### Solvency

### AT: Doesn’t Meet Demand

#### And, that makes production meet demand

**Weidenmier, ’10** adjunct scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, an associate professor of economics at Claremont McKenna College and a research associate at NBER (Marc D. Weidenmier, Forbes, 1 April 2012, “Drill, Baby, Drill,” http://www.forbes.com/2010/04/01/off-shore-drilling-energy-economy-opinions-contributors-marc-d-weidenmier.html)//CC

The prospect for increasing domestic fossil fuel production is much brighter for natural gas than conventional oil. Hydraulic fracturing, a new technique for extracting natural gas from shale rocks, led the Potential Gas Committee to increase their estimate of American natural gas reserves by 35% over the past couple of years. A more recent private sector report argues that shale gas more than doubles America's natural gas reserves. Another possible way to increase domestic fossil fuel production is to expand drilling on the public lands where many believe there are significant oil and natural gas deposits. Some energy experts believe that there are significant pools of oil and natural gas in sections of the Gulf of Mexico or off the coast of California, areas where offshore drilling is still prohibited. The U.S. should take advantage of more offshore oil and natural gas drilling and exploration opportunities. The U.S. could probably increase its fossil fuel production by 20% or 30% over the next decade through a combination of oil and natural gas. This could create jobs and help these states better cope with future spikes in oil prices. If we do not drill offshore, it is possible that foreign countries could drill off the continental shelf for their own benefit. To the extent that the U.S. can switch from oil to natural gas as a source of energy, this will reduce carbon emissions as natural gas is a significantly cleaner fuel. The U.S. could possibly even reduce its imports of fossil fuels by increasing domestic energy production, a political objective of both Democrats and Republicans. At the very least, the U.S. should be able to slow down the growth of fossil fuel imports, which contributes to its trade deficit. The extent to which the U.S. can reduce its oil imports will also depend on building nuclear power plants that can replace oil and coal generators that account for nearly 75% of U.S. electrical power.

### Prices

### XT: Econ Impact

#### Economic collapse causes global nuclear war

Friedberg and Schoenfeld, 2008[Aaron, Prof. Politics. And IR @ Princeton’s Woodrow Wilson School and Visiting Scholar @ Witherspoon Institute, and Gabriel, Senior Editor of Commentary and Wall Street Journal, “The Dangers of a Diminished America” <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB122455074012352571.html>]

Then there are the dolorous consequences of a potential collapse of the world's financial architecture. For decades now, Americans have enjoyed the advantages of being at the center of that system. The worldwide use of the dollar, and the stability of our economy, among other things, made it easier for us to run huge budget deficits, as we counted on foreigners to pick up the tab by buying dollar-denominated assets as a safe haven. Will this be possible in the future? Meanwhile, traditional foreign-policy challenges are multiplying. The threat from al Qaeda and Islamic terrorist affiliates has not been extinguished. Iran and North Korea are continuing on their bellicose paths, while Pakistan and Afghanistan are progressing smartly down the road to chaos. Russia's new militancy and China's seemingly relentless rise also give cause for concern. If America now tries to pull back from the world stage, it will leave a dangerous power vacuum. The stabilizing effects of our presence in Asia, our continuing commitment to Europe, and our position as defender of last resort for Middle East energy sources and supply lines could all be placed at risk. In such a scenario there are shades of the 1930s, when global trade and finance ground nearly to a halt, the peaceful democracies failed to cooperate, and aggressive powers led by the remorseless fanatics who rose up on the crest of economic disaster exploited their divisions. Today we run the risk that rogue states may choose to become ever more reckless with their nuclear toys, just at our moment of maximum vulnerability. The aftershocks of the financial crisis will almost certainly rock our principal strategic competitors even harder than they will rock us. The dramatic free fall of the Russian stock market has demonstrated the fragility of a state whose economic performance hinges on high oil prices, now driven down by the global slowdown. China is perhaps even more fragile, its economic growth depending heavily on foreign investment and access to foreign markets. Both will now be constricted, inflicting economic pain and perhaps even sparking unrest in a country where political legitimacy rests on progress in the long march to prosperity. None of this is good news if the authoritarian leaders of these countries seek to divert attention from internal travails with external adventures.

### AT: US Not Key

#### The US is key to the world economy

Caploe 09—Ph.D., International Political Economy, Princeton University, M.A., Politics, Princeton University, Honors A.B., Social Theory, Harvard University (David, Focus still on America to lead global recovery, 7 April 2009, <http://www.straitstimes.com/vgn-ext-templating/v/index.jsp?vgnextoid=908c318314c70210VgnVCM100000430a0a0aRCRD&vgnextchannel=0162758920e39010VgnVCM1000000a35010aRCRD>, RBatra)

IN THE aftermath of the G-20 summit, most observers seem to have missed perhaps the most crucial statement of the entire event, made by United States President Barack Obama at his pre-conference meeting with British Prime Minister Gordon Brown: 'The world has become accustomed to the US being a voracious consumer market, the engine that drives a lot of economic growth worldwide,' he said. 'If there is going to be renewed growth, it just can't be the US as the engine.' While superficially sensible, this view is deeply problematic. To begin with, it ignores the fact that the global economy has in fact been 'America-centred' for more than 60 years. Countries - China, Japan, Canada, Brazil, Korea, Mexico and so on - either sell to the US or they sell to countries that sell to the US. This system has generally been advantageous for all concerned. America gained certain historically unprecedented benefits, but the system also enabled participating countries - first in Western Europe and Japan, and later, many in the Third World - to achieve undreamt-of prosperity. At the same time, this deep inter-connection between the US and the rest of the world also explains how the collapse of a relatively small sector of the US economy - 'sub-prime' housing, logarithmically exponentialised by Wall Street's ingenious chicanery - has cascaded into the worst global economic crisis since the Great Depression. To put it simply, Mr Obama doesn't seem to understand that there is no other engine for the world economy - and hasn't been for the last six decades. If the US does not drive global economic growth, growth is not going to happen. Thus, US policies to deal with the current crisis are critical not just domestically, but also to the entire world. Consequently, it is a matter of global concern that the Obama administration seems to be following Japan's 'model' from the 1990s: allowing major banks to avoid declaring massive losses openly and transparently, and so perpetuating 'zombie' banks - technically alive but in reality dead. As analysts like Nobel laureates Joseph Stiglitz and Paul Krugman have pointed out, the administration's unwillingness to confront US banks is the main reason why they are continuing their increasingly inexplicable credit freeze, thus ravaging the American and global economies. Team Obama seems reluctant to acknowledge the extent to which its policies at home are failing not just there but around the world as well. Which raises the question: If the US can't or won't or doesn't want to be the global economic engine, which country will? The obvious answer is China. But that is unrealistic for three reasons. # First, China's economic health is more tied to America's than practically any other country in the world. Indeed, the reason China has so many dollars to invest everywhere - whether in US Treasury bonds or in Africa - is precisely that it has structured its own economy to complement America's. The only way China can serve as the engine of the global economy is if the US starts pulling it first. # Second, the US-centred system began at a time when its domestic demand far outstripped that of the rest of the world. The fundamental source of its economic power is its ability to act as the global consumer of last resort. China, however, is a poor country, with low per capita income, even though it will soon pass Japan as the world's second largest economy. There are real possibilities for growth in China's domestic demand. But given its structure as an export-oriented economy, it is doubtful if even a successful Chinese stimulus plan can pull the rest of the world along unless and until China can start selling again to the US on a massive scale. # Finally, the key 'system' issue for China - or for the European Union - in thinking about becoming the engine of the world economy - is monetary: What are the implications of having your domestic currency become the global reserve currency? This is an extremely complex issue that the US has struggled with, not always successfully, from 1959 to the present. Without going into detail, it can safely be said that though having the US dollar as the world's medium of exchange has given the US some tremendous advantages, it has also created huge problems, both for America and the global economic system. The Chinese leadership is certainly familiar with this history. It will try to avoid the yuan becoming an international medium of exchange until it feels much more confident in its ability to handle the manifold currency problems that the US has grappled with for decades. Given all this, the US will remain the engine of global economic recovery for the foreseeable future, even though other countries must certainly help. This crisis began in the US - and it is going to have to be solved there too.

### XT: KT Competitiveness

#### **Only internal link to competitiveness**

Boushey 12 – Heather Boushey, Senior Economist, Center for American Progress Action Fund, July 19th, 2012, "Testimony before the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Ways and Meanson Tax Reform and the U.S. Manufacturing Sector" waysandmeans.house.gov/uploadedfiles/boushey\_testimony.pdf

**Having a strong manufacturing industry in the United States should be at the top of our national economic agenda. Without a vibrant and innovative manufacturing base,** we will not be a global leader **for long. Moreover, as more of our energy** future will rely on high-tech manufacturing**, our** economic competitiveness will be even more closely aligned with our ability to be an innovator and producer of manufactured goods**.** Further, this is an urgent national issue and one of those cases where success begets success. Economists have begun to study and show that the “industrial commons” matters for innovation and the extent to which we allow manufacturing processes to continue to go overseas, we only make it that much harder to regain our place as a global leader.11 As my colleagues Michael Ettlinger and Kate Gordon have put it, “the cross-fertilization and engagement of a community of experts in industry, academia, and government is vital to our nation’s economic competitiveness.”12 Manufacturing is not only a key part of our economy, but moving forward it will remain critical to our nation’s economic vitality **The U.S. manufacturing sector is still a force internationally and an important part of our economy, despite employment losses and the relative rise in manufacturing in other countries over the past few decades**.13 **Last year, manufacturing contributed over** $1.8 trillion **to U.S.** g**ross** d**omestic** p**roduct, or about** 12 percent of the economy.14 Two years ago, manufacturing accounted for 60 percent of all U.S. exports.15 In 2008, the United States ranked first in the world in manufacturing value added, and it was the third largest exporter of manufactured goods to the world, behind only China and Germany and ahead of Japan and France.16 Between 1979 and 2010 manufacturing output per hour of labor in the United States increased by an average of 4 percent annually, and the United States has one of the world’s most productive workforces.17 Moreover, in 2009 there were 11.8 million direct jobs in manufacturing and 6.8 million additional jobs in related sectors.18 Put another way, one in six U.S. private-sector jobs is directly linked to manufacturing.19 Yet the industry suffered declines in the 2000s. The U.S. share of worldwide manufacturing value added dropped from 26 percent in 1998 to less than 20 percent in 2007, and we have gone from being a net exporter of manufactured goods in the 1960s to a net importer.20 Manufacturing as a share of U.S. GDP has declined from more than 15 percent in 1998 to 11 percent in 2009.21 And jobs in U.S. manufacturing declined from 17.6 million in January 1998 to 11.5 million in January 2010.22 And although the manufacturing sector has gained jobs in every month since then, for a total of 504,000 jobs as of June 2012, its share of total employment is down from 16.8 percent in 1998 to 10.8 percent today.23 These trends matter because the United States needs a strong manufacturing sector. **Manufacturing** provides good, middle-class jobs; **propels U.S. leadership in technology and innovation**, which is critical to our economic growth and vitality; and is important to balancing the trade deficit, as well as important for our nation’s long-term national security. The manufacturing sector has historically been a source of solid, middle-class jobs and it continues to be so today. **The average manufacturing worker earns a weekly wage that is 8.4 percent higher than non-manufacturing workers,** taking into account worker and job characteristics that influence wages, including unionization.24 **Economist Susan Helper and her colleagues conclude** that the economic evidence points to the fact that “the main reason why manufacturing wages and benefits are higher than those outside of manufacturing is that manufacturers need to pay higher wages to ensure that their workers are appropriately skilled and motivated.” 25 U.S.-based **manufacturing underpins a broad range of jobs in other industries,** including higher skill service jobs such as accountants, bankers, and lawyers, as well as a broad range of other jobs such as basic research and technology development, product and process engineering and design, operations and maintenance, transportation, testing, and lab work.26 Compared to jobs in other economic sectors, manufacturing jobs have the highest “multiplier effect**,” that is, the largest effect on the overall economy for each job created, relative to jobs in other industries.** To put this in perspective, each job in motor vehicle manufacturing creates 8.6 indirect jobs, each job in computer manufacturing creates 5.6 indirect jobs, and each job in steel product manufacturing creates 10.3 indirect jobs.27 Manufacturing is also important because it fuels the United States’ leadership in technology and innovation, which are critical to maintain for our future economic competitiveness.28 Manufacturing firms are more likely to innovate than firms in other industries: **Research from the National Science Foundation finds that 22 percent of manufacturing companies are active innovators compared to only 8 percent of nonmanufacturing companies.**29 This number is even higher for specific sectors within manufacturing. For example, in computer and electronic products manufacturing, 45 percent of companies are product innovators and 33 percent are process innovators.30 Manufacturing firms also **perform the vast majority of private research and development**: Despite comprising just 12 percent of the nation’s GDP in 2007, manufacturing companies contributed 70 percent of private research and development spending.31 In addition to what manufacturers spend on innovation, there is **increasingly strong empirical evidence showing a tight link between innovation and manufacturing production.** Economic research now shows that the United States will not likely be able to keep the highly skilled technical jobs if the production jobs go overseas. Harvard Business School professors Gary Pisano and Willy Shih have written about the decline of the “industrial commons” in the United States: the collective R&D, engineering, and manufacturing capabilities that mutually reinforce each other to sustain innovation.32 **For many types of manufacturing,** geographic proximity is key **to having a strong “commons,” and they point to evidence showing that there are few hightech industries where the feedback loop from the manufacturing process is not a factor in developing new products.**33 As they put it, “product and process innovation are intertwined.” Pisano and Shih point to the example of rechargeable batteries as a product where innovation followed manufacturing. Rechargeable battery manufacturing left the United States many years ago, leading to the migration of the batteries commons to Asia. Now new technology (batteries for hybrid and electric vehicles) are being designed in Asia where the commons are located. I’d draw your attention to a January New York Times article on China’s increasing investment in research and development, which asked, “**Our global competitiveness is based on being the origin of the newest, best ideas.** How will we fare if those ideas originate somewhere else?”34

### XT: Heg Impact

#### And, manufacturing capabilities key to technology necessary for U.S. deterrence

**O’Hanlon et al 2k12** (Mackenzie Eaglen, American Enterprise Institute Rebecca Grant, IRIS Research Robert P. Haffa, Haffa Defense Consulting Michael O'Hanlon, The Brookings Institution Peter W. Singer, The Brookings Institution Martin Sullivan, Commonwealth Consulting Barry Watts, Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments “The Arsenal of Democracy and How to Preserve It: Key Issues in Defense Industrial Policy January 2012,” pg online @ <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2012/1/26%20defense%20industrial%20base/0126_defense_industrial_base_ohanlon> //um-ef)

The current wave of defense cuts is also different than past defense budget reductions in their likely industrial impact, as **the U.S. defense industrial base is in a much different place than it was in the past**. Defense industrial issues are too often viewed through the lens of jobs and pet projects to protect in congressional districts. **But the overall health of the firms that supply the technologies our armed forces utilize does have national security resonance**. Qualitative superiority in weaponry and other key military technology has become an essential element of American military power in the modern era—**not only for winning wars but for deterring them**. **That requires world-class** scientific and **manufacturing capabilities—**which in turn can also generate civilian and military export opportunities for the United States in a globalized marketplace.

#### Credible deterrence solves global nuclear wars.

C. Paul **Robinson**, president and director of the Department of Energy Sandia National Laboratories, “A White Paper: Pursuing a New Nuclear Weapons Policy for the 21st Century,” 3/22/20**01**,http://www.nukewatch.org/importantdocs/resources/pursuing\_a\_new\_nuclear\_weapons\_p.html

I served as an arms negotiator on the last two agreements before the dissolution of the Soviet Union and have spent most of my career enmeshed in the complexity of nuclear weapons issues on the government side of the table. It is abundantly clear (to me) that formulating a new nuclear weapons policy for the start of the 21st Century will be a most difficult undertaking. While the often over-simplified picture of deterrence during the Cold War—two behemoths armed to the teeth, staring each other down—has thankfully retreated into history, there are nevertheless huge arsenals of nuclear weapons and delivery systems, all in quite usable states, that could be brought back quickly to their Cold War postures. Additionally, throughout the Cold War and ever since, there has been a steady proliferation of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction by other nations around the globe. The vast majority of these newly armed states are not U.S. allies, and some already are exhibiting hostile behaviors, while others have the potential to become aggressors toward the U.S., our allies, and our international interests. Russia has already begun to emphasize the importance of its arsenal of nuclear weapons to compensate for its limited conventional capabilities to deal with hostilities that appear to be increasing along its borders. It seems inescapable that the U.S. must carefully think through how we should be preparing to deal with new threats from other corners of the world, including the role that nuclear weapons might serve in deterring these threats from ever reaching actual aggressions. I personally see the abolition of nuclear weapons as an impractical dream in any foreseeable future. I came to this view from several directions. The first is the impossibility of ever “uninventing” or erasing from the human mind the knowledge of how to build such weapons. While the sudden appearance of a few tens of nuclear weapons causes only a small stir in a world where several thousands of such weapons already exist, their appearance in a world without nuclear weapons would produce huge effects. (The impact of the first two weapons in ending World War II should be a sufficient example.) I believe that the words of Winston Churchill, as quoted by Margaret Thatcher to a special joint session of the U.S. Congress on February 20, 1985, remain convincing on this point: “Be careful above all things not to let go of the atomic weapon until you are sure, and more sure than sure, that other means of preserving the peace are in your hands.” Similarly, it is my sincere view that the majority of the nations who have now acquired arsenals of nuclear weapons believe them to be such potent tools for deterring conflicts that they would **never surrender them**. Against this backdrop, I recently began to worry that because there were few public statements by U.S. officials in reaffirming the unique role which nuclear weapons play in ensuring U.S. and world security, far too many people (including many in our own armed forces) were beginning to believe that perhaps nuclear weapons no longer had value. It seemed to me that it was time for someone to step forward and articulate the other side of these issues for the public: first, that nuclear weapons remain of vital importance to the security of the U.S. and to our allies and friends (today and for the near future); and second, that nuclear weapons will likely have an enduring role in preserving the peace and preventing **world wars** for the foreseeable future. These are my purposes in writing this paper. For the past eight years, I have served several Commanders-in-Chief of the U.S. Strategic Command by chairing the Policy Subcommittee of the Strategic Advisory Group (SAG). This group was asked to help develop a new terms of reference for nuclear strategy in the post-Cold War world. This paper draws on many of the discussions with my SAG colleagues (although one must not assume their endorsement of all of the ideas presented here). We addressed how nuclear deterrence might be extended—not just to deter Russia—but how it might serve a continuing role in deterring wider acts of aggression from any corner of the world, including deterring the use of nuclear, chemical or biological weapons. [Taken together, these are normally referred to as Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD).] My approach here will be to: (1) examine what might be the appropriate roles for nuclear weapons for the future, (2) propose some new approaches to developing nuclear strategies and policies that are more appropriate for the post-Cold War world, and (3) consider the kinds of military systems and nuclear weapons that would be needed to match those policies. The Role(s) of Nuclear Weapons The Commander-in-Chief of the Strategic Command, Admiral Rich Mies, succinctly reflected the current U.S. deterrent policy last year in testimony to the U.S. Senate: “Deterrence of aggression is a cornerstone of our national security strategy, and strategic nuclear forces serve as the most visible and most important element of our commitment Š (further) deterrence of major military attack on the United States and its allies, particularly attacks involving **weapons of mass destruction**, remains our highest defense priority.” While the application of this policy seemed clear, perhaps we could have said even “straightforward,” during the Cold War; application of that policy becomes even more complicated if we consider applying it to any nation other than Russia. Let me first stress that nuclear arms must never be thought of as a single “cure-all” for security concerns. For the past 20 years, only 10 percent of the U.S. defense budget has been spent on nuclear forces. The other 90 percent is for “war fighting” capabilities. Indeed, conflicts have continued to break out every few years in various regions of the globe, and these nonnuclear capabilities have been regularly employed. By contrast, we have not used nuclear weapons in conflict since World War II. This is an important distinction for us to emphasize as an element of U.S. defense policy, and one not well understood by the public at large. Nuclear weapons must never be considered as war fighting tools. Rather we should rely on the catastrophic nature of nuclear weapons to achieve war prevention, to prevent a conflict from **escalating** (e.g., **to the use of weapons of mass destruction**), or to help achieve war termination when it cannot be achieved by other means, e.g., if the enemy has already escalated the conflict through the use of weapons of mass destruction. Conventional armaments and forces will remain the backbone of U.S. defense forces, but **the** inherent threat to escalate to nuclear use can help to prevent conflicts from ever starting, can prevent their escalation, as well as bring these conflicts to a swift and certain end. In contrast to the situation facing Russia, I believe we cannot place an over-reliance on nuclear weapons, but that we must maintain adequate conventional capabilities to manage regional conflicts in any part of the world. Noting that the U.S. has always considered nuclear weapons as “weapons of last resort,” we need to give constant attention to improving conventional munitions in order to raise the threshold for which we would ever consider nuclear use. It is just as important for our policy makers to understand these interfaces as it is for our commanders. Defenses Although it is beyond the scope of this paper to strictly consider “defensive” tactics and armaments, I believe it is important for the United States to consider a continuum of defensive capabilities, from boost phase intercept to terminal defenses. Defenses have always been an important element of war fighting, and are likely to be so when defending against missiles. Defenses will also provide value in deterring conflicts or limiting escalations. Moreover, the existence of a credible defense to blunt attacks by armaments emanating from a rogue state could well eliminate that rogue nation’s ability to dissuade the U.S. from taking military actions. If any attack against the U.S., its allies, or its forces should be undertaken with nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction, there should be no doubt in the attacker’s mind that the United States might retaliate for such an attack with nuclear weapons; but the choice would be in our hands.

### 2AC Shipbuilding

#### Gulf drilling k2 econ and shipbuilding

Mason 11 (Joseph – Senior Fellow, The Wharton School, Louisiana State University Endowed Chair of Banking and nationally-renowned economist, “House Natural Resources Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources Hearing; Fisheries, Wildlife, Oceans and Insular Affairs Legislative Hearing on H.R. 306, H.R. 588, S. 266 and H.R. 285”, 4/6, lexis)

Apart from national energy concerns, however, economic considerations also favor increased development of OCS energy resources. Specifically, the boost provided to local onshore economies by offshore production would be particularly welcome in the present economic climate. Similar to fiscal alternatives presently under consideration, OCS development would provide a long-run economic stimulus to the U.S. economy because the incremental output, employment, and wages provided by OCS development **would be spread over many years**. Unlike those policies, however, this stimulus would not require government expenditures to support that long-term growth. A. The Present State of Offshore U.S. Oil and Gas Production Despite its importance, U.S. oil and natural gas production in offshore areas is currently limited to only a few regions. At the present time, oil and gas is only actively produced off the coast of six U.S. states: Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas, California, and Alaska. The Energy Information Administration (EIA) reports that Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas are the only coastal states that provide access to all or almost all of their offshore energy resources. Only two additional states--Alaska and California--are producing any offshore energy supplies. All California OCS Planning Areas and most Alaska OCS Planning Areas, however, were not open to any new facilities until the recent end of the Congressional and Presidential moratoria. The remaining 16 coastal states are not open to new production and are not presently extracting any offshore energy resources. Even without those remaining sixteen states, plus California and Alaska, the OCS is already the most important source of U.S. energy supplies. According to the MMS, "the Federal OCS is a major supplier of oil and **natural gas** for the domestic market, contributing more energy (oil and natural gas) for U.S. consumption than any single U.S. state or country in the world." That is, OCS production presently meets more U.S. energy demand than any other single source, including Saudi Arabia. B. Offshore Oil Production Stimulates Onshore Economies Offshore oil and gas production has **a significant effect** on local onshore economies as well as the national economy. There are broadly three "phases" of development that contribute to state economic growth: (1) the initial exploration and development of offshore facilities; (2) the extraction of oil and gas reserves; and (3) refining crude oil into finished petroleum products. Industries supporting those phases are most evident in the sections of the Gulf of Mexico that are currently open to offshore drilling. For example, the U.S. shipbuilding industry - based largely in the Gulf region - **benefits significantly** from initial offshore oil exploration efforts. Exploration and development also requires specialized exploration and drilling vessels, floating drilling rigs, and miles and miles of steel pipe, as well as highly educated and specialized labor to staff the efforts. The onshore support does not end with production. A recent report prepared for the U.S. Department of Energy indicates that the Louisiana economy is "highly dependent on a wide variety of industries that depend on offshore oil and gas production" and that offshore production supports onshore production in the chemicals, platform fabrication, drilling services, transportation, and gas processing. **Fleets of** helicopters and U.S.-built vessels **also supply offshore facilities with a wide range of industrial and consumer goods**, from industrial spare parts to groceries. As explained in Section IV.G, however, the distance between offshore facilities and onshore communities can affect the relative intensity of the local economic effects. The economic effects in the refining phase are even more diffuse than the effects for the two preceding phases. Although significant capacity is located in California, Illinois, New Jersey, Louisiana, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Washington, additional U.S. refining capacity is spread widely around the country. As a result, refinery jobs, wages, and tax revenues are even more likely to "spill over" into other areas of the country, including non-coastal states like Illinois, as those are home to many refining and chemical industries that ride the economic coattails of oil exploration and extraction.

#### Prevents multiple great power conflicts --- risk of escalation high

Crospey 12 (Dr. Seth – Senior Fellow at Hudson Institute, Former Assistant to the Secretary of Defense and Deputy Undersecretary of the Navy, ““The U.S. Navy Shipbuilding Plan: Assumptions and Associated Risks to National Security”, Statement before the Committee on Armed Services Subcommittee on Oversight & Investigations U.S. House of Representatives, 4/18, http://www.hudson.org/files/publications/SethCropsey--USNavyShipbuildingPlan--Testimony041812.pdf)

If the Navy’s assumption is mistaken that current political leadership will agree to large future increases in shipbuilding we will be headed toward a kind of naval holiday. The equally optimistic expectation that average ship costs can be maintained at $2 billion dollars per vessel prolongs the holiday. This will not be a pleasant holiday. China’s economy has its problems but it continues to perform. Janes Defence Forecasts says that China will double its defense budget between now and 2015.iii Russia plans a $160 billion dollar naval expansion in the Pacific which is to include 36 new submarines and 40 surface ships.iv If a couple postpones needed repairs on their home for a decade and then decides to fix all that has broken they will be very lucky to finish the job in a year. They will also be fortunate because other more prudent owners will have sustained the home repair industry. Our shipbuilding industry **does not have the benefit of other purchasers** who can sustain it if Navy budgets prove unequal to the task. For the industrial base that supports U.S. shipbuilding a budget-induced naval holiday would be a disaster that could take decades—**if ever**—from which to recover. Knowledge of shipbuilding remains part of American manufacturing. But accelerating cost, an ageing workforce, reduced orders for warships, and an uncertain future risk the nation’s ability to turn out sufficient numbers of vessels at affordable prices and profitably enough to keep shipbuilding companies alive. The destabilization of the American shipbuilding industrial base is one reason that the cost of warships is outpacing the rate of inflation. The Navy’s reduced procurement of ships over the past twenty years has caused the industry to contract, lay off workers, and in general to become less reliable. This has driven up the cost of labor and the cost of construction materials. The fewer ships the Navy buys, the less lucrative the industry is for skilled workers. As the cost of labor rises shipbuilders are increasingly pressed to attract and train qualified personnel. The negative trends reinforce each other. As younger workers are dissuaded from seeking employment or remaining in the industry by the prospects of sporadic employment those who remain—the existing workers—age. The cycle is self-defeating. Paying older workers increases overhead costs and makes it increasingly expensive to invest in the training and education of a younger workforce. The destabilization of the industrial base also causes costs to rise since many of the materials and products that go into building Navy ships are not useful for other purposes. Since the Navy is buying far fewer ships now than it did in the 1980s, many shipyards rely on a single source for necessary materials. With a virtual monopoly on these products, the suppliers have in large part the ability to name their price. The inefficient manner in which the shipyards acquire these materials drives up labor and overhead costs. The solution lies in stabilizing the American shipbuilding industry. This means that the Navy must either increase its orders of ships and/or improve its business practices, for example disciplining the changes it requires of shipbuilders once orders have been placed and vessels are under construction. Buying and stockpiling spare parts for ships that are already in service and whose need for regular maintenance and repair is well known would also help provide stability for the American shipbuilding industry. In a study conducted on the subject in 2006, the RAND Corporation concluded that the rising costs of building ships is the result of a combination of unsteady U.S. Government procurement rates and a “monopsony relationship” between the government and the shipbuilders. In a monopsony a single purchaser is faced with a host of sellers. Because there is so little American shipbuilding outside of what the Navy purchases, U.S. firms are at the commercial mercy of the 9 percent of the Navy budget devoted to buying ships. A 2005 Government Accountability Office report attributed cost increases in shipbuilding to instability in the entire industry, the difficulty in recruiting and training qualified personnel, high rates of skilled personnel turnover and the shipbuilders’ dependence on a rapidly shrinking supplier base. Finally there are the consequences **if U.S. seapower continues to decrease** and proves unable to meet even the reduced goals it has set for itself. History is a good guide. Nations in the middle like to side with the winner. During our Civil War British political leadership considered recognizing the Confederacy but was eventually dissuaded by Union military success. In World War II Sweden declared neutrality but grew increasingly amenable to Allied requests as Germany’s military position worsened. Romania initially sided with Germany in the same war but changed sides following U.S. attacks on their oil fields and a coup that deposed the pro-German dictator, Antonescu. Bulgarians followed a similar path from siding with the Nazis to switching their allegiance to the Allies in 1944. Saudi Prince Bandar, acknowledging China’s increasing international prominence and power visited Beijing last year and met with President Hu. American weakness at sea, especially in the Indo-Pacific will change the current military, diplomatic, and commercial character of the region. Whether the U.S. fleet shrinks because of too little funding or because unreformed procurement practices have raised the price of ships or because ships have been called home to save on operational expense, the result is the same. While we were once present in strength, we would be no more. A nation burdened with massive debt whose ability to shape world events has been limited in tandem with its capacity to invest in research and technology will have more and more trouble finding markets. China’s potential hegemony would not only force its neighbors’ to reconsider whether the U.S. is a reliable ally. It would also become an increasingly powerful magnet for trade in the region—at the expense of U.S. commerce. Unlike the U.S. whose seapower has protected global sea lanes that other states have used to their benefit **China has a different set of values**. It views with suspicion a liberal trading system notwithstanding the benefits received from it. **China’s friends include Iran and North Korea**. Beijing is a poor candidate to support the international order that has been the keel of U.S. foreign and security policy for a century. Waning U.S. seapower **is an invitation that China will regard as a complement to its rising military and navy** in particular. It foreshadows **a coercive resolution** of territorial disputes in the South China Sea, the likelihood of an increased regional arms race, and the troubling international perception that the U.S. is—or has—**abandoned its role as a great power**. American seapower is the strategic keel of our foreign and security policy. Reducing it would be an exercise of history-making shortsightedness. Restoring it would be an act of statesmanship from which Americans and all who cherish political liberty would benefit for the remainder of this century. Thank you.

### Warming

### AT: Not Real/Anthro

#### Warming is real – fundamental scientific theories prove – their arguments against correlation don’t disprove overwhelming science

**Braganza 11 –** received his PhD from the School of Mathematics at Monash University. His research work has centred on understanding and attributing climate variability and change, using numerical modelling, instrumental observations and past climate evidence, Manager of Climate Monitoring at the Bureau of Meteorology. The Bureau presently operates under the authority of the Meteorology Act 1955, which requires it to report on the state of the atmosphere and oceans in support of Australia's social, economic, cultural and environmental goals. His salary is not funded from any external sources or dependent on specially funded government climate change projects. Karl Braganza does not consult to, own shares in or receive funding from any company or organisation that would benefit from this article, and has no relevant affiliations.(Karl, June 14, “The greenhouse effect is real: here’s why” <http://theconversation.edu.au/the-greenhouse-effect-is-real-heres-why-1515>) Jacome

In public discussions of climate change, the full range and weight of evidence underpinning the current science can be difficult to find.

A good example of this is the role of observations of the climate system over the past one hundred years or more.

In the current public discourse, the focus has been mostly on changes in global mean temperature.

It would be easy to form the opinion that everything we know about climate change is based upon the observed rise in global temperatures and observed increase in carbon dioxide emissions since the industrial revolution.

In other words, one could have the mistaken impression that the entirety of climate science is based upon a single correlation study.

In reality, the correlation between global mean temperature and carbon dioxide over the 20th century forms an important, **but very small part of the evidence for a human role in climate change.**

Our assessment of the future risk from the continued build up of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere is even less informed by 20th century changes in global mean temperature. For example, our understanding of the greenhouse effect – the link between greenhouse gas concentrations and global surface air temperature – **is based primarily on our fundamental understanding of mathematics, physics, astronomy and chemistry.**

**Much of this science is textbook material that is at least a century old and does not rely on the recent climate record**.

For example, it is a scientific fact that Venus, the planet most similar to Earth in our solar system, experiences surface temperatures of nearly 500 degrees Celsius due to its atmosphere being heavily laden with greenhouse gases.

Back on Earth, that fundamental understanding of the physics of radiation, combined with our understanding of climate change from the geological record, clearly demonstrates that increasing greenhouse gas concentrations will inevitably drive global warming.

The observations we have taken since the start of 20th century have confirmed our fundamental understanding of the climate system.

While the climate system is very complex, observations have shown that our formulation of the physics of the atmosphere and oceans is largely correct, and ever improving.

Most importantly, the observations have confirmed that human activities, in particular a 40% increase in atmospheric carbon dioxide concentrations since the late 19th century, have had a discernible and significant impact on the climate system already.

In the field known as detection and attribution of climate change, scientists use indicators known as of climate change.

These fingerprints show the entire climate system has changed in ways that are consistent with increasing greenhouse gases and an enhanced greenhouse effect. They also show that recent, long term changes are inconsistent with a range of natural causes.

A warming world is obviously the most profound piece of evidence.

Here in Australia, the decade ending in 2010 has easily been the warmest since record keeping began, and continues a trend of each decade being warmer than the previous, that extends back 70 years.

Globally, significant warming and other changes have been observed across a range of different indicators and through a number of different recording instruments, and a consistent picture has now emerged.

Scientists have observed increases in continental temperatures and increases in the temperature of the lower atmosphere.

In the oceans, we have seen increases in sea-surface temperatures as well as increases in deep-ocean heat content. That increased heat has expanded the volume of the oceans and has been recorded as a rise in sea-level.

Scientists have also observed decreases in sea-ice, a general retreat of glaciers and decreases in snow cover. Changes in atmospheric pressure and rainfall have also occurred in patterns that we would expect due to increased greenhouse gases.

There is also emerging evidence that some, though not all, types of extreme weather have become more frequent around the planet. These changes are again consistent with our expectations for increasing atmospheric carbon dioxide.

Patterns of temperature change that are uniquely associated with the enhanced greenhouse effect, and which have been observed in the real world include: greater warming in polar regions than tropical regions greater warming over the continents than the oceans greater warming of night time temperatures than daytime temperatures greater warming in winter compared with summer a pattern of cooling in the high atmosphere (stratosphere) with simultaneous warming in the lower atmosphere (troposphere).

By way of brief explanation, if the warming over the 20th century were due to some deep ocean process, we would not expect to see continents warming more rapidly than the oceans, or the oceans warming from the top down.

For increases in solar radiation, we would expect to see warming of the stratosphere rather than the observed cooling trend. Similarly, greater global warming at night and during winter is more typical of increased greenhouse gases, rather than an increase in solar radiation.

There is a range of other observations that show the enhanced greenhouse effect is real. The additional carbon dioxide in the atmosphere has been identified through its isotopic signature as being fossil fuel in origin.

The increased carbon dioxide absorbed by the oceans is being recorded as a measured decrease in ocean alkalinity. Satellite measurements of outgoing long-wave radiation from the planet reveal increased absorption of energy in the spectral bands corresponding to carbon dioxide, exactly as expected from fundamental physics.

#### Warming anthropogenic

Lemonick, 12/4/12 [“New Evidence of Human Fingerprints on Global Warming”, Michael D, Mr. Lemonick covered science and the environment for TIME magazine for nearly 21 years, where he wrote more than 50 cover stories, and has also written for Discover, Scientific American, Wired, New Scientist and The Washington Post. Lemonick is the author of four books, and a cover story for TIME was featured in the anthology “Best American Science and Nature Writing 2007.” He has taught science and environmental journalism at Princeton, Columbia, Johns Hopkins and New York Universities. He holds a Master of Science in Journalism from Columbia University, <http://www.climatecentral.org/news/new-evidence-of-human-fingerprints-on-global-warming-15316>]

That’s what makes a new study in [Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences](http://www.pnas.org/content/early/2012/11/28/1210514109.full.pdf+html?with-ds=yes) so important. Using state-of-the-art climate models, Ben Santer of Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and 21 colleagues have found what they call “**some of the clearest evidence to date of a discernible influence on atmospheric temperature.”** Lower troposphere and lower stratosphere 1979-2011 temperature trend (°C/decade) and 12 months running mean global temperature time series with respect to 1979-1998. Specifically, they found that while the [troposphere](http://www.srh.weather.gov/srh/jetstream/atmos/layers.htm) — the lowest part of the atmosphere — has warmed over the past three decades, the [stratosphere](http://www.srh.weather.gov/srh/jetstream/atmos/layers.htm), which starts 5 to 12 miles above the ground, has cooled. This is exactly what you’d expect if greenhouse gases were trapping heat near the surface rather than letting it percolate upward. “This is not a new idea,” Santer said in an interview. “We did the first fingerprinting studies of the troposphere and stratosphere back in 1996.”The problem back then, Santer said, was that only a couple of climate models were available for studies like this. Models are crucial in this kind of research because you can’t do controlled experiments with the planet the way doctors do when they test new pharmaceuticals. With medicines, you give some patients the drug and others a placebo, or sugar pill, and see the difference in how their illnesses respond. With the climate system, by contrast, there’s only one patient, and it’s already been dosed with extra greenhouse gases such as carbon dioxide. So scientists like Santer do simulations of how the atmosphere should look both with and without those extra gases. Unlike in 1996, Santer and his co-authors had 20 different simulations to work with for this study, all of them [state-of-the-art models](http://cmip-pcmdi.llnl.gov/cmip5/) developed for the upcoming major report of the [Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change](http://www.ipcc.ch), due out starting in 2014. The extra modeling power was crucial because the climate system is so complex no single model can truly capture it. They’re all approximations at best, so each has some uncertainty built in. But if you compare a number of models against each other and see the same fingerprint in most of them, you can be pretty confident that you’re seeing something real. “After removing all global mean signals,” the authors write, referring to natural changes like volcanic eruptions and changes in the brightness of the sun, “model fingerprints remain identifiable in 70 percent of the tests involving tropospheric temperature changes.” In plain English, that simply means that the warming of the troposphere and cooling of the stratosphere can’t be explained in any other way than by the heat-trapping effects of human-generated greenhouse gases. “It was surprising to me how large the signal was,” Santer said This is only one of the fingerprints scientists expect to see in a human–influenced climate, moreover. “In the past we’ve looked at ocean surface temperatures changes in hurricane-forming regions, patterns in atmospheric pressure; rainfall patterns, and changes in Arctic sea ice,” Santer said. All of these and more can be identified more easily and clearly with the new models “I think these simulations are like a scientific gold mine,” Santer said. “Analysts will be exploiting them for many years to come.”

### AT: Inevitable

**Warming happening now – small window to act**

**Borenstein 12** [“Climate Change Study Ties Recent Heat Waves To Global Warming, Seth”. Huffington Post, 08/04/12]

WASHINGTON — The relentless, weather-gone-crazy type of heat that has blistered the United States and other parts of the world in recent years is so rare that it can't be anything but man-made global warming, says a new statistical analysis from a top government scientist.¶ The research by a man often called the "godfather of global warming" says that the likelihood of such temperatures occurring from the 1950s through the 1980s was rarer than 1 in 300. Now, the odds are closer to 1 in 10, according to the study by NASA scientist James Hansen. He says that statistically what's happening is not random or normal, but pure and simple climate change.¶ "This is not some scientific theory. We are now experiencing scientific fact," Hansen told The Associated Press in an interview.¶ Hansen is a scientist at NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies in New York and a professor at Columbia University. But he is also a strident activist who has called for government action to curb greenhouse gases for years. While his study was published online Saturday in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Science, it is unlikely to sway opinion among the remaining climate change skeptics.¶ However, several climate scientists praised the new work.¶ In a blunt departure from most climate research, Hansen's study – based on statistics, not the more typical climate modeling – blames these three heat waves purely on global warming:¶ \_Last year's devastating Texas-Oklahoma drought.¶ \_The 2010 heat waves in Russia and the Middle East, which led to thousands of deaths.¶ \_The 2003 European heat wave blamed for tens of thousands of deaths, especially among the elderly in France.¶ The analysis was written before the current drought and record-breaking temperatures that have seared much of the United States this year. But Hansen believes this too is another prime example of global warming at its worst.¶ The new research makes the case for the severity of global warming in a different way than most scientific studies and uses simple math instead of relying on complex climate models or an understanding of atmospheric physics. It also doesn't bother with the usual caveats about individual weather events having numerous causes.¶ The increase in the chance of extreme heat, drought and heavy downpours in certain regions is so huge that scientists should stop hemming and hawing, Hansen said. "This is happening often enough, over a big enough area that people can see it happening," he said.¶ Scientists have generally responded that it's impossible to say whether single events are caused by global warming, because of the influence of natural weather variability.¶ However, that position has been shifting in recent months, as other studies too have concluded climate change is happening right before our eyes.¶ Hansen hopes his new study will shift people's thinking about climate change and goad governments into action. He wrote an op-ed piece that appeared online Friday in the Washington Post.¶ "There is still time to act and avoid a worsening climate, but we are wasting precious time," he wrote.¶ The science in Hansen's study is excellent "and reframes the question," said Andrew Weaver, a climate scientist at the University of Victoria in British Columbia who was a member of the Nobel Prize-winning international panel of climate scientists that issued a series of reports on global warming.¶ "Rather than say, `Is this because of climate change?' That's the wrong question. What you can say is, `How likely is this to have occurred with the absence of global warming?' It's so extraordinarily unlikely that it has to be due to global warming," Weaver said.¶ For years scientists have run complex computer models using combinations of various factors to see how likely a weather event would happen without global warming and with it. About 25 different aspects of climate change have been formally attributed to man-made greenhouse gases in dozens of formal studies. But these are generally broad and non-specific, such as more heat waves in some regions and heavy rainfall in others.¶ Another upcoming study by Kevin Trenberth, climate analysis chief at the National Center for Atmospheric Research, links the 2010 Russian heat wave to global warming by looking at the underlying weather that caused the heat wave. He called Hansen's paper an important one that helps communicate the problem.¶ But there is bound to be continued disagreement. Previous studies had been unable to link the two, and one by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration concluded that the Russian drought, which also led to devastating wildfires, was not related to global warming.¶ White House science adviser John Holdren praised the paper's findings in a statement. But he also said it is true that scientists can't blame single events on global warming: "This work, which finds that extremely hot summers are over 10 times more common than they used to be, reinforces many other lines of evidence showing that climate change is occurring and that it is harmful."¶ Skeptical scientist John Christy of the University of Alabama at Huntsville said Hansen shouldn't have compared recent years to the 1950s-1980s time period because he said that was a quiet time for extremes.¶ But Derek Arndt, director of climate monitoring for the federal government's National Climatic Data Center, said that range is a fair one and often used because it is the "golden era" for good statistics.¶ Granger Morgan, head of engineering and public policy at Carnegie Mellon University, called Hansen's study "an important next step in what I expect will be a growing set of statistically-based arguments."¶ In a landmark 1988 study, Hansen predicted that if greenhouse gas emissions continue, which they have, Washington, D.C., would have about nine days each year of 95 degrees or warmer in the decade of the 2010s. So far this year, with about four more weeks of summer, the city has had 23 days with 95 degrees or hotter temperatures.

#### 2 C can still be achieved

ANI, 12/17/12 [“Action by 2020 key to keep global warming below 2 degrees”, <http://zeenews.india.com/news/eco-news/action-by-2020-key-to-keep-global-warming-below-2-degrees_817302.html>]

Washington: Limiting climate change to target levels will become much more difficult to achieve, and more expensive, if action is not taken soon, a new analysis has revealed. The study from IIASA, ETH Zurich, and NCAR explores technological, policy, and social changes that would need to take place in the near term in order to keep global average temperature from rising above 2 degree C, a target supported by more than 190 countries as a global limit to avoid dangerous climate change. This study for the first time comprehensively quantifies the costs and risks of greenhouse gas emissions surpassing critical thresholds by 2020. The findings of the study are particularly important given the failure of the recent climate negotiations in Doha to decide to increase mitigation action before 2020. The researchers revealed that the 2 degree C target could still be reached even if greenhouse gas emissions are not reduced before 2020, but only at very high cost, with higher climate risks, and under exceedingly optimistic assumptions about future technologies. The more emissions are reduced in the near term, the more options will be available in the long run and, by extension, the cheaper it will be to reach international climate targets. “We wanted to know what needs to be done by 2020 in order to be able to keep global warming below two degrees Celsius for the entire twenty-first century,” said Joeri Rogelj, lead author of the paper and researcher at ETH Zurich. The team of researchers analyzed a large array of potential scenarios for limiting global temperature rise to 2 degree C above preindustrial levels, a target set by international climate agreements. Projections based on current national emissions pledges suggest that global carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e) emissions will reach 55 gigatons (billion metric tons, Gt) or more per year in 2020, up from approximately 50 Gt today. At such levels, it would still be possible to reach the 2 degree C target in the long term, though it would be more difficult and expensive than if near-term emissions were lower.

### Methane

#### Plan is key to extract methane hydrates

US Chamber of Commerce 11 (Institute for 21st Century Energy, Chamber of Commerce, no date given (website registered 2011), “Immediately Expand Domestic Oil and Gas Exploration and Production,” <http://www.energyxxi.org/immediately-expand-domestic-oil-and-gas-exploration-and-production)//CC>

Another potential source of significant amounts of domestic natural gas is methane hydrates, an icelike substance containing natural gas, found beneath the ocean floor and in the Arctic permafrost. The United States Geological Survey estimates there are some 317 quadrillion cubic feet of methane gas stored in hydrates in the United States. This represents more than 1,600 times the amount of conventional natural gas reserves estimated in the United States. More R&D is necessary to more accurately locate this resource and economically produce it with **minimal** geologic impact or **release of GHG emissions**. However, the moratorium preventing exploration and production of traditional natural gas on the OCS also acts to thwart work to develop methane hydrates.

#### Methane release outweighs nuclear war

**Ryskin ‘3** Ph.D. Chemical Engineering California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA Engineer-Physicist St. Petersburg Polytechnic Institute, St. Petersburg, Russia Fluid dynamics; statistical physics; geophysics Associate Professor of Chemical and Biological Engineering (Gregory, Department of Chemical Engineering, Northwestern University, “Methane-driven oceanic eruptions and mass extinctions,” Geology, 31(9), September 2003, <http://pangea.stanford.edu/research/Oceans/GES205/methaneGeology.pdf>)

METASTABILITY AND ERUPTION A liquid subject to gravity and completely or partially saturated with dissolved gas is, thermodynamically, in a metastable state. Consider for clarity the case when the concentration of the dissolved gas is only slightly below saturation throughout, and thus increases downward in accordance with Henry’s law. Then locally there is no tendency for the dissolved gas to exsolve (to form bubbles), in spite of the fact that nuclei are abundant in seawater. (Exsolution would lead to a slight increase in free energy: below saturation, the chemical potential of the gas species is lower in solution than in the free gas phase.) At the same time, the free energy of the system as a whole would be greatly reduced if most of the dissolved gas were to somehow escape from solution and collect above the liquid. (This free energy reduction is due to the fast decrease of the chemical potential of gas with a drop in pressure.) Thus, the system is in a metastable state, albeit an unusual one. Strictly speaking, this state is not an equilibrium one even locally: the increase of the solute concentration with depth causes a diffusion flux directed upward, which, given sufficient time, could bring the system into the above state of minimum free energy. However, the continuous supply of methane by the rising bubbles from the seafloor ensures that the concentration profile will remain nonuniform, slowly approaching the saturation one. Even if that supply were to cease, the diffusion time scales are so long that this path toward the global energy minimum can be ignored. A very fast transition from this metastable state can be triggered by disturbances that displace fluid a finite distance in the vertical direction. Such disturbances may result from an earthquake, a seafloor volcano, convection currents due to geothermal heating, or an internal gravity wave. Consider a parcel of fluid that is displaced upward, and is now subject to lower hydrostatic pressure, to which corresponds a lower solubility value. As a result, the fluid in the parcel is now supersaturated with the dissolved gas, which must begin to exsolve, forming tiny gas bubbles. (If the fluid in its original position was only partially saturated, exsolution will begin after the parcel has risen through some significant distance, so in this case the initial disturbance must be sufficiently large.) The volume of the ascending parcel of fluid increases due to the formation of bubbles, making it more buoyant and accelerating its rise; this leads to further reduction in the ambient pressure, further exsolution of gas, and further increase in the volume of the parcel. This self-accelerating motion entrains the surrounding fluid; exsolution of the gas in the latter reinforces the motion. The result is a violent eruption (Kling et al., 1987; Zhang, 1996). From the initial eruption site, hydrodynamic disturbances propagate in all directions (via turbulent entrainment and/or internal gravity waves), triggering eruptions at other sites. Similarly to transitions from other metastable states (e.g., boiling of a superheated liquid), the eruption should spread quickly throughout the region of the ocean where the water column is saturated, or partially saturated, with gas. In spite of the low solubility of methane in seawater, the total possible increase in the buoyancy of the parcel can be large. Consider a parcel that started its rise at 4 km depth, where solubility of methane is ;4.3 3 1023. Then, if the parcel had a volume of 18 cm3 (1 mol of water) and was saturated with methane, it contained 4.3 3 1023 mol of dissolved methane. By the time this parcel has risen to the surface, essentially all the methane in the parcel has exsolved (solubility is ;2 3 1025 at the surface). At the surface conditions (T ø 25 8C, P 5 1 bar), 1 mol of any gas occupies 25 3 103 cm3, so the total volume of methane in the parcel is ;108 cm3, and the volume of the parcel, which now contains a mist of water droplets in gaseous methane, is 126 cm3. That is, the volume of the parcel has increased by a factor of seven. Concurrent exsolution of other dissolved gases (e.g., carbon dioxide CO2, hydrogen sulfide H2S) will add to the effect. A rather similar process is responsible for the most violent, explosive volcanic eruptions(called Plinian), such as eruptions of Mount Vesuvius in A.D. 79 or Mount St. Helens in 1980. These eruptions are driven by exsolution of gases (primarily water vapor) dissolved in the liquid magma. In Lake Nyos (Cameroon), CO2 of magmatic origin enters the water column from the bottom, at a depth of ;200 m. In 1986, the lake erupted, creating a gas-water fountain ;120 m in height (Zhang, 1996), and releasing a lethal cloud of CO2. A water surge washed up the shore to a height of ;25 m. The eruption continued for several hours (Kling et al., 1987). OCEANIC ERUPTION AS A CAUSE OF MASS EXTINCTION The consequences of a methane-driven oceanic eruption for marine and terrestrial life are likely to be catastrophic. Figuratively speaking, the erupting region ‘‘boils over,’’ ejecting a large amount of methane and other gases (e.g., CO2, H2S) into the atmosphere, and flooding large areas of land. Whereas pure methane is lighter than air, methane loaded with water droplets is much heavier, and thus spreads over the land, mixing with air in the process (and losing water as rain). The air-methane mixture is explosive at methane concentrations between 5% and 15%; as such mixtures form in different locations near the ground and are ignited by lightning, explosions 2 and conflagrations destroy most of the terrestrial life, and also produce great amounts of smoke and of carbon dioxide. Firestorms carry smoke and dust into the upper atmosphere, where they may remain for several years (Turco et al., 1991); the resulting darkness and global cooling may provide an additional kill mechanism. Conversely, carbon dioxide and the remaining methane create the greenhouse effect, which may lead to global warming. The outcome of the competition between the cooling and the warming tendencies is difficult to predict (Turco et al., 1991; Pierrehumbert, 2002). Upon release of a significant portion of the dissolved methane, the ocean settles down, and the entire sequence of events (i.e., development of anoxia, accumulation of dissolved methane, the metastable state, eruption) begins anew. No external cause is required to bring about a methane-driven eruption—its mechanism is self-contained, and implies that eruptions are likely to occur repeatedly at the same location. Because methane is isotopically light, its fast release must result in a negative carbon isotope excursion in the geological record. Knowing the magnitude of the excursion, one can estimate the amount of methane that could have produced it. Such calculations (prompted by the methane-hydrate-dissociation model, but equally applicable here) have been performed for several global events in the geological record; the results range from ;1018 to 1019 g of released methane (e.g., Katz et al., 1999; Kennedy et al., 2001; de Wit et al., 2002). These are very large amounts: the total carbon content of today’s terrestrial biomass is ;2 3 1018 g. Nevertheless, relatively small regions of the deep ocean could contain such amounts of dissolved methane; e.g., the Black Sea alone (volume ;0.4 3 1023 of the ocean total; maximum depth only 2.2 km) could hold, at saturation, ;0.5 3 1018 g. A similar region of the deep ocean could contain much more (the amount grows quadratically with depth3). Released in a geological instant (weeks, perhaps), 1018 to 1019 g of methane could destroy the terrestrial life almost entirely. Combustion and explosion of 0.75 3 1019 g of methane would liberate energy equivalent to 108 Mt of TNT,; 10,000 times greater than the world’s stockpile of nuclear weapons, implicated in the nuclear winter scenario (Turco et al., 1991).

### AT: Kills Renewables

#### Wind and solar are competitive despite low gas prices

**Lacey, ’12** (Stephen Lacey, Climate Progress, 21 February 2012, “Top Three Reasons Cheap Natural Gas Won't Kill Renewable Energy," http://www.thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/02/21/421319/top-three-reasons-cheap-natural-gas-wont-kill-renewable-energy/)//CC

The industry clearly took the challenge seriously. Today, due to bigger turbines, more reliable equipment and better materials, the cost of wind has dropped to record lows. In fact, some developers are even signing long-term power purchase agreements in the 3 cents a kilowatt-hour range. And last fall, Bloomberg New Energy Finance projected that wind would be “fully competitive with energy produced from combined-cycle gas turbines by 2016″ under fair wind conditions.¶ The same technological improvements and maturation in project development in wind are driving down the cost of solar PV as well. For example, in California, solar developers have signed contracts for power below the projected price of natural gas from a 500-MW combined cycle power plant. (That projection does include a carbon price).

#### Cheap abundant natural gas is key to a renewables transition

**Doran, 8/13** \*institute fellow and assistant research professor at the Renewable and Sustainable Energy Institute (RASEI), a joint institute of the National Renewable Energy Laboratory and the University of Colorado at Boulder AND \*\*research associate at RASEI (Kevin Doran and Adam Reed, 13 August 2012, “Natural Gas and Its Role In the U.S.’s Energy Endgame,” e360.yale.edu/feature/natural\_gas\_role\_in\_us\_energy\_endgame/2561/)//CC

Third, we should take advantage of cheap gas to **lower** the **integration costs of renewable energy**. We’ve all heard that the wind doesn’t blow and the sun doesn’t shine all the time. The rest of the power grid must be flexible enough to accommodate these energy sources when available. In other words, conventional, controllable generation should be able to **adjust its output to keep the grid balanced** when, for example, wind power output rises or falls. Natural gas is an excellent generation asset for this role. Indeed, it is a model “grid citizen” — **flexible, accommodating, and abundant**. Provided renewable energy maintains a strong presence in the generation portfolio, gas will automatically assume this role due to its low cost and high flexibility.¶ Renewable energy is often criticized as expensive and undependable, and thus undeserving of public support and subsidization. But the presence of abundant natural gas mitigates both of these factors ably. With cheap gas replacing coal, power system costs should decline over time anyway, leaving a chunk of savings that could be applied to renewables investment with relatively low impact on consumer rates. The presence of additional gas-powered, system-balancing resources will further lower these costs, as well as **account for renewable energy’s natural variability**. Moreover, increasing concentrations of renewable energy will actually reduce its overall variability, since the net variability of a collection of many wind farms is lower than the variability of a single wind farm.

### XT: Independently Solves

#### Trends prove the warming link is backwards

Carey, 12/7/12 [Julie M. Carey is an energy economist with Navigant Economics who provides consulting and testifying services, “Surprise Side Effect Of Shale Gas Boom: A Plunge In U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions”, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/energysource/2012/12/07/surprise-side-effect-of-shale-gas-boom-a-plunge-in-u-s-greenhouse-gas-emissions/>]

\*\*Charts omitted\*\*

Environmental activists seem elated that the Obama administration may tackle climate change in its second term. In order to determine where climate change fits into the priority ranking of our nation’s most important agenda items, it seems worthwhile to step back and take stock of the quiet but tremendous progress that the U.S. has already made in reducing carbon emissions, and take a few moments to understand the underlying factors that are bringing about such benefits. In the first quarter of this year, U.S. carbon emissions [hit a 20-year low](http://www.forbes.com/sites/energysource/2012/12/07/surprise-side-effect-of-shale-gas-boom-a-plunge-in-u-s-greenhouse-gas-emissions/www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.cfm?id=7350#tabs_co2emissions-1). As Figure 1 below demonstrates, the U.S. has observed substantial reductions in CO2 emissions over the last five years. These reductions contrast with the increases in CO2 emissions that the Energy Information Administration forecasted in 1998 when the U.S. was considering committing to CO2 emissions reductions in the Kyoto Agreement. At the time of these discussions, the EIA estimated that CO2 emissions would increase at a rate of approximately 1.3 percent annually through 2020. In fact, to reach the Kyoto Agreement target for 2012, the U.S. would have needed to reduce CO2 emissions to 7 percent below 1990 levels—to approximately 4,700 million metric tons. Fast forward to 2012: The U.S. achieved approximately 70% of the CO2 emissions reductions targeted under Kyoto (as compared to the 1998 EIA CO2 forecast). That’s substantial progress. A major factor in CO2 emission reduction is shale gas, which, with the continued displacement/retirement of coal plants, has the potential to provide even more CO2 reduction benefits in the future.Also noteworthy is the fact that the U.S. appears to be within reach of President Obama’s [2009 environmental goal](http://www.nytimes.com/cwire/2009/11/25/25climatewire-obama-announces-2020-emissions-target-dec-9-22088.html) of reducing emissions to 17 percent below 2005 levels by 2020, which equates to 5,000 million metric tons. In 2005, the CO2 emission level was approximately 6,000 million metric tons. Today, the EIA estimates that total U.S. 2012 energy-related CO2 emissions will equal 5,320 million metric tons. One of the primary factors for much of the improvement in the U.S. environmental picture includes the shale gas revolution. The benefits of the shale gas explosion include the newfound abundant supply which will provide more than enough natural gas to meet U.S domestic consumption needs and provide an expectation for relatively low natural gas prices in the future. However, the country’s **increased reliance on natural gas** (and displacement of some coal-fired generation) has already benefited the environment, and will continue to do so in the future. As a result of current low natural gas prices, natural gas-fired power plant operating costs have fallen so much that they are now displacing previously lower cost coal-fired power in the dispatch order of many electricity supply regions. Figure 2 shows that electricity net generation from coal-fired power plants declined by an estimated 25 percent between 2007 and 2012. Over this same period of time, electricity net generation from natural gas-fired power plants [increased by approximately 35 percent](http://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.cfm?id=7350#tabs_co2emissions-1). Much of the uptick in production is a direct result of the sharp decline in the price of natural gas which has been largely triggered by the unprecedented growth in shale gas production. Additionally, the market-driven decline in coal is expected to continue into the future. While Environmental Protection Agency clean air regulations such as the Mercury and Air Toxics Standard (MATS) can explain some of the future expected displacement of coal by natural gas, shale gas economics is a significant reason for the displacement.

#### Gas has brought the US into compliance with Kyoto targets – price advantage key

Shahan, 12 [September, Darrell L. Shahan, of Zanesville, is a columnist for the Times Recorder. “Cheap natural gas might help reduce global warming”, <http://www.zanesvilletimesrecorder.com/article/20120916/OPINION02/209160306/Cheap-natural-gas-might-help-reduce-global-warming>]

According to the Associated Press, U.S. carbon dioxide emissions have dropped to a 20-year low. The switch from coal to natural gas for generating electric power is the principal reason. This might reduce global warming. In the past seven years, the proportion of electric power produced by burning coal, has dropped from about 50 percent to 34 percent. Part of the shift was caused by new environmental regulations. Older coal-burning plants were retired because retrofitting them to meet the new pollution standards was not economically feasible. The main factor was the low price of natural gas. Market forces operated in the absence of government policy that would cap carbon emissions. Because of a plentiful supply of natural gas produced by horizontal drilling and the fracking process, the price of natural gas has dropped from about $8 to $3 per unit, the lowest price in 10 years. This means that natural gas has a huge price advantage in the amount of electricity generated. The bonus is that burning natural gas produces only about half as much air pollution as coal, and unlike coal, there is no bottom ash and fly ash disposal problem. The Kyoto Protocol is a binding agreement that commits 37 developed countries and the European zone to meet specific targets of lower greenhouse gas emissions . It took effect in 2005. Although the U.S. has refused to ratify the agreement, the power companies' unexpectedly rapid shift to natural gas has brought the U.S closer to complying with the GHG reduction targets of the Kyoto Protocol.

#### And, only our evidence accounts for realistic usage

Science Daily, 12 [Replacing Coal With Natural Gas Would Reduce Global Warming, <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2012/07/120716214334.htm>]

July 16, 2012 — A debate has raged in the past couple of years as to whether natural gas is better or worse overall than coal and oil from a global warming perspective. The back-and-forth findings have been due to the timelines taken into consideration, the details of natural gas extraction, and the electricity-generating efficiency of various fuels. An analysis by Cathles, which focuses exclusively on potential warming and ignores secondary considerations, such as economic, political, or other environmental concerns, finds that natural gas is better for electricity generation than coal and oil under all realistic circumstances. To come to this conclusion, the author considered three different future fuel consumption scenarios: (1) a business-as-usual case, which sees energy generation capacity continue at its current pace with its current energy mix until the middle of the century, at which point the implementation of low-carbon energy sources dominates and fossil fuel-derived energy production declines; (2) a gas substitution scenario, where natural gas replaces all coal power production and any new oil-powered facilities, with the same midcentury shift; and (3) a low-carbon scenario, where all electricity generation is immediately and aggressively switched to non-fossil fuel sources such as solar, wind, and nuclear.

#### And, its TRY or DIE for the AFF – prefer pragmatic action to their idealism

Levi, 11/28/12 [“Critics of gas should be realistic” The writer, a senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, is author of ‘The Power Surge’, to be published next year, <http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:hHZx6275b7MJ:www.ft.com/cms/s/0/d1bc8bb0-3887-11e2-bd7d-00144feabdc0.html+&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us#axzz2G1HSh59R>]

The logic is straightforward. The world still generates 46 per cent of its electricity from coal, a figure that is projected to increase slightly over the next 25 years without any changes in government policies. Replacing coal-fired power stations with gas-fired equivalents slashes carbon dioxide emissions roughly by half. If natural gas is abundant and cheap, the market will make this replacement on its own, **reducing climate risks in the process.** This view is popular in the US. But it has received a wary welcome in Europe and among climate activists, for whom dealing with climate change is inseparable from efforts to boost renewable fuels. Alas, those who oppose natural gas on the grounds that all CO2 emissions are intolerable, **are living in a** fantasy **world**. Curbing supplies of natural gas immediately would simply lead to more use of coal and oil because renewable, zero-carbon energy is still relatively expensive. The result would be higher CO2 emissions and greater climate risks.

#### And, prices are the key internal link to solving warming

Rotman, 12 [August, editor of MIT Technology Review, “King Natural Gas”, <http://www.technologyreview.com/review/428900/king-natural-gas/>]

Blue Elephant Burning natural gas, which is mainly methane, produces far less carbon dioxide than burning coal. UCSD’s David ­Victor, for one, estimates that a modern gas-fired power plant emits roughly two-fifths as much carbon as even a new coal plant. According to his calculations, the United States is saving about 400 million metric tons of carbon emissions annually in the recent switch to natural gas from coal. That’s roughly twice as much progress as the European Union has made in complying with the Kyoto Protocol through policy efforts. “There is no single event that has had as large and sustained an impact on carbon emissions as the gas revolution,” he says. But optimism about the environmental benefits should be tempered. For one thing, utilities might return to using more coal as increased demand makes natural gas more expensive. Another concern is that extracting and transporting natural gas itself generates greenhouse gases. Dueling studies have published varied and sometimes contradictory estimates of the total emissions associated with natural-­gas production, but the contributing factors include the energy used in the extraction process and the fact that methane—an extremely potent greenhouse gas—is released during drilling and leaks from pipelines during transport. In fact, there are no reliable measurements of how much energy drilling for shale gas consumes or how much methane actually escapes.

#### Natural gas demand and usage inevitable – trends prove gas is overall positive

Chase, 11/2/12 [Robert W. Chase is chair and professor of Marietta College's Department of Petroleum Engineering, “Positive impact of natural gas on climate change”http://shaleplayohiovalley.com/page/content.detail/id/500368/Positive-impact-of-natural-gas-on-climate-change.html?nav=5044]

It is a remarkable paradox: At a time when the rest of the world is looking toward America for leadership in combating global warming, some refuse to accept the only energy source that can make a real difference now in reducing greenhouse-gas emissions ... natural gas! Natural gas is clean, reliable and very cheap. Its carbon dioxide emissions are significantly less than that of coal which has been used to drive our economy for decades. While natural gas is not the only clean source of energy, its low cost and availability as a fuel for producing electricity is unmatched. Consequently, electric utilities are switching to gas to generate electricity. Since gas produces 60 percent less carbon dioxide emissions than coal, the use of natural gas in the power industry is achieving measurable benefits. According to the Energy Information Administration (EIA), **U.S. energy-related emissions of carbon dioxide are at their lowest levels since 1992.** That's impressive, because the nation's economy, despite a downturn in recent years, is 60 percent larger than it was two decades ago. Yet we're emitting fewer greenhouse gases. Improvements in energy efficiency are part of the reason for lower greenhouse gas emissions. Automobiles on average get more miles per gallon. Mild weather last winter and reduced energy consumption over the past few years also were factors. The principal reason for the reduction, however, has been the revolution in natural gas production due largely to horizontal drilling methods and multi-stage hydraulic fracturing in shale formations. Natural gas is among the greatest gifts ever bestowed on Ohio. Both the Utica and Marcellus shales have rich natural gas deposits as well as oil in some parts of the state. Not only is gas leading to a lower-carbon future, its production has created tens of thousands of jobs throughout the Appalachian region. In Ohio, the economic benefits of drilling are numerous and substantial and, to various degrees, all people benefit. Mineral owners receive substantial lease payments plus long-term royalty payments, while increased revenues go to government at all levels. Other winners are manufacturers of steel piping needed for shale-gas drilling and well completions, and the chemical industry that uses natural gas as a building block for many products including ethylene and fertilizer. Manufacturers are hiring more workers and there is a significant trickle-down effect to the rest of Ohio's economy. Because gas has become cheaper than coal, the trend toward its increased use is expected to continue for the foreseeable future. To be sure, coal is not going to be completely displaced, nor should it be. We need to improve technology so that coal can be burned even cleaner, because coal, like natural gas, is one of America's greatest natural resources. Coal-fired plants are needed to keep the electricity grid stable, and utilities understandably want a hedge against the possibility that gas prices might climb in the years ahead. Natural gas, however, is likely to be the dominant energy source in electricity production for the foreseeable future. EIA projects that the levelized cost of an advanced combined-cycle natural gas plant entering service in 2017 will be $63.10 per megawatt-hour, compared to $97.70 for a conventional coal plant and $110.90 for an advanced coal plant. Wind and solar energy will also be more expensive than natural gas, with new wind generation estimated to cost $96 and solar photovoltaics, $152.70. Already, inexpensive natural gas is putting downward pressure on electricity costs for millions of American homeowners and businesses. At a time when everything else is going up in price, America can look to a cheap and stable resource in our vast reserves of natural gas. **Demand for natural gas is not going away** and neither is hydraulic fracturing. But environmentalists who oppose natural gas production are making it harder for the U.S. economy to wean itself from coal. That is shortsighted, since the natural gas industry is committed to continuous improvement in fracturing operations and waste-water treatment. Fracking is being done safely in the Marcellus and Utica shales and other shale formations elsewhere across the country. Energy producers should be commended, not demonized, for adopting safe and environmentally sensitive drilling and well completion practices. We are blessed to have significant shale deposits in our own backyard. If we want to avoid being held hostage to climate change, we should encourage full production of our shale-gas resources and work with companies to increase our domestic energy supply.

### 2AC PTX

#### Cliff and guns thump the link, polarization means it doesn’t pass

**Gonzalez and Nowicki, 1/4** (Daniel Gonzalez and Dan Nowicki, azcentral, 4 January 2012, “‘Cliff’ fight, gun control pushing immigration reform out of spotlight,” http://www.azcentral.com/news/politics/articles/20130103immigration-reform-at-crossroads.html)//CC

But the already-difficult challenge of passing comprehensive immigration reform this year, as Obama hopes, has been exacerbated by the drawn-out battle over the “fiscal cliff” and emergence of gun control as a major issue following the December shooting of 20 first-graders and six adults at an elementary school in Newtown, Conn. In an interview Sunday on NBC’s “Meet the Press,” Obama reiterated that “fixing our broken immigration system is a top priority.” “We’ve talked about it long enough,” he said. The overwhelming support Obama received from Latino voters in November also prompted many Republicans to call for immigration reform in a bid to rehabilitate their party’s negative image with Latinos. But immigration reform has a long history of being sidetracked by other issues. Health-care reform and fixing the economy knocked immigration reform off the table in 2009 and 2010. Now, spending cuts and gun control are threatening to derail immigration reform again. That’s because the window to pass immigration legislation is short, analysts and immigration-reform advocates say. If nothing happens this year, immigration reform may become too politically radioactive to tackle leading up to the 2014 congressional midterm election and then the 2016 presidential election. Obama has said numerous times since the election that he wants to begin tackling immigration reform this month. In his first term, he failed to deliver on his pledge to pass a sweeping bill that would have included a legalization program for the more than 11 million undocumented immigrants in the U.S., including about 350,000 in Arizona. To win back support from Latino voters leading up to the election, Obama directed Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano to implement broad administrative changes aimed at helping some undocumented immigrants remain in the United States. One of those changes allows undocumented immigrants to remain in the country while they attempt to legalize their status through a spouse who is a U.S. citizen or other immediate relative. The rule change was finalized this week, a year after it was proposed by the Obama administration, and takes effect on March 4. In the past, illegal immigrants had to first leave the country to apply for a waiver to avoid having to wait outside the country for 10 years as punishment for entering illegally. After the change, illegal immigrants will still have to leave the country to apply for a green card, but they will be able to apply for the waiver inside the U.S., greatly reducing the amount of time they will have to spend separated from relatives who are U.S. citizens. A second change, announced on June 15, allows young undocumented immigrants who came to the United States as minors to apply to live and work temporarily in the country without the threat of deportation. So far, more than 367,000 young undocumented immigrants, often referred to as “dreamers,” have applied for the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program. Meanwhile, the clock is ticking on immigration reform. Although Obama says he wants to jump right into immigration reform, he and Congress will have to focus their attention for months on several unresolved issues left over from the New Year’s Day deal to avert the “fiscal cliff,” including a March1 deadline to avoid billions of dollars in across-the-board spending cuts and a late February/early March deadline to raise the debt ceiling. “That is problem Number 1 for immigration reform. That will dominate the agenda for the time being,” said Louis DeSipio, a political-science professor at the University of California-Irvine. Immigration reform also will have to compete with gun-control legislation. After the shooting in Newtown, Obama appointed Vice President Joe Biden to head an anti-violence commission to come up with new gun-control measures by the end of this month. “That is going to put more pressure on Congress,” DeSipio said. Gun control, plus the divisive atmosphere demonstrated by the Republican-controlled House and the Democrat-run Senate during the fiscal-cliff debate, “makes it more and more unlikely that Congress will actually be able to debate a comprehensive immigration-reform bill,” he said.

#### Won’t pass – if it does, turns their impacts

**Groening, 1/4** quoting the head of the Center for Immigration Studies(Chad Groening, NE News Now, 4 January 2012, “IMMIGRATION REFORM A TOP PRIORITY,” http://www.onenewsnow.com/politics-govt/2013/01/04/immigration-reform-a-top-priority)//CC

While the head of an immigration reform think tank says it's unlikely that Congress will pass any meaningful immigration legislation this year, he is concerned that what might get passed will be bad. Now that Congress has averted the so-called "fiscal cliff," Fox News reports that lawmakers will turn their attention to other issues -- like comprehensive immigration reform. President Barack Obama has made it clear that he wants to get an amnesty passed by the newly seated 113th Congress. But considering the current makeup of Congress, Mark Krikorian, executive director of the Center for Immigration Studies (CIS), thinks it will be difficult to pass anything. "There's no question that basic legislative changes in immigration are not going to be happening anytime soon," he contends. "Or frankly, if they do, it would be in a bad way, because the Republicans have a significant faction that actually wants both amnesty and huge increases in future unskilled immigration. So it's not even a guarantee that the Republicans would stop that."

#### Hagel will be nominated as defense secretary – confirmation process will be a huge fight

Chuck Todd (writer for ABC News) January 4, 2013 “Hagel likely to be nominated for Defense Secretary next week” http://firstread.nbcnews.com/\_news/2013/01/04/16353378-hagel-likely-to-be-nominated-for-defense-secretary-next-week?lite

Multiple sources on Capitol Hill and in key special-interest groups involved in national security issues say they have been told to be prepared for a Chuck Hagel nomination for Defense Secretary, either as early as Monday or perhaps more likely Tuesday of next week. Related: Former Sen. Chuck Hagel apologizes for gay comment While it's still possible for the president to have a change of heart, all signs are pointing to a Hagel nomination. That said, a White House spokesperson tells NBC News pretty emphatically that the president has not made a final decision and does not expect the president to make a final decision until he gets back from Hawaii. The White House spokesperson adds, the "chatter" about Hagel-as-the-pick in the national-security and Capitol Hill communities is "premature." That said this spokesperson acknowledged Hagel is a "leading contender." For what it's worth, the reason a lot of outside sources are being given a heads up on Hagel is that the White House knows if Hagel is indeed the president's choice, it's going to be a real fight. There are as many as 10 Democratic senators who could vote no, Capitol Hill sources say. But Hagel has some big backers besides the president who would become the key point people in getting Hagel over the finish line – Vice President Joe Biden and Rhode Island Sen. Jack Reed, both of whom are huge proponents of Hagel. Asked on MSNBC’s Morning Joe about the opposition to Hagel, Obama political adviser David Axelrod defended the former Republican Nebraska senator. “It speaks to the larger problem that we’re talking about, which is, we have to get the point, where, first of all, independence is admired and not discouraged, and we can disagree on some things and still work together on others,” Axelrod said. “And the notion that we demonize people because of a position that they’ve taken and disqualify them on that basis is what’s destroying the ability to get things done in this town.” Bottom line: It appears to be Hagel, but the White House says no final decision has been made.

#### Sandy Aid will pass now, top of the agenda, and the White House is pushing it – it will be a fight

Kerry Young (Staff Writer at Roll Call) January 3, 2013 “http://www.rollcall.com/news/houses\_sandy\_aid\_bill\_is\_only\_the\_first\_chapter-220545-1.html?pos=htmbtxt

But the measure expected to win passage on Friday, more than two months after the storm, is only a first installment of the more than $60 billion the White House has requested. Getting the rest of the money through the House and Senate — probably in two more pieces on the House side — will take weeks and could prove difficult. The $60.4 billion aid package the Senate passed in December died in the House on Thursday when the 112th Congress ended and the 113th was sworn in. After an uproar that saw Speaker John A. Boehner, R-Ohio, harshly criticized by New York and New Jersey Republicans, leadership placed Sandy relief at the top of the legislative agenda for the new Congress. The House is set to pass a measure Friday to provide $9.7 billion in additional borrowing authority for the National Flood Insurance Program and avert a delay in payment on about 115,000 claims. The Federal Emergency Management Agency said Wednesday that without additional borrowing, the flood insurance program will run out of money for claims next week. The bill will be considered in the House under expedited procedures normally reserved for noncontroversial measures. A Democratic leadership aide said the Senate will attempt to clear that measure by unanimous consent on Friday, following House passage.

#### Obama circumventing congress on immigration now – pushing through every XO he can – causing huge backlash now

David Nakamura and Tara Bahrampour (writers for the Washington Post) January 3, 2013 “White House pushes forward on immigration ahead of bigger reform fight” <http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/white-house-seems-poised-to-retool-deportation-laws/2013/01/03/7cb52930-55db-11e2-8b9e-dd8773594efc_story.html>

The Obama administration’s decision this week to ease visa requirements for hundreds of thousands of illegal immigrants represents its latest move to reshape immigration through executive action, even as the White House gears up for an uncertain political fight over a far-more-sweeping legislative package in the months ahead. Immigration advocates on Thursday hailed a rule change at the Department of Homeland Security that would make it easier for many undocumented immigrants to stay in the United States as they seek permanent residency, saying it will improve the lives of relatives who could have been separated for years without the changes. For President Obama — who has called the inability to achieve comprehensive immigration reform among the biggest regrets of his first term — the new policy is among a series of steps his administration has taken over the past year aimed in part at easing the pace of deportations, which have surged during his tenure. Many of the steps came amid a presidential campaign that included sharp disagreements over immigration policy and strong support among Latinos and Asians for Obama. The centerpiece was Obama’s decision, announced last June, to stop deporting people who were brought to the country as children and have gone on to be productive and otherwise law-abiding residents. “He is checking off every administrative box he can of what he can do with executive authority that comports with his overall view of immigration policy,” said Angela Kelley, an analyst at the Center for American Progress, a liberal think tank allied with the White House. The latest policy change is focused on illegal immigrants who have a spouse, parent or child with U.S. citizenship. Currently, in order to become legal they must leave the United States and apply for a waiver forgiving their unlawful presence in the country. Only then can they apply for an immigrant visa. And if they don’t get a waiver, they are barred from returning to the United States for up to 10 years, depending on the case. The specter of being barred deterred many from applying. But under the rule change finalized Wednesday, those who qualify will be able to apply for waivers from within the United States starting March 4. Applicants must return to their native country for a brief period for the consular immigrant visa process. The new rule greatly reduces the risk inherent in applying for a waiver, as people whose applications are rejected would still be in the United States when they heard the news. Even for those whose applications are approved, the new rule will allow them to spend much less time outside the United States, as they will travel abroad with waivers in hand. Michelle Escobar, 38, a U.S. citizen who lives in Laurel, said her husband, German, 33, plans to apply for a waiver under the new rule. Until now, she said, he had been afraid to go to his native El Salvador to apply. “He would be barred for 10 years, probably,” said Escobar, a state investigator. “That’s why we’ve been so scared to put in for it.” But champions § Marked 10:06 § of stricter immigration controls denounced the administration’s action, saying that such rule changes reward lawbreakers and allow them to cut the line in front of people who have abided by legal procedures. “It’s definitely using executive authority or privileges to make an end run around the law the way it’s written,” said Jessica Vaughan of the Washington-based Center for Immigration Studies. “The law was intended to make it difficult for people who were living here illegally. This is a way for the administration to change a law that they don’t like . . . without having to go through Congress, where they probably couldn’t get it changed.”

#### Link turn and non-unique – recent vote counts prove

Natural Resources Committee (Congressional Committee – Headed by Chairman Doc Hastings) June 21, 2012 “House Passes Bipartisan Bill to Boost American Energy Production and Job Creation” http://naturalresources.house.gov/News/DocumentSingle.aspx?DocumentID=300321

Today, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 4480, the Domestic Energy and Jobs Act, with a bipartisan vote of 248-163. This bipartisan package of bills will expand American energy production on federal lands and create new American jobs by streamlining government red-tape and regulations. It will also set long term production goals to establish a real all-of-the-above American energy plan.

#### Link turn – oil lobbies control Congress, the White House, and agencies – they support the OCS

**Broder and Krauss, 5/23** political and business correspondents covering energy (John M. Broder and Clifford Krauss, The New York Times, 23 May 2012, “New and Frozen Frontier Awaits Offshore Drilling,” http://www.nytimes.com/2012/05/24/science/earth/shell-arctic-ocean-drilling-stands-to-open-new-oil-frontier.html?pagewanted=1&\_r=1&hp)//CC

Mr. Obama took office under the watchful gaze of environmentalists who had supported him and an oil industry that feared he would rescind its subsidies and push climate change legislation. ExxonMobil and other major oil companies spent millions of dollars to ensure that such legislation never passed. Shell took a different tack. Even before Mr. Obama’s election, the company joined the United States Climate Action Partnership, a coalition of businesses and environmental groups advocating a response to global warming. It was a canny move, calculated to gain access to top policy makers, including the president. “It helped people look at us differently and helped open doors,” Mr. Odum said. “I do not think there is any doubt about that.” Shell employs three dozen lobbyists, according to government disclosure records. It spent $4.5 million on lobbying in 2008, the last year of the Bush administration. Lobbying costs leapt to $10.2 million in 2009, $10.4 million in 2010 and $14.8 million last year. In the Obama administration’s first two and a half years, Mr. Odum visited the White House at least six times, according to federal records. In 2010 and 2011, Sara B. Glenn, a top Shell lobbyist, was cleared into the executive complex 13 times, to meet with Ms. Zichal and others. The intensity of Shell’s campaign was matched by the fervor of Mark Begich, the new senator from Alaska. He had won his seat in something of a fluke, defeating the longtime Republican incumbent, Ted Stevens, who was ensnared in what later turned out to be a deeply flawed Justice Department corruption investigation. No politician in Alaska can survive as an opponent of any oil development, including those in the waters of the Arctic, the National Petroleum Reserve and the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Mr. Begich enthusiastically supported all three. When he first met Mr. Obama at a mayors’ conference in June 2008, Mr. Begich said, he told him, “If I’m elected, this is what I’m going to focus on.” Being a crucial Democratic vote in a narrowly divided Senate representing a decidedly Republican state gave Mr. Begich leverage. Whenever the president called to court his support — on health care, climate change, the debt ceiling or budget matters — Mr. Begich always turned the discussion to oil and gas in Alaska, particularly Arctic exploration. “Any time he initiated a call, I felt that was carte blanche to make my case,” Mr. Begich said. A chronology of his contact with the Obama administration on Arctic oil issues fills six pages. He came to believe that his re-election hinged on delivering a reluctant president on oil issues, particularly drilling on the Outer Continental Shelf in the Arctic. A Begich aide said that the unstated premise of every conversation with the president was, “You need me, and I need the O.C.S.” The senator said he remained unsure of Mr. Obama’s intentions until the spring of 2011, when the president called to discuss budget negotiations with Republicans, and Mr. Begich again pressed him on oil. “He said, ‘I’m with you 60 or 70 percent,’ ” Mr. Begich said. “What that meant to me was he was going to approve everything except A.N.W.R.,” the Arctic wildlife refuge. He was right. Shell also kept up a steady flow of visits, letters and calls to the agencies that could grant or deny the myriad permits it needed in the Arctic. Over time, Shell’s proposal had expanded to include a total of as many as 10 test wells in the Beaufort and Chukchi Seas over two years. A company lobbyist said that the most resistance came from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, which had the singular mission of protecting whales and other sea mammals.

**The disad doesn’t provide an opportunity cost to the plan – it’s reciprocal with advantage CPs, we’ll only make one, and it’s limited to logic.**

#### Normal means is Obama taking deliberate measures to avoid spending political capital – court nomination decisions prove

Mark Russell (writer for Newser) August 18, 2012 “Obama Way Behind Bush, Clinton on Picking Judges” <http://www.newser.com/story/152360/obama-lets-judicial-picks-slide-in-first-term.html>

In a deliberate strategy designed to save political capital, President Obama has nominated dozens fewer federal judges than either George W. Bush or Bill Clinton did in their first terms, potentially greatly reducing his long-term judicial impact on the United States, reports the New York Times. So far, Obama has appointed 125 federal district court judges, compared to Clinton's 170 and Bush's 162 at similar points in their first terms. In addition, Obama's picks have been on average four years older than Bush's and more moderate, further reducing his impact. "The White House in that first year did not want to nominate candidates who would generate rancorous disputes over social issues that would further polarize the Senate," says Gregory B. Craig, Obama’s first White House counsel. Nevertheless, Republicans often used Senate procedures to significantly delay even uncontroversial nominees. Defenders point out that Obama has nominated two Supreme Court justices already, the same number Clinton and Bush did over their two terms in office, and Obama's 30 appeals court judges is about the same as his predecessors.

#### And, it’s not legislation, just repealing an executive moratorium

**The round is Congress – fiat assumes passage vote, means link has already been triggered.**

#### Plan is spun as increasing competitiveness – ensures broad support

Curry L. Hagerty (Specialist in Energy and Natural Resources Policy at the Congressional Research Service) June 15, 2010 “Outer Continental Shelf Moratoria on Oil and Gas Development” http://crs.ncseonline.org/nle/crsreports/10Jul/R41132.pdf

Global economic factors play a major role in deliberations about OCS drilling activity. At the end of FY2008, annual moratoria expired amid global economic turmoil and calls for greater stability in the national economy.11 Congress consistently finds that domestic oil and gas development is vital to the nation, despite disagreements over the economic feasibility of specific oil and gas development projects.12 Development advocates raise competitiveness arguments, specifically claiming that other coastal countries are allowing greater access to offshore resources and that the United States should not fall behind in the international race to develop offshore resources because of concerns about the marine environment. Those in favor of OCS drilling observe that on a global scale, the use of drilling restrictions is changing, and that continuing an annual congressional moratorium, for example, would be out of step with policies being considered by other countries engaged in OCS development.13 Concerns about competitiveness influence congressional consideration of OCS development policy in legislative proposals and consideration of international treaties and conventions addressing OCS governance.

**Fiat solves – Either fiat is immediate and the plan passes without debate, plan goes under the bill at the top of the docket and passes after it’s debate, or the bill’s not the top of the docket and the disad’s non-unique**

**Politics are compartmentalized – political capital is irrelevant**

**Dickinson 9** – professor of political science at Middlebury College and taught previously at Harvard University where he worked under the supervision of presidential scholar Richard Neustadt (5/26/09, Matthew, Presidential Power: A NonPartisan Analysis of Presidential Politics, “Sotomayor, Obama and Presidential Power,” http://blogs.middlebury.edu/presidentialpower/2009/05/26/sotamayor-obama-and-presidential-power/, JMP

What is of more interest to me, however, is what her selection reveals about the basis of presidential power. Political scientists, like baseball writers evaluating hitters, have devised numerous means of measuring a president’s influence in Congress. I will devote a separate post to discussing these, but in brief, they often center on the creation of legislative “box scores” designed to measure how many times a president’s preferred piece of legislation, or nominee to the executive branch or the courts, is approved by Congress. That is, how many pieces of legislation that the president supports actually pass Congress? How often do members of Congress vote with the president’s preferences? How often is a president’s policy position supported by roll call outcomes? These measures, however, are a misleading gauge of presidential power – they are a better indicator of congressional power. This is because how members of Congress vote on a nominee or legislative item is rarely influenced by anything a president does. Although journalists (and political scientists) often focus on the legislative “endgame” to gauge presidential influence – will the President swing enough votes to get his preferred legislation enacted? – this mistakes an outcome with actual evidence of presidential influence. Once we control for other factors – a member of Congress’ ideological and partisan leanings, the political leanings of her constituency, whether she’s up for reelection or not – we can usually predict how she will vote without needing to know much of anything about what the president wants. (I am ignoring the importance of a president’s veto power for the moment.) Despite the much publicized and celebrated instances of presidential arm-twisting during the legislative endgame, then, most legislative outcomes don’t depend on presidential lobbying. But this is not to say that presidents lack influence. Instead, the primary means by which presidents influence what Congress does is through their ability to determine the alternatives from which Congress must choose. That is, presidential power is largely an exercise in agenda-setting – not arm-twisting. And we see this in the Sotomayer nomination. Barring a major scandal, she will almost certainly be confirmed to the Supreme Court whether Obama spends the confirmation hearings calling every Senator or instead spends the next few weeks ignoring the Senate debate in order to play Halo III on his Xbox. That is, how senators decide to vote on Sotomayor will have almost nothing to do with Obama’s lobbying from here on in (or lack thereof). His real influence has already occurred, in the decision to present Sotomayor as his nominee. If we want to measure Obama’s “power”, then, we need to know what his real preference was and why he chose Sotomayor. My guess – and it is only a guess – is that after conferring with leading Democrats and Republicans, he recognized the overriding practical political advantages accruing from choosing an Hispanic woman, with left-leaning credentials. We cannot know if this would have been his ideal choice based on judicial philosophy alone, but presidents are never free to act on their ideal preferences. Politics is the art of the possible. Whether Sotomayer is his first choice or not, however, her nomination is a reminder that the power of the presidency often resides in the president’s ability to dictate the alternatives from which Congress (or in this case the Senate) must choose. Although Republicans will undoubtedly attack Sotomayor for her judicial “activism” (citing in particular her decisions regarding promotion and affirmative action), her comments regarding the importance of gender and ethnicity in influencing her decisions, and her views regarding whether appellate courts “make” policy, they run the risk of alienating Hispanic voters – an increasingly influential voting bloc (to the extent that one can view Hispanics as a voting bloc!) I find it very hard to believe she will not be easily confirmed. In structuring the alternative before the Senate in this manner, then, Obama reveals an important aspect of presidential power that cannot be measured through legislative boxscores.

#### PC not key

**Klein, 3/19/12** [The Unpersuaded Who listens to a President? by Ezra Klein March 19, 2012, Ezra Klein is the editor of Wonkblog and a columnist at the Washington Post, as well as a contributor to MSNBC and Bloomberghttp://www.newyorker.com/reporting/2012/03/19/120319fa\_fact\_klein#ixzz1p36PrMbH]

This, Edwards says, is the reality facing modern Presidents, and one they would do well to accommodate. “In a rational world, strategies for governing should match the opportunities to be exploited,” he writes. “Barack Obama is only **the latest** in a **long line** of presidents who have not been able to transform the political landscape **through** their efforts at **persuasion**. When he succeeded in achieving major change, it was by mobilizing those ***predisposed* to support** him and driving legislation through Congress on a party-line vote.”

That’s easier said than done. We don’t have a system of government set up for Presidents to drive legislation through Congress. Rather, we have a system that was designed to encourage division between the branches but to resist the formation of political parties. The parties formed anyway, and they now use the branches to compete with one another. Add in minority protections like the filibuster, and you have a system in which the job of the President is to persuade an opposition party that has both the incentive and the power to resist him.

Jim Cooper says, “We’ve effectively lost our Congress and gained a parliament.” He adds, “At least a Prime Minister is empowered to get things done,” but “we have the extreme polarization of a parliament, with party-line voting, without the empowered Prime Minister.” And you can’t solve that with a speech.

#### CIR fails – doesn’t address the green card problem

**Morrison 12-9** - Bruce Morrison, a former U.S. Representative from Connecticut, was the chairman of the House immigration subcommittee and the author of the Immigration Act of 1990. (One Bill of Compromises Isn’t the Answer, NYT, http://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2012/12/09/understanding-immigration-reform/one-immigration-bill-of-compromises-isnt-the-answer)

To many, “comprehensive immigration reform” means “fix it and forget it.” But doing it all in one bill reprises what got us in the current mess in the first place. After major reform bills in 1986 and 1990, the failing employment verification scheme and the clogged green card process were allowed to go unattended. The “enforcement only” 1996 law only froze the mess in place.

A huge compromise of all competing immigration fixes larded into one bill will involve compromises that do not serve the nation’s interests. Instead we need to assemble the votes to do the two things that must be done — a broad earned legalization program for the 11 million now illegally resident in the country in conjunction with the assurance that this problem will not happen again. That assurance will come from a universal, electronic, identity-authenticating screening of all workers to ensure that they are authorized to work in the U.S.