric drive vehicles are sold daily in the United States, according to the Electric Drive Transportation Association. Worldwide, the number of vehicles is expected to increase from 700 million to more than 2 billion by 2050, and the annual global market for advanced batteries could reach $100 billion by 2030, according to Pike Research, a leading market research firm that provides in-depth analysis of global clean energy technology markets. Currently, the United States leads in PEV manufacture and deployment: The Chevrolet Volt and Nissan Leaf are produced and sold domestically, and the United States has higher sales of electric drive vehicles than other nations, according to Bloomberg New Energy Finance. But if America wants to seize the opportunity presented by this growing market, it must do more. Pew’s research indicates that for the United States to compete effectively in the rapidly expanding clean energy sector and reduce dependence on foreign oil, we must adopt national policies that will spur private investment in technologies such as PEVs. In the growing domestic PEV sector, cities, states, utilities, and manufacturers are working together to develop local policies to spur greater adoption of plug-in vehicles and charging infrastructure. But national policies are needed to support the development of local markets and provide incentives for consumers to purchase these vehicles. As with airplanes and semiconductors, federal policy should also lead by example through expanded procurement activities such as adding electric vehicles to the fleet of government cars. Public investment in clean energy research and development, especially advanced batteries and related components, is necessary to ensure that American entrepreneurs continue to turn out the best technologies in this growing sector. Countries such as China, Japan, France, and Korea are dedicating billions to advances in battery technologies in order to lower PEV costs over the long term and take the lead in manufacturing. They are also using incentives to spur private-sector innovation and create consumer demand. Under President Bush, temporary purchase incentives were adopted, and the current administration continued to expand opportunities for PEV deployment at the federal, state and local levels. Both administrations saw promise and invested in developing advanced battery technologies. These targeted public investments in battery technology development helped secure additional private sector investment in the projects as well. Policy matters. With fierce competition from abroad now is not the time for America to relinquish its lead in advanced battery innovation and the manufacture of electric vehicles. Simply put, the United States should continue to support electric vehicle and technology innovation, because the economic and national security benefits of cleaner vehicles powered by affordable domestic electricity – rather than foreign oil – are too significant to ignore.

#### U.S. leadership on the broader green tech transition solves extinction

Klarevas 9 –Louis Klarevas, Professor for Center for Global Affairs @ New York University, 12/15, “Securing American Primacy While Tackling Climate Change: Toward a National Strategy of Greengemony,” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/louis-klarevas/securing-american-primacy\_b\_393223.html

As national leaders from around the world are gathering in Copenhagen, Denmark, to attend the United Nations Climate Change Conference, the time is ripe to re-assess America's current energy policies - but within the larger framework of how a new approach on the environment will stave off global warming and shore up American primacy. By not addressing climate change more aggressively and creatively, the United States is squandering an opportunity to secure its **global primacy** for the next few generations to come. To do this, though, the U.S. must rely on innovation to help the world escape the coming environmental meltdown. Developing the key technologies that will save the planet from global warming will allow the U.S. to outmaneuver potential great power rivals seeking to replace it as the international system's hegemon. But the greening of American strategy must occur soon. The U.S., however, seems to be stuck in time, unable to move beyond oil-centric geo-politics in any meaningful way. Often, the gridlock is portrayed as a partisan difference, with Republicans resisting action and Democrats pleading for action. This, though, is an unfair characterization as there are numerous proactive Republicans and quite a few reticent Democrats. The real divide is instead one between realists and liberals. Students of realpolitik, which still heavily guides American foreign policy, largely discount environmental issues as they are not seen as advancing national interests in a way that generates relative power advantages vis-à-vis the other major powers in the system: Russia, China, Japan, India, and the European Union. ¶ Liberals, on the other hand, have recognized that global warming might very well become the greatest challenge ever faced by (hu)mankind. As such, their thinking often eschews narrowly defined national interests for the greater global good. This, though, ruffles elected officials whose sworn obligation is, above all, to protect and promote American national interests. What both sides need to understand is that by becoming a lean, mean, green fighting machine, the U.S. can actually bring together liberals and realists to advance a collective interest which benefits every nation, while at the same time, securing America's global primacy well into the future. To do so, the U.S. must re-invent itself as not just your traditional hegemon, but as history's first ever green hegemon. Hegemons are countries that dominate the international system - bailing out other countries in times of global crisis, establishing and maintaining the most important international institutions, and covering the costs that result from free-riding and cheating global obligations. Since 1945, that role has been the purview of the United States. Immediately after World War II, Europe and Asia laid in ruin, the global economy required resuscitation, the countries of the free world needed security guarantees, and the entire system longed for a multilateral forum where global concerns could be addressed. The U.S., emerging the least scathed by the systemic crisis of fascism's rise, stepped up to the challenge and established the postwar (and current) liberal order. But don't let the world "liberal" fool you. While many nations benefited from America's new-found hegemony, the U.S. was driven largely by "realist" selfish national interests. The liberal order first and foremost benefited the U.S. With the U.S. becoming bogged down in places like Afghanistan and Iraq, running a record national debt, and failing to shore up the dollar, the future of American hegemony now seems to be facing a serious contest: potential rivals - acting like sharks smelling blood in the water - wish to challenge the U.S. on a variety of fronts. This has led numerous commentators to forecast the U.S.'s imminent fall from grace. Not all hope is lost however. With the impending systemic crisis of global warming on the horizon, the U.S. again finds itself in a position to address a transnational problem in a way that will benefit both the international community collectively and the U.S. selfishly. The current problem is two-fold. First, the competition for oil is fueling animosities between the major powers. The geopolitics of oil has already emboldened Russia in its 'near abroad' and China in far-off places like Africa and Latin America. As oil is a limited natural resource, a nasty zero-sum contest could be looming on the horizon for the U.S. and its major power rivals - a contest which threatens American primacy and global stability. Second, converting fossil fuels like oil to run national economies is producing irreversible harm in the form of carbon dioxide emissions. So long as the global economy remains oil-dependent, greenhouse gases will continue to rise. Experts are predicting as much as a 60% increase in carbon dioxide emissions in the next twenty-five years. That likely means more devastating water shortages, droughts, forest fires, floods, and storms. In other words, if global competition for access to energy resources does not undermine international security, global warming will. And in either case, oil will be a culprit for the instability. Oil arguably has been the most precious energy resource of the last half-century. But "black gold" is so 20th century. The key resource for this century will be green gold - clean, environmentally-friendly energy like wind, solar, and hydrogen power. Climate change leaves no alternative. And the sooner we realize this, the better off we will be. What Washington must do in order to avoid the traps of petropolitics is to convert the U.S. into the world's first-ever green hegemon. For starters, the federal government must drastically increase investment in energy and environmental research and development (E&E R&D). This will require a serious sacrifice, committing upwards of $40 billion annually to E&E R&D - a far cry from the few billion dollars currently being spent. By promoting a new national project, the U.S. could develop new technologies that will assure it does not drown in a pool of oil. Some solutions are already well known, such as raising fuel standards for automobiles; improving public transportation networks; and expanding nuclear and wind power sources. Others, however, have not progressed much beyond the drawing board: batteries that can store massive amounts of solar (and possibly even wind) power; efficient and cost-effective photovoltaic cells, crop-fuels, and hydrogen-based fuels; and even fusion. Such innovations will not only provide alternatives to oil, they will also give the U.S. an edge in the global competition for hegemony. If the U.S. is able to produce technologies that allow modern, globalized societies to escape the oil trap, those nations will eventually have no choice but to adopt such technologies. And this will give the U.S. a tremendous economic boom, while simultaneously providing it with means of leverage that can be employed to keep potential foes in check. The bottom-line is that the U.S. needs to become green energy dominant as opposed to black energy independent.

### Japan

#### Offshore drilling collapses biodiversity – extinction

DW No Date (Debate Wise, <http://debatewise.org/debates/2213-oil-companies-should-not-be-allowed-to-drill-offshore/>)

Offshore drilling poses environmental risks The environmental risk taken by offshore drilling is very topical, made evident by oil spills such as the recent BP oil spill and the Exxon Valdez oil spill in 1989 off the coast of Alaska. In the case of the Exxon Valdez spill up to 250,000 sea birds died, over 2,800 sea otters and thousands of other animals, (figures from the BP oil spill are not yet complete), having had a massive impact on the local wildlife and leading to a ban on all offshore drilling in America, until George Bush overturned it in 2008 - the recent oil spill suggests this repeal was a mistake. In this way, offshore drilling destroys ecosystems and fish stocks. These resources are vital for humanity to feed its population, and wasteland like much of the coast of southern USA is of no use until cleaned. There is also a long term effect because the remaining species will have a lower heterozygosity index (the amount of allele variation within a species). This is important because if there is a change in selection pressure, such as a new disease, this could leave the remainder of the species vulnerable as they are less likely to survive because they are less likely to have a dormant allele that becomes advantageous. The potential environmental risk is massive and thus offshore drilling should not be allowed because it can have such an effect on the environment, both in the short term and long term. Offshore drilling could lead to the extinction of various species, and a ban would be a sure way to help preserve biodiversity.

#### No effect until after 2020 and it’s a tiny amount then – most is available already

Newell ’11 (Richard Newell, the Gendell Associate Professor of Energy and Environmental Economics at the Nicholas School at Duke and the head of the U.S Energy Information Administration, 3-17-11, “STATEMENT OF RICHARD NEWELL ADMINISTRATOR ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY before the COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,” <http://www.eia.gov/neic/speeches/newell_03172011.pdf#page=7>)

Access to offshore federal resources. As of January 2009, the mean estimate of technically ¶ recoverable crude oil resources located in Federal offshore areas of the lower-48 states is 64.1 ¶ billion barrels. Of this amount, 3.7 billion barrels are estimated to exist in the Eastern/Central ¶ Gulf of Mexico region that is still under a Federal leasing moratorium.¶ 1¶ In addition, the mean ¶ estimate of technically recoverable resources of crude oil located in the Alaska OCS area is 26.6¶ billion barrels. Note that these and other technically recoverable resource estimates provided ¶ here tend to be higher than resource estimates from the USGS because the USGS estimates only ¶ include undiscovered resources, where as the EIA estimates used for modeling purposes also ¶ include proved reserves, inferred reserves, and undiscovered resources in areas not yet assessed ¶ by the USGS. In addition, the resource estimates provided here do not reflect recent downward ¶ revisions by USGS to resource estimates for the National Petroleum Reserve Alaska.¶ 2¶ From the above, it is evident that the Eastern/Central Gulf oil resources now subject to a formal ¶ leasing moratorium represent only a small part of the Federal OCS. Even if the moratorium that ¶ restricts leasing in this region were to be lifted, lags associated with the awarding of new Federal ¶ offshore leases and with the exploration and development of such leases suggest that production ¶ would be unlikely to occur until after 2020.¶ Given that OCS areas not under any leasing moratorium are estimated to account for over 95 ¶ percent of the total mean estimate of technically recoverable OCS resources, perhaps the most ¶ significant Federal OCS development issues relate to those areas that are already open to Federal ¶ oil and gas leasing. One such issue revolves around when newly available offshore areas, ¶ particularly in the Pacific and Atlantic, will be made available to oil and gas producers in future ¶ Federal lease sales. Areas where OCS leasing has been available for many years—including the ¶ Western Gulf, most of the Central Gulf, and Alaska—hold the vast majority of estimated ¶ technically recoverable OCS oil resources. The AEO2011 generally assumes that both leasing ¶ and regulatory approvals in areas where OCS leasing has been available for many years will ¶ proceed in a manner that supports their continued major contribution to overall U.S. oil ¶ production. Were leasing and/or regulatory processes to slow or speed up significantly, ¶ projected OCS production could be reduced or increased from the level of 1.5 to 2 million ¶ barrels per day that is projected in the 2014 though 2035 period in the AEO2011 Reference case.

#### Japan economic growth now - OECD projections prove

RT 3/28/13 ("US and Japan to drive G7 recovery as eurozone is dwarfed," http://rt.com/business/us-japan-growth-g7-eurozone-oecd-996/)

The eurozone’s recession will last until at least the second half of 2014, while the US and Japan will return to moderate growth in 2013, according to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. The eurozone has not seen economic growth since the second half of 2011 the OECD said in its report on Thursday. Its economy dropped by 0.6 percent overall in the final quarter of last year. The OECD forecasts for 2013 don't exclude optimism either. The organization expects a divergence between growth in Germany and the rest of the bloc to continue. The three largest eurozone economies – Germany, France and Italy – will grow by an annualized rate of 0.4 percent in the first quarter and 1 percent in the three months to June. However, the growth is mostly linked with the relatively strong performance of Germany, the region’s economic powerhouse, which the OECD expects to expand by 2.3 percent in the first quarter and 2.6 percent in the second. The region’s second and third-largest economies will shrink over the first half of the year. The French economy will lose 0.6 percent before growing by 0.5 percent, while Italy’s economy will see 1.6 percent and 1 percent fall respectively. The Paris-based body also warned of the risk of asset-price bubbles emerging in the currency bloc. The surge in equity and bond prices across the eurozone is, as yet, unjustified by countries’ economic performance. “Real activity has yet to reflect fully the improvement in financial market sentiment, especially in the euro area. This highlights the risk of asset prices getting out of line with fundamentals, especially as regards corporate securities,” chief economist at the OECD Pier Carlo Padoan told Reuters. The UK is expected to avoid a triple-dip recession, growing by 0.5 percent in the first quarter of 2013 and by 1.4 percent in the following three months. Meanwhile, the United States and Japan will be leading a rebound in advanced economies. The world’s largest economy is forecast to grow by 3.5 percent and 2 percent in the first and second quarters of 2013. Japan’s economy is likely to strengthen by 3.2 percent and 2.2 percent. "The bottom line is that we are moderately more optimistic," Padoan said. "We see growth firming in the US, we see more growth in Japan thanks to new measures."

#### Japan economy resilient – post-tsunami recovery proves

Gunn 12/6/12 (Campbell, Portfolio Manager @ T Rowe Price Japan Fund, "The Resilience of Japan," http://individual.troweprice.com/public/Retail/Planning-&-Research/T.-Rowe-Price-Insights/Fund-Manager-Views/The-Resilience-of-Japan)

Japan is home to some of the world's largest and strongest companies—including consumer electronics and auto manufacturers—and it ranks among the most technologically advanced nations on the globe. Japan is also notable for its resiliency: Within weeks of the earthquake and tsunami, the Nikkei index had more than regained its losses. In March 2012, just a year after the catastrophe, it closed its best quarter since 1988. The country today—with a slightly weaker yen and attractive stock valuations—may offer growth potential for equity investors.

#### No East China sea conflict

Rudd 3/14 -- Former Prime Minister and Former Foreign Minister, Member, Australian Parliament, interview with Jonathan Tepperman (Kevin, 2013, "The Situation in North Korea and the Future of U.S.-China Relations," http://www.cfr.org/australasia-and-the-pacific/situation-north-korea-future-us-china-relations/p30230)

What ultimately drives this is a -- is a conflicting set of interests between rampant nationalisms on the one hand and, on the other hand, a pragmatic recognition by governments both in Beijing and Tokyo that conflict, for both of them, would be absolutely disastrous and would retard economic growth and stability in the wider region and would further (retard China's ?) -- primacy of China's own economic development objectives. Now, if they're the two competing poles in this debate, both in Tokyo and Beijing, rational foreign policy actors would conclude that rational self-interest and rational economic self-interest would ultimately (prevail ?). As you know, history cautions us against reaching those conclusions. And I think if you've seen the drift in the numbers, both in terms of Sino-Japanese trade numbers and Sino-Japanese investment numbers over the last six to nine months, the impact in real numbers is palpable and measurable in terms of the state of the China-Japan relationship. I think my friends in Beijing, when I have spoken with them, including the military, I think it's fair to say, are working very actively behind the scenes to find face-saving mechanisms by which this can be managed to the point of stability for the period ahead and then put into some longer-term process with the Japanese. However, when I was last in Beijing, which was prior to the -- (audio interference) -- lock-on incident, the -- it was very much a question within the Chinese minds about how one would do that without actually losing face on the national mistakes in the public discourse both about Japan and with Japan.

#### No impact – rearm will be strategic, not aggressive

Green ’07(Michael, associate professor of international relations at the Walsh School of Foreign Service at Georgetown, and Japan Chair at CSIS. “Japan Is Back.” Foreign Affairs, March/April 2007, Vol. 86 Iss. 2, p. 142-147. Ebsco.)

The resurgence of Japanese power and purpose is not all about petty nationalism, even though nationalism characterizes the Japanese public mood these days (just as it does the public moods of South Korea and China). Nor is Japan's resurgence a simple matter of remilitarization, since Japan's defense spending remains below one percent of GDP, as it has for decades. Japan's latest rise is once again about doing more with less. Fortunately for the United States, leveraging the U.S.-Japanese alliance will be high on the list of Tokyo's priorities. That is a good thing both for the United States and for the world. The question is whether Washington fully comprehends this.

### Economy

#### 2. High prices don’t impact our economy seriously

**Bourland 08** Chief Economist & Head of Research Jadwa Investment

(Brad, 5-9, Oil's surge: what's behind it and what it means for Saudi Arabia, <http://www.saudi-us-relations.org/articles/2008/ioi/080509-bourland-oil.html>)

We think it would take clear evidence of a slowdown in demand for oil for prices to retreat. Higher oil prices are hurting the global economy, but not by as much as analysts had expected. A benchmark study by the International Energy Agency (in conjunction with the IMF and OECD) in 2004 concluded that a 40 percent increase in oil prices takes around 1 percent off global GDP. Since the end of 2002, oil prices have risen by nearly 500 percent, yet global growth last year was 4.9 percent and even with recession looming in the US, it is expected to be around 3.7 percent this year, above its 20-year average. In part, the resilience of the global economy to the ongoing run-up in oil prices is because the price rise is the result of a shift in demand rather than a shock to supply (as was the case with the price surges in the mid-1970s and the early 1980s). In addition, the full extent of the prices rises has not been passed on to the consumer for the following reasons: \*In many emerging markets gasoline is sold at a fixed price that is not adjusted in line with movements in the global oil price. In China, for example, the retail price for gasoline has been increased by 95 percent since the end of 2002. In most Middle Eastern countries, prices have not been changed at all and in some cases they have been cut (Jordan is a notable exception; it removed all oil subsidies in February). \*In Western Europe fuel is heavily taxed. In the UK, for example, tax accounts for 55 percent of the retail price of gasoline. As crude oil prices account for less than half of the final retail price (refining, transportation and other costs make up around 10 percent of the total) the impact of the run-up in oil prices on final prices is less pronounced. Since the end of 2002, the retail price of gasoline in the UK has climbed by only 80 percent. \*The weakness of the dollar against most leading currencies over the last five years has offset some of the rise in international oil prices, which are denominated in dollars. For example, in euros the oil price has increased by just less than half of the increase in dollar terms. \*In the US, taxes are much lower than in Western Europe (they account for around 26 percent of the gasoline price) and there has been not been a beneficial exchange rate impact. Nonetheless, the retail price of gasoline is up by only 140 percent, as refiners have absorbed much the higher costs. Margins for US West Coast refiners have plunged since the middle of last year, from over $22 per barrel to less than $6 per barrel. As a percent of the oil price the decline is even more marked. Analysts assumed that higher crude prices would pass more directly to final consumers and this would cause inflation, leading central banks to raise interest rates and ultimately slowing economic growth. It is the lack of impact on inflation to date that explains why high crude prices have not significantly slowed global GDP growth.

#### Economic decline doesn’t cause war

Tir 10 [Jaroslav Tir - Ph.D. in Political Science, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and is an Associate Professor in the Department of International Affairs at the University of Georgia, “Territorial Diversion: Diversionary Theory of War and Territorial Conflict”, The Journal of Politics, 2010, Volume 72: 413-425)]

Empirical support for the economic growth rate is much weaker. The finding that poor economic performance is associated with a higher likelihood of territorial conflict initiation is significant only in Models 3–4.14 The weak results are not altogether surprising given the findings from prior literature. In accordance with the insignificant relationships of Models 1–2 and 5–6, Ostrom and Job (1986), for example, note that the likelihood that a U.S. President will use force is uncertain, as the bad economy might create incentives both to divert the public’s attention with a foreign adventure and to focus on solving the economic problem, thus reducing the inclination to act abroad. Similarly, Fordham (1998a, 1998b), DeRouen (1995), and Gowa (1998) find no relation between a poor economy and U.S. use of force. Furthermore, Leeds and Davis (1997) conclude that the conflict-initiating behavior of 18 industrialized democracies is unrelated to economic conditions as do Pickering and Kisangani (2005) and Russett and Oneal (2001) in global studies. In contrast and more in line with my findings of a significant relationship (in Models 3–4), Hess and Orphanides (1995), for example, argue that economic recessions are linked with forceful action by an incumbent U.S. president. Furthermore, Fordham’s (2002) revision of Gowa’s (1998) analysis shows some effect of a bad economy and DeRouen and Peake (2002) report that U.S. use of force diverts the public’s attention from a poor economy. Among cross-national studies, Oneal and Russett (1997) report that slow growth increases the incidence of militarized disputes, as does Russett (1990)—but only for the United States; slow growth does not affect the behavior of other countries. Kisangani and Pickering (2007) report some significant associations, but they are sensitive to model specification, while Tir and Jasinski (2008) find a clearer link between economic underperformance and increased attacks on domestic ethnic minorities. While none of these works has focused on territorial diversions, my own inconsistent findings for economic growth fit well with the mixed results reported in the literature.15 Hypothesis 1 thus receives strong support via the unpopularity variable but only weak support via the economic growth variable. These results suggest that embattled leaders are much more likely to respond with territorial diversions to direct signs of their unpopularity (e.g., strikes, protests, riots) than to general background conditions such as economic malaise. Presumably, protesters can be distracted via territorial diversions while fixing the economy would take a more concerted and prolonged policy effort. Bad economic conditions seem to motivate only the most serious, fatal territorial confrontations. This implies that leaders may be reserving the most high-profile and risky diversions for the times when they are the most desperate, that is when their power is threatened both by signs of discontent with their rule and by more systemic problems plaguing the country (i.e., an underperforming economy).

#### US not key—global economies decoupling

Caryl**, Sr. Fellow @ MIT,** 10 [Christian Caryl is a Editor at Foreign Policy and Newsweek and a Senior Fellow of the CSIS at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, “Crisis? What Crisis?” 4/5/10 http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/04/05/crisis\_what\_crisis?print=yes&hidecomments=yes&page=full]

We went through a terrifying moment back in the fall of 2008. The financial system in the United States was imploding. It was impossible to predict how the effects would ripple through the rest of the world, but one outcome seemed inevitable: Developing economies were going to take a terrible hit. There was just no way they could escape the maelstrom without seeing millions of their citizens impoverished. Many emerging-market countries did experience sharp drops in GDP. Their capital markets tanked. Dominique Strauss-Kahn, managing director of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), sounded downright apocalyptic: "All this will affect dramatically unemployment, and beyond unemployment for many countries it will be at the roots of social unrest, some threat to democracy, and maybe for some cases it can also end in war." The Economist recently noted, "The Institute of International Finance (IIF), a think-tank in Washington, DC, forecast that net private capital flows into poor countries in 2009 would be 72% lower than at their peak in 2007, an unprecedented shrinkage." Virtually everyone expected to see the countries that had benefited so dramatically from growth in the years leading up to the crisis to suffer disproportionately in its wake. An entirely rational assumption -- except it hasn't turned out that way at all. To be sure, there were far too many poor people in the world before the crisis, and that still remains the case. Some 3 billion people still live on less than $2.50 a day. But the global economic crisis hasn't added appreciably to their ranks. Just take China, India, and Indonesia, Asia's three biggest emerging markets. Although growth in all three slowed, it never went into reverse. China's robust growth through the crisis has been much publicized -- but Indonesia's, much less conspicuously. Those countries, as well as Brazil and Russia, have rebounded dramatically. The Institute of International Finance -- the same people who gave that dramatically skepticism-inducing estimate earlier -- now says that net private capital flows to developing countries could reach $672 billion this year (double the 2009 amount). That's less than the high point of 2007, to be sure. But it still seems remarkable in light of the dire predictions. In short, the countries that have worked the hardest to join the global marketplace are **showing remarkable resilience**. It wasn't always this way. Recall what happened back in 1997 and 1998, when the Thai government's devaluation of its currency triggered the Asian financial crisis. Rioting across Indonesia brought down the Suharto government. The administration of Filipino President Joseph Estrada collapsed. The turbulence echoed throughout the region and into the wider world, culminating in the Russian government default and August 1998 ruble devaluation. Brazil and Argentina trembled. The IMF was everywhere, dispensing advice and dictating conditions. It was the emerging markets that bore the brunt of that crisis. So what's different this time around? The answers differ from place to place, but there are some common denominators. Many of the BRICs (Brazil, Russia, India, China) learned vital lessons from the trauma of the late 1990s, hence the IMF's relatively low-key profile this time around. (The fund has been most active in Africa, where they still need the help -- unless you count Greece, of course.) Many emerging economies entered the 2008-2009 crisis with healthy balance sheets. In most cases governments reacted quickly and flexibly, rolling out stimulus programs or even expanding poverty-reduction programs. Increasingly, the same countries that have **embraced globalization** and markets are starting to **build social safety nets**. And there's another factor: **Trade is becoming more evenly distributed** throughout the world. China is now a bigger market for Asian exporters than the United States. Some economists are talking about "emerging market decoupling." Jonathan Anderson, an emerging-markets economist at the Swiss bank UBS, showed in one recent report how car sales in emerging markets have actually been rising during this latest bout of turmoil -- powerful evidence that **emerging economies no longer have to sneeze when America catches a cold**. Aphitchaya Nguanbanchong, a consultant for the British-based aid organization Oxfam, has studied the crisis's effects on Southeast Asian economies. "The research so far shows that the result of the crisis isn't as bad as we were expecting," she says. Indonesia is a case in point: "People in this region and at the policy level learned a lot from the past crisis." Healthy domestic demand cushioned the shock when the crisis hit export-oriented industries; the government weighed in immediately with hefty stimulus measures. Nguanbanchong says that she has been surprised by the extent to which families throughout the region have kept spending money on education even as incomes have declined for some. And that, she says, reinforces a major lesson that emerging-market governments can take away from the crisis: "Governments should focus more on social policy, on health, education, and services. They shouldn't be intervening so much directly in the economy itself." This ought to be a big story. But you won't have much luck finding it in the newspapers -- perhaps because it runs so contrary to our habitual thinking about the world economy. The U.N. Development Programme and the Asian Development Bank recently published a report that attempts to assess what effect the crisis will have on the world's progress toward the U.N. Millennium Development Goals, benchmarks that are supposed to be achieved by 2015. At first glance the report's predictions are daunting: It states that 21 million people in the developing world are "at risk" of slipping into extreme poverty and warns that the goals are unlikely to be met. Many experts wonder, of course, whether the V-shaped crisis we've witnessed so far is going to turn into a W, with another sharp downturn still to come. Some argue that the Great Recession's real damage has yet to be felt. Yet the report also contains some interesting indications that this might not be the case. "The global economic crisis has been widely predicted to affect international migration and remittances adversely," it notes. "But as the crisis unfolds, it is becoming clear that the patterns of migration and remittances may be more complex than was previously imagined." In other words, these **interconnections are proving to be much more resilient** than anyone might have predicted earlier. As the report notes, receipts of remittances have so far actually increased in Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, and Sri Lanka. Perhaps migrant workers -- those global experts in entrepreneurship and risk-taking -- know something that a lot of the rest of us don't. So why should we care? Anirudh Krishna, a Duke University political scientist who studies poverty reduction, says that there's a moral to the story: "Certainly cutting countries and people off from markets is no longer a sensible thing to do. Expanding those connections, bringing in a larger part of a talent pool into the high-growth sector -- that is what would make most countries grow faster and more individuals climb out of poverty." Echoing Nguanbanchong, he argues that governments are well-advised to concentrate on providing their citizens with education and health care -- the great enablers in the fight for social betterment. Microfinance and income subsidy programs can fill important gaps -- as long as they aim to empower future entrepreneurs, not create cultures of entitlement. This is not to say the outlook is bright on every front, of course. As the Economist noted, the number of people facing hunger recently topped 1 billion, the highest since 1970. The reason for that has more to do with the 2007-2008 spike in food prices than with the financial crisis. (Remember how the price of rice shot up?) We are still a long way from conquering poverty. There is still a huge -- and in some cases growing -- gap between the world's rich and poor. Yet how remarkable it would be if we could one day look back on the 2008-2009 crisis as the beginning of a more equitable global economy**.**

#### -- Food wars are a myth – there’s zero empirical evidence

Salehyan 7 (Idean, Professor of Political Science – University of North Texas, “The New Myth About Climate Change”, Foreign Policy, Summer, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/story/cms.php?story\_id=3922)

First, aside from a few anecdotes, there is **little systematic empirical evidence** that resource scarcity and changing environmental conditions lead to conflict. In fact, several studies have shown that an abundance of natural resources is more likely to contribute to conflict. Moreover, even as the planet has warmed, the number of civil wars and insurgencies has decreased dramatically. Data collected by researchers at Uppsala University and the International Peace Research Institute, Oslo shows a steep decline in the number of armed conflicts around the world. Between 1989 and 2002, some 100 armed conflicts came to an end, including the wars in Mozambique, Nicaragua, and Cambodia. If global warming causes conflict, we should not be witnessing this downward trend.

Furthermore, if famine and drought led to the crisis in Darfur, why have scores of environmental catastrophes failed to set off armed conflict elsewhere? For instance, the U.N. World Food Programme warns that 5 million people in Malawi have been experiencing chronic food shortages for several years. But famine-wracked Malawi has yet to experience a major civil war. Similarly, the Asian tsunami in 2004 killed hundreds of thousands of people, generated millions of environmental refugees, and led to severe shortages of shelter, food, clean water, and electricity. Yet the tsunami, one of the most extreme catastrophes in recent history, did not lead to an outbreak of resource wars. Clearly then, there is much more to armed conflict than resource scarcity and natural disasters.

#### No CCP collapse—the government represses instability

Pei 9(Minxin, Senior Associate in the China Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 3/12. “Will the Chinese Communist Party Survive the Crisis?” Foreign Affairs. http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/64862/minxin-pei/will-the-chinese-communist-party-survive-the-crisis)

It might seem reasonable to expect that challenges from the disaffected urban middle class, frustrated college graduates, and unemployed migrants will constitute the principal threat to the party's rule. If those groups were in fact to band together in a powerful coalition, then the world's longest-ruling party would indeed be in deep trouble. But that is not going to happen. Such a revolutionary scenario overlooks two critical forces blocking political change in China and similar authoritarian political systems: the regime's capacity for repression and the unity among the elite. Economic crisis and social unrest may make it tougher for the CCP to govern, but they will not loosen the party's hold on power. A glance at countries such as Zimbabwe, North Korea, Cuba, and Burma shows that a relatively unified elite in control of the military and police can cling to power through brutal force, even in the face of abysmal economic failure. Disunity within the ruling elite, on the other hand, weakens the regime's repressive capacity and usually spells the rulers' doom. The CCP has already demonstrated its remarkable ability to contain and suppress chronic social protest and small-scale dissident movements. The regime maintains the People's Armed Police, a well-trained and well-equipped anti-riot force of 250,000. In addition, China's secret police are among the most capable in the world and are augmented by a vast network of informers. And although the Internet may have made control of information more difficult, Chinese censors can still react quickly and thoroughly to end the dissemination of dangerous news. Since the Tiananmen crackdown, the Chinese government has greatly refined its repressive capabilities. Responding to tens of thousands of riots each year has made Chinese law enforcement the most experienced in the world at crowd control and dispersion. Chinese state security services have applied the tactic of "political decapitation" to great effect, quickly arresting protest leaders and leaving their followers disorganized, demoralized, and impotent. If worsening economic conditions lead to a potentially explosive political situation, the party will stick to these tried-and-true practices to ward off any organized movement against the regime.

### Geopolitics

#### High prices force US-Chinese cooperation on energy security – solves relations

**Shinn 07** Adjunct Professor, Elliott School of International Affairs, CSIS Report

(David, "Africa, China, the United States, and Oil" may 8)

In the meantime, a senior U.S. official warned that Beijing’s ties with “troublesome” states would have repercussions.  Countries deemed troublesome by the United States that export significant quantities of oil to China will probably continue to cause tension between the United States and China.  There is no inherent reason, however, why American and Chinese energy policy in Africa should result in conflict.  There are opportunities for Sino-American cooperation on the development and security of oil reserves.  It is in the interest of both the United States and China to develop a secure supply of crude at a reasonable international price.

#### Squo solves the aff– Production is up now, 70% is unrestricted, opening up more oil won’t change prices

Weiss 13

[Daniel J, Senior Fellow and the Director of Climate Strategy at American Progress, 2/28/13, <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/green/news/2013/02/28/54907/5-oily-myths-about-gasoline-prices/>]

Myth No. 1: Too few federal lands and waters are open for oil production Gerard falsely asserted that the Obama administration is limiting oil production from federal lands and waters when, in fact, the vast majority of these resources are already available to the oil industry. In 2012 the Congressional Budget Office “estimate[d] that about 70 percent of undiscovered oil and gas resources are on federal lands that are available for leasing under current laws and administrative policies.” Further opening up these protected places—including off the California and Florida Gulf coasts—would do little to lower oil or gasoline prices. Richard Newell, the administrator of the Energy Information Administration, testified before Congress in 2011 to explain that, “We do not project additional volumes of oil that could flow from greater access to oil resources on Federal lands to have a large impact on prices given the globally integrated nature of the world oil market.” In other words, because the price of oil is set on a global—rather than a domestic—basis, opening up protected lands and waters would not alter the price of oil or gasoline in a substantial or noticeable way. Interestingly, the oil industry itself has expressed a declining interest in leasing the onshore public lands that are already eligible for drilling. Under current leasing rules, oil companies can make industry “expressions of interest [that] identify lands sought by industry for possible oil and gas leasing.” These requests to lease eligible onshore public lands averaged 6.6 million acres annually from 2006 through 2008. The average acreage sought by oil companies dropped by 27 percent from 2009 to 2012, to an average of 4.8 million acres annually. Though oil companies sought less federal land to expand their drilling, oil production from already-leased federal lands and waters grew from 2009 to 2011, the most recent year for which data are available. The Energy Information Administration estimated that in 2011 the United States produced 646 million barrels of crude oil from federal lands and waters, compared to 575 million barrels in 2008—a 12 percent increase. According to the agency, oil production from federal areas was higher in every year from 2008 to 2011 than it was from 2006 to 2008.

#### Empirically the world grew more peaceful when heg declined

**Fettweis 11** [Christopher J. Fettweis - Department of Political Science Tulane University and Professor of National Security Affairs at the US Naval War College, “Free Riding or Restraint Examining European Grand Strategy”, Comparative Strategy; Sep/Oct2011, Vol. 30 Issue 4, p316-332, 17p, Chetan]

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 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.**

#### Relations fine and resilient -- interdependence

Brookings 11/29 -- citing Dr. Jeffrey Bader -- John C. Whitehead Senior Fellow in International Diplomacy (2012, "U.S.-China Relations under Barack Obama and Xi Jinping," http://www.brookings.edu/events/2012/11/29-us-china-obama-jinping)

In Bader’s view, U.S.-China relations are in pretty good shape right now. Interdependence is the most important characteristic of this relationship, and a crucial aspect is that the two countries continue to maintain strategic cooperation in many fields. America’s foreign policies and strategies toward China will not change significantly under President Obama’s second term, and the key issue will be how to react properly to China’s continued rise and its increasingly important role in global society.

#### US-China relations are superficial – cooperation’s always fails, but issues don’t escalate

Haixia 12 (Qi, Lecturer at Department of International Relations – Tsinghua University, “Football Game Rather Than Boxing Match: China–US Intensifying Rivalry Does not Amount to Cold War,” Chinese Journal of International Politics, 5(2), Summer, p. 105-127, http://cjip.oxfordjournals.org/content/5/2/105.full)

Shortly after US President Obama and Australian Prime Minister Julia Gillard sealed the bilateral defense deal in November 2011 under which 2500 US marines will be stationed in Australia came Obama's announcement on January 5 2012 of the new strategic defense guidance entitled Sustaining U.S. Global Leadership: Priorities for the 21st Century Defence. The document claims that China's rise might have impact on the US economy and security, and that countries such as China and Iran continue to pursue asymmetric means of countering US power projection capabilities.1 Both the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Defense refuted these claims, arguing that not a shred of evidence exists to support such wild accusations.2 Many media reports nevertheless argue that competition between the United States and China amounts to a new Cold War.3 This article discusses characteristics and trends in Sino–US relations, and in this connection answers the specific question: How do the characteristics of Sino–US relations affect trends in their bilateral ties? How much longer can Sino–US relations continue to follow current trends? Where will strategic competition between China and the United States lead? Different Views of Trends in Sino–US Relations The conflict between China and the United States at the 2009 Copenhagen Climate Talks gave rise to the mainstream view within US academic circles that Sino–US ties are worsening. Paul Pedrozo and Seth Cropsy argued that competition between China and the United States was a necessary outcome of China's naval modernization.4 Robert Kaplan, meanwhile, contended that China's growing military capacities and economic power made heightened tensions in Sino–US relations inevitable.5 Thomas Christensen holds that relations between the two countries will come under stress as China shifts towards a hard-line policy with respect to its sovereignty and territorial claims.6 While in 2010 US academics blamed China for the deterioration in Sino–US relations, Chinese scholars regarded the worsening of ties in 2011 as obviously a result of the Obama Administration's beefing-up of its pivot strategy in the Asia Pacific region. Scholars are nonetheless split on whether the pivot constitutes a strategy adjustment or a tactical adjustment. Those arguing the former predict long-term competition between China and the United States; those who see it as a tactical adjustment regard the deterioration in Sino–US ties as temporary, that is to say, Obama's pivot strategy in the Asia Pacific region is part of his 2012 electoral strategy that he will drop after the elections and revert to his 2009 policy towards China. We identify three distinct views regarding the future of Sino–US relations. Pessimists argue that Sino–US relations are entering a new Cold War period. Henry C. K. Liu suggests that a new Cold War is brewing between China and the United States, but that it is more geopolitically framed than ideologically based, albeit couched in residual ideological polemic.7 William Jones goes as far as to expect conflict between China and the United States to culminate in a third world war.8 Yongnian Zheng also considers that East Asia is headed towards a new Cold War dynamic that has prompted developments on the Korean Peninsula.9 Mearsheimer holds that it is not possible for China to rise peacefully. He argues that ‘if China continues its impressive economic growth over the next few decades, the United States and China are likely to engage in an intense security competition with considerable potential for war. Most of China's neighbours, to include India, Japan, Singapore, South Korea, Russia, and Vietnam, will join with the United States to contain China's power.’10 Lawrence S. Wittner even infers the possibility of nuclear war.11 Those more optimistic about the future of Sino–US relations are primarily Chinese scholars, who generally believe that it is possible for China and the United states to avoid a new Cold War. Wu Jianmin argues that China will not as a matter of national policy enact the role of a hegemon, but follow the historical trend of peace, development and cooperation and absolutely reject war, competition and conflict. Under no circumstances, therefore, will China enter into a new Cold War with the United States.12 Wang Jisi has long held that while China and the United States will not become allies, nor will a crisis in their ties arise of an extent amounting to Cold War.13 Wang argues that the structural contradictions that appeared between China and the United States in 2010 are attributable to the narrowing gap in their respective comparative capacities which, conversely, have driven them further apart in terms of mutual understanding. Major issues such as Taiwan, the Korean Peninsula and the exchange rate have had escalating negative impact on Sino–US ties and created higher levels of strategic suspicion rather than mutual strategic trust.14 This implies that as long as the United States and China bolster strategic trust they can prevent their bilateral relationship from slipping into a Cold War scenario. As distinct from these pessimists and optimists, we, together with a number of colleagues, argue that United States’ pivot towards the Asia Pacific represents a strategy adjustment. Competition between China and the United States will consequently grow, but this does not meet the criteria for a Cold War.15 We characterize the United States and China as ‘superficial friends’, and argue that as such they have a highly volatile relationship, apparent in shifts between good and bad periods.16 As, at least for the meantime, China and the United States have no desire to abandon their strategy of superficial friendship, the conditions necessary for a Cold War are not present. For example, although Obama supports a new defense strategy whose focus is on containing China, he purposely avoided any mention of China at the time he announced this new policy at the Department of Defense.17 Moreover, four days after the announcement, Obama sent Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner to China to seek Beijing's support of US sanctions against Iran.18 As China and the United States will not for the time being abandon their superficial friendship strategy, Sino–US relations will hence not teeter towards Cold War.
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### violation overview

#### Framing issue – can you comply? You can comply with the aff’s regulation, but you cannot comply with restrictions

Mohammed 7

Kerala High Court Sri Chithira Aero And Adventure ... vs The Director General Of Civil ... on 24 January, 1997 Equivalent citations: AIR 1997 Ker 121 Author: P Mohammed Bench: P Mohammed

Microlight aircrafts or hang gliders shall not be flown over an assembly of persons or over congested areas or restricted areas including cantonment areas, defence installations etc. unless prior permission in writing is obtained from appropriate authorities. These provisions do not create any restrictions. There is no total prohibition of operation of microlight aircraft or hang gliders. The distinction between 'regulation' and 'restriction' must be clearly perceived. The 'regulation' is a process which aids main function within the legal precinct whereas 'restriction' is a process which prevents the function without legal sanction. Regulation is allowable but restriction is objectionable. What is contained in the impugned clauses is, only regulations and not restrictions, complete or partial. They are issued with authority conferred on the first respondent, under Rule 133A of the Aircraft Rules consistent with the provisions contained in the Aircraft Act 1934 relating to the operation, use etc. of aircrafts flying in India.

### ground

#### Anell defines ‘restriction on production’ – they don’t – resolutional context is key to predictability

Haneman 59, justice – Superior Court of New Jersey, Appellate Division, 12/4/59

(J.A.D., “RUSSELL S. BERTRAND, ET AL., PLAINTIFFS-RESPONDENTS, v. DONALD T. JONES, ET AL., DEFENDANTS-APPELLANTS,” 58 N.J. Super. 273; 156 A.2d 161; 1959 N.J. Super. LEXIS 569)

HN4 In ascertaining the meaning of the word "restrictions" as here employed, it must be considered in context with the entire clause in which it appears. It is to be noted that the exception concerns restrictions "which have been complied with." Plainly, this connotes a representation of compliance by the vendor with any restrictions upon the permitted uses of the subject property. The conclusion that "restrictions" refer solely to a limitation of the manner in which the vendor may [\*\*\*14] use his own lands is strengthened by the further provision found in said clause that the conveyance is "subject to the effect, [\*\*167] if any, of municipal zoning laws." Municipal zoning laws affect the use of property. HN5 A familiar maxim to aid in the construction of contracts is noscitur a sociis. Simply stated, this means that a word is known from its associates. Words of general and specific import take color from each other when associated together, and thus the word of general significance is modified by its associates of restricted sense. 3 Corbin on Contracts, § 552, p. 110; cf. Ford Motor Co. v. New Jersey Department of Labor and Industry, 5 N.J. 494 (1950). The [\*284] word "restrictions," therefore, should be construed as being used in the same limited fashion as "zoning."

### conditions violation

#### Conditions and restrictions are distinct – key to predictability and precision

Pashman 63 - justice – New Jersey Supreme Court (Morris, “ISIDORE FELDMAN, PLAINTIFF AND THIRD-PARTY PLAINTIFF, v. URBAN COMMERCIAL, INC., AND OTHERS, DEFENDANT,” 25 March 1963. 78 N.J. Super. 520; 189 A.2d 467; 1963 N.J. Super. LEXIS 479)

HN3A title insurance policy "is subject to the same rules of construction as are other insurance policies." Sandler v. N.J. Realty Title Ins. Co., supra, at [\*\*\*11] p. 479. It is **within** these **rules of construction** that this policy must be construed. Defendant contends that plaintiff's loss was occasioned by restrictions excepted from coverage in Schedule B of the title policy. The question is whether the provision in the deed to Developers that redevelopment had to be completed [\*528] within 32 months is a "restriction." Judge HN4 Kilkenny held that this provision was a "condition" and "more than a mere covenant." 64 N.J. Super., at p. 378. The word "restriction" as used in the title policy cannot be said to be synonymous with a "condition." A "restriction" generally refers to "a limitation of the manner in which one may use his own lands, and may or may not involve a grant." Kutschinski v. Thompson, 101 N.J. Eq. 649, 656 (Ch. 1927). See also Bertrand v. Jones, 58 N.J. Super. 273 (App. Div. 1959), certification denied 31 N.J. 553 (1960); Freedman v. Lieberman, 2 N.J. Super. 537 (Ch. Div. 1949); Riverton Country Club v. Thomas, 141 N.J. Eq. 435 (Ch. 1948), affirmed per curiam, 1 N.J. 508 (1948). It would not be inappropriate to say that **the word "restrictions," as used** [\*\*\*12] **by defendant** insurers, **is ambiguous.** The rules of construction heretofore announced must guide us in an interpretation of this policy. I find that the word "restrictions" in Schedule B of defendant's title policy does not encompass the provision in the deed to Developers which refers to the completion [\*\*472] of redevelopment work within 32 months because (1) the word is **used ambiguously** and must be strictly construed against defendant insurer

## Counterplan

### Perm – Do the CP 2NC

#### The CP is less than the plan --- it only implements the plan if Congress accepts the trade. It uses the plan as leverage.

#### Severs immediacy –

#### “Should” means immediate.

**Summer 1994** (Justice, Oklahoma Supreme Court, “Kelsey v. Dollarsaver Food Warehouse of Durant”, http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn14)

4 The legal question to be resolved by the court is whether the word "should"[13](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn13) in the May 18 order connotes futurity or may be deemed a ruling *in praesenti.*[14](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn14) The answer to this query is *not* to be divined from rules of grammar;[15](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287" \l "marker3fn15) it must be governed by the age-old practice culture of legal professionals and its immemorial language usage. To determine if the omission (from the critical May 18 entry) of the turgid phrase, "and the same hereby is", (1) makes it an *in futuro* ruling - i.e., an expression of what the judge *will* or *would* do at a later stage - or (2) constitutes an in *in praesenti* resolution of a disputed law issue, the trial judge's intent must be garnered from the four corners of the *entire* record.[16](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn16)  ¶5 Nisi prius orders should be so construed as to give effect to *every words and every part of the text*, with a view to carrying out the evident intent of the judge's direction.[17](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn17) The order's language ought not to be considered abstractly. The actual meaning intended by the document's signatory should be derived from the context in which the phrase to be interpreted is used.[18](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn18) When applied to the May 18 memorial, these told canons impel my conclusion that the judge doubtless intended his ruling as an *in praesenti* resolution of Dollarsaver's quest for judgment n.o.v. Approval of all counsel plainly appears on the face of the critical May 18 entry which is [885 P.2d 1358] signed by the judge.[19](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn19) True minutes[20](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn20) of a court neither call for nor bear the approval of the parties' counsel nor the judge's signature. To reject out of hand the view that in this context "should" is *impliedly followed* by the customary, "and the same hereby is", makes the court once again revert to medieval notions of ritualistic formalism now so thoroughly condemned in national jurisprudence and long abandoned by the statutory policy of this State. **[Continues – To Footnote]** [14](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker2fn14) *In praesenti* means literally "at the present time." BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY 792 (6th Ed. 1990). In legal parlance the phrase denotes that which in law is presently or immediately effective, as opposed to something that will or would become effective in the future [in futurol]. See Van Wyck v. Knevals, [106 U.S. 360](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/deliverdocument.asp?box1=106&box2=U.S.&box3=360), 365, 1 S.Ct. 336, 337, 27 L.Ed. 201 (1882).

#### Severs implementation –

#### “Substantial” means the plan must happen.

**Words & Phrases 64** (40 W&P 759)

The words “outward, open, actual, visible, substantial, and exclusive,” in connection with a change of possession, mean substantially the same thing. They mean not concealed; not hidden; exposed to view; free from concealment, dissimulation, reserve, or disguise; in full existence; denoting that which not merely can be, but is opposed to potential, apparent, constructive, and imaginary; veritable; genuine; certain; absolute; real at present time, as a matter of fact, not merely nominal; opposed to form; actually existing; true; not including admitting, or pertaining to any others; undivided; sole; opposed to inclusive.

#### **“Reduce” means the plan has to remove a restriction.**

Wordnik No Date (“Reduce,” http://www.wordnik.com/words/reduce)

In Scots law, to set aside by an action at law; rescind or annul by legal means: as, to reduce a deed, writing, etc. Milit., to take off the establishment and strike off the pay-roll, as a regiment. When a regiment is reduced, the officers are generally put upon half-pay.

#### Severance is a voting issue – it kills CP competition, avoids DA links, and disproves the resolution. Making the aff a moving target makes debate impossible.

### CP Theory

#### That’s key to decision-making.

**Williams**, 6/20/**2008** (Candace, An Educator’s Guide to Opportunity Cost and Rational Choice Theory, or “How I Learned to Continue Worrying but Advocate for TFA Reform (Instead of Total Dissolution)”, p. http://educatorblog.wordpress.com/2008/06/20/opportunity-cost/)

The concept of opportunity cost is **important to all decision-making processes** The opportunity cost of a course of action is the **forgone benefit** from an alternative action. In order for a benefit to be forgone, the chosen and alternative actions have to be mutually exclusive. This means that one **cannot do both actions act the same time**. Our lives are made up of choices about mutually exclusive actions, from deciding to go to college instead of working full-time for four years, to choosing between coffee and tea during a quick break. Opportunity cost can be computed in terms of anything – including money, ice cream cones, love, life experience, friendship, and “achievement”. The concept of opportunity cost reflects the scarcity of our resources – especially time and money. When we integrate opportunity cost into our decision-making, we ensure the most efficient use of our scarce resources.

### Solvency Advocate

#### It’s predictable – we have a solvency advocate.

**Jenkins**, 3/19/**2013** (Jesse – researcher at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, How Serious Are President Obama and Congressional Republicans About an Energy Security Trust Fund, The Energy Collective, p. <http://theenergycollective.com/jessejenkins/200436/how-serious-are-president-obama-and-congressional-republicans-about-energy-secur>)

Given these bipartisan bonafides, one might think this concept was a slam dunk. The tricky situation though is that each of the Republican proposals envision dedicating royalty revenues from expanded domestic production of oil and gas, including opening up new areas previously closed to production in the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) and places like the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR). So both the CBO budget procedures and the GOP's position on using royalties for an energy R&D trust fund means that if President Obama wants to secure truly bipartisan support for this new Energy Security Trust proposal and ensure it doesn't increase the deficit, he's ultimately going to have to offer a real trade: new oil and gas production areas for new revenues dedicated to clean energy R&D.

### Solvency – R&D Funding

#### Clean energy R&D is underfunded --- CP is key to increase funding.

**Yin**, 3/20/**2013** (Clifton – Clean Energy Policy Analyst at the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation, Energy Security Trust Fund an Important Policy Pilot for Supporting Innovation, The Energy Collective, p. http://theenergycollective.com/cliftonyin/201126/energy-security-trust-fund-important-policy-pilot-supporting-innovation)

Tying next-generation transportation energy R&D to a dedicated revenue source is a welcome step towards consistently funding energy R&D overall. Federal energy research and development is severely underfunded. For years, energy policy experts and stakeholders have advocated for an annual federal energy R&D budget of $15 billion or more. Yet according to the Energy Innovation Tracker, federal funding for energy R&D totaled just $3.6 billion in fiscal year 2012. In comparison, the Defense Department’s R&D budget that year was $72.3 billion, or more than 20 times as much. Furthermore, energy R&D has long been hampered by inconsistent, start-stop funding from Congress. Thus, increasing funding for R&D – even by just $200 million a year – and dedicating it to a critical endeavor like decarbonizing transportation, is a welcome move.

### Advanced Battery Impact – Auto Industry

#### Battery industry key to auto competitiveness.

Christian Science Monitor, 7/15/**2010** (Why Obama is putting so much stock in battery technology, p.http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/2010/0715/Why-Obama-is-putting-so-much-stock-in-battery-technology )

The reason is that batteries are central to the president's election-year message that green-tech will lead America into well-paid jobs and a revived economy. But politics aside, the $2.4 billion the Obama administration has funneled to the advanced battery industry points to a tooth-and-nail struggle as the United States endeavors to catch up to Asia in making cutting-edge lithium-ion batteries for use in vehicles. "The workers at this plant, already slated to produce batteries for the new Chevy Volt, learned the other day that they’re also going to be supplying batteries for the new electric Ford Focus as soon as this operation gears up," Obama said Thursday at the Compact Power plant in Michigan. "By 2012, the batteries will be manufactured here in Holland, Michigan. So when you buy one of these vehicles, the battery could be stamped 'Made in America' – just like the car." Last week, he visited an electric-truck plant in Kansas City, Mo. Developing US manufacturing prowess in new batteries is vital, analysts agree. Those batteries will power next-generation electrified plug-in vehicles, which are expected to dominate auto sales within a decade, they say. The nation that dominates batteries is also likely take the lead in overall auto manufacturing.

### EVs Good – Air Pollution 2NC

#### EVs solve air pollution.

**Greenwald and Nigro**, March **2012** (Judi – Project Director for the Center for Climate and Energy Solutions, and Nick – Project Manager for the Center for Climate and Energy Solutions, An Action Plan to Integrate Plug-In Electric Vehicles With the U.S. Electrical Grid, p. <http://www.c2es.org/docUploads/PEV-action-plan.pdf>)

Local Air Quality Problem Description: Smog and other vehicle-related air pollutants continue to harm human health in urban areas throughout the United States. Motor vehicles are currently responsible for one-half of smog-forming air pollutants and about 75 percent of carbon monoxide emissions, though tougher standards are continuing to improve the effects of conventional vehicles on air quality.7 PEVs’ Effect on Local Air Quality: Already, efforts by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and others in implementing the Clean Air Act, including vehicle emission standards, have mitigated health problems and saved millions of lives since 1970.8 PEVs would further improve air quality, as they have no tailpipe emissions when operating in battery-electric mode. However, PEVs can be responsible for upstream emissions, depending how the electricity they use is generated.

#### Air pollution causes extinction.

**Driesen**, Fall/Spring **2003** (David – Associate Professor at Syracuse University Law, 10 Buff Envt’l L.J. 25, p. Lexis- Nexis)

Air pollution can make life unsustainable by harming the ecosystem upon which all life depends and harming the health of both future and present generations. The Rio Declaration articulates six key principles that are relevant to air pollution. These principles can also be understood as goals, because they describe a state of affairs that is worth achieving. Agenda 21, in turn, states a program of action for realizing those goals. Between them, they aid understanding of sustainable development's meaning for air quality. The first principle is that "human beings. . . are entitled to a healthy and productive life in harmony with nature", because they are "at the center of concerns for sustainable development." 3 While the Rio Declaration refers to human health, its reference to life "in harmony with nature" also reflects a concern about the natural environment. 4 Since air pollution damages both human health and the environment, air quality implicates both of these concerns. 5

### Perm 2NC

#### Perm undermines Obama’s leverage --- the GOP won’t give him EST if they already have the plan. This seems pretty intuitive AND we have a card

**Jenkins**, 3/19/**2013** (Jesse – researcher at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, How Serious Are President Obama and Congressional Republicans About an Energy Security Trust Fund, The Energy Collective, p. <http://theenergycollective.com/jessejenkins/200436/how-serious-are-president-obama-and-congressional-republicans-about-energy-secur>)

Unfortunately, Obama already agreed to open up new areas of the OCS for offshore oil and gas production in April 2010 -- and he did so without demanding any concessions from the GOP regarding the use of revenues for advanced energy R&D. He's unlikely to get any credit for his previous actions in any new negotiations with Republicans, and even if he did, CBO's scoring would now take into account revenues from these areas in the budget baseline. In short, the president missed a big chance to put this energy trust fund into action in 2010. To get another chance now, he'll have to find some new carrot to entice GOP cooperation. A rock and a hard place Presumably the president already knows all of this. So perhaps this is simply his opening bid, and he's fully prepared in the future to make this a real deficit neutral proposal by offering new areas for oil & gas production in exchange for support from Congressional Republicans. I don't doubt that Senator Murkowski would demand something like that, and the House GOP most certainly would. So maybe, for once, President Obama hasn't pre-capitulated and is saving his cards for the negotiating table. But it's not clear.

#### That means the GOP will say no --- Obama looks weak.

**Scheiber**, 12/31/**2012** (Noam – senior editor for the New Republic, Rhodes Scholar, M.A. in Economics from Oxford, Democrats’ Cliff Compromise is Bad; But the Strategic Consequences Are Disastrous, The New Republic, p. http://www.newrepublic.com/blog/plank/111521/the-cliff-compromise-bad-the-strategic-consequences-are-disastrous)

Instead, the emerging deal will reinforce the convictions that have made the GOP such a toxic presence in Washington. If Obama will cave even when he’s got all the leverage, when won’t he cave? Never, the Republicans will assume. If Obama’s too scared to stop bargaining and let the public decide who’s right in this instance, when the polls appear to back him, then he must think our position is more popular than he lets on. Suffice it to say, these are not sentiments you want at the front of Republicans’ mind as they prepare to shake him down over the debt limit in another two months. The White House continues to maintain that it simply won't negotiate over the limit. After this deal, why would any Republican ever believe this? I certainly don’t, and I desperately want to.

## Geopolitics

### Squo Solves/Plan Doesn’t – 2NC

#### Status quo solves – oil production is up on federal lands and opening up new areas would do nothing to increase drilling or production . 70 % of undiscovered oil is on already opened lands – only a risk of our DA’s – that’s Weiss

#### Their evidence is industry propaganda – oil production is up now

Weiss 13

[Daniel J, Senior Fellow and the Director of Climate Strategy at American Progress, 2/28/13, <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/green/news/2013/02/28/54907/5-oily-myths-about-gasoline-prices/>]

After the tragic BP Deepwater Horizon oil spill in 2010, the Department of the Interior adopted new safeguards to protect offshore oil-rig workers and established rules to reduce the likelihood of another rig blowout. Even with these new regulations, offshore oil production continues to flourish, despite what Big Oil would have you believe. The Department of the Interior recently reported that, “In fiscal year 2012, Interior paid out $12.15 billion in revenue generated from energy production on public lands and offshore areas—a $1 billion increase over the previous year.” And the Energy Information Administration’s Short Term Energy Outlook Supplement projects that offshore oil production will only continue to increase in the coming years: During 2012, oil production in the Federal GOM [Gulf of Mexico] is projected to have increased from about 1.31 million bbl/d [barrels per day] in January to about 1.39 million bbl/d in December (up 6 percent). … EIA [Energy Information Administration] expects Federal GOM production to increase from an average 1.27 million bbl/d in 2012 to an average 1.39 million bbl/d in 2013.

#### Lots of drilling now

Conathan 12 (Michael Conathan is the Director of Ocean Policy at American Progress. His work focuses on driving progressive solutions to the multitude of problems facing the world’s oceans. Prior to joining American Progress, Mike spent five years staffing the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation’s Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard—initially serving a one-year appointment as a Dean John Knauss Marine Policy Fellow before joining the committee full-time as a professional staff member in 2007. In that capacity Mike worked primarily for Subcommittee Ranking Member Sen. Olympia Snowe (R-ME), as well as the Ranking Members of the full committee, Sen. Ted Stevens (R-AK) and Kay Bailey Hutchison (R-TX). He oversaw enactment of multiple key pieces of ocean legislation, including the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Reauthorization Act, the Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observing Act, the Federal Ocean Acidification Research and Monitoring Act, and the Shark Conservation Act. A native Cape Codder, Mike received a master’s degree in marine affairs from the University of Rhode Island in 2005 and also holds a Bachelor of Arts in English literature from Georgetown University., 2/29/2012, "More Drilling Won’t Lower Gas Prices", [www.americanprogress.org/issues/green/news/2012/02/29/11091/more-drilling-wont-lower-gas-prices/](http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/green/news/2012/02/29/11091/more-drilling-wont-lower-gas-prices/))

It hasn’t worked yet. There are currently more oil rigs operating on U.S. lands and waters than in the rest of the world combined, production is at an eight-year high, and the most recent “Short-Term Energy Outlook” from the Energy Information Administration projects production to continue growing at least through 2013 based on current activity. By the end of President Obama’s recently issued five-year drilling plan, fully 75 percent of our undiscovered, technically recoverable offshore reserves will be open to drilling. All that additional activity hasn’t stemmed the recent gas price spike. If oil companies wanted to increase production, they could. In March 2011 the Department of the Interior released a report revealing two-thirds of oil-and-gas companies’ offshore leases and more than half of their onshore leases are not being produced. Pumping oil takes time. Opening new offshore areas will take seven years to produce any new oil, and the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge will take 10 years to produce a single drop of oil. Even if more production would lower prices, it wouldn’t happen tomorrow. And the Energy Information Administration finds that even if we wave the green flag for our entire exclusive economic zone, it will do nothing more than reduce the cost of gasoline by two cents, and not until 2030.

### Shale Solves 2NC

#### sq production solves ---

#### a) companies are only reducing shale plays because it’s so abundant and cheap---but low prices are self-correcting

Knowledge@Wharton 12, the University of Pennsylvania’s business school, “The Once and Future U.S. Shale Gas Revolution,” 8/29/12, http://knowledge.wharton.upenn.edu/article.cfm?articleid=3068

Today, operators are pulling back from more mature shale gas fields, such as the Barnett in Texas and the Haynesville in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas, and deploying to newer fields with the potential of producing gas along with oil -- including the Utica in Ohio and Bone Spring in Texas and New Mexico, says Drew Koecher, KPMG's U.S. energy leader in transactions and restructuring. With low gas prices, many shale gas developers are facing financial challenges. Chesapeake Energy, based in Oklahoma City and the nation's second largest shale gas company after Exxon Mobil, needs to raise cash through asset sales, while managing a U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission investigation into CEO Aubrey McClendon's alleged conflicts of interest, which involve taking loans against his personal stake in the company's wells, according to news reports.

Still, the recent shale gas boom is far from over, and a full realization of the U.S. shale gas revolution is yet to come, say experts. For starters, the U.S. has significantly more resources to recover. "The U.S. has a long way to go before it depletes shale gas," says Brandon Beard, KPMG's managing director for U.S. energy transactions and restructuring. "It will take 10 to 20 years to play through." Moreover, as new demand for gas develops, gas prices will recover and buck up the industry. "The glut of gas is somewhat temporary," states Noam Lior, a Penn mechanical engineering and applied mechanics professor who is also on the graduate faculty of Penn/Wharton's Lauder Institute. "As long as oil prices are holding above $100 a barrel or so, gas will be very competitive." Jonathan Banks, senior climate policy advisor at the Clean Air Task Force in Boston, agrees. "Nothing cures low prices like low prices," he says. Spurred by these low prices, demand from electric utilities, chemical manufacturers, natural gas vehicles and overseas markets will restore health to the shale gas industry, and relatively low natural gas energy prices could help buoy the U.S. economy, experts predict. "It's a game changer," notes A.J. Scamuffa, U.S. chemicals leader at PwC in Philadelphia.

### Prices Low

#### Prices will drop – thumps the aff

Wahito 3/13

[Margaret, All Africa, Kenya: Fuel Prices Likely to Drop – Experts, 3/13/13, http://allafrica.com/stories/201303140004.html]

The Energy Regulatory Commission (ERC) is likely to review fuel pump prices downwards in its monthly review expected on Thursday. Senior Investments Manager at PineBridge Investments Edward Gitahi predicts that the decline is likely to be attributed to the stable shilling evidenced in the last two months. The exchange rate remained stable, according to Central Bank Kenya (CBK), fluctuating within a narrower range of between Sh85 and Sh87.50 for the US dollar in January and February this year, indicating what CBK termed as return of confidence in the market. "You remember when we started the year, many had fears that the shilling may drop in value like it happened sometimes back, especially due to the heightened political campaigns and the elections that have just ended. But instead we have seen the shilling even gain. This is usually very positive, not only to oil importation, but also to other imported commodities," Gitahi told Capital FM Business. He said the international oil prices have also remained stable hence giving high hopes for a slight drop in March.

### Chemical Industry Strong

#### Chemical industry strong

Burns 3/22 -- Co-Editor and Co-Founder of MetalMiner, and has over 30 years of international metal supply experience (Stuart, 2013, "Dow Shows Enthusiasm For Low-Cost U.S. Natural Gas," http://seekingalpha.com/article/1295321-dow-shows-enthusiasm-for-low-cost-u-s-natural-gas?source=google\_news)

Few examples, though, could be more telling than that of the world’s second-largest chemical producer by revenue, Dow Chemical (DOW). As margins have narrowed in Europe and Asia - where feedstock is based on more expensive oil-based Naptha - Dow, along with other chemicals firms, is investing heavily in converting plants to run on shale gas-based ethane feedstock. Natural gas prices are currently $3.85 per mmBtu in the U.S., well below Asian spot liquid natural gas prices of $16.15 per mmBtu, according to Reuters. As a clear vote in the long-term cost advantages that shale gas will bring, Dow is building several new specialty production plants on the US Gulf Coast as it seeks to produce lower-priced plastics onshore for use in the transportation and telecommunications markets, according to the International Business Times. Illustrating how such investments spin off into the wider economy, Dow Chemical advised that up to 5,000 jobs would be created in the construction phase, and that investment by one firm can stimulate activity in others. The article quoted Nikkei Business Daily reports stating that two Japanese chemical companies - oil refiner Idemitsu Kosan and trading company Mitsui & Co. - plan to partner with Dow to build a 100 billion yen ($1.05 billion) petrochemical plant in Texas to be online as early as 2017 and use Dow-supplied ethylene. The new plant will be right next to Dow’s planned plant. A Houston Business Journal article quotes Dow as saying the investments will boost Dow’s support for up to 35,000 jobs in the wider US economy following these Gulf Coast expansions. The investments are said to be in the order of US$4 billion and will include both the production of ethylene, some of which will go as a feedstock to the JV operation with the Japanese firms and then take back alpha olefins from the JV for use in Dow’s performance plastics division. Dow Chemical’s investment is only one of many flooding into the Texas Gulf Coast area. Chevron Phillips is investing billions in an ethane cracker and polyethylene plant, while Exxon Mobil (XOM) is considering plans to build a multi-billion-dollar chemical plant at its existing Baytown complex. The plant is expected to produce 1.5 million tons of ethylene per year.

#### Chemical industry high now

Geewax 3/28

[Marilyn, NPR, Cheap Natural Gas Pumping New Life Into U.S. Factories, 3/28/13, http://www.npr.org/2013/03/28/175483517/cheap-natural-gas-pumping-new-life-into-u-s-factories]

In the chemical-manufacturing sector alone, companies are building plants worth an estimated $95 billion, according to IHS Global Insight, a forecasting firm. In Freeport, Texas, for example, Dow Chemical Co. is employing armies of construction workers to help with a multibillion-dollar expansion of its facilities there. The new operations will add about 600 new jobs, and spin off many more jobs for truckers, suppliers and others. The sprawling facility will break down natural gas byproducts into their chemical building blocks, to be used to make everything from food packaging to pharmaceuticals. "We have low-cost, affordable feed stocks again in North America," Earl Shipp, who runs Dow's Texas operations, told NPR. "It's the start of what some of us in the industry call a renewal of our industry in the United States." And in the Houston suburb of Baytown, Chevron Phillips Chemical Co. is investing in a $5 billion expansion of its Cedar Bayou Chemical Complex and other nearby facilities. "For most of the last 20 years, the best places for growth capital have been in the Middle East," CEO Peter Cella said. Now, Texas is becoming a magnet for investment. "For every one direct chemical job in one of our plants, there are six additional indirect or induced jobs to serve that job," Cella said.

#### -- Asian chemical companies will fill-in

CEN 4 (Chemical and Engineering News, 1-12,

http://pubs.acs.org/cen/coverstory/8202/html/8202asia.html)

China's outstanding economic performance is having a major impact on the Asian chemical industry. The country is mentioned in nearly every financial statement released by chemical companies in the region. Based on numbers for the first 10 months of 2003, China last year increased its imports of chemicals by more than 40%. Most of this increase was due to increased imports of organic chemicals, a category that includes polymers. As it experiences high profitability in its chemical operations, China Petroleum & Chemical Corp. (Sinopec) is speeding up the renovation of an ethylene cracker at its Qilu Petrochemical unit as well as a coal gasification project at the same site. Sinopec profits surged 69% compared with a year earlier in the fiscal year's first nine months, which ended Dec. 31. Chemicals account for approximately 20% of the oil company's sales and 7% of its operating income. THE BUOYANT Chinese economy is helping to prop up Japan. A large portion of the electronic materials, components, plastics, machinery, and engineered goods that China needs to fuel its growth is supplied by Japan, Witte says. Based on numbers for the first 10 months of 2003, it appears that Japanese exports of chemicals--excluding photographic materials--grew 25% in 2003 to nearly $40 billion., the highest amount ever. Unlike in previous years when Japanese production of most chemicals was in decline, a major portion of Japanese-made chemicals has experienced growth in 2003. And as incomes rise, Japanese consumers purchase more Chinese-made goods, thus creating a "virtuous" circle of growth. Evidence of this circle was not clearly visible in the mixed bag of financial statements released by Japanese chemical companies in their first half. JSR, for example, increased its net profit by 173% over the past year's first half, but Sumitomo's net profit declined by 31% on high depreciation charges. However, chemical companies are generally optimistic about their full-year results--as of March 31. Sumitomo is expecting to boost its net profit by 6% over last year; Mitsui, by 13%; and JSR, by 50%. The Indian economy is being propelled by strong industrial and agricultural growth. ADB reports that industrial growth reached 6% in the first few months of 2003. Agricultural production received additional impetus from a "normal" monsoon--neither too long nor too short. Agriculture is more important to India than industry, so the rise in rural income had a more positive effect on the economy than the increase in industrial output. ADB expects stronger growth this year as India further benefits from the strengthening of the world economy. With rising incomes, Indian demand for petrochemicals is strong. Reliance reported a 23% increase in net profit for the half-year ended Sept. 30. This happened despite an unscheduled shutdown of its Jamnagar p-xylene facilities. Overall, Reliance says it experienced 16% growth in demand for its petrochemical products, which it was able to supply by having most of its plants producing beyond their nameplate capacities. In an upbeat forecast in October, Chairman and Managing Director Mukesh D. Ambani said, "We are seeing signs of an upturn in the petrochemical cycle and are confident of achieving even better performance in the future."

### 2NC Heg/War – Fettweis Biz

#### No wars absent hegemony – nuclear deterrence, globalization, insituitions and democracy will exist with or without the US and will check great power conflict

#### Unipolarity is comparatively meaningless to other factors in preventing conflict

**Legro 11** (Jeffrey W. – professor of politics and Randolph P. Compton Professor in the Miller Center at the University of Virginia, Sell unipolarity? The future of an overvalued concept in International Relations Theory and the Consequences of Unipolarity, p. EBook)

Such a view, however, is problematic. What seems increasingly clear is that the role of polarity has been overstated or misunderstood or both. This is the unavoidable conclusion that emerges from the penetrating chapters in this volume that probe America’s current dominant status (unipolarity) with the question “does the distribution of capabilities matter for patterns of international politics?”3 Despite the explicit claim that “unipolarity does have a profound impact on international politics”4 what is surprising is how ambiguous and relatively limited that influence is across the chapters. The causal impact of unipolarity has been overvalued for three fundamental reasons. The first is that the effects of unipolarity are often not measured relative to the influence of other causes that explain the same outcome. When the weight of other factors is considered, polarity seems to pale in comparison. Second, rather than being a structure that molds states, polarity often seems to be the product of state choice. Polarity may be more outcome than cause. Finally, while international structure does exist, it is constituted as much by ideational content as by material capabilities. Again polarity loses ground in significance.

## Econ

### 2NC US Econ Resilient

#### Prefer our authors – their evidence is biased by economic Stockholm syndrome

Dornbrook, 10 – Reporter for the Kansas City Business Journal, \*\*Citing Brian Wesbury – Chief Economist for First Trust Advisors and Author (James, "Economist: Ongoing rebound gives reason for optimism", January 8th 2010, May 21st 2010, http://kansascity.bizjournals.com/kansascity/stories/2010/01/04/daily46.html)

People should start being more optimistic about the economy because it probably will continue rebounding in 2010, said Brian Wesbury, chief economist for First Trust Advisors LP. Wesbury was the keynote speaker at the Association for Corporate Growth Kansas City’s annual economic forecast meeting Friday morning at the Kansas City Marriott Downtown. Wesbury was also the keynote speaker for last year’s event, and many members agreed that his predictions for 2009 were accurate. Wesbury, author of “It’s Not as Bad as You Think,” told the crowd that too many people are suffering from a sort of economic Stockholm Syndrome, where they have fallen in love with pessimism. It’s because we just experienced the first real panic in the economy since 1907, Wesbury said, and it altered the psyche of people to the point where they expect bad things to constantly happen. But economic data show that the economy bottomed out in March 2009 and that recovery is under way, he said.

### Case

#### no econ collapse and no instability

Adomanis 13

[Mark, Forbes Contributor, Why We Probably Shouldn't Pay Attention to Owen Matthews' Prediction of Russia's Imminent Economic Collapse, 1/2/13, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/markadomanis/2013/01/02/why-we-probably-shouldnt-pay-attention-to-owen-matthews-prediction-of-russias-imminent-economic-collapse/>]

Owen Matthews recent wrote a Newsweek/Daily Beast story “The End of Putinomics: A dozen years of prosperity and stability have kept Russia’s leader wildly popular. Now his whole world is about to collapse.” that was one of the more alarmist articles on the subject that I can recall reading. Matthews painted a colorful, and downright terrifying, picture of a country standing on the edge of catastrophe and with a political leadership spectacularly ignorant of the crisis facing them. It would be very hard, if not impossible, to present a more negative portrait of Russia as it enters 2013 without employing four-letter words. While I’ve long doubted such alarmist analysis, and have repeatedly pushed back against similar articles, it is certainly possible to present a compelling case that Russia is going to face serious, and potentially fatal, economic problems in the not-too-distant future. However, Matthews has been writing about Russia and its energy-dependent economy for a very long time. He has consistently been extreme in his pessimism about Russia’s economy and consistently extremely negative in his predictions. I quickly poked around the intertubes and was quickly able to assemble a representative sample of Matthews writing on the Russian economy and Russia in general. I don’t think I’m being unfair or uncharitable when I say that, considering his track record, we should probably take Matthews’ latest predictions of spectacular collapse with just a few grains of salt (emphasis added) March 26, 2006: Fear and Loathing in Siberia: Yes, Russia may be sloshing with petrodollars. But China‘s surplus of trade capital is even bigger–to the point that Chinese investment threatens to swamp Russia’s dysfunctional economy, particularly in its impoverished but strategically critical Far East. September 15, 2006: Welcome to a lawless nation: He [Putin] chatted with George Bush and Tony Blair as an equal. Yet the endemic corruption of his nation blows apart such global grandstanding and destroys Putin’s claims to be governing a functioning market economy… deep down, the fundamental reality of Russia’s economy – that almost everyone steals, nearly all the time – remains a sadly immutable fact. December 1, 2007: War Inside the Kremlin:The oil-powered economy may be soaring, but so is inflation, and labor unrest is breaking out. A pay strike recently shut down the Ford Motor Co. plant in Vsevolozhsk, near St. Petersburg, and roughly 1,500 teachers and nurses staged a protest outside Astrakhan’s regional Parliament to demand better public-sector salaries. Resolving problems like these is likely to be a full-time job for the next president. That is, if he’s not too busy breaking up fights among his bureaucrats and their private armies. December 22, 2007: Russia’s Big Energy Secret: Gazprom hasn’t opened up a new gas field since 1991, and its existing fields are dwindling. A recent report by the Russian Industry and Energy Ministry warned that if the decline continued, Russia may be unable to service even its own domestic gas needs by 2010, and recommended doubling prices, a conservation move that has upset business and could also put a damper on economic growth. May 6, 2008: Economy of Clay: But in truth, the Russian economy as a whole is an edifice with feet of clay. The bling and glitter of the capital obscures a harsh reality: the architecture of Russia’s economy is no more solid than that of an inflatable children’s castle at fairground, with energy and commodity prices the wind that keeps it inflated. Yes, the Russian economy has been growing fast. But little of that growth has spilled over into the real Russian economy. Rather, the boom has, in many ways, held back Russia’s non-commodities economy from growing: rampant inflation, spiraling real-estate prices and higher labor costs, bureaucratic corruption, expensive credit and bad governance have combined to stifle the competitiveness of many Russian businesses. Feb 13, 2009: The Kremlin Vigilantes: But the damage is already done. Research last year by the International Organization for Migration showed that 76 percent of immigrants had no intention of staying in Russia for more than a few years, or bringing their families there. In the hostile new climate, the exodus of workers is likely to be as dramatic as their influx—and those remaining are likely to reap more of Russia’s anger at growing unemployment and poverty. August 5, 2009: Russia’s Headed for a Long Economic Winter:Don’t be fooled: Russia’s still reeling from the commodities crash, and things are poised to get worse before they get better… Worse, many Russian businesses appear to be all but insolvent. They face a $200 billion mountain of debt, much of which comes due this fall. With Russia’s indebted businesses expected to net a mere $70 billion in profits this year, that leaves a potential $130 billion private-sector shortfall. Putin has tried to help by capping interest rates charged to private borrowers, but that means the pricing of risky loans has become artificially reduced. Over-leveraged banks and corporations aren’t just a Russian phenomenon, but no other economy is as dangerously dependent on the boom-and-bust cycles of the world’s energy markets. Turns out Russia’s recovery isn’t nearly as tough as Putin’s talk. February 23, 2010: So Long, Salad Days: It’s time for Moscow to kiss goodbye those dreams of energy hegemony… At the same time, worldwide demand for Russia’s gas has plummeted. And meanwhile, the government has punctured investor confidence by pressuring BP, one of the few major foreign investors left in Russia’s energy sector, to hand over a giant Siberian gas field to a government-owned rival. It’s time for Moscow to kiss goodbye those dreams of energy hegemony. September 19, 2010: A 21st Century Potemkin: Twenty-first-century Potemkinism is a worrying sign of how modern Russia is coming to resemble the we-pretend-to-work-you-pretend-to-pay-us days of the Brezhnev stagnation. As that period showed, if a government comes to believe its own lies, it can’t recognize rot in the society and the economy, which eventually leads to collapse. Putin may be a great shot, and who knows, the Lada (a marque that dates from Soviet days) may be the car of the future. But right now Russia’s leaders are not ruling with both hands on reality. December 27, 2010: Backward, Russia! But the real meaning of the Khodorkovsky case is that the authorities are weak, and scared. If the first trial of Khodorkovsky was a kind of perverse victory for Putin over the once-powerful oligarchs, the second trial shows that the Kremlin is afraid of showing what it sees as weakness. More, the ham-handedness of the charges themselves, and the heavy police presence and mass arrests at the trial today, betrays a dangerous amateurishness. Totalitarianism is scary. Incompetent totalitarianism is actually scarier. January 30, 2011: Losing to Terrorism: Putin has built a police state that’s good at cracking down on dissent but bad at delivering security… unless the Kremlin addresses the brutality of its own local security forces and the corruption of the state’s employees, Russians can count on a long and painful future of Domodedovo-style bombings. August 7, 2011: Fascist Russia? On the surface, a decade of high oil prices has brought ordinary Russians rising living standards and a semblance of political stability. But even the Kremlin’s closest allies fear that when oil prices eventually fall and the tide of easy money recedes, the ugly reality of an angry, fascist Russia could be revealed. October 10, 2011: Back to the USSR? The parallel is an apt one. After the oil crisis of 1973, the Soviet Union, then as now the world’s biggest oil producer, was flush with cash that covered up the catastrophic dysfunction of the Soviet economy and allowed the Communist Party elite to enrich itself. Apparatchiks pretended to believe in the lofty principles of communism as they built themselves villas and rode luxury yachts. Meanwhile, the KGB ruthlessly squashed any signs of opposition and rewarded conformist writers and filmmakers with places at the trough. Substitute “democracy” for “communism” and “FSB” for “KGB,” and you’re back to the future. I don’t have a whole lot to add. Matthews’ contempt for Putin and the entire Putinist economic system is so strong as to be virtually palpable. It’s clear to anyone who reads any of the articles quoted above that Matthews has an exceedingly low opinion of Putin, considering him a murderous, incompetent thug, and that he views the system he’s created as a farcical, unstable disaster. But while it’s easy and commonplace to oppose Putin on ethical grounds Matthews seems to be gravely mistaken is in his estimation of the Putinist system’s durability. Matthews has consistently underestimated its ability to respond to external challenges and changing circumstances, and consistently overestimated the influence of negative factors such as shale gas, the European Union, and the world energy market. Matthews has been openly arguing that Russia’s economy is on the verge of collapse for the better part of a decade, presenting seemingly reasonable observations on the country’s corruption, inefficiency, and backwardness. But in the real world Russia’s economy, after a sharp but temporary downturn, keeps on growing and Putin is still supported by a sizable (though greatly reduced) majority of Russians. To put it as succinctly as possible, a country with 3+% GDP growth and with a head of state with 60+% popularity doesn’t seem particularly ripe for a social revolution It is, of course, possible that this time Matthews is right and that this time a coming decrease in energy prices is going to cause Putin’s system to rapidly unravel and collapse: there is nothing magical about the stability of Russia’s government and no “iron law of history” that says it must endure in its current configuration. But when you consider the broad continuity in Russia’s political system over the past twelve years I think that by far the most likely scenario is not revolution but a “soft stagnation:” just enough economic growth (3-4% per year) to keep the system limping along in substantially unreformed fashion. Basically, I think Russia will be in a prolonged state of semi-crisis for the next 5 to 10 years and that Putin, while weakened, will continue to be top-dog at least through his current term in office and quite likely through another one. That’s not what I want to happen, but on balance I think it’s by far the most likely outcome. It appears to me that Matthews consistently allows his (perfectly understandable) contempt for Putin strongly color his analysis of Russia, and that we should be highly suspicious of his most recent prediction of the country’s rapidly approaching implosion.

#### Japan’s economy increasingly stable now – revised data, global recovery, Abe’s economic policies

Kajimoto and Kaneko 3/8/13 ("Japan’s revised GDP signals moderate recovery," http://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/international-business/asian-pacific-business/japans-revised-gdp-signals-moderate-recovery/article9499352/)

Japan’s economy stabilized in the fourth quarter after two quarters of a shallow recession, revised data showed on Friday, but a third consecutive monthly current account deficit in January showed an anticipated recovery was slow in coming. The data signalled the challenge facing Prime Minister Shinzo Abe, who swept to power in December promising more fiscal spending and big monetary stimulus to rev up the economy and end nearly two decades of deflation. His policies have driven the yen to 3-1/2 year lows against the U.S. dollar, supporting the economy’s traditional export engine. But the weaker currency has also driven up import costs at a time when energy imports have surged, putting pressure on the balance of payments. Japan’s gross domestic product was unchanged in October-December from the previous quarter, revised data from the Cabinet Office showed. That compared with a median forecast of economists for 0.1 per cent growth, and an initial estimate of a 0.1 per cent contraction, reflecting upward revisions to private capital spending and inventory and private consumption. Separate data from the finance ministry showed Japan’s current account deficit was ¥364.8-billion ($3.85-billion U.S.) in January. That was less than a median forecast for a deficit of ¥626.0-billion, but marked a third straight month of deficit, the longest sequence since the series began in 1985. On Thursday, the Bank of Japan held policy steady and said in its assessment the economy had stopped worsening. That chimed with economists’ view there will be moderate growth this year on the back of a global recovery and Abe’s policies.

#### No East China sea conflict – they are rational actors that wouldn’t go to war because of deterrence

Rudd 3/14 -- Former Prime Minister and Former Foreign Minister, Member, Australian Parliament, interview with Jonathan Tepperman (Kevin, 2013, "The Situation in North Korea and the Future of U.S.-China Relations," http://www.cfr.org/australasia-and-the-pacific/situation-north-korea-future-us-china-relations/p30230)

What ultimately drives this is a -- is a conflicting set of interests between rampant nationalisms on the one hand and, on the other hand, a pragmatic recognition by governments both in Beijing and Tokyo that conflict, for both of them, would be absolutely disastrous and would retard economic growth and stability in the wider region and would further (retard China's ?) -- primacy of China's own economic development objectives. Now, if they're the two competing poles in this debate, both in Tokyo and Beijing, rational foreign policy actors would conclude that rational self-interest and rational economic self-interest would ultimately (prevail ?). As you know, history cautions us against reaching those conclusions. And I think if you've seen the drift in the numbers, both in terms of Sino-Japanese trade numbers and Sino-Japanese investment numbers over the last six to nine months, the impact in real numbers is palpable and measurable in terms of the state of the China-Japan relationship. I think my friends in Beijing, when I have spoken with them, including the military, I think it's fair to say, are working very actively behind the scenes to find face-saving mechanisms by which this can be managed to the point of stability for the period ahead and then put into some longer-term process with the Japanese. However, when I was last in Beijing, which was prior to the -- (audio interference) -- lock-on incident, the -- it was very much a question within the Chinese minds about how one would do that without actually losing face on the national mistakes in the public discourse both about Japan and with Japan.

#### Cooperation over Senkaku now

Yoshioka 3/22

[Keiko, Asahi Shimbun, Japanese economic leaders, Beijing politicos seek to improve ties, 3/22/13, http://ajw.asahi.com/article/economy/business/AJ201303220084]

Members of the Japan-China Economic Association met with a former Chinese state official on March 21 in the Chinese capital to discuss ways to improve ties between the two countries, which have been strained since last fall over the Senkaku Islands dispute. Fujio Cho, Toyota Motor Corp. chairman, and Hiromasa Yonekura, chairman of Keidanren (Japan Business Federation), told Tang Jiaxuan, a former Chinese state councilor and chairman of the China-Japan Friendship Association, that they would be glad to help China solve its serious air pollution problems in Beijing and other cities. About 500 member companies of the Japan-China Economic Association are ready to pass along their technologies and experiences through private-sector exchanges, and they hope to find a path to negotiations within the economic field during the latest visit. The association previously planned to visit Beijing in September, but the storm of anti-Japan demonstrations across China after the Japanese government purchased three of the Senkaku Islands the same month caused the meeting to be postponed. The approximately 20 members in Beijing on March 21 represent only about one-10th the number the group had originally planned to send. "(Sino-Japanese relations are) in the toughest situation since the normalization of our diplomatic relationship," Tang told the Japanese representatives. "**We both have to make efforts so that we can get back on track toward the normalization (of our bilateral ties)** as soon as possible. “The economies of Japan and China have been molded into one. It will be better to promote exchanges and cooperation (in economic fields) as planned.”

#### Rearm is strategic and will not be used in an aggressive manner – Tokyo will do so peacefully – that prevents escalation

Green ’07(Michael, associate professor of international relations at the Walsh School of Foreign Service at Georgetown, and Japan Chair at CSIS. “Japan Is Back.” Foreign Affairs, March/April 2007, Vol. 86 Iss. 2, p. 142-147. Ebsco.)

The resurgence of Japanese power and purpose is not all about petty nationalism, even though nationalism characterizes the Japanese public mood these days (just as it does the public moods of South Korea and China). Nor is Japan's resurgence a simple matter of remilitarization, since Japan's defense spending remains below one percent of GDP, as it has for decades. Japan's latest rise is once again about doing more with less. Fortunately for the United States, leveraging the U.S.-Japanese alliance will be high on the list of Tokyo's priorities. That is a good thing both for the United States and for the world. The question is whether Washington fully comprehends this.

### Impact – 2NC

#### Cyberattacks crush heg

**Schmitt 99** (Michael, Prof Int’l Law, European Center Security Studies, Visiting scholar @ yale law, retired air force judge advocate, columbia journal transnational law)

\*Note – CNA = Computer Network Attacks

Facing these realities, a lesser-advantaged state hoping to seriously harm a dominant adversary must **inevitably** compete asymmetrically. It must seek to counter the strengths of the opponent not head-on, but rather, circuitously, employing unorthodox means to strike at centers of gravity. For instance, possession of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) can offset conventional military weakness. This is precisely why the United Nations Security Council takes the UNSCOM effort to deprive Iraq of WMD so seriously. Iraq cannot possibly hope to successfully confront the U.S. and its allies on the battlefield, but a credible threat to employ chemical or biological weapons in pursuit of national objectives would give it disproportionate (and malevolent) influence on the world scene. Similarly, asymmetry also under girds most state or state-sponsored very visible, yet relatively cost-free manner.31 CNA offers analogous asymmetrical benefits. In the first place, and as will be explored infra, in many cases a computer network attack will either not merit a response involving the use of force, or the legality of such a response will be debatable (even if the victim is able to accurately identify the fact, much less the source, of attack). Thus, because of the potentially grave impact of CNA on a state’s infrastructure, it can prove a high gain, low risk option for a state outclassed militarily or economically. Moreover, to the extent that an opponent is militarily and economically advantaged, it is probably technologicallydependent, and, therefore, teeming with tempting CNA targets. To further complicate matters, the knowledge and equipment necessary to mount a computer network attack are widely available; CNA is quite literally “war on the cheap.” One expert has asserted that with one million dollars and twenty individuals, he can “bring the U.S. to its knees.”32 Another maintains that the defense information infrastructure (DII) can be disrupted for weeks by ten individuals with $10,000, while still others claim that for $30,000,000, one hundred individuals could so corrupt the country’s entire information infrastructure that recovery would take years.33 To place these figures into context, a single F-16 aircraft cost $26,000,000 in fiscal year 1997.34 Unfortunately, the ability to conduct such operations is widespread. The President’s Commission on Critical Infrastructure Protection has projected that by the year 2002, some nineteen million individuals will have the know-how to launch cyber attacks.35 Today, over 120 countries are in the process of establishing information operations competence.36 In particular, the Chinese have discovered information warfare, and organized research in the subject proceeds apace.37 So too, not surprisingly, has the United States. Each of the armed services, as well as the Central Intelligence Agency, currently operates an information operations center.38

#### Cyber attacks collapse the economy

**Habiger 10** (Eugene, Retired Air Force General, “Cyberwarfare and Cyberterrorism: The Need for a New U.S. Strategic Approach”, Cyber Security Institute, 2-1, http://cybersecureinstitute.org/docs/whitepapers/Habiger\_2 \_1\_10.pdf)

However, there are reasons to believe that what is going on now amounts to a fundamental shift as opposed to business as usual. Today’s network exploitation or information operation trespasses possess a number of characteristics that suggest that the line between espionage and conflict has been, or is close to being, crossed. (What that suggests for the proper response is a different matter.) First, the number of cyberattacks we are facing is growing significantly. Andrew Palowitch, a former CIA official now consulting with the US Strategic Command (STRATCOM), which oversees the Defense Department’s Joint Task Force‐Global Network Operations, recently told a meeting of experts that the Defense Department has experienced almost 80,000 computer attacks, and some number of these assaults have actually “reduced” the military’s “operational capabilities.”20 Second, the nature of these attacks is starting to shift from penetration attempts aimed at gathering intelligence (cyber spying) to offensive efforts aimed at taking down systems (cyberattacks). Palowitch put this in stark terms last November, “We are currently in a cyberwar and war is going on today.”21 Third, these recent attacks need to be taken in a broader strategic context. Both Russia and China have stepped up their offensive efforts and taken a much more aggressive cyberwarfare posture. The Chinese have developed an openly discussed cyberwar strategy aimed at achieving electronic dominance over the U.S. and its allies by 2050. In 2007 the Department of Defense reported that for the first time China has developed first strike viruses, marking a major shift from prior investments in defensive measures.22 And in the intervening period China has launched a series of offensive cyber operations against U.S. government and private sector networks and infrastructure. In 2007, Gen. James Cartwright, the former head of STRATCOM and now the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, told the US‐China Economic and Security Review Commission that China’s ability to launch “denial of service” attacks to overwhelm an IT system is of particular concern. 23 Russia also has already begun to wage offensive cyberwar. At the outset of the recent hostilities with Georgia, Russian assets launched a series of cyberattacks against the Georgian government and its critical infrastructure systems, including media, banking and transportation sites.24 In 2007, cyberattacks that many experts attribute, directly or indirectly, to Russia shut down the Estonia government’s IT systems. Fourth, the current geopolitical context must also be factored into any effort to gauge the degree of threat of cyberwar. The start of the new Obama Administration has begun to help reduce tensions between the United States and other nations. And, the new administration has taken initial steps to improve bilateral relations specifically with both China and Russia. However, it must be said that over the last few years the posture of both the Chinese and Russian governments toward America has clearly become more assertive, and at times even aggressive. Some commentators have talked about the prospects of a cyber Pearl Harbor, and the pattern of Chinese and Russian behavior to date gives reason for concern along these lines: both nations have offensive cyberwarfare strategies in place; both nations have taken the cyber equivalent of building up their forces; both nations now regularly probe our cyber defenses looking for gaps to be exploited; both nations have begun taking actions that cross the line from cyberespionage to cyberaggression; and, our bilateral relations with both nations are increasingly fractious and complicated by areas of marked, direct competition. Clearly, there a sharp differences between current U.S. relations with these two nations and relations between the US and Japan just prior to World War II. However, from a strategic defense perspective, there are enough warning signs to warrant preparation. In addition to the threat of cyberwar, the limited resources required to carry out even a large scale cyberattack also makes likely the potential for a significant cyberterror attack against the United States. However, the lack of a long list of specific incidences of cyberterrorism should provide no comfort. There is strong evidence to suggest that al Qaeda has the ability to conduct cyberterror attacks against the United States and its allies. Al Qaeda and other terrorist organizations are extremely active in cyberspace, using these technologies to communicate among themselves and others, carry out logistics, recruit members, and wage information warfare. For example, al Qaeda leaders used email to communicate with the 9‐11 terrorists and the 9‐11 terrorists used the Internet to make travel plans and book flights. Osama bin Laden and other al Qaeda members routinely post videos and other messages to online sites to communicate. Moreover, there is evidence of efforts that al Qaeda and other terrorist organizations are actively developing cyberterrorism capabilities and seeking to carry out cyberterrorist attacks. For example, the Washington Post has reported that “U.S. investigators have found evidence in the logs that mark a browser's path through the Internet that al Qaeda operators spent time on sites that offer software and programming instructions for the digital switches that run power, water, transport and communications grids. In some interrogations . . . al Qaeda prisoners have described intentions, in general terms, to use those tools.”25 Similarly, a 2002 CIA report on the cyberterror threat to a member of the Senate stated that al Qaeda and Hezbollah have become "more adept at using the internet and computer technologies.”26 The FBI has issued bulletins stating that, “U. S. law enforcement and intelligence agencies have received indications that Al Qaeda members have sought information on Supervisory Control And Data Acquisition (SCADA) systems available on multiple SCADA‐related web sites.”27 In addition a number of jihadist websites, such as 7hj.7hj.com, teach computer attack and hacking skills in the service of Islam.28 While al Qaeda may lack the cyber‐attack capability of nations like Russia and China, there is every reason to believe its operatives, and those of its ilk, are as capable as the cyber criminals and hackers who routinely effect great harm on the world’s digital infrastructure generally and American assets specifically. In fact, perhaps, the most troubling indication of the level of the cyberterrorist threat is the countless, serious non‐terrorist cyberattacks routinely carried out by criminals, hackers, disgruntled insiders, crime syndicates and the like. If run‐of‐the‐mill criminals and hackers can threaten powergrids, hack vital military networks, steal vast sums of money, take down a city’s of traffic lights, compromise the Federal Aviation Administration’s air traffic control systems, among other attacks, it is overwhelmingly likely that terrorists can carry out similar, if not more malicious attacks. Moreover, even if the world’s terrorists are unable to breed these skills, they can certainly buy them. There are untold numbers of cybermercenaries around the world—sophisticated hackers with advanced training who would be willing to offer their services for the right price. Finally, given the nature of our understanding of cyber threats, there is always the possibility that we have already been the victim or a cyberterrorist attack, or such an attack has already been set but not yet effectuated, and we don’t know it yet. Instead, a well-designed cyberattack has the capacity cause widespread chaos, sow societal unrest, undermine national governments, spread paralyzing fear and anxiety, and create a state of utter turmoil, all without taking a single life. A sophisticated cyberattack could throw a nation’s banking and finance system into chaos causing markets to crash, prompting runs on banks, degrading confidence in markets, perhaps even putting the nation’s currency in play and making the government look helpless and hapless. In today’s difficult economy, imagine how Americans would react if vast sums of money were taken from their accounts and their supporting financial records were destroyed. A truly nefarious cyberattacker could carry out an attack in such a way (akin to Robin Hood) as to engender populist support and deepen rifts within our society, thereby making efforts to restore the system all the more difficult. A modestly advanced enemy could use a cyberattack to shut down (if not physically damage) one or more regional power grids. An entire region could be cast into total darkness, power‐dependent systems could be shutdown. An attack on one or more regional power grids could also cause cascading effects that could jeopardize our entire national grid. When word leaks that the blackout was caused by a cyberattack, the specter of a foreign enemy capable of sending the entire nation into darkness would only increase the fear, turmoil and unrest. While the finance and energy sectors are considered prime targets for a cyberattack, an attack on any of the 17 delineated critical infrastructure sectors could have a major impact on the United States. For example, our healthcare system is already technologically driven and the Obama Administration’s e‐health efforts will only increase that dependency. A cyberattack on the U.S. e‐health infrastructure could send our healthcare system into chaos and put countless of lives at risk. Imagine if emergency room physicians and surgeons were suddenly no longer able to access vital patient information. A cyberattack on our nation’s water systems could likewise cause widespread disruption. An attack on the control systems for one or more dams could put entire communities at risk of being inundated, and could create ripple effects across the water, agriculture, and energy sectors. Similar water control system attacks could be used to at least temporarily deny water to otherwise arid regions, impacting everything from the quality of life in these areas to agriculture.

### Will Pass – 2NC

#### 1NC evidence indicates that the status quo is goldilocks –

#### Will pass -.

**Martin**, **3/28**/2013 (Gary, Immigration reform gaining support in Congress, CT Post, p. http://www.ctpost.com/local/article/Immigration-reform-gaining-support-in-Congress-4393187.php)

A Republican Party in desperate search for relevance to Latino voters. An expanded Democratic advantage in the Senate. A second-term President with his legacy on the line. Does all that add up to enough to break decades of impasse and produce comprehensive immigration reform? As expectations -- and tensions -- rise, the answer won't be long in coming. A bipartisan bill could be filed in the Senate as early as next week, followed in relatively short order by a House bill, also crafted by a bipartisan group, aiming at a compromise on the key issue of citizenship. The efforts are being applauded by President Barack Obama, who is using every ounce of his political clout to try to get comprehensive reform. Obama said the time has come "to work up the political courage to do what's required to be done." "I expect a bill to be put forward. I expect a debate to begin next month. I want to sign that bill into law as soon as possible," Obama said at a White House naturalization ceremony. In addition to the issue of eventual citizenship for 11 million undocumented immigrants, Congress is expected to address the need for temporary or guest worker programs. Congress last passed comprehensive bipartisan reform legislation in 1986, when President Ronald Reagan signed a law that granted citizenship to several million undocumented immigrants and created a guest worker program. Up until now, Republicans have opposed citizenship programs as an "amnesty" for lawbreakers who entered the country illegally, and labor has chafed at guest worker programs. But Republican losses in the 2012 elections and increased public support for reform have many in the GOP talking compromise. "If there is one issue that the two parties could produce something meaningful on in this Congress, it would be immigration," said Stephen Hess, a political expert at The Brookings Institution. Hess said an eventual bill "will have lots of provisos, and it will go back and forth, but it would be hard not to produce something given the general feeling that something has to be produced." More and more Republicans are moving toward immigration-reform measures as the party seeks to reach out to Latinos, the nation's largest -- and growing -- minority voting bloc. Public opinion is behind them. A recent poll showed 63 percent of Americans supported a path to citizenship for undocumented workers provided they meet certain requirements, according to a survey by the Public Religion Research Institute. Notable Republicans who have recently spoken in favor of compromise on citizenship proposals include Sen. Rand Paul, R-Ky.; former Mississippi Gov. Haley Barbour; and Rep. Paul Ryan, R-Wis. And a March report by the National Republican Committee, considered a "post mortem" on the 2012 elections, recommended the GOP embrace comprehensive immigration reform to shore up its shaky standing with minorities -- Latinos, in particular. Roy Beck, executive director of Numbers USA, which advocates lower numerical numbers on immigration, predicted a majority of Republican senators would oppose citizenship. Groups like Numbers USA are working to hold GOP senators in line. They sent 13,000 emails to Kentucky voters that claimed Paul's position was "more radical and pro-immigration than anything proposed by President Obama." The group has targeted Sen. Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., one of the "Gang of Eight" senators writing the Senate bipartisan bill, as a lawmaker who favors foreign workers over unemployed South Carolinians. Democrats from conservative-leaning states could also feel political heat. Beck said if five to 10 Democrats in the Senate oppose a bill, proponents would need 10 to 15 Republicans to reach the 60 votes needed to cut off debate and vote on legislation. "You do the math," Beck said. In 2007, an effort to cut off debate on a Senate immigration reform bill died on a 46-53 vote. But immigrant reform proponents, such as America's Voice, say there is a "tectonic shift" in the GOP, and the Democrats also have expanded their Senate majority to 53-45, plus two independents who caucus with them. They predict the Senate will muster the votes necessary to pass a reform bill.

#### Insiders and GOP support

MacAskill 3-25 (Ewen, “Obama Pushes Immigration Reform Deadline as Congress Signals Progress,” Guardian, 2013, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2013/mar/25/obama-immigration-reform-deadline-congress>)

Barack Obama put pressure on Congress on Monday to introduce an immigration reform bill by April, saying the "time has come to fix once and for all" the broken system. Speaking at the White House at a naturalisation ceremony for 28 people, Obama indicated that he wanted to stick to the timetable he outlined in his inaugural address in January. Members of Congress directly involved in discussions had been reporting better-than-expected progress over the last few weeks but by the end of last week admitted they had been unable to resolve outstanding differences before breaking for the Easter holiday. Senators expressed hope that they could have a bill ready within two weeks of their return. Hopes of a deal have been raised by the support coming from Republican senators such as Marco Rubio, Rand Paul, John McCain and Lindsey Graham.

#### Momentum

Mali 3-25 (Meghashyam, Correspondent, “Obama to Host New Citizens, Push for Action on Immigration Reform,” The Hill, 2013, <http://thehill.com/blogs/blog-briefing-room/news/290053-obama-to-host-new-citizens-press-congress-on-immigration-reform>)

President Obama will host a naturalization ceremony on Monday for 28 new citizens, including 13 service members, at the White House. The move comes as the president continues to press lawmakers to pass comprehensive immigration reform, one of his second-term priorities. Obama will be joined by Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano and U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services Director Alejandro Mayorkas in the East Room. The president will deliver remarks at the ceremony, the White House announced. “The event underscores the contributions made to the United States by immigrants from all walks of life, including the foreign-born members of the U.S. Armed Forces, as well as our shared history as a nation of immigrants,” said a White House official. “While the President remains pleased that Congress continues to make progress towards commonsense immigration reform, he believes Congress needs to act quickly, and he expects a bill to be introduced as soon as possible.” Bipartisan groups in both the House and Senate are moving closer to unveiling separate immigration reform proposals. The Senate’s “Gang of Eight” introduced their framework in January, calling for a pathway to citizenship, heightened border security, increased high-skilled immigration and a guest worker program. But since then, senators have been tied down in negotiations over the details of the plan, with many key issues still unresolved. Reports last week, though, said that sources close to the talks said they hoped to have a bill by the end of April. The bipartisan House group has yet to share details of their proposals, but their work has already received general support from leaders in both parties. Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) last week praised their work as a “pretty responsible solution.” House Minority Whip Steny Hoyer (D-Md.) said the group was “very close to an agreement,” and that lawmakers had made “real progress.” Advocates for immigration reform see a real chance that a bill could pass Congress this year, with growing momentum on both sides. But any immigration deal would need to pass muster with 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. But after the strong showing President Obama made among Hispanic voters in the 2012 election, a growing number of conservative lawmakers have signaled they would back immigration reform, including measures to provide a pathway to citizenship.

### Will Pass – A2: Labor

#### Labor issue’s resolved – PC key

Lerer 3-28 (Lisa, Bloomberg, “Obama, senators upbeat on immigration overhaul,” Bloomberg News, <http://www.philly.com/philly/news/nation_world/20130328_Obama__senators_upbeat_on_immigration_overhaul.html>)

"Bottom line is, we are very close," Schumer, who is part of an eight-member group working on the proposal, said Wednesday at the news conference in Arizona. Talks were left unresolved last week, when Congress left for its holiday recess without striking a deal. Union workers and business groups disagree over visas for low-skilled workers. Obama and senators from both parties signaled Wednesday that they were open to solving that dispute and were working on the details. "This is a resolvable issue," the president said in an interview Wednesday with Spanish-language station Telemundo. "I'm optimistic." Overhauling the country's immigration system is Obama's top legislative priority for his second term. Still, wary of undermining talks with Republicans, he has taken a backseat in negotiating a bill. Rather then advocate for specific proposals, he has spoken privately to lawmakers in the group and dispatched aides to provide technical support.

### Will Pass – A2: Guest Workers

#### A deal is close --- this assumes the guest worker argument.

**Washington Times**, **3/27**/2013 (Immigration agreement ‘very close’ in Congress; guest workers still a hurdle, p. <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2013/mar/27/national-latino-coalition-pushes-immigration-refor/>)

Members of the “Gang of Eight” tasked with carving out a comprehensive immigration package said Wednesday that they hope to file a bill when they return to Washington from their Easter break, and suggested that they are on the verge of a deal between business and labor leaders on visas for low-skilled workers. The high-profile immigration talks stalled out last week when the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the AFL-CIO failed to agree on the details of a proposed guest-worker program, a snag that has bogged down ongoing negotiations. But after touring the border on Wednesday, Democrats Sens. Charles E. Schumer of New York and Michael F. Bennet of Colorado, as well as Sens. John McCain and Jeff Flake, both Arizona Republicans, sounded optimistic about their chances of filing a bill next month. “Bottom line, we’re very close,” Mr. Schumer told reporters. “I’d say we’re 90 percent there. We have a few little problems, we’ve been on the phone all day with our four other colleagues.”

### A2: Obama Not Pushing

#### Obama’s pushing

Lerer 3-28 (Lisa, Bloomberg, “Obama, senators upbeat on immigration overhaul,” Bloomberg News, <http://www.philly.com/philly/news/nation_world/20130328_Obama__senators_upbeat_on_immigration_overhaul.html>)

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.

Senate negotiators say they are close to a final deal.

### A2: Thumper – General

#### Pivoting to immigration away from other issues

Hook 3-24 (Janet, “Congress Set to Alter Focus After Passing Two Budgets,” Wall Street Journal, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887323466204578380820319800066.html>)

After the Senate passed its budget this weekend, Congress is expected to pivot to issues such as immigration and guns before attempting a broader deal on taxes, spending and the national debt later this year. Capitol Hill fell quiet as lawmakers headed home for a two-week spring recess, the longest pause in the Capitol Hill budget wars in months. Before leaving town, the Senate early Saturday morning and the House last week passed nonbinding budget blueprints that laid out the parties' competing fiscal priorities. President Barack Obama is expected to release his own fiscal 2014 budget in early April—months late and almost an afterthought now that Senate passed a Democratic budget in sync with White House priorities. The Senate budget calls for nearly $1 trillion in tax increases over 10 years and tries to reduce the deficit without making big changes in Medicare and other safety-net programs. The House GOP budget, by contrast, calls for eliminating the deficit in 10 years without raising taxes, while making major cuts in the growth of Medicare. Mr. Obama has indicated a willingness to support bigger changes in Medicare and other entitlement programs than the Democratic budget called for, but only as part of broader deficit-reduction deal with Republicans that includes tax increases. The president isn't likely to detail such entitlement cuts as part of his formal budget request. When the House and Senate return the week of April 8 from their spring recess, Speaker John Boehner (R., Ohio) has said House Republicans will begin meetings to decide how to handle the next budget challenge. Congress will have to raise the federal debt limit or else the U.S. Treasury will run out of cash to pay its bills. Mr. Boehner has said the GOP won't approve any debt increase unless it is paired with matching budget cuts. Democrats have refused to make more big spending cuts unless they are linked to tax increases. Congress is expected to have until July or August to settle that conflict. The Senate, meanwhile, plans in April to turn to gun-control legislation, Democrats' response to the mass shooting at a Newtown, Conn., school in December. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D., Nev.) plans to bring up a bill that includes broader background checks for gun purchasers, but not a controversial ban on semiautomatic firearms known as assault weapons. However, Mr. Reid has said he plans to hold votes on amendments on a wide range of gun measures, including the assault-weapons ban. A compromise to overhaul immigration law may also soon surface in the Senate, where a bipartisan group of senators has been laboring to craft a bill spelling out a detailed plan to increase U.S. border security and provide a path to citizenship for millions of people now in the U.S. illegally. The group is continuing to work privately on the bill through the spring recess, although they fell short of their goal of reaching consensus before leaving town.

### A2: Thumper – Budget

#### Obama’s pushing immigration – and backing away from budget

Weil 3-28 (Dan, “Obama a ‘Minor Actor’ in DC as His Power Wanes,” Newsmax, 2013, <http://www.newsmax.com/Newsfront/karl-rove-obama/2013/03/28/id/496756>)

The former White House aide adds, “Bipartisan groups of senators and congressmen are doing the difficult work of writing detailed immigration reform legislation. Mr. Reid — contrary to the president’s wishes — took it upon himself to sculpt a gun control bill that doesn’t include Mr. Obama’s bans on so-called ‘assault weapons’ and, perhaps, limits on the capacity of ammunition clips.” Then there’s the matter of a White House budget. “Astonishingly, little importance in all this has been attached to the president’s budget,” Rove writes. “Mr. Obama was required by law to deliver one to Congress by Feb. 4. He has yet to do so. It hardly seems to matter: congressional leaders plowed ahead anyway.” The budget is a symbol of Obama’s shrinking importance, Rove says. “Mr. Obama has become a minor actor on Capitol Hill. On a growing array of issues, members of both parties have come to understand that progress is more likely with the president on the sideline.”

### OCS – 2NC

#### Plan costs political capital

MART 8 Mergers and Acquisitions Round Table, This section includes quotes from Andrew Spitzer, Founder of the Energy and Power Group at Harris and Williams Co., and Douglas Korn of Irving Place Partners. “Combustible; The volatility of the energy sector has turned the industry upside down. Top players in the space discuss what this means for investors and how dealmakers can capitalize.,” Dec 1, Lexis

But it’s also important to remember that oil is a fungible commodity and the price is set on a worldwide¶ basis. Ultimately, we have to focus on domestic production to help with the supply issue, and, internationally,¶ see if we can’t encourage the national oil companies to¶ open up more acreage for competition. This is a worldwide problem; not just a US problem. ¶ Mergers & Acquisitions: Is it even possible, though, to¶ completely eliminate demand for foreign oil? Is this something that could happen in our lifetime?¶ Spitzer:The economics certainly make it extremely challenging, and frankly, without the political willpower to¶ put in a variety of reforms — whether it’s CAFE standards or relieving offshore drilling inhibitors — it’s not¶ something that would get done without some form of¶ government intervention.¶ Korn: That being said, the recent turmoil in the market¶ and the government’s response have created a very difficult fiscal situation going into 2009. You have the normal cyclical impacts of a downturn in government receipts and that overlays all of the government support to shore up the markets.¶ You have to go back to the question of whether or not there will¶ there be the political will. There are important reasons behind why we¶ haveto become less reliant on foreign energy; from a geopolitical point¶ of view, from a carbon emissions point of view. But how now you have¶ to ask, “How do we make that happen in an environment where the¶ government will be under some severe fiscal constraints.” That’s going¶ to be the real challenge.¶ Spitzer: And regulation is effectively a silent taxation policy. So instituting that in the face of the pocketbook issues that people are dealing with is going to be tough. Any administration would have to burn a lot of political capital to push through an energy policy that tries to¶ accomplish what either candidate proposed.

#### Plan can only hurt Obama – only opposition to the plan—kills democrat support

Margaret Kriz Hobson 12, E&E reporter, April 18, http://www.eenews.net/public/energywire/2012/04/18/1

OFFSHORE DRILLING: Obama's development plans gain little political traction in years since Gulf spill 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. The Republicans and industry officials long for the offshore oil and gas plan floated by former President George W. Bush during his last days in office. That proposal would have offered 31 federal lease sales and included regions off the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. By comparison, Obama's 2012 to 2017 leasing blueprint includes a dozen sites in Alaska and the Gulf of Mexico and excludes the West Coast and northern East Coast.

#### No turns---liberals hate the plan and conservatives won’t give Obama credit for it

Walsh 11, Bryan, TIME Senior editor, November 9, “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.

#### Empirics

E&E Daily 12 (Environment and Energy Daily, 1/17, lexis)

Despite an impressive track record at clearing energy and public lands measures, the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee didn't see a single measure debated on the Senate floor in 2011. Retiring committee Chairman Jeff Bingaman (D-N.M.) is likely to keep the pressure on Senate leaders to take those measures up in the full chamber as his time in the Senate comes to a close at the end of this year. And he'll also likely encourage discussions of his upcoming clean energy standard legislation. The measure isn't likely to gain much traction among Republicans in either chamber -- a fact Bingaman acknowledges -- but he says it will still be important to start debate on the issue. Other highlights Lessons learned from 2011 The committee last year kept up its famously bipartisan appearances, churning out an impressive 61 bills. But the panel still suffered from bouts of partisanship that brought action on certain issues -- like a response to the 2010 Gulf of Mexico oil spill -- to a standstill. The addition of several new tea party-backed GOP freshmen to the roster also caused some strife at committee meetings and in negotiations on seemingly noncontroversial bills. Head-butting isn't likely to go away on key issues as election-year politics dominate discussions throughout the Capitol. CES: Bingaman has vowed to float legislation early this session that would create a federal clean energy standard requiring utilities to generate a certain percentage of their electricity from low-carbon sources in the coming decades. Once introduced, the measure is sure to get ample face time in the committee, but partisan roadblocks in the full Senate and a sure death in the House will likely prevent it from moving beyond the panel. Smaller bipartisan bills: The committee last year cleared dozens of smaller energy bills on a bipartisan basis -- many of them breakouts from a broad 2009 energy bill that stalled in the full Senate -- but none have seen floor time. Bingaman will likely push Senate leaders to move on some of those measures as he sees the clock ticking on his time in the Senate. Offshore drilling: Efforts last year to advance offshore drilling safety language stalled after ranking member Lisa Murkowski (R-Alaska) and Sen. Mary Landrieu (D-La.) urged the inclusion of coastal revenue-sharing language in a bill responding to the 2010 oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico. Bingaman isn't likely to advance the legislation this session, but the committee could take a look at other offshore drilling issues, such as Interior's five-year leasing plan. Republicans and the oil industry want to see the areas included in that plan beefed up, while environmentalists and many Democrats say it already infringes on too many sensitive areas.

Forces political energy fights- saps capital

Geman 10

[Ben, The Hill, 4/1/10, <http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/90137-drilling-push-shakes-up-climate-fight->]

While most of the drilling proposal can be undertaken using executive power, expanded drilling in the eastern Gulf of Mexico would require congressional approval. That will surely play a role in the fight over energy and climate legislation that Democrats hope to bring to the floor. Republicans called Obama’s plan too narrow, as it closes off or delays leasing or sales in other areas. The energy consulting firm ClearView Energy Partners, in a research note Wednesday, said the limits of the White House plan give architects of the Senate energy and climate bill an opening to woo new support. “One obvious implication of today’s announcement: delaying and canceling OCS [Outer Continental Shelf] sales gives lawmakers the opportunity to ‘sweeten’ a climate bill by restoring or accelerating sales,” ClearView states. But the White House and the architects of Senate legislation — Sens. John Kerry (D-Mass.), Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.) and Joe Lieberman (I-Conn.) **— risk losing support among liberal Democrats and environmentalists as they seek expanded drilling**. For instance, Sen. Frank Lautenberg (D-N.J.) attacked the plan Wednesday. “Drilling off the Virginia coast would endanger many of New Jersey’s beaches and vibrant coastal economies,” Lautenberg said in a prepared statement. Environmental groups that are on board with efforts to craft a compromise climate change and energy bill — such as the Sierra Club and the Natural Resources Defense Council — **also slammed the proposal.**

### A2: Oil Lobbies Turn

#### Oil lobby weak - congressional defiance proves

Learsy, 9/10 (Raymond J., "No Oil Producing and Exporting Cartels Act': A Presidential Issue And A Test Of Political Integrity", Politics Daily, lexis)

Yet some years ago, in 2007, there was a genuine effort to change the equation in a fundamental way when Congress voted overwhelmingly, in defiance of the oil lobby and their allied interests for the NOPEC bill, so named because it would allow the international oil cartel, OPEC, and its national oil companies operating outside the law, hiding behind our sovereign immunity shield, to be sued and held accountable for what are clearly anti-competetive attempts to limit the world's supply of petroleum and the consequent impact on oil prices. In defiance of oil interests Congress voted overwhelmingly for the Bill (70 votes to 23 in the Senate and 345 to 72 in the House). This was an act of refreshing and courageous leadership by our Congress only to be abandoned after President George W. Bush, that great stalwart of oil interests and friend of Saudi Arabia, made it clear that he would veto the bill should it land on his desk.

#### Politicians aren’t swayed- proves no support

NFN, 12 (News From Nowhere, “The Politics of Energy”, July 6, http://newsfromnowhere.info/archive/issue-15-april-20-2012/the-politics-of-energy)

The oil industry is one of America's biggest recipients of corporate welfare, sucking up $4 billion in taxpayer subsidies every year. It's a worthy cause, of course: Big guns like Exxon-Mobil rake in a paltry $9 billion each quarter in profits (free and clear – not gross income), so they need the charity of the working-class taxpayer to stay afloat. But the oil industry came pretty close to losing their subsidies last week, when the Close Big Oil Tax Loopholes Act, backed by President Obama, came to a vote in the U.S. Senate. The bill failed on a 51-48 vote. Even though a majority supported the bill, proponents didn’t get the 60 votes they needed for ‘cloture,’ which moves the bill to a vote. Some 88% of oil and gas industry campaign contributions went to Republicans last year, and the investment paid off. In the Senate that was able to buy the votes of all but two – Olympia Snowe and Susan Collins, the two famously moderate Republicans from Maine. The 48 Senators who voted against removing the oil industries subsidies received almost $18 million in campaign contributions from the employees and political action committees of oil and gas companies during their Congressional careers, while the 51 Senators who voted to get rid of the taxpayer subsidies received $3.7 million. Want to know what’s driving America’s politics? Follow the money. Certainly today's political climate is not nearly as favorable to the oil industry as the halcyon days of the Bush administration. With the former CEO of Arbusto Petroleum at as Chief Executive and his trusty sidekick Dick Cheney of Halliburton fame occupying the White House, they stacked federal agencies with oil executives and lobbyists, appointing the industry's most vacal supporters to oversee regulation. Gale Norton, protege of James Watt at the Mountain States Legal Foundation, spent her career as a lawyer defending the biggest polluters in the oil industry, was appointed as Secretary of the Interior, in charge of the Bureau of Land Management, the agency that regulates most federal oil and gas operations. (Now she works for Shell). Steven Griles, a notorious coalbed methane industry lobbyist who did a lot of his dirty work in Wyoming's Powder River Basin, was appointed Assistant Secretary in charge of Lands and Minerals.

#### Oil lobby influence limited – can only maintain current benefits

Davenport, 12 (Coral, "Slick Operators", National Journal, March 1, lexis)

To be sure, the oil lobby doesn't win every battle. It has been trying without success for two decades to get Congress to open up the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge for drilling. But industry lobbyists acknowledge that they've been supremely successful at protecting the many advantages they already have, such as the tax breaks that Democrats have been trying to slash for years.

### AT: Cyber Attacks Fail

#### Even if it fails, the U.S. will retaliate --- starts World War III

**Lawson 9** (Dr. Sean, Assistant Professor in Communication – University of Utah, “Cross-Domain Response to Cyber Attacks and the Threat of Conflict Escalation”, Transformation Tracker, 5-13, [http://www.seanlawson.net/ ?p=477](http://www.seanlawson.net/?p=477))

At a time when it seems impossible to avoid the seemingly growing hysteria over the threat of cyber war,[1] network security expert Marcus Ranum delivered a refreshing talk recently, “The Problem with Cyber War,” that took a critical look at a number of the assumptions underlying contemporary cybersecurity discourse in the United States. He addressed one issue in partiuclar that I would like to riff on here, the issue of conflict escalation–i.e. the possibility that offensive use of cyber attacks could escalate to the use of physical force. As I will show, his concerns are entirely legitimate as current U.S. military cyber doctrine assumes the possibility of what I call “cross-domain responses” to cyberattacks. Backing Your Adversary (Mentally) into a Corner Based on the premise that completely blinding a potential adversary is a good indicator to that adversary that an attack is iminent, Ranum has argued that “The best thing that you could possibly do if you want to start World War III is launch a cyber attack. [...] When people talk about cyber war like it’s a practical thing, what they’re really doing is messing with the OK button for starting World War III. We need to get them to sit the f-k down and shut the f-k up.” [2] He is making a point similar to one that I have made in the past: Taking away an adversary’s ability to make rational decisions could backfire. [3] For example, Gregory Witol cautions that “attacking the decision maker’s ability to perform rational calculations may cause more problems than it hopes to resolve. Removing the capacity for rational action may result in completely unforeseen consequences, including longer and bloodier battles than may otherwise have been.” [4] Cross-Domain Response So, from a theoretical standpoint, I think his concerns are well founded. But the current state of U.S. policy may be cause for even greater concern. It’s not just worrisome that a hypothetical blinding attack via cyberspace could send a signal of imminent attack and therefore trigger an irrational response from the adversary. What is also cause for concern is that current \*\*U.S. policy indicates that “kinetic attacks\*\*” (i.e. physical use of force) \*\*are seen as\*\* potentially \*\*legitimate responses to cyber attacks\*\*. Most worrisome is that current U.S. policy implies that a nuclear response is possible, something that policy makers have not denied in recent press reports. The reason, in part, is that the U.S. defense community has increasingly come to see cyberspace as a “domain of warfare” equivalent to air, land, sea, and space. The definition of cyberspace as its own domain of warfare helps in its own right to blur the online/offline, physical-space/cyberspace boundary. But thinking logically about the potential consequences of this framing leads to some disconcerting conclusions. If cyberspace is a domain of warfare, then it becomes possible to define “cyber attacks” (whatever those may be said to entail) as acts of war. But what happens if the U.S. is attacked in any of the other domains? It retaliates. But it usually does not respond only within the domain in which it was attacked. Rather, responses are typically “cross-domain responses”–i.e. a massive bombing on U.S. soil or vital U.S. interests abroad (e.g. think 9/11 or Pearl Harbor) might lead to air strikes against the attacker. Even more likely given a U.S. military “way of warfare” that emphasizes multidimensional, “joint” operations is a massive conventional (i.e. non-nuclear) response against the attacker in all domains (air, land, sea, space), simultaneously. The possibility of “kinetic action” in response to cyber attack, or as part of offensive U.S. cyber operations, is part of the current (2006) National Military Strategy for Cyberspace Operations [5]: Of course, the possibility that a cyber attack on the U.S. could lead to a U.S. nuclear reply constitutes possibly the ultimate in “cross-domain response.” And while this may seem far fetched, it has not been ruled out by U.S. defense policy makers and is, in fact, implied in current U.S. defense policy documents. From the National Military Strategy of the United States (2004): “The term WMD/E relates to a broad range of adversary capabilities that pose potentially devastating impacts. WMD/E includes chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, and enhanced high explosive weapons as well as other, more asymmetrical ‘weapons’. They may rely more on disruptive impact than destructive kinetic effects. For example, cyber attacks on US commercial information systems or attacks against transportation networks may have a greater economic or psychological effect than a relatively small release of a lethal agent.” [6] The authors of a 2009 National Academies of Science report on cyberwarfare respond to this by saying, “Coupled with the declaratory policy on nuclear weapons described earlier, this statement implies that the United States will regard certain kinds of cyberattacks against the United States as being in the same category as nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons, and thus that a nuclear response to certain kinds of cyberattacks (namely, cyberattacks with devastating impacts) may be possible. It also sets a relevant scale–a cyberattack that has an impact larger than that associated with a relatively small release of a lethal agent is regarded with the same or greater seriousness.” [7] Asked by the New York Times to comment on this, U.S. defense officials would not deny that nuclear retaliation remains an option for response to a massive cyberattack: