### 2AC T – Restriction

#### We meet – the moratorium is a restriction on the production of natural gas – this is contextual evidence

**Bernstein, ‘6** Dr. Bernstein is a Visiting Professor of Philosophy at Marist College; he also teaches at SUNY Purchase (which selected him Outstanding Teacher for 2004) and formerly at Pace University, and Marymount College (which selected him Outstanding Teacher for 1995). Dr. Bernstein lectures regularly at American universities and appears frequently on the radio talk shows. His op-eds have been published in such newspapers as The San Francisco Chronicle, The Chicago Tribune, The Baltimore Sun, The Atlanta Journal-Constitution, The Washington Times, The Los Angeles Daily News, and The Houston Chronicle. (Andrew Bernstein, The Arlington Times, 2 June 2006, “Bush and Congress Should Life Environmental Restrictions on Energy Production,” Print)//CC

In addition to the moratorium on offshore drilling, the federal government repeatedly refuses to permit oil drilling in Alaska's National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR). Geologists claim that ANWR holds seven billion barrels of oil, enabling it to add significantly to American energy production. Further, in large measure due to environmental restrictions, America has not built a new oil refinery for more than 25 years, meaning a diminished ability to refine crude oil into gasoline, diesel, jet fuel, heating oil, and other petroleum products. Our refineries run at capacity constantly, making repairs difficult, leaving them more susceptible to breakdowns and fires, and--with most centered in the Gulf of Mexico--leaving the country's supply of refined oil vulnerable to such natural disasters as Katrina. Additionally, regulations have made building new nuclear power plants economically uninviting--despite the fact that nuclear plants, operated in free countries, where top minds are liberated to create advanced technology, have proven their reliability and safety. In France, for example, nuclear power provides roughly two-thirds of the nation's electricity. American nuclear plants have had, and continue to show, a superb safety record--and this includes Three Mile Island, whose 1979 partial meltdown led to no deaths or injuries. Finally, environmental restrictions also limit production of natural gas, which currently supplies 25 percent of the energy Americans consume, a figure that will rise in the future. Huge natural gas reserves in places such as the Rocky Mountain basins, Alaska, and the Outer Continental Shelf are either "off limits" or have their development severely restricted. These unnecessary restrictions endure despite the fact that the wholesale price of natural gas has quadrupled since the 1990s. As an example of the hurdles placed in front of natural gas companies, producers in Wyoming's Powder River Basin, which holds 39 trillion cubic feet of gas, several years ago saw the federal government suspend the issuing of drilling permits pending the outcome of a second "environmental impact" study. Is this kind of treatment going to encourage more companies to get into the energy business?

#### CI – A restriction is a limitation

**American Heritage Dictionary, ‘9** (The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Houghton Mifflin, Updated 2009, Print)//CC

1. a. The act of restricting. b. The state of being restricted. 2. Something that restricts; a regulation or limitation.

#### We meet – Land access limits production of natural gas – contextual evidence

**NaturalGas.org, no date** (NaturalGas.org, no date given [website registered 2004], “Natural Gas Supply,” http://www.naturalgas.org/business/analysis.asp)//CC

In addition to the short term impediments to increasing natural gas supply, there exist other more general barriers to the increased supply of natural gas in the United States. These include: Land Access - The U.S. government owns more than 29 percent of all the land in the country, and an estimated 40 percent of undiscovered natural gas exists on this land. In several areas, the government has restricted access to federal lands. 59 percent of undiscovered gas resources are on federal lands and offshore waters. Outside of the western Gulf of Mexico, production companies are prohibited access to virtually all federal lands offshore the Lower 48 states. About 9 percent of resource-bearing land in the Rockies is also off limits, and access to another 32 percent is significantly restricted. The National Petroleum Council in 1999 estimated that 213 Tcf of natural gas exists in areas under federal access restrictions. This restriction is the result of presidential and congressional leasing moratoria, and affects the amount of natural gas resources that may be extracted to increase supply.

#### This is contextual evidence – the new plan is a restriction on the production of natural gas

**Toplansky, 7/19** (Eileen F. Toplansky, American Thinker, 19 July 2012, “Obama Continues to Despise American Energy,” http://www.americanthinker.com/2012/07/obama\_continues\_to\_despise\_american\_energy.html)//CC

The recent Supreme Court decision on ObamaCare gave sufficient cover to the administration to release a five-year plan for offshore drilling which will continue to depress the economy and eliminate energy independence in this country. This new plan "resinstitutes a 30-year moratorium on offshore energy exploration" in the United States. Thus, the 44th president has now denied "access to nearly 98% of America's vast energy potential on the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS)." Thomas J. Pyle, president of the Institute for Energy Research explains that the "Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act or OCSLA of 1953 provided the interior secretary with the authority to administer mineral exploration and development off our nation's coastlines." In effect, this Act allows the interior secretary to "provide oil and gas leases to the highest-qualified bidder while establishing guidelines for implementing an oil and gas exploration-and-development program for the Outer Continental Shelf." In 1978, the Act was amended to require a series of five-year plans that would provide a schedule for the sale of oil and gas leases in order to better meet America's national energy needs. Since 2008, President Obama and former U.S. Sen. Kenneth L. Salazar of Colorado, the current interior secretary, have restricted access to American offshore oil and gas resources. These restrictions include: Canceling lease sales Delaying lease sales Creating an uncertainty about offshore development that has caused job-creators to look for other countries' waters to transport their offshore rigs Restricting Alaska's development of its 24 billion barrels of oil reserves Prohibiting Virginians from unlocking their offshore resources of 130 million barrels of offshore oil and 1.14 trillion cubic feet of natural gas

### 2AC Helium

#### US natural gas production is key global helium production

EIA (Energy Information Administration, the official energy statistics agency of U.S. Government) 2006 “Natural Gas Processing: The Crucial Link Between Natural Gas Production and Its Transportation to Market” http://www.eia.gov/pub/oil\_gas/natural\_gas/feature\_articles/2006/ngprocess/ngprocess.pdf

The world’s supply of helium comes exclusively from natural gas production. The single largest source of helium is the United States, which produces about 80 percent of the annual world production of 3.0 billion cubic feet (Bcf). In 2003, U.S. production of helium was 2.4 Bcf, about two-thirds of which came from the Hugoton Basin in north Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas (Figure 2). The rest mostly comes from the LaBarge field located in the Green River Basin in western Wyoming, with small amounts also produced in Utah and Colorado. According to the National Research Council, the consumption of helium in the United States doubled between 1985 and 1996, although its use has leveled off in recent years. It is used in such applications as magnetic resonance imaging, semiconductor processing, and in the pressurizing and purging of rocket engines by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Twenty-two natural gas treatment plants in the United States currently produce helium as a major byproduct of natural gas processing. Twenty of these plants, located in the Hugoton-Panhandle Basin, produce marketable helium which is sold in the open market when profitable, while transporting the remaining unrefined helium to the Federal Helium Reserve (FHR). The FHR was created in the 1950s in the Bush salt dome, underlying the Cliffside field, located near Amarillo, Texas. Sales of unrefined helium in the United States for the most part, come from the FHR.

#### This collapses US particle acceleration efforts

CN 12 – Citation News, “Scientists' High-Pitched Response to Helium Shortage”, 3-22, http://www.cyberregs.com/webapps/Blog/post/Scientists-High-Pitched-Response-to-Helium-Shortage.aspx

Helium - the second lightest element in the universe with an atomic weight of 4.002602 - is an inert gas that can be cooled to temperatures of -270 Celsius without becoming a solid, making it indispensible in the operation of, among many things, superconducting magnets used in MRI scanners, telescopes and particle accelerators like the Large Hadron Collider. Helium also holds an important place in the defense industry. It also has some far less profound applications, which consume great quantities of the gas annually - applications such as party balloons and squeak-voice huffing. These latter applications have drawn the ire of researchers. This month, the Guardian reported that the UK's Rutherford Appleton Laboratory wasted three days and £90,000 (US$ 143,091), when, during an important experiment exploring the structure of matter, they could not obtain a supply of helium. Needless to say, the scientists were in a less-than-celebratory mood. "We put the stuff into party balloons and let them float off into the upper atmosphere, or we use it to make our voices go squeaky for a laugh. It is very, very stupid. It makes me really angry,” said Oleg Kiricheck, the research team leader. Cornell University Professor Robert Richardson is also concerned. He believes that, with our current reserves of helium, the price of the element severely discounts its real value. By his estimation, the price of a single party balloon should cost as much as $100. Richardson suggests increasing the price of helium by 20-50% to eliminate excessive waste. Although helium ranks next to hydrogen as the most abundant element in the universe, here on earth it is a finite commodity. The helium that is here is all we have! Helium is collected during natural gas and oil drilling. If the gas is not captured, it dissipates into earth's upper atmosphere and is lost forever. The same happens when a party balloon is released into the air, or when it self-deflates, because helium atoms are so small that they can easily move through the balloon's latex shell. Party balloons do not represent the only wasteful expenditures of helium. Macy's Thanksgiving Day parade typically uses 400 Mcf a year, although there have been recent attempts to recycle some of the helium used in the floats. NASA uses up to 75 MMcf annually to pressurize rocket tanks. The agency has made no attempt to recycle this huge amount of gas. Weather balloons also consume about 140 MMcf of helium per year. At the present rate of supply depletion, the United States will become an importer of helium from the Middle East and Russia within 10 years, and the world will run out of helium within 30 years. This would have major implications for space travel and exploration, scientific and nuclear research, medical advances and early detection of diseases. Possible solutions for this problem should address supply, not pricing. A drastic increase in the price of helium as a preservative measure would cause a huge spike in billing for medical procedures, such as MRIs, scientific research, and defense expenditures, as well as party balloons.

#### Accelerators stop nuclear testing

* Monitoring arms control
* Maintaining stockpile stewardship

Henning 10 (Walter, Senior Physicist – Argonne National Laboratory and Member – American Association for the Advancement of Science, “Accelerators for America’s Future”, June, <http://www.acceleratorsamerica.org/files/Rep> ort.pdf)

From the earliest days of their development, accelerators have made critical contributions to the security and defense of the United States. During World War II, accelerators contributed directly to the separation of isotopes using industrial- scale accelerator mass spectrometry and provided facilities for defense-related nuclear physics research. The plutonium war effort relied heavily on Ernest Lawrence’s 60-inch cyclotron at Berkeley. In turn, war-related research, most notably radar, found peacetime applications in technologies for accelerators. Post World War II government support of accelerator research led to the global preeminence of U.S. acceleratorresearch facilities and technological expertise. Universities and national laboratories, including defense laboratories, developed increasingly powerful and sophisticated accelerators for basic and applied sciences. As early as 1949, the potential uses of accelerators for national security included the predetonation of critical nuclear devices, the deployment of antipersonnel weapons, the detection of contraband fissile materials, the identification of aircraft and the enrichment of nuclear materials. Lawrence and the Berkeley group developed prototype accelerators including a high-intensity linear accelerator, the Materials Testing Accelerator. The current U.S. accelerator-facility infrastructure at the national laboratories is the direct legacy of the Atomic Energy Commission’s postwar program. The Department of Energy defense laboratories, Livermore, Los Alamos and Sandia, have also pursued security-related accelerator technology. Induction linac technology, originally developed for acceleratorinduced fusion, finds application in radiography, of direct importance to the nuclear weapons program. The Los Alamos Neutron Science Center, or LANSCE, provides important nuclear data. Both Livermore and Sandia pursued electronbeam- based technology for directed-energy weapons. The 458 Accelerators for America’s Future Particle beams can scan shipping containers for contraband materials. Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, or DARPA, supported the exploration of the potential of accelerators for direct military applications at the Advanced Test Accelerator and the RADLAC I, the Radial Line Accelerator. The Los Alamos-based Beam Experiments Aboard a Rocket, or BEAR, deployed the then-new radio-frequency-quadrupole, or RFQ, based LINAC. This experiment succeeded in producing a neutral particle beam in flight and generated data on these technologies for the Department of Defense Strategic Defense Initiative Organization, SDIO. Argonne National Laboratory pursued neutral-particle-beam research with the Continuous Wave Deuterium Demonstrator. The SDIO activities were noteworthy for joint laboratory and industry cooperation. Early applications of accelerators to inspect nuclear fuels used commercial low-energy (tens of MeV) electron linacs to induce photo-fission reactions. These inspection technologies expanded to waste-drum assays in the 1980s and eventually to cargo inspections. The invention of the free electron laser in the 1970s led to ever-higher-power electromagnetic radiation using high-energy electrons, of direct interest to security and defense applications, including the Navy’s proposed application of free-electron laser technology to shipboard defense. Nearly all accelerator applications for security and defense have sprung from research and development in fundamental science. The promise of future accelerator technologies continues to rest on advances in basic science and its need for more and more powerful tools. These accelerator advances stock the shelves with technologies and data. The scientific and technical workforce engaged in these developments contributes to their application to security programs. Continued support for basic science and for accelerator R&D as a scientific discipline has great significance for national security and defense. Accelerator technologies find applications for a diverse and growing set of security and defense needs, including stockpile stewardship, war-fighter and asset protection, materials characterization, interrogation of cargo and inspection capabilities of all types, and the support of present and future nonproliferation regimes. Accelerator laboratories and technologies have the potential to make significant contributions to the needs of national security and defense in ten key areas: physical data; high-energy-density conditions; directed-energy capability; cargo inspection and interrogation; replacement of radioactive sources and materials; isotope production; nuclear forensics; compact, fieldable accelerator systems; simulation tools; and workforce training. Physical data National security and defense programs have a critical need for the highestquality data on materials characterization, material alteration, nuclear fission, and the interaction of radiation with materials. These requirements rely on all the types of accelerator facilities operated by the DOE Office of Science: neutron sources, synchrotron radiation light sources, and low- and high-energy particle beams. The data are necessary to reliably simulate systems for detecting special nuclear materials and byproducts of nuclear fission. Much of the current data is incomplete and much of it dates from the 1950s and 1960s. Missing data include time, angular, and neutron-gamma correlations; high-resolution spectroscopy; and nuclear resonance fluorescence. Existing accelerator facilities could perform this work, but often encounter impediments to conducting measurements with special nuclear materials. The facilities may lack licenses to hold such materials or may be unprepared for the associated health and safety requirements. Obtaining these data will require particle- and nuclear-physics-style detectors with near full solid-angle coverage, particle identification, and fast timing. A significant challenge is the development of detectors that operate in ambient conditions. For example, many current detectors must operate at extremely low (tens of degrees Kelvin) temperatures. Developing materials that can operate in ambient conditions while accurately recording events is a great challenge for security and defense field operations. A further challenge is to develop dedicated accelerator-based beamlines, for example a beamline at a synchrotron light source, for security and defense needs. Currently, the nation has no dedicated beamline for studies of exotic materials including radiological, biological, chemical and explosive ones. Accelerator-based science has much to contribute to better production of such materials, characterization of their reactions, decontamination and safer handling. High energy density Facilities that provide conditions of high energy density, such as those found in plasmas, provide an important, controlled environment for understanding phenomena important to aspects of the security mission. Many such pulsedpower based facilities have operated outside the DOE Office of Science mission. However, accelerator research for inertial confinement fusion concepts could advance such high-energy-density environments and serve high-energy-density research for security and defense. Directed energy Accelerator-based directed-energy capabilities have been pursued from the earliest times of accelerator development. Research into beam-power levels high enough for directed energy has supported the development of several technologies, most notably radio-frequency-quadrupole structures, or RFQs, now ubiquitous in the accelerator world. The current need is for development of a fieldable device for testing with defense and security partners. Relativistic electron beams can generate high-power electromagnetic radiation at various frequencies for directed-energy-specific missions. Examples include free electron lasers, highly directional gamma-ray beams through Compton scattering, and millimeter-wave to terahertz radiation. Free electron lasers can in principle achieve megawatt average power levels and optical beam quality and wavelengths required for security and defense purposes. In the mid-1990s, the highest average-power FEL had achieved only 11 watts. The Navy, as a user of the FEL at DOE’s Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility achieved 2.2 kW, and a subsequent upgrade in 2006 demonstrated 14kW at 1.6microns, a wavelength of particular interest to the Navy. Free electron laser-based directed energy can expand to a wide range of missions. With increased efficiency and decreased weight, for example, FELs might serve as airborne platforms. With appropriate R&D, such goals appear achievable. Most such improvements would feed back to the basic science programs, potentially leading to lower-cost FEL systems and associated energyrecovery- linac light sources. A megawatt-class FEL will require several critical accelerator R&D developments. Credible designs exist for two of these: a high-quality ampereclass electron gun and continuous wave injector that can operate for weeks, and ampere-class SRF cavities with higher-mode suppression using high-temperature superconductors. However, demonstration of these designs requires funding. At the conceptual level with simulations, researchers are currently exploring a third critical element, megawatt-level RF couplers. Complete system modeling is underway; but bringing these efforts to the point of comparison to the actual performance of, for example, future 100-kW prototypes, will require major efforts. Cargo inspection and interrogation Security priorities of the last decade have turned to deterring the threat from subnational organizations. Some of these deterrents rely on identifying small quantities of special nuclear material in shipping containers through a signature reaction induced by radiation. Accelerators are a natural choice for producing well-characterized beams of radiation and are central to a number of current proposals to develop active interrogation techniques. “ Standing off” at a distance from the object under inspection by using electromagnetic radiation, including that from accelerators, is of significant interest in security and defense. The recent developments in terahertz radiation at FELs show potential for active interrogation with desirable standoff distances for cargo, improvised explosive devices and biological investigations. Other interrogation techniques use neutron and proton beams ranging from tens of keV to tens of GeV with radiographic sensitivity to a variety of materials. Standoff with GeV protons to induce fission will require milliampere beam currents, high gradient and high temperature superconducting technologies, as well as compact devices that laser-driven accelerator technology may make possible. Researchers have proposed more exotic radiography using the low interaction rates of muons to achieve significant standoff. Such proposals would build on developments for muon colliders and neutrino factories, the subject of R&D for possible future basic-science facilities. Replacement of radioactive sources and materials In the 1970s, accelerator-based gamma-ray radiation therapy replaced radioisotope- based devices in the United States and Western Europe. However, in much of the rest of the world, 60Co-based teletherapy units are still very common, with over 10,000 in service, according to the International Atomic Energy Agency. With an average radioactivity of 2000 curies, these devices represent a potential source of material for a radiological attack. Progress towards more compact, rugged, and reliable accelerators can replace 60Co-based sources in medicine, as well as in industrial applications. Advances in high-gradient accelerator structures, microwave generation, and power electronics could sharply reduce the cost of accelerator-based therapy. The accelerator must be able to function with high reliability in adverse environmental conditions, with fluctuating electrical supply. Because it is unlikely that private industry would undertake such a design without a defined market, deployment of this accelerator would need to be a coordinated effort among various U.S. government agencies, industry and the international community. Isotope production Accelerator production of both stable and radioactive isotopes has potential impact on security and defense. Demand for the stable helium isotope 3He has significantly increased in recent years, due to its use in neutron detectors for portal monitors and other systems for detecting special nuclear materials. The main source of 3He is as a byproduct of the nuclear weapons stockpile. Changes in stockpile management have led to decreased production, creating a need that accelerators could meet. Beyond security, researchers in low-temperature physics and materials science are suffering severely from the shortfall in 3He. Production of the medical isotope 99mTc by reactor irradiation of a nuclear material (235U) yields the same by-products as detonation of a nuclear device. As part of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, monitoring stations worldwide look for telltale by-products, specifically for the radioactive isotopes of the noble gas xenon that are difficult to contain and that propagate over large distances in the atmosphere. Medical isotope production affects the sensitivity of radio-xenon measurements by producing elevated and variable concentrations over large areas around production facilities. Accelerator-based production at required volumes and competitive costs would reduce backgrounds, enhance international monitoring capabilities, and simultaneously eliminate the need for highly enriched uranium and nuclear reactor facilities for production.

#### Global nuclear war --- and causes space militarization and bioweapons use

Johnson 1 (Rebecca, Executive Director – Acronym Institute for Disarmament Diplomacy, The Guardian, 7-17, Lexis)

Then the international arms control and non- proliferation regimes collapsed. Americans weren't bothered at first, for hadn't the government promised a super-sophisticated force field round the whole nation that no terrorist or missile would ever penetrate? So nuclear testing resumed in Nevada for new warheads to improve the kill prospects of missile interceptors and to penetrate deep into enemies' bunkers. India had been waiting for just such a go-ahead, and Pakistan soon followed; both raced to test warheads to fit on to missiles, upping the tension in Kashmir and along the borders with China. Free now to resume its own testing, China boosted its programme to modernise and increase the size of its small nuclear arsenal. Somewhat reluctantly, Russia followed. Moscow suspended all further reductions and cooperative security and safety programmes for its still-large nuclear arsenal and facilities. Within a few short years, the nuclear non-proliferation treaty was just another discarded agreement. Many governments with nuclear power programmes developed nuclear weapons as well, while others fitted anthrax or sarin on to weapons, just in case. Most hadn't wanted to, but fearful that their neighbours would, all felt compelled. Regional rivalries grew quickly into major international problems. Alliances collapsed amid suspicion and recriminations. The burgeoning arms races even spread into outer space, threatening military surveillance, as well as public communication, entertainment and navigation. No one knew who had what. Deterrence was empty, as defence analysts calculated the advantages of the pre-emptive strike. In that terrified atmosphere of insecurity and mistrust, someone launched first. And then it was too late to speak out. The Republicans hadn't yet managed to get missile defence to work. Such a doomsday scenario is notsofanciful. On July 7, the New York Times announced that President Bush wants to ditch the comprehensive test ban treaty. A week before, the administration asked nuclear laboratories to work out how quickly the US could resume testing after its nine-year moratorium. If Bush were to back out of the test ban treaty or break the moratorium on nuclear testing - undertaken with China, Russia, Britain and France - he would also explicitly breach agreements made last May, when 187 countries negotiated measures to strengthen and implement the non- proliferation treaty. The test ban is no outdated cold war instrument, but a fundamental tool to prevent new, destabilising developments in nuclear weapons. Over several decades, from the Arctic to the Pacific, from the capitals of Europe to the deserts of Nevada, people have marched, petitioned, demonstrated and even sailed or hiked into test sites. Many have been imprisoned, and some even lost their lives trying to stop the nuclear weapons governments from polluting our oceans and earth with radioactivity from nuclear explosions, conducted for one purpose only - to make "better" nuclear bombs. It took three arduous years to complete negotiations on the comprehensive test ban treaty. It isn't perfect. No product of compromise ever is. The verification system is very thorough, but it also had to be affordable, financially and politically. The treaty stopped short of closing and dismantling the known test sites or banning laboratory testing, which the weapon states said they needed to assure the safety and reliability of weapons in the stockpiles (pending achievement of their other treaty obligations to eliminate the nuclear arsenals com pletely). But it does ban all nuclear test explosions in all environments. India panicked, because the treaty would close off its nuclear options. It refused to sign, and then let off a string of nuclear explosions in May 1998. Pakistan followed, to prove it could. Even so, the treaty held. Neither government has felt able to keep testing, which means their options for further developments were curbed. Bush has embarked on a very slippery slope that could potentially put at risk the future of the citizens of even the most advanced military nation. Mumbling and grumbling won't keep us safe. It is time to speak out.

### 2AC Resource Wars

#### Specifically, Sino-Indian competition for natural gas will cause conflict.

Mohan Malik (PhD at the Asia Pacific center for Security Studies in Honolulu). “China’s Strategy of Containing India.” Power and Interest News Report. 6 February 2006. Online.

On the surface, relations between India and China are positive. India's economic ties with China are booming. China is set to emerge as India's leading trade partner in the near future, leaving its current number one partner, the United States, behind. Between 2000 and 2005, trade with China registered a hike of 521 percent, whereas India's trade with the U.S. increased by only 63 percent during the same period. There are regular high-level meetings between Asia's two rising powers. India and China have just concluded their second round of bilateral "strategic dialogue" and declared 2006 as a Sino-Indian friendship year. More importantly, they have agreed to cooperate, rather than compete, for global energy resources. The incipient Sino-Indian entente has prompted some to argue that it has the potential to alter Asian geopolitics radically. Long-time observers of India-China relations, however, maintain that some improvement in the rhetoric and atmospherics notwithstanding, India-China ties remain fragile and as vulnerable as ever to a sudden deterioration. The combination of internal issues of stability and external overlapping spheres of influence forestall the chances for a genuine Sino-Indian rapprochement. Though both sides are working to expand and deepen economic cooperation, there is as yet no strategic congruence between the two giants. Indeed, the issues that bind the two countries together are also the issues that divide them and fuel their rivalry because they have different positions in the international system, contrasting strategic cultures, world views, political systems, and competing geostrategic interests. In the power competition game, China has clearly surged far ahead of India by acquiring potent economic and military capabilities, and the existing asymmetry in power and status serves Beijing's interests; therefore, China has resisted any Indian attempts to narrow the power gap. Unlike China, India's fractious polity continues to limit its economic and military potential. Nor has New Delhi been able to lend a strategic purpose to its foreign and economic policies. Beneath the surface, frictions and tensions are simmering between the two countries over some fundamental issues: the territorial dispute, the nuclear issue, the U.N. Security Council reform issue, to name a few. Both remain locked in a classic security dilemma: one country sees its own actions as justifiably self-defensive, but these same actions appear aggressive to the other. In the past year, India has found itself ranged against China at the United Nations, the International Atomic Energy Agency over Iran's nuclear program, the East Asia Summit and the Nuclear Suppliers Group (N.S.G.) over the issue of India's membership. Three major developments which shook the ground beneath South Block (India's External Affairs Ministry building) in New Delhi recently were the emergence of a pro-China axis comprising Pakistan, Nepal, and Bangladesh at the 13th South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (S.A.A.R.C.) Summit in Dacca, China's opposition to the July 2005 India-U.S. nuclear energy agreement, and Beijing's moves to confine India to the periphery of a future East Asia Community at the first East Asia Summit in Kuala Lumpur in mid-December 2005. Add to this Beijing's worldwide campaign against India's (and Japan's) bids for permanent membership in the U.N. Security Council, the continuing stalemate in the India-China border negotiations, coupled with their ever-expanding economies and widening geopolitical horizons, it is clear that the bilateral relationship between the two rising Asian giants continues to be characterized more by competition and rivalry than by cooperation. Despite the hype over India's burgeoning trade with China, it consists mostly of raw materials, iron ore, steel, and like commodities that are used to fuel China's economic growth while China exports manufactured goods, electronics and machinery to India. Even in the information technology sector, the focus of Chinese diplomacy remains on leveraging India's strengths to China's advantage without any quid pro quo in the technology hardware or manufacturing sectors. Neither power is comfortable with the rise of the other. Each perceives the other as pursuing regional hegemony and entertaining geographical expansion. Each puts forward its own proposals for multilateral cooperation that exclude the other. Both vie for influence in Central, South and Southeast Asia, and for leadership positions in global and regional organizations. More than ever before, the state of the India-China relationship is increasingly being influenced by "the U.S. factor" as the Southern and Central Asian region becomes an arena of strategic competition in Asia. China's Shadow over South Asia All the talk of a "new beginning" in Sino-Indian relations notwithstanding, there is little evidence to support the view that China has re-cast its foreign policy to build an accommodative relationship with Asia's other rising power -- India. If anything, Beijing has unveiled major strategic moves that will effectively isolate India in South Asia and further squeeze India's traditional strategic space in the region, keeping New Delhi tied down with multiple sub-continental concerns. After Pakistan and Myanmar, Beijing is skillfully employing economic and military means to draw Bhutan, Bangladesh, Nepal, the Maldives, and Sri Lanka into China's orbit. The Chinese military's recent incursions and road construction activity in Bhutanese territory are aimed at coercing the tiny Himalayan kingdom to end its protectorate relationship with India and move into China's orbit "if Bhutan desires peace and development with the world's fastest growing superpower." Ignoring Indian pleas not to fish in troubled waters in volatile Nepal, Beijing has gone ahead with arms supplies to the beleaguered monarchy. Nepal's King Gyanendra has been openly playing "the China card" to counter Indian and U.S. demand for an early restoration of multi-party democracy in the Himalayan Kingdom. [See: "Nepal's Instability in the Regional Power Struggle"] Taking advantage of a sharp downturn in India's relations with Bangladesh over issues ranging from illegal immigration to Islamist terrorism, transit and trade, Beijing has upgraded its ties with Dacca to gain naval access to the Chittagong port, to establish a road link with Bangladesh via Myanmar and to acquire Dacca's immense natural gas reserves. China is already the largest supplier of weaponry to Bangladesh. Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao's recent offer to provide Dacca with nuclear reactor technology has led to speculation as to whether Beijing would replicate in Bangladesh the sort of military, nuclear and missile collaboration it has with Pakistan. Bangladesh and Nepal are also expected to join Pakistan in concluding peace and friendship treaties with China in the near future. At the 13th S.A.A.R.C. summit held in Dacca in November 2005, India's physical presence was overshadowed by China's invisible presence but growing influence. Nothing highlighted this more strikingly than India's volte-face on the issue of China's induction into the grouping as an observer or a dialogue partner. On the first day of the proceedings on November 12, Indian Foreign Secretary Shyam Saran ruled out China's induction unless it signed a memorandum of understanding for being associated with S.A.A.R.C. However, within less than 24 hours, Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh was forced -- mainly by the pro-China grouping comprising Nepal, Pakistan and Bangladesh -- to come out with a statement welcoming China as an observer. (The only consolation for India was that it managed to extend the same privilege to its friend, Japan.) India's climb-down occurred in the backdrop of the pro-China grouping threatening to veto Afghanistan's entry into S.A.A.R.C. as the grouping's eighth member, which India supported, unless China was allowed in. The inclusion of China as an observer is seen by most S.A.A.R.C. member-states as a counterbalance to India. Apparently, while India has been preoccupied with fighting cross-border terrorism on its own territory, China has been busy making significant inroads into India's backyard through cross-border economic and strategic penetration of Nepal, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, and the Maldives. Beijing's main objectives are said to be access to raw materials, commodities, natural resources and access to South Asian markets for Chinese goods and to expand China's influence in the region. However, China's support for India's smaller neighbors suggests that gaining access to markets and natural resources is not the only reason behind Beijing's South Asia policy: Beijing also wants to make a point on the limits of Indian power. In fact, aiding "India-wary" countries in South Asia to "concircle (contain and encircle) India" has long been an integral part of China's strategic calculus. As a rising maritime trading power, Beijing is also seeking to once again project force into the Indian Ocean in the manner of the fleets sent out under the command of Admiral Zheng He nearly 600 years ago during the Ming dynasty. Border Talks End in Stalemate, Again China's growing presence in South Asia is accompanied by a hardening of its stance on the territorial dispute. This became evident at the last round of border talks held in Beijing between September 26-27, 2005. Defense analysts attribute the Chinese intransigence in resolving the border dispute to the rapidly shifting military balance of power in Beijing's favor on the Tibetan plateau. Since 1999, there has been a constant probing of the line of actual control, via frequent border crossings by Chinese border patrols in a manner designed to test Indian resolve, psychology, vulnerabilities and border intelligence. With the near completion of the 1,118 kilometer (695 miles) Qinghai-Tibetan railway and other military infrastructure projects in Tibet, China "may be tempted to resort to force or coercion more quickly to press diplomatic advantage, advance security interests or resolve disputes," according to an unnamed senior Indian military officer. The Chinese have also rebuffed India's pleas for a quick boundary settlement within a fixed timeframe. Even on Sikkim, the Chinese have deliberately decided to "go slow" on the implementation of their verbal promise after obtaining a written commitment on Tibet from India in June 2003 during Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee's visit to China. From the Chinese standpoint, the concept of give and take vis-à-vis India could also damage China's image in South Asia as the predominant power. China Opposes India's Bid for U.N.S.C. Seat Another sign of pro-active containment of India is Beijing's opposition to any move to expand the veto-holding permanent membership of the U.N. Security Council. With the exception of China, the remaining four permanent members have voiced their support for expansion of U.N.S.C. permanent membership, with the United States supporting Japan while Russia, France and Britain are supporting India's bid. The Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesperson has now made it clear that while Beijing is willing to see India occupy a seat in the semi-permanent or non-permanent category, it remains opposed to having its Asian rivals -- India or Japan -- sitting in the U.N.S.C. permanent membership category. The fact that China has now emerged as the major obstacle to U.N.S.C. reforms can be attributed to divergent world views held by Beijing and other world capitals. Similar to how the U.S. seeks to prevent the emergence of a peer competitor at the global level, China wants to prevent the rise of a peer competitor at the regional level. This stance leads Washington to support a multipolar Asia (with a strong Japan and powerful India to balance China) but a unipolar world (with the United States as the sole hyper-power without any peers). In contrast, Beijing prefers a unipolar Asia-Pacific (with China as the sole superpower without any peers) and a multipolar world (with the U.S., E.U., Russia and China as four major power poles). In contrast with both Washington and Beijing, New Delhi champions multipolarity at both regional and global levels. Beijing's attitude to the expansion of the U.N. Security Council is a clear indication that it will not countenance the emergence of an Asian peer competitor. The East Asia Summit In early 2005, Beijing dispatched its diplomats to Laos (then "country convener for India" within the A.S.E.A.N. regional grouping) and other Southeast Asian capitals to dissuade them from lobbying for India's membership (albeit, unsuccessfully) in the East Asia Summit (E.A.S.) scheduled for its first inaugural meeting in Kuala Lumpur in December 2005. However, with the exception of Malaysia, Beijing did not find any takers for its anti-India stance primarily because nearly all Southeast Asian countries supported India's participation in the E.A.S. seeing it as a useful counterweight to China's growing power. Having failed to keep India (and Australia and New Zealand) out of the new regional grouping, the Chinese Foreign Ministry attempted to dominate the emerging East Asian Community (E.A.C.) by dividing it into two blocs: the core or primary states with China as the leading, dominant player inside the A.S.E.A.N.+3 (China, South Korea, Japan) and the peripheral or secondary states of India, Australia and New Zealand (or, "outsiders" as the People's Daily editorial of December 7, 2005 described them). Beijing remains leery of India's great power pretensions and attempts to extend its influence in China's backyard. Seeing New Delhi's "Look East" policy as part of a wider "congage China" strategy unveiled by the Washington-Tokyo-New Delhi grouping, the thrust of Chinese diplomacy is to confine India to the periphery of a future East Asia Community and to foil India's efforts to break out of the South Asian straitjacket. The People's Daily commentator reacted sharply to the Indian prime minister's proposal for an Asian Economic Community (A.E.C.): "India's proposal is not warmly responded [to] as each country has its own considerations." Apparently, China's "own considerations" are primarily geostrategic in nature. Beijing fears that India's participation in the core group would shift the balance of power and make the E.A.C. less susceptible to domination by China. Therefore, in the run-up to the East Asia Summit in Malaysia and days after obtaining observer status in S.A.A.R.C., China's message to India was crystal clear. Finding India relegated to the outer circle, an Indian diplomat expressed his disappointment over the decision to entrench the A.S.E.A.N.+3 framework within the E.A.S.: "To state that A.S.E.A.N. is in the driver's seat, the passengers have a right to know where they are going." Energy Fuels Feud Both face growing demand for energy and are locked in fierce competition for stakes in overseas oil and gas fields in Asia, Africa, Latin America, and the Middle East. In the energy competition stakes, however, China currently has an overwhelming lead because China has linked energy to its national security policy for longer than India has. Moreover, China has been more successful in diversifying its energy resources, developing a varied network of oil suppliers from Africa to Latin America. China's superior financial muscle and diplomatic clout also enables it to win friends and contracts for natural resources. As 2005 progressed, Chinese oil firms went out of their way (excessively overpaying for assets) to thwart India's attempts to secure international energy assets in Kazakhstan, Ecuador, Angola, Nigeria, and Myanmar. Clearly, India's efforts to secure supplies cannot succeed unless and until New Delhi creates incentives (arms, aid and diplomatic support) or economic dependencies (via trade) for the supplying country to sell oil and gas to India. Ironically, the day India's oil minister, Mani Shankar Aiyar, left for Beijing to discuss energy-cooperation joint ventures, Myanmar announced that its gas would be flowing east to China instead of north and west to India. Despite the conclusion of energy cooperation agreements, China is likely to go solo in its quest for energy security; energy competition, rather than energy cooperation, will be the norm. As finding new sources of oil becomes more difficult, there are bound to be areas of friction between Asia's two fastest growing economies. While China views the Andaman Sea off Myanmar's coast as an important source of oil to fuel the economic expansion of China's western provinces, India sees China's presence in the Bay of Bengal an unwelcome development. The Chinese Navy has asserted its legitimate right to operate in the Indian Ocean to ensure security of its oil and trade transiting through the region. China already has better relations with the two largest energy suppliers -- Saudi Arabia and Iran -- than does India. With Pakistan as its long-term military ally, China also has closer relations with four important Islamic countries (Saudi Arabia, Iran, Pakistan and Bangladesh) than India, the United States and Japan. As a major trading country and a future world power, China is now laying the groundwork for a naval presence along maritime chokepoints in the South China Sea, the Malacca Straits, the Indian Ocean and the Strait of Hormuz in the Persian Gulf through acquisition of naval bases in Cambodia, Myanmar, Bangladesh and Pakistan to protect its long-term economic security interests. Sooner rather than later, China's military alliances and forward deployment of its naval assets in the Pakistani, Bangladeshi and Burmese ports would prompt India to respond in kind by seeking access to the Vietnamese (Cam Ranh Bay), Taiwanese (Kao-hsiung) and Japanese (Okinawa) ports for the forward deployment of Indian naval assets to protect India's shipping and trade routes and access to energy resources from the Russian Sakhalin province.

#### And, the impact is nuclear war

Brigadier General Gurmeet Knawal. ( is currently a Visiting Senior Research Fellow at the South Asian Strategic Stability Unit, London and Senior Fellow, Centre for Air Power Studies, New Delhi. He commanded an infantry brigade in the high-altitude Gurez Sector on the Line of Control with Pakistan (during Operation Parakram, 2001-03) and an artillery field regiment in counter-insurgency operations in the Kashmir Valley (during Operation Rakshak, 1993-94). He also served as Deputy Assistant Chief of the Integrated Defence Staff at HQ Integrated Defence Staff, New Delhi and as Director MO-5 in the Directorate General of Military Operations at Army Headquarters (dealing with threat, strategy and force structure). He is the author of several books including Nuclear Defence: Shaping the Arsenal, Pakistan's Proxy War, and Artillery: Honour and Glory.) “ Does India Need Tactical Nuclear Weapons?” CIAO.NET. 2000. Online.

China is continuing to modernise its nuclear and missile forces and tactical nuclear weapons, 29 including by acquiring Western technology through clandestine means. The US has claimed that China has acquired the technology for its W-88 nuclear warhead through illegal means. Notwithstanding the US claim and China's vigorous denial, it is clear that China is continuing to place immense emphasis on tactical nuclear weapons. It naturally follows that China's concept of fighting a 'limited war under high-tech conditions' includes a nuclear warfighting strategy. Hence, India may expect to witness Chinese mushroom clouds over the high Himalayas during a future Sino-Indian border war, particularly if the Chinese Military Region commander is convinced that Indian forces are gaining advantage at the operational level. Due to India's affinity and long-standing cultural links with the Tibetan people, India would naturally like to ensure that collateral damage in Tibet is scrupulously avoided. In fact, even more worrisome would be the long-term contamination of the Himalayan water sources. Since most of the Tibetan rivers drain into the Indian plains, it is in India's interest to ensure that nuclear exchanges over the Himalayan watershed are not allowed to occur. It is also for this reason that India must ensure that ADMs are not employed by either side during a Himalayan conflict, contrary to the proposals made by Bharat Karnad, 30 et al. How, then, is such a threat to be countered? Some Indian analysts argue that India must retaliate in kind on China's forward troops, firepower assets, headquarters, logistics support areas and communications choke points and that raising the ante and targeting Chinese cities would prove to be counter-productive as China has a much superior nuclear arsenal. In the unlikely event that China employs battlefield nuclear weapons against the Indian army on the grounds that it is justified in using them on the territory that it claims in 'self-defence', India will really have no option but to retaliate massively against Chinese cities and economic centres on China's well developed eastern seaboard. Only such a declaratory policy and matching operational plans will make the first use cost for China prohibitive. It is a moot point whether the loss of a single Chinese city would be acceptable to the proponents of the first use of battlefield nuclear weapons within the Chinese Central Military Commission.

#### Independently, greater reliance on imports guarantees global gas wars

Mike Ewall. (Founder and Director of the Energy Justice Network). “Fact Sheet: Liquified Natural Gas (LNG)” November 2007.

FACT SHEET: Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) Why LNG? 97% of natural gas consumed in the U.S. is from the U.S. and Canada, transported via pipeline. However, natural gas production has peaked in North America. Over time, we’re drilling more and more, but finding less and less. Between 1998 and 2007, natural gas prices more than tripled as imports from Canada slowed and domestic production failed to keep up with demand. To feed the increasing demand, more liquefied natural gas (LNG) terminals are being proposed, to increase imports from overseas. How Many? The U.S. has five existing LNG terminals – in Massachusetts, Maryland, Georgia, Louisiana and a newer one in the Gulf of Mexico. Approximately 60 additional LNG terminals have been proposed in North America (45 of which would be in the U.S.), though the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) has estimated that only 10 LNG terminals are needed to meet short-term demand (of which two are in Mexico and two are in Eastern Canada). Thirty-one proposals have been approved by federal regulators already. Many are being fought by local opposition groups, but fighting them is difficult in the U.S. since local and state rights to block such projects are largely overridden by the Energy Policy Act of 2005. Peak Gas Globally, the demand for natural gas is increasing faster than it can be met. Global production is going to peak around 2020, meaning that supply will start to drop as demand continues to rise. This will drastically increase costs and will exacerbate global conflict, as China, India and other growing economies compete with the U.S. for the world’s limited gas supplies. China has plans for 8-9 LNG terminals. Bad Economics An LNG terminal will be an economic nightmare. Gas prices have already tripled since their historical average, which was fairly constant from 1976 through 1998. The push for LNG won’t help in the long-run, since these new terminals wouldn’t be built until around 2010. Companies will have to compete with India, China and the rest of the world for competitive contracts to secure LNG supplies (or the U.S. will use military force – also very expensive – to control the supply). Since natural gas production is going to peak globally around 2020, any new LNG import terminals will only have around 10 good years of economic life (propped up by excessive use of U.S. tax dollars to support military ventures to secure foreign sources of gas) before global prices start to skyrocket. LNG = More Wars Globalization of gas markets increases global conflict over gas supplies. Liquefied natural gas would be imported from Qatar, Algeria, Nigeria, Trinidad and Tobago, Australia and Indonesia. Iraq, Iran, central Asia and Russia are also have major gas resources and are likely to remain the focus of US military ventures. The U.S. has a long-standing history of conflict with oil-producing nations, to control oil supplies. Now, as natural gas markets globalize, our military conflicts are starting to be about natural gas as well.

### A2 Politics

#### Not sufficient political capital to negotiate fiscal cliff

The Washington Times November 7, 2012 “EDITORIAL: Obama: A lame-duck president” http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2012/nov/7/obama-a-lame-duck-president-lack-of-convincing-man/

When it comes to America’s problems, there will be no slowdown. The hard issues that were shunted aside until after the election will soon come due. The looming fiscal cliff will be Mr. Obama’s first post-election test. He is expected to try to make good on his pledge to close the budget gap through higher taxes on incomes, capital gains and dividends. This would depress markets, stifle growth and prevent job creation. It’s the perfect plan for people who want more of the same. Whether Mr. Obama can pull off his tax agenda is an open question. He lacks the political clout to get it through the Republican-led House, and he has shown no inclination to seek compromise. Leaving the House in GOP hands confirms the public’s ambivalence toward Mr. Obama. The American people did not want a repeat of the first-term orgy of big-ticket legislation that has left the government further awash in debt. Gridlock is a preferable alternative to Mr. Obama’s fiscal recklessness. After the election, the United States is left virtually where it was on Monday, with the same weak leadership facing mounting crises. Calling Mr. Obama a lame duck simply affirms what has been true all along.

#### Election PC not sufficient for debt deal

Chris Burrett (writer for Bloomberg News) November 7, 2012 “‘Sad and Depressed’ CEOs See No Light at End of Partisan Impasse” http://www.businessweek.com/news/2012-11-07/ceos-ask-obama-to-fix-deficit-while-bridging-chasm-in-congress#p2

The close popular vote and tight races in swing states such as Florida don’t give Obama and the Democrats enough political capital to push through a solution on the debt and tax reform without Republican support, according to Cote, of Morris Township, New Jersey-based Honeywell. “You won, but you didn’t win by enough to just do what you want,” Cote said. “At the end of the day there’s no kidding around that they need to work together as Americans and develop an American solution to an American problem.”

#### Political capital not sufficient – GOP is emboldened

Edward Luce (writer for the Financial Times) November 7, 2012 “Obama must renew bipartisan effort” http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/3ef414fa-28b1-11e2-9591-00144feabdc0.html#axzz2BhEPRihW

Second, Republicans also claimed victory on Tuesday night having retained the House of Representatives – and possibly with a larger majority. They will interpret just as clear a mandate from their congressional victory as Mr Obama will his. After the results were declared, John Boehner, the Republican speaker, issued an emollient statement about working across the aisle with Mr Obama. In his speech, the president returned the compliment. In reality, both will feel confirmed in their negotiating stance: Mr Obama plans to stand firm on tax increases for the wealthy, and Mr Boehner will stand equally resolutely against them. One side will have to blink or the US will plunge over the cliff. In the past, the blinker has usually been Mr Obama. But nothing quite emboldens a president like a re-election. Tuesday night brought him a remarkable victory. But it also confirmed how deeply – and evenly – divided the US remains. The big question now is whether Mr Obama can use his replenished political capital to leverage some kind of fiscal grand bargain on Capitol Hill. The odds must be against a breaking of the “Republican fever” any time soon. But they are narrower than they were on Monday. For the first time in a long while, Mr Obama has the initiative. And for the first time in his life, he knows he will never have to run for office again. For some presidents, such knowledge can be a great liberation.

#### 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.

**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.

**The fight itself accrues capital**

Newstex 11 [Cruiskeen Consulting LLC, “On Done Deals, Or, Sometimes Losing Is How You Win , <http://uppitywis.org/blogarticle/done-deals-or-sometimes-losing-how-you-win>]

Right off the bat, you might be surprised how often you can win, even when you did not think you would; the fights over DADT and Elizabeth Warren's nomination are a couple of recent examples that come to mind. Beyond that, losing a political fight, and doing it well, helps to move the conversation incrementally over the longer term; I would suggest that it took two political cycles before the tide turned on the war in Iraq, and now it's beginning to look like the military's plan for "Victory In Afghanistan Through Massive Force" is a proposition that's tougher and tougher to sell every day-even within the White House. Conservatives know this well, and efforts to advocate for gun rights, to advance "pro-life" policies, and to radically change the form and function of government have extended over decades, with incremental changes often being the incremental goal ("let's create these temporary tax cuts today...and let's try to extend them forever another day..."). Ironically, another good reason to "fight the good fight", even in an environment where you might not see victory as possible, is one that is very familiar to the most fervent of Obama's '08 supporters: the very fight, in and of itself, is often a way to create political capital-even if you lose. How many of us have wished this very President would have stood up and fought for things that he might not have thought he would get? Would you support this President more if he had demanded that Congress pass a single-payer plan, or if he was pushing harder to end renditions and close Guantanamo, even if Congress was blocking him? I bet you would. And it makes sense: if you support single-payer, and you see someone out there fighting hard for the idea...that's a good thing, and that's someone you're likely to come back and support later. It worked for three Congressional Democrats who lost elections this fall: Feingold, Grayson, and Patrick Murphy are all in a great position to seek support from the very people who are the most frustrated with pretty much all the other Democrats today. Some of those supporters aren't even waiting for the future candidates; the "Draft Feingold for President" movement goes back to at least 2004, Grayson and Murphy also have supporters ready and willing to go. So...if it's true that if this President would fight like Bernie Sanders, even in a losing cause, then we would treat him with the same degree of affection and respect we feel toward Bernie Sanders...is it also true that we should, maybe, apply that lesson to ourselves? There is an argument to be made that trying to move your opponent when you don't think you can, and in the process showing how they appear to be either intransigent, or ignorant, or corrupt by comparison...or just plain wrong about something...can regularly end up moving voters, instead-and that the result of that movement is that your opponent sometimes has to move your way as well. I would submit that the 2005 effort to "reform" Social Security, when we had a Republican President, House, and Senate, went exactly nowhere fast because being wrong did move a bunch of voters to say...well, to say that all those Republicans were wrong. So there you go, folks: I'm here today to suggest that, even when we might not feel we have a good chance of winning a political fight-or even a fair chance-you still have to get out and fight the fight, if only to advance the cause for another day. It's also a great way to accrue political capital that can be used to your advantage later-and if the resistance from the other side is perceived as being too heavy-handed, they can suffer (OOTC:WLVTQ) from a sort of "attrition", as their own political capital is diminished. And even if you lose, there's still a lot to be gained in the effort, although you might not see the results until further down the road. As we said at the top of the story, there are lots of battles left over, including what is going to happen to Social Security and the potential for reforming Senate rules; but win or lose, it's probably a better idea to be trying to fight these fights, loudly and logically, just as we wish the President would, then to find ourselves hanging back and doing nothing at all today...and then voting for Jack Box for President 2012 as a way of expressing our frustration.

#### No impact – ‘fiscal cliff’ overblown

Christine Benz (writer for the Morningstar) September 23, 2012 ‘Who's Getting Conservative in Advance of the Fiscal Cliff?

'The Fiscal Cliff Is More Like a Fiscal Stairway' Even as some posters were actively making changes with the expectation of a rough patch, many others are standing pat. The, worries over the fiscal cliff are overblown in KitCat's view. "I have hopes (or some may call it hopeless optimism) that something will be done about the fiscal cliff. Maybe not everything as I'd prefer it, but I feel 75% will be. Therefore [I have] no plans for any changes at this point." Sezen13 also argues that worries over the fiscal cliff are overblown. "The fiscal cliff is more like a fiscal stairway, a gradual descent, federal taxes raised a small amount, spending cuts spread over a period of time. Any adverse impact will likely be short, soon swamped by worldwide economic events."