# OCS 1AC---OLC

### PLAN

#### The United States Federal Government should substantially reduce restrictions on crude oil extraction from the Alaskan Outer Continental Shelf.

### 1AC – Arctic Advantage

#### CONTENTION 1: ARCTIC

#### Offshore drilling key to US Arctic leadership

Cohen and Altman 11 Ariel Cohen, Ph.D. is a Senior Research Fellow for Russian and Eurasian Studies and International Energy Policy at the Heritage Foundation, Anton Altman is a research volunteer at The Heritage Foundation, August 16, 2011, “Russia’s Arctic Claims: Neither LOST nor Forgotten”, http://blog.heritage.org/2011/08/16/russias-arctic-claims-neither-lost-nor-forgotten/

Moscow has an unquestionable head start on the rest of the world, and it is not shy about investing in its ambitions. At least six new icebreakers and Sabetta, a new year-round port on the arctic shores—costing $33 billion—are on the agenda, but Prime Minister Putin has said the Kremlin is “open for a dialogue with our foreign partners and with all our neighbors in the Arctic region, but of course we will defend our own geopolitical interests firmly and consistently.” Or as they said in Soviet times, “What is mine is mine, and what is yours is negotiable.”¶ The Arctic is of vital geopolitical importance not just to Russia, but to the entire world. It has enormous quantities of hydrocarbon energy and other natural resources, and as the Arctic is no longer completely icebound, in summertime it may become an important transportation route vital to U.S. national security.¶ Despite this, at present the U.S. has made virtually no effort to strengthen its position in the frozen final frontier. The chief concern is America’s lack of icebreakers—even Canada and Finland have more than the United States. Icebreakers are vital to exploring the Arctic and enforcing one’s sovereignty there. As of 2010, Russia had 29 icebreakers in total and was building more. The United States had two (including one that is obsolete), with no plans to expand. The Heritage Foundation has exposed this problem extensively:¶ The United States has significant geopolitical and geo-economic interests in the High North, but the lack of policy attention and insufficient funding have placed the U.S. on track to abdicate its national interests in this critical region.¶ The United States must strengthen its position in the Arctic and make its interests clear to friend and foe alike. Washington should reach out to the Arctic Council members to block Russia’s expansion plans at the U.N. Meanwhile, the U.S. should fund and build its icebreaking squadron and deploy it in Alaska.¶ Russia’s Arctic aspirations are a serious geopolitical challenge for U.S. and allied interests. America’s security and economic prosperity in the 21st century will depend on U.S. ability to access polar waters and the Arctic Ocean bed.

#### Arctic drilling is critical to retain heg

Hobson 12 - Energy and Environmental Correspondent for the National Journal

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

Grimsson noted that despite the increased international interest in oil and gas development in the American Arctic, the United States has been less involved in Arctic policy issues than any other Arctic nation, particularly much less so than Russia.¶ He also said that when he visited China, Singapore and South Korea, the heads of state buttonholed him to support their request to become permanent observers to the Arctic Council, a high-level intergovernmental forum that addresses issues faced by Arctic governments and indigenous people in the region.¶ Grimsson said China, which has no coastal lands located on the Arctic, recently launched a new heavy-duty icebreaker designed to travel through the polar waters. By contrast, the U.S. Coast Guard has only one older operating research icebreaker, the Healy, and no new ice ships under construction.¶ “There’s something profound in the political system of the United States that prevents Washington from becoming as active as China is now in the Arctic,” Grimsson said. “I’m not talking about Russia. It would take you a long time to catch up with Russia. But you can hopefully in the next few years match China in the interest in the Arctic.”¶ Meanwhile, investor David Rubenstein told the conference that Washington isn’t likely to consider underwriting new ice breakers or prioritizing Alaska issues unless the nation suddenly faces a crisis in the Arctic.¶ The co-founder of the Carlyle Group, Rubenstein compared today’s lack of federal investment in the Arctic infrastructure and Coast Guard activities to the 1950s when the government ignored space exploration until Russia launched the Sputnik, the first earth satellite.¶ In the aftermath, the Kennedy administration inspired the nation by channeling federal funds into the space race and beating Russia to land a man on the moon.¶ “What’s going to have to happen is that somebody from outside the United States, perhaps Russia, will have to take such a compelling lead in the Arctic that our national security and our economic viability is clearly threatened in ways that people in Washington see it,” Rubenstein said.¶ “I think you need to have a boogeyman,” he suggested. “[Russian President Vladimir] Putin might be the best one in some respects. He said that the Arctic is his strategic reserve for the 21st century. And people in Washington need to remember what he said. Because if it’s his strategic reserve, then it’s not our strategic reserve.”¶ Iceland President Grimsson said that as the world increasingly looks to the Arctic for resource extraction and international shipping, America must take a larger role in Arctic policy issues or risk losing its primacy on the world political scene.¶ “Quite seriously,” he said, “I cannot see how the United States of America is going to conduct a comprehensive, responsible foreign policy in the coming decades without being the leader of the Arctic.”

**Hegemony prevents extinction**

**Barnett 11** (Thomas P.M., Former Senior Strategic Researcher and Professor in the Warfare Analysis & Research Department, Center for Naval Warfare Studies, U.S. Naval War College American military geostrategist and Chief Analyst at Wikistrat., worked as the Assistant for Strategic Futures in the Office of Force Transformation in the Department of Defense, “The New Rules: Leadership Fatigue Puts U.S., and Globalization, at Crossroads,” March 7 <http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/8099/the-new-rules-leadership-fatigue-puts-u-s-and-globalization-at-crossroads>)

Events in Libya are a further reminder for Americans that we **stand at a crossroads in our continuing evolution as the world's sole full-service superpower**. Unfortunately, we are increasingly seeking change without cost, and shirking from risk because we are tired of the responsibility. We don't know who we are anymore, and our president is a big part of that problem. Instead of leading us, he explains to us. Barack Obama would have us believe that he is practicing strategic patience. But many experts and ordinary citizens alike have concluded that he is actually beset by strategic incoherence -- in effect, a man overmatched by the job. It is worth first examining the larger picture: We live in a time of arguably **the greatest structural change in the global order yet endured**, with this historical moment's most amazing feature being its relative and absolute **lack of mass violence**. That is something to consider when Americans contemplate military intervention in Libya, because if we do take the step to prevent larger-scale killing by engaging in some killing of our own, we will not be adding to some fantastically imagined global death count stemming from the ongoing "megalomania" and "evil" of American "empire." We'll be engaging in the same sort of system-administering activity that has marked our stunningly successful stewardship of global order since World War II. Let me be more blunt: As the **guardian of globalization**, the U.S. military has been the **greatest force for peace the world has ever known**. Had America been removed from the global dynamics that governed the 20th century, the **mass murder never would have ended**. Indeed, it's entirely conceivable **there would now be no identifiable human civilization left, once nuclear weapons entered the killing equation.**  But the world did not keep sliding down that **path of perpetual war**. Instead, America stepped up and changed everything by **ushering in our now-perpetual great-power peace**. We introduced the **international liberal trade order known as globalization** and played loyal Leviathan over its spread. What resulted was the collapse of empires, **an explosion of democracy**, the **persistent spread of human rights**, the liberation of women, **the doubling of life expectancy**, a roughly **10-fold increase in adjusted global GDP** and a **profound and persistent reduction in** battle deaths from **state-based conflicts.** That is what American "hubris" actually delivered. Please remember that the next time some TV pundit sells you the image of "unbridled" American military power as the cause of global disorder instead of its cure. With self-deprecation bordering on self-loathing, we now imagine a post-American world that is anything but. Just watch who scatters and who steps up as the Facebook revolutions erupt across the Arab world. While we might imagine ourselves the status quo power, we remain the world's most vigorously revisionist force. As for the sheer "evil" that is our military-industrial complex, again, let's examine what the world looked like before that establishment reared its ugly head. The last great period of global structural change was the first half of the 20th century, a period that saw a death toll of about 100 million across two world wars. That comes to an average of 2 million deaths a year in a world of approximately 2 billion souls. Today, with far more comprehensive worldwide reporting, researchers report an average of less than 100,000 battle deaths annually in a world fast approaching 7 billion people. Though admittedly crude, these calculations suggest a 90 percent absolute drop and a 99 percent relative drop in deaths due to war. We are clearly headed for a world order characterized by multipolarity, something the American-birthed system was designed to both encourage and accommodate. But given how things turned out the last time we collectively faced such a fluid structure, we would do well to keep U.S. power, in all of its forms, deeply embedded in the geometry to come. To continue the historical survey, after salvaging Western Europe from its half-century of civil war, the U.S. emerged as the progenitor of a new, far more just form of globalization -- one based on actual free trade rather than colonialism. America then successfully replicated globalization further in East Asia over the second half of the 20th century, setting the stage for the Pacific Century now unfolding.

#### That’s necessary to prevent Arctic warfare

Borgerson 10 SCOTT G. BORGERSON is International Affairs Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations and a former Lieutenant Commander in the U.S. Coast Guard, April 2008, “Arctic Meltdown: The Economic and Security Implications of Global Warming”, http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/20032581.pdf?acceptTC=true

Washington cannot afford to stand idly by. The Arctic region is not currently governed by any comprehensive multilateral norms and regulations because it was never expected to become a navigable water¬way or a site for large-scale commercial development. Decisions made by Arctic powers in the coming years will therefore profoundly shape the future of the region for decades. Without U.S. leadership to help develop diplomatic solutions to competing claims and potential conflicts, the region could erupt in an armed mad dash for its resources.

#### Risk of Arctic conflict high---most recent evidence

Tassinari 12 Fabrizio Tassinari is a non-resident Senior Fellow at the German Marshall Fund and the Head of Foreign Policy and EU Studies at the Danish Institute for International Studies, September 7, 2012, “Avoiding a Scramble for the High North”, http://blog.gmfus.org/2012/09/07/avoiding-a-scramble-for-the-high-north/

The geopolitics of the Arctic are stuck in a paradox: The more regional players restate the importance of international cooperation, the more some pundits and policymakers seem to conclude that the Arctic risks descending into competition and even conflict.¶ The world is awakening to the growing strategic importance of the High North. As the Arctic ice melts due to global warming, it opens up new opportunities, from shorter shipping lanes to newly accessible oil and gas reserves; respectively, about 13 percent and 30 percent of the world’s undiscovered resources are in the Arctic, according to the U.S. Geological Survey. These discoveries are usually followed by declarations of the littoral nations to the effect that any potential disagreements over them will be resolved peacefully. However, beneath expressions of goodwill, the Arctic debate is often characterized by a sense of urgency, and even forms of alarmism.¶ In recent years, instances of growing securitization of the Arctic have abounded. Back in 2008, a paper by Javier Solana, then the EU’s foreign policy’s chief, and the European Commission warned about “potential conflict over resources in Polar regions” as they become exploitable due to melting ice. In 2010, NATO’s supreme allied commander in Europe, Adm. James Stavridis, argued that “for now, the disputes in the North have been dealt with peacefully, but climate change could alter the equilibrium.” Then there are actions that speak louder than prepared speeches — from the famous August 2007 expedition that planted a Russian flag on the North Pole’s seabed to the annual summer military exercises carried out by Canada to assert its sovereignty in the North. Although the Russian stunt was most likely aimed at nationalist domestic audiences, some observers view these exercises as the expressions of competing national interests. As the scholar Scott Borgerson ominously put it: “The Arctic powers are fast approaching diplomatic gridlock, and that could eventually lead to the sort of armed brinkmanship that plagues other territories.”¶ The geopolitical constellation in and around the region provides a ready justification for such an assessment. While no-one really imagines the United States, Canada, Norway, and Denmark fighting over the Arctic, some of their politicians have occasionally framed rhetoric in more peppered terms than one might expect. Russia, the fifth Arctic littoral nation, typically treads a fine line between declarations of cooperation and an innate instinct for great-power competition. Add to that the EU, which is seeking to carve its own role, and Asia’s giants, above all China, for which the opening of the Northeast passage may reduce sailing distance with Europe by some 40 percent, and it is not hard to conjure up the prospect of an Arctic race building up.

#### Goes nuclear

Wallace and Staples 10 Michael Wallace is Professor Emeritus at the University of British Columbia; Steven Staples is President of the Rideau Institute in Ottawa, March 2010, “Ridding the Arctic of Nuclear Weapons A Task Long Overdue”, http://www.arcticsecurity.org/docs/arctic-nuclear-report-web.pdf

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

### 1AC – Russia Environment Advantage

#### CONTENTION 2: RUSSIA

#### Failure to open US Arctic drives drilling to Russia---destroys the environment

Sullivan 12 – Commissioner of Alaska's Department of Natural Resources & Fmr. St. Atty. General

It's time to develop our Arctic resources, Dan Sullivan, Special to CNN, Fri July 20, 2012

http://www.cnn.com/2012/07/20/opinion/sullivan-arctic-drilling/index.html

(CNN) -- The United States is on the verge of an energy renaissance. We need to recognize and seize the opportunity.¶ This renaissance involves domestic production of natural resources ranging from clean renewables to hydrocarbons.¶ In particular, domestic hydrocarbon production -- both oil and gas -- is increasing dramatically, with some experts predicting that the United States could become the largest hydrocarbon producer in the word -- outstripping Saudi Arabia and Russia -- by 2020.¶ Increased domestic production of hydrocarbons is driven by two trends. First, new technology is unlocking unconventional resources such as shale-derived oil and gas. And second, investors and policy makers are recognizing that the U.S. still has an enormous resource base of conventional oil and gas, particularly in Alaska.¶ Federal agencies estimate that Alaska's North Slope and federal waters off Alaska's northern coast contain approximately 40 billion barrels of technically recoverable oil and more than 200 trillion cubic feet of conventional gas.¶ According to the U.S. Geological Survey, this region contains more oil than any comparable region located in the Arctic, including northern Russia.¶ However, the United States is lagging behind its Arctic neighbors in developing these resources. This is unfortunate, because we have some of the highest environmental standards in the world and we should be setting the bar for Arctic development.¶ Developing our Arctic resources will promote our nation's interests in many ways: securing a politically stable, long-term supply of domestic energy; boosting U.S. economic growth and jobs; reducing the federal trade deficit; and strengthening our global leadership on energy issues. Leading academic researchers and economists in Alaska have estimated that oil production from Alaska's outer continental shelf will bring federal revenues of approximately $167 billion over 50 years, and create 55,000 jobs throughout the country.¶ Developing U.S. resources in the Arctic has the added benefit of enhancing global environmental protection.¶ One of the arguments used by Arctic drilling opponents is that "we aren't ready," but it is obvious that no matter what preparations are made, they will argue that it isn't enough.¶ Shell, for example, has spent billions to prepare for drilling in the Arctic this summer, incorporating the lessons learned from the Deepwater Horizon spill in the Gulf of Mexico, state-of-the-art equipment and extensive scientific research. Recently, the Obama administration has publically expressed its confidence in the company's drilling plans.¶ The U.S. has created some of the highest standards in the world for environmental protection. When we delay or disallow responsible resource development, the end result is not to protect the environment, but to drive hydrocarbon investment and production to countries with much lower environmental standards and enforcement capacity.¶ Last year, it was reported that between 5 million and 20 million tons of oil leak in Russia per year. This is equivalent to a Deepwater Horizon blowout about every two months. Russia had an estimated 18,000 oil pipeline ruptures in 2010 -- the figure for the U.S. that year was 341.¶ If we do not pursue responsible development in the Arctic, countries such as Russia -- perhaps even China, which is interested in securing access to Arctic hydrocarbon resources -- will dominate energy production from the Arctic. Such a scenario does not bode well for the global environment.¶ By embracing the opportunities in the Arctic, the United States will show the world that it can be a strong leader in responsible energy development.

#### Russian drilling triggers Arctic environmental collapse

Heath 12 Julia Heath is a writer for Foreign Policy in Focus, February 15, 2012, “Preventing a Blowout in the Arctic”, http://www.fpif.org/articles/preventing\_a\_blowout\_in\_the\_arctic

The Russian Record¶ Russia has had a terrible environmental record and a history of oil spills. The area around Usinsk, just south of the Arctic Circle, is home to what the Huffington Post calls “the world’s worst ecological oil catastrophe,” where leaks in a decommissioned oil well wreaked havoc in 2011.¶ It wasn't the first such incident. In 1994, the town suffered the third largest oil spill in history. A pipeline in Usinsk had been leaking for eight months when the dike containing the leakage collapsed, spreading 102,000 tons of oil across the tundra, into the Kolva and Rechora rivers, and eventually into the Barents Sea. The leak, eight times larger than the Exxon Valdez spill, was the result of old, corroded, poorly maintained, and over-pumped pipelines. The company responsible, Komineft, had five major accidents in the area between 1986 and 1994. In 1994, Russia was losing an estimated 20 percent of the oil it extracted, but refused to revamp inefficient and environmentally detrimental Soviet pipelines for fear that the break in production would lessen the Russian hold on former Soviet republics and interfere with loan repayment. More recently, Greenpeace, the World Wildlife Fund, and the Institute of the Environment and Genetics of Microorganisms have estimated that Russia continues to spill 5 million tons of oil every year, or as the Huffington Post put it, “one Deepwater Horizon-scale leak about every two months.” ¶ Vladimir Chuprov, head of the Arctic campaign for Greenpeace Russia, said that Greenpeace International is absolutely against all offshore drilling in the Arctic. Even the U.S. Minerals Management Service estimates a one in five chance of a major spill occurring over the life of just one lease block on Alaska’s outer continental shelf (OCS). Greenpeace International wants to accord the Arctic a world park status similar to Antarctica. At the very least, they demand that the international community provide strict standards to eradicate the risk of oil spills and require mandatory guarantees that any spills will be mitigated at a cost no less than what was spent on the Deepwater Horizon spill.¶ Like Greenpeace International, the NRDC also advocates mandatory international standards on how to develop the Arctic. According to Lisa Speer of the NRDC, the United States doesn’t “have enough information to be able to determine whether or not oil and gas activities can be conducted safely (in the Arctic). And we don’t have the ability to contain and clean up oil in ice, and therefore we think we should wait for drilling in the Arctic until we do have the ability to deal with that.”¶ At a forum on Arctic drilling in January 2012, Andrew Hartsig of the Ocean Conservancy recommended that the United States wait until it has a better hold on the technological requirements of Arctic drilling. However, the U.S. Bureau of Ocean Energy (BOEM) representative Shoshana Lew replied that the federal five-year leasing plan for blocks on Alaska’s OCS would not be deferred until exploration was complete.¶ Putin abolished the Russian Environmental Agency in order to more easily access Arctic extraction that would otherwise require environmental assessments. This is particularly disconcerting because the Arctic region, according to the UN Environment Programme, “is characterized by some of the largest continuous intact ecosystems on the planet,” and therefore environmentally detrimental projects in the region should require careful consideration and planning.¶ The United States has been slow to invest in developing its own Arctic energy reserves for fear of ecological devastation. However, it has not done enough to slow development in nearby Russia. Russian offshore drilling is a crucial issue for Americans because polar currents could make an Arctic oil spill into a transnational event. A Russian Arctic oil spill would rapidly become a cultural, ecological, and economic disaster for the United States as well.

#### Spills over to global biodiversity

Gill 9 (Michael Gill, Chair of the Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Program, “ABSTRACT: BIODIVERSITY AND ECOSYSTEM SERVICES”, March, UNESCO, http://www.unesco.org/csi/LINKS/monaco-abstracts/Gill\_abstract\_MonacoUNESCOarctic.pdf)

Arctic ecosystems and the biodiversity they support are experiencing growing pressure from climate change and resource development while established research and monitoring programs remain largely uncoordinated, lacking the ability to effectively monitor, understand and report on biodiversity trends at the circumpolar scale. The maintenance of healthy Arctic ecosystems is a global imperative as the Arctic plays a critical role in the Earth’s physical, chemical and biological balance. A coordinated and comprehensive effort for monitoring Arctic ecosystems is needed to facilitate effective and timely conservation and adaptation actions. The Arctic’s size and complexity represents a significant challenge towards detecting and attributing important biodiversity trends. This demands a scaled, pan-Arctic, ecosystem-based approach that not only identifies trends in biodiversity, but also identifies underlying causes. It is critical that this information be made available to generate effective strategies for adapting to changes now taking place in the Arctic - a process that ultimately depends on rigorous, integrated, and efficient monitoring programmes that have the power to detect change within a ‘management’ time frame. Biodiversity is a popular way of describing the diversity of life on earth: it includes all life forms and the ecosystems of which they are a part. World Food Day — the anniversary of FAO's founding on 16 October 1945 — celebrates, in particular, that part of biodiversity that nurtures people and contributes to long-term food security for all. Biodiversity forms the foundation for sustainable development. It is the basis for the environmental health of our planet and the source of economic and ecological security for future generations. In the developing world, biodiversity provides the assurance of food, countless raw materials such as fibre for clothing, materials for shelter, fertilizer, fuel and medicines, as well as a source of work energy in the form of animal traction. The rural poor depend upon biological resources for an estimated 90 percent of their needs. In the industrialized world access to diverse biological resources is necessary to support a vast array of industrial products. In the continuing drive to develop efficient and sustainable agriculture for many different conditions, these resources provide raw material for plant and animal breeding as well as the new biotechnologies. In addition, biodiversity maintains the ecological balance necessary for planetary and human survival.

#### Extinction

Science Daily 11 ("Biodiversity Key to Earth's Life-Support Functions in a Changing World," Cites Albert-Ludwigs-Universitat Freiburg, August 11, [www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2011/08/110811084513.htm](http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2011/08/110811084513.htm))

The biological diversity of organisms on Earth is not just something we enjoy when taking a walk through a blossoming meadow in spring; it is also the basis for countless products and services provided by nature, including food, building materials, and medicines as well as the self-purifying qualities of water and protection against erosion. These so-called ecosystem services are what makes Earth inhabitable for humans. They are based on ecological processes, such as photosynthesis, the production of biomass, or nutrient cycles. Since biodiversity is on the decline, both on a global and a local scale, researchers are asking the question as to what role the diversity of organisms plays in maintaining these ecological processes and thus in providing the ecosystem's vital products and services. In an international research group led by Prof. Dr. Michel Loreau from Canada, ecologists from ten different universities and research institutes, including Prof. Dr. Michael Scherer-Lorenzen from the University of Freiburg, compiled findings from numerous biodiversity experiments and reanalyzed them. These experiments simulated the loss of plant species and attempted to determine the consequences for the functioning of ecosystems, most of them coming to the conclusion that a higher level of biodiversity is accompanied by an increase in ecosystem processes. However, the findings were always only valid for a certain combination of environmental conditions present at the locations at which the experiments were conducted and for a limited range of ecosystem processes. In a study published in the current issue of the journal Nature, the research group investigated the extent to which the positive effects of diversity still apply under changing environmental conditions and when a multitude of processes are taken into account. They found that 84 percent of the 147 plant species included in the experiments promoted ecological processes in at least one case. The more years, locations, ecosystem processes, and scenarios of global change -- such as global warming or land use intensity -- the experiments took into account, the more plant species were necessary to guarantee the functioning of the ecosystems. Moreover, other species were always necessary to keep the ecosystem processes running under the different combinations of influencing factors. These findings indicate that much more biodiversity is necessary to keep ecosystems functioning in a world that is changing ever faster. The protection of diversity is thus a crucial factor in maintaining Earth's life-support functions.

### 1AC – Economy Advantage

#### CONTENTION 3: ECONOMY

#### The economy’s on the brink---2013’s key

Cox 11 Jeff, CNBC Writer citing Nouriel Roubini - Professor at Stern School, NYU, Chairman of Roubini Global Economics, "'Perfect Storm' Coming for Global Economy in 2013: Roubini", July 6, www.cnbc.com/id/43659234/039Perfect\_Storm039\_Coming\_for\_Global\_Economy\_in\_2013\_Roubini

Weakening economic conditions will come together in 2013 and create a "perfect storm" of global weakness, economist Nouriel Roubini told CNBC.¶ Known for his generally dour outlook that helped him see the financial crisis before it hit in 2008, Roubini said the US, European nations and others have become adept enough at forestalling their problems that a true crisis won't hit until 2013.¶ But when it does, the effects are likely to be painful.¶ "My prediction for the perfect storm is not this year or next year but 2013, because everybody is kicking the can down the road," he said in a live interview. "We now have a problem in the US after the election if we don't resolve our fiscal problems. China is overheating...eventually it's going to have a hard landing."¶ In the nearer term, Roubini sees slow but steady growth in the US, with gross domestic product likely to be a bit above 2 percent, with unemployment and housing continuing to hold back the economy.¶ From there, recovery will be difficult as the government cuts spending and raises taxes to ease pressure from the bulging debt and deficit issues.¶ At the same time, euro zone periphery nations like Greece, Portugal and Spain will continue to wrestle with their own debt problems, and China will act to prevent inflation from getting out of control.¶ Then the storm hits, he said.¶ "I see every economy in the world trying to push their problems to the future," he said. "We start with private debt, public debt, supra-national debt—we're kicking the can down the road and eventually this is going to come to a head in 2013."¶ China's efforts to pull inflation back to the 5 or 6 percent range also will constrain growth and hit its trading partners, said Roubini, head of Roubini Global Economics.¶ "That implies lower commodities, lower exports from Europe to China, weaker global economic growth and a situation in which all advanced economies have weak economic growth," he said.¶ Roubini refrained from any specific predictions about GDP or stock market levels, but said the damage will be widespread.¶ "If we don't have enough job creation there's not enough labor income. Therefore, there's not enough consumption and consumer companies are going to be depressed. Therefore, the recovery is going to remain weak," he said. "The markets are expecting now a robust recovery in the second half of the year. I think the recovery is going to disappoint on the downside."

**US is key to the global economy**

**Caploe 9** David, CEO of the Singapore-incorporated American Centre for Applied Liberal Arts and Humanities in Asia., “Focus still on America to lead global recovery”, April 7, The Strait Times, lexis

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.

#### Global economic crisis causes nuclear war

Cesare Merlini 11, nonresident senior fellow at the Center on the United States and Europe and chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Italian Institute for International Affairs, May 2011, “A Post-Secular World?”, Survival, Vol. 53, No. 2

Two neatly opposed scenarios for the future of the world order illustrate the range of possibilities, albeit at the risk of oversimplification. The first scenario entails the premature crumbling of the post-Westphalian system. One or more of the acute tensions apparent today evolves into an open and traditional conflict between states, perhaps even involving the use of nuclear weapons. The crisis might be triggered by a collapse of the global economic and financial system, the vulnerability of which we have just experienced, and the prospect of a second Great Depression, with consequences for peace and democracy similar to those of the first. Whatever the trigger, the unlimited exercise of national sovereignty, exclusive self-interest and rejection of outside interference would self-interest and rejection of outside interference would likely be amplified, emptying, perhaps entirely, the half-full glass of multilateralism, including the UN and the European Union. Many of the more likely conflicts, such as between Israel and Iran or India and Pakistan, have potential religious dimensions. Short of war, tensions such as those related to immigration might become unbearable. Familiar issues of creed and identity could be exacerbated. One way or another, the secular rational approach would be sidestepped by a return to theocratic absolutes, competing or converging with secular absolutes such as unbridled nationalism.

**We have strong statistical support**

**Royal 10** Jedediah, Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction at the U.S. Department of Defense, “Economic Integration, Economic Signaling and the Problem of Economic Crises,” in Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal and Political Perspectives, ed. Goldsmith and Brauer, p. 213-215

Less intuitive is how **periods of economic decline** may **increase the likelihood of external conflict**. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defence behaviour of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances Modelski and Thompson's (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous shocks such as economic crises could usher in a redistribution of relative power (see also Gilpin, 1981) that leads to **uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation** (Fearon, 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflict as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power (Werner, 1999). Separately, Pollins (1996) **also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers**, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remain unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland's (1996, 2000) theory of trade expectations suggests that ‘future expectation of trade’ is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behaviour of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However**, if the expectations of future trade decline, particularly for difficult to replace items such as energy resources, the likelihood for conflict increases**, as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states.4 Third, **others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict**, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write, **The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing.** Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favour. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self-reinforce each other. (Blomberg & Hess, 2002, p. 89)Economic decline has also been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism (Blomberg, Hess, & Weerapana, 2004), which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. ‘Diversionary theory’ suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have increased incentives to fabricate external military conflicts to create a ‘rally around the flag’ effect. Wang (1996), DeRouen (1995), and Blomberg, Hess, and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997), Miller (1999), and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states, due to the fact that democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States, and thus weak Presidential popularity, are statistically linked to an increase in the use of force. In summary, **recent economic scholarship positively correlates economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflict at systemic, dyadic and national levels**.5 This implied connection between integration, crises and armed conflict has not featured prominently in the economic-security debate and deserves more attention. This observation is not contradictory to other perspectives that link economic interdependence with a decrease in the likelihood of external conflict, such as those mentioned in the first paragraph of this chapter. Those studies tend to focus on dyadic interdependence instead of global interdependence and do not specifically consider the occurrence of and conditions created by economic crises. As such, the view presented here should be considered ancillary to those views.

#### Plan generates massive economic benefits---job growth, deficit reduction and ripple effect in the short-term

Mills 12 Mark, member of the advisory council of the McCormick School of Engineering and Applied Science at Northwestern University and serves on the board of directors of the Marshall Institute, 7/9, “Could the United States Become the World’s Energy-Export Powerhouse?”, <http://www.manhattan-institute.org/pdf/press_release_pgi_01.pdf>

Unleashing 20 billion barrels of cumulative oil from Alaska’s ANWR and some currently off-limits regions of the outer continental shelf would bring over $1 trillion of net benefits to the U.S. economy. 36¶ In general, both history and recent analyses show that for every billion barrels of oil produced (or oil-equivalent in natural gas, and similar range for coal), there are about $75 billion in broad economic benefits. 37¶ A number of recent studies have explored the implications of the new hydrocarbon trajectory, should it continue unimpeded:¶ o Citi’s analysis concludes that the oil and gas extraction sector could add as many as 3.6 million net new jobs by 2020 (for North America, both direct and indirect) and shrink the deficit by 60 percent. 38¶ o Wood Mackenzie 39 finds in its scenario report for the American Petroleum Institute a cumulative $800 billion in increased revenues to governments (federal, state, local) and another 1.5 million U.S. jobs, direct and indirect, over the coming two decades.¶ o IHS Global Insight, 40 in its analysis for America’s Natural Gas Alliance, estimates that the shale gas industry alone will add more than 1 million jobs across the U.S. economy over the coming two decades and provide over $900 billion in cumulative additional federal, state, and local government tax revenues ($465 federal, $460 state and local).¶ While there are differences in assumptions and boundaries among these and similar analyses, the order-of magnitude benefits are similar and similarly impressive: millions of jobs and hundreds of billions in revenues to government coffers.¶ None of the above accounts for the economic contributions thus far from coal, nor does it countenance expanding coal production, North America’s third great hydrocarbon resource. Some 600,000 jobs are associated with the coal industry, a fuel that already contributes some $60 billion annually to the U.S. economy, not the least of which is the increasingly vital role of low-cost electricity in an information centric economy. 41¶ The U.S. uses about three BBOE of coal per year, while the world consumes about 20 BBOE of coal annually. Expanding coal exports by an amount comparable with the increase in the oil and gas sectors would add several hundred thousand more jobs and several hundred billion more dollars in cumulative tax receipts. 42¶ While expanding hydrocarbon production will require significant investment, it will be supplied by the private sector, generating benefits to the public sector, to private citizens, and to businesses. These kinds of benefits, which accrue without cost to taxpayers, come at a particularly important time, considering the current state of persistent unemployment and underemployment, the losses in net worth for many citizens, and the budget deficits in most states and the federal government.¶ Economic benefits from expanding hydrocarbon production will be felt widely given the structural and geographic diversity of hydrocarbon resources and the associated industries. In contrast to other parts of the world, benefits here won’t flow to a handful of oligarchs but will involve thousands of businesses and ripple broadly throughout the economy. ¶ Expanding hydrocarbon production may be the single most important opportunity for near-term economic growth in North America and a beneficial resetting of energy geopolitics.

#### Job growth’s key to an economic recovery

Patton 12 Mike, Forbes Contributor, "The Key to Economic Growth: Reduce the Unemployment Rate!", 8/27, www.forbes.com/sites/mikepatton/2012/08/27/the-key-to-economic-growth-reduce-the-unemployment-rate/

We’ve all heard how the U.S. economy has been slow to recover. In the final analysis, there is one issue which resides at the epicenter of economic growth. That is our unemployment dilemma. How important is the unemployment rate to our economic recovery? Let me put it in these terms. Employment is to economic growth what oxygen is to the human existence. You can’t have one without the other. In this article, I will present evidence to bolster the point that until the unemployment rate is brought down to a more reasonable level, our economic recovery will falter.¶ Just The Facts¶ The chart below illustrates how unemployment and GDP move in opposition to each other. Using data from January 1948 until the present, one can easily see the inverse relationship between the two. Upon more careful scrutiny, you will notice that most of the time GDP falls as unemployment rises and vice versa. When you calculate the correlation of these two data sets, you find it is -0.38%. As a refresher, correlation measures how closely two (or more) series of data move relative to each other. The scale is from negative one (-1) to positive one (+1). If the correlation was positive one, then it would be said that the two items moved exactly together. If negative one, then they move in the exact opposite direction. In layman terms, correlation measures how each “zigs” and/or “zags” in relation to each other. With unemployment and GDP having a correlation of -0.38%, there is a strong negative relationship. Therefore, we must get the American worker back into the labor force.¶ More Evidence¶ If you need additional evidence, consider this. When you include all calendar quarters from January 1948 through the end of the second quarter 2012, the average unemployment rate during quarters when GDP was negative (i.e.; the economy contracted), was 7.4%. The average rate during the entire period was 5.8%. When you exclude all quarters with negative GDP, the average unemployment rate was 5.6%. Therefore, it is easy to conclude that until we can get unemployment down to say less than 6.0%, GDP will likely remain sluggish.

#### Deficit reduction’s key to prevent economic collapse

Mauldin 11 John, President of Business Marketing Group and President of Millennium Wave Advisors, LLC (MWA) which is an investment advisory firm registered with multiple states,

Business Insider, "We Need To Cut The Deficit Right Now -- And Doing It Is Going To Clobber The Economy", May 7, articles.businessinsider.com/2011-05-07/news/29964201\_1\_endgame-spain-enemies-list/4

Then there is the crisis scenario. Let’s assume we do not deal with the deficit in any meaningful way. Eventually the debt will rise to epic, Greek proportions. The bond vigilantes arise from the dead and start to push up interest rates. Interest as a percentage of government spending rises, crowding out other government expenses or increasing the debt still further.¶ Then we have a crisis. We are FORCED by the bond market to get the deficits under control, but now we are doing so in a crisis. Health care will have to be slashed by far more than it would in a more controlled scenario. Tax increases will be brutal. You think Social Security is untouchable? Not in this crisis world. Means testing and spending freezes will be the rule of the day. Military cuts will seem draconian. Our allies who depend on us for a defense shield will not be happy. Education? On the chopping block. The economy will not be Muddle Through, but Depression 2.0. Unemployment will go north of 15%.¶ What’s my basis for this? History. This movie has played over and over again in various countries in modern history. While we may be the world’s superpower, we are not immune from the laws of economic reality.¶ In such a scenario, I expect QE 3-4-5-6. Could the Fed literally monetize the debt and then “poof” it? When our backa are against the wall, don’t assume that what has been seen as normal will be the reigning paradigm.¶ Let me jump out on a real limb. I was having dinner last Monday with Christian Menegatti, the #2 economist at friend Nouriel Roubini’s economic analysis shop. We were comparing notes (imagine that), and he said their opinion is that the US has until 2015 before the bond market really calls the deficit hand. Knowing that Nouriel is seen as the ultimate bear, it makes me nervous to put out my own even more bearish analysis.¶ I think the crucial point will be reached in late 2013. If the bond market sees a serious move to control the deficit, I think they let us “skate.” Then we Muddle Through. But if not, I think we begin to see some real push-back on rates then.¶ Why so early? Because bond investors are going to be watching the slow-motion train wreck that is happening in Europe and especially Japan. It is one thing for Greece to default (which they will in one form or another, with lots of rumors flying this morning), yet another for Japan to do so. Japan is big and makes a difference. Japan could start to go as early as the middle of 2013. As I have said, Japan is a bug in search of a windshield. Whenever this happens, 2013 or a year or so later, it is going to spook the bond market. The normal indulgence that a superpower and reserve-currency country would be accorded will become much more strained. It will seemingly happen overnight. Think Lehman Brothers on steroids.¶ I think the chances we will deal with this potential crisis are about 75%. Not doing so is such a horrific outcome that I think politicians will do the right thing. See, I am an optimist. (What was it Winston Churchill said? “You can always depend on the Americans to do the right thing, after they have exhausted all the other possibilities.”)¶ And let me note that I have had some rather at-length, high-level (but very off-the-record) discussions with politicians on the right in recent weeks. More and more of them are really getting it. But as one said to me, “John, I can’t run on that platform.” And that is the reason that I give it a 25% chance that we’ll wait until a crisis hits us. If the “good guys” (my view, not yours, gentle reader – I know many of you are of the more liberal persuasion) need a real push to act correctly, we are not in good shape.¶ I totally recognize it will not be easy to fix it. It will probably mean tax increases, which will not be good for the economy. And spending cuts that will be painful. I get all the consequences. I have written about them. But the goal is to get rid of the cancer of the deficit. It could truly destroy our economic body. Sometimes, if you have cancer, you take very ugly chemicals into your body, which have very serious side effects. The prospect does not make me happy at all, but we have made bad choices as a country for decades, and now we have to pay the price.

#### Independently, removing oil restrictions ensures long-term growth and revitalizes the shipbuilding and chemical industries

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. II. OFFSHORE OIL AND GAS RESERVE ESTIMATES AND THE SOURCES OF THEIR ECONOMIC BENEFITS As described in my 2009 white paper, "The Economic Contribution of Increased Offshore Oil Exploration and Production to Regional and National Economies," available at www.americanenergyalliance.org/images/aea\_offshore\_updated\_final.pdf, significant oil and gas reserves lie under the U.S. Outer Continental Shelf (OCS). According to the Energy Information Administration (EIA), the OCS (including Alaskan OCS Planning Areas) contains approximately 86 billion barrels of recoverable oil and approximately 420 trillion cubic feet of recoverable natural gas. As noted by the White House, however, the OCS estimates are conservative. Of the total OCS reserves, a significant portion was unavailable to exploration until recently. Specifically, Presidential and Congressional mandates banned production from OCS Planning Areas covering approximately 18 billion barrels of recoverable oil and 77.61 trillion cubic feet of recoverable natural gas. These bans covered approximately 31 percent of the total recoverable OCS oil reserves and 25 percent of the total recoverable OCS natural gas reserves. Economic benefits of utilizing OCS reserves accrue from three primary sources: (1) exploration/platform investments; (2) production; and (3) refining. Sources (1) and (3) produce initial effects--that is, new industry expenditures--today; in contrast, source (2) produce economic effects only once production begins. The analysis therefore considers "initial" economic effects as those that flow from exploration or investments in new refining capacity and long-term economic effects as those that flow from production and ongoing refining. A. Exploration and Offshore Facility Development In contrast to other industries, the high fixed investment costs associated with offshore oil and gas production produce large initial investments that reverberate throughout the economy. Once oil or gas reserves are located, billions of additional dollars must be spent before the well produces even $1 of revenue. For example, oil exploration costs can amount to between $200,000 and $759,000 per day per site. Additional production in the U.S. will also require a costly expansion refining capacity as well. Taken together, the fixed expenditures that precede actual offshore oil and gas production can amount to billions of dollars. For example, Chevron's "Tahiti" project in the Gulf of Mexico is representative of the large investments that firms must make before production is achieved. In 2002, Chevron explored the Tahiti lease--which lies 100 miles off the U.S. coast at a depth of 4,000 feet--and found "an estimated 400 million to 500 million barrels of recoverable resources." Chevron estimates that it will take seven years to build the necessary infrastructure required to begin production at Tahiti. The firm estimates that its total development costs will amount to "$4.7 billion--before realizing $1 of return on our investment." As a typical U.S. offshore project, the Tahiti project provides a wealth of information regarding the up-front investment costs, length of investment, and lifespan of future OCS fields. As noted above, the Tahiti field is estimated to hold between 400 million and 500 million barrels of oil and oil equivalents (primarily natural gas) and is expected to require an initial fixed investment of $4.7 billion. Using the mid-point reserve estimate of 450 million barrels of oil equivalent, up-front development costs amount to approximately $10.44 per barrel of oil reserves or $1.86 per 1,000 cubic feet of natural gas reserves. These costs will be spread over 7 years, resulting in average up-front development expenditures equal to $1.49 per barrel of oil and $0.27 per 1,000 cubic feet of natural gas. Chevron also estimates that the Tahiti project will produce for "up to 30 years". Although investment and production times vary widely, the analysis that follows uses the Tahiti project numbers - an average initial investment period of seven years followed by an average production period of 30 years - as indicative of the "typical" offshore project. I will thus assume an average initial investment period of seven years followed by an average production period of 30 years. The speed of OCS development also factors into the analysis. Because most areas of the U.S. OCS have been closed to new exploration and production for almost forty years, it is unclear how quickly firms would move to develop new offshore fields. Given its large potential reserves, however, the OCS is sure to attract significant investment. Without the benefit of government data, a rough estimate suggests that annual total investment in OCS fields would be $9.09 billion per year. Those annual expenditures are expected to last, on average, the full seven years of the development phase. Additional investment in states that already support significant production - Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas - are limited. Some of the greatest benefits accrue to areas that are home to enormous - but unavailable - total reserves: California and Florida. B. Production The likely value of state recoverable oil and gas reserves are estimated using the likely lifetime revenue that could be generated by the project. In that case, average wholesale energy prices provide the information necessary to translate reserves into revenues. Taking the simple average of the EIA's latest inflation-adjusted energy price forecasts through 2030 as provided by its Annual Energy Outlook 2009, the average inflation-adjusted price of oil will be $110.64 per barrel and the average inflation-adjusted price of natural gas will be $6.83 per thousand cubic feet. At these prices, the estimated OCS reserves are worth about $13 trillion. The value of each state's available reserves are calculated as the sum of (1) its share of available OCS Planning Area oil reserves times $110.64 per barrel and (2) its share of available OCS Planning Area natural gas reserves times $6.83 per thousand cubic feet. The same method applies to the valuation of total state OCS reserves. By those estimation methods, states such as California, facing a budget crisis in the current recession, have an estimated $1.65 trillion in resources available in nearby OCS planning areas. Florida, while not facing as dire a fiscal crisis, has about $0.55 trillion in resources available in nearby OCS planning areas. Hence, a permanent relaxation of all federal OCS production moratoria would unlock more than $3.4 trillion in new production among all the coastal states. C. Investments in Incremental Refining Capacity Since U.S. refineries are presently operating near maximum capacity increased offshore oil and gas production would also spur investment in new refineries. The U.S. refining industry is presently operating at 97.9 percent of capacity and can no longer depend on excess foreign refining to meet production shortfalls arising from seasonality or repairs. In response, many large refiners are already considering refinery expansions: ConocoPhillips announced that it planned to spend $6.5 billion to $7 billion on capacity expansion at its U.S. facilities; Chevron has also considered a major refinery expansion; and while Shell is completing a $7 billion expansion and its Port Arthur, Texas refinery they are considering further expansion elsewhere. Additional refinery investments are likely to occur in the few U.S. states that already host significant U.S. refineries. This result is largely due to environmental restrictions that severely limit the placement of new refining capacity. Current capacity is primarily concentrated in California, Louisiana, and Texas. The U.S. presently has an operating refining capacity of approximately 6.287 billion barrels of crude oil per year. Conservative estimates of OCS production would add approximately 3.773 billion barrels per year, or about sixty percent of current U.S. operating refinery capacity. Because some OCS refining production would most likely substitute for foreign production, however, the analysis conservatively assumes that only one-quarter of this new OCS production necessitates additional U.S. refinery capacity. That is, I estimate that U.S. refinery demand would increase by 943.25 million barrels per year, or 15 percent of current installed capacity. Even this modest capacity increase would require substantial new investments. In response to existing capacity constraints, Shell is already increasing the capacity of its Port Arthur, Texas refinery. This expansion will take approximately two and one-half years to complete and cost $7 billion. The facility will add 325,000 barrels per day (or 118.6 million barrels per year) in new capacity, at a cost of approximately $59.02 per barrel of new annual capacity. As noted above, since tough environmental regulations effectively limit new refinery capacity to a few states, refinery investments are likely to be limited to only a few states with large existing capacity. These states can be reasonably assumed to be the same states the already have large installed refinery capacity. Hence, incremental refinery capacity will be added predominantly in states already home to large refining capacity--those with a present capacity of more than 200 million barrels per year. There are seven such states: California, Illinois, Louisiana, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Washington. Expected increases in offshore oil production will induce approximately $22 billion in refining capacity investments each year for two and one half years. California, Texas, and Louisiana will receive the bulk of this investment, but investments of more than $1 billion annually can be expected in Illinois, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Washington. III. INCREASED INVESTMENTS IN OFFSHORE OIL AND GAS PRODUCTION WILL CAUSE SUBSTANTIAL INCREASES IN WAGES, EMPLOYMENT, AND TAXES, AND PROFOUND EFFECTS ON COMMUNITIES THROUGHOUT THE NATION Onshore state and local economies benefit from the development of OCS reserves by providing goods and services to offshore oil and gas extraction sites. Onshore communities provide all manner of goods and services required by offshore oil and gas extraction. A variety of industries are involved in this effort: shipbuilders provide exploration vessels, permanent and movable platforms, and resupply vessels; steelworkers fashion the drilling machinery and specialized pipes required for offshore resource extraction; accountants and bankers provide financial services; and other onshore employees provide groceries, transportation, refining, and other duties. These onshore jobs, in turn, support other jobs and other industries (such as retail and hospitality establishments). The statistical approach known as an "input-output" analysis measures the economic effects associated with a particular project or economic development plan. This approach, which was pioneered by Nobel Prize winner Wassily Leontif, has been refined by the U.S. Department of Commerce. The most recent version of the Commerce Department's analysis is known as the Regional Input-Output Modelling System, or "RIMS II." The RIMS II model provides a variety of multipliers that measure how an economic development project--such as offshore drilling--would "trickle down" through the economy providing new jobs, wages, and government revenues. This analysis can be broken down into two parts: (1) a "direct" analysis measuring the benefits that arise from industries that directly supply offshore oil and gas exploration and (2) the "final" analysis that measures the direct and indirect benefits associated with offshore exploration. The RIMS II model is the standard method governmental authorities use to evaluate the benefits associated with an economic development project. According to the Commerce Department, the RIMS II model has been used to evaluate the economic effects of many projects, including: opening or closing military bases, tourist expenditures, new energy facilities, opening or closing manufacturing plants, shopping malls, sports stadiums, and new airport or port facilities. A. Opening OCS Planning Areas would Unleash More than $11 trillion in Economic Activity The broadest measure of the incremental effect of increased OCS oil and natural gas extraction is the effect on total economic output. Until OCS production begins, onshore communities will realize only the benefits associated with offshore investment. These benefits take two forms: (1) the development of the offshore facilities themselves and (2) the expansion of onshore refining capacity. These two effects, taken together, provide a rough approximation of the additional output that would be created by allowing greater access to offshore reserves. Of course, the investment expenditures and resulting output estimated above is only made to facilitate oil and gas extraction. Once extraction begins, additional economic activity continues for the lifetime of the oil and natural gas reserves. Using the total U.S. multipliers (2.2860 for refining and 2.3938 for extraction), the total increase in U.S. output from initial investment is estimated to be a total of about $0.5 trillion, or approximately $73 billion per year for the first seven years the OCS is open. For comparative purposes, a $73 billion stimulus amounts to approximately 0.5 percent of total U.S. output (GDP) per year. Increased OCS oil and gas extraction would yield approximately $5.75 trillion in new coastal state output over the lifetime of the fields. Approximating the total increase in output associated with increasing offshore resource production throughout the U.S. (including states in the interior), yields approximately $2.45 trillion in additional output. The total increase in output in the United States is estimated to total approximately $8.2 trillion or about $273 billion per year, which amounts to just over two percent of GDP. Because the OCS areas are currently unavailable, the entire amount--$8.2 trillion--is completely new output created by a simple change in policy allowing resource extraction in additional OCS Planning Areas. B. Opening OCS Planning Areas could Create Millions of New Jobs An economic expansion tied to increased OCS resource production would also create millions of new jobs both in the extraction industry and in other sectors that serve as suppliers or their employees. The annual increase in coastal state employment from initial investments in previously unavailable OCS planning areas and additional refining capacity is estimated to be 185,320 full-time jobs per year. Again, this number does not consider the spill-over effects of investment in productive capacity and refining to other U.S. states. The total increase in U.S. employment from the investment phase is approximately 271,570 full-time jobs per year. Applying the BEA multipliers to the estimated production value results in approximately 870,000 coastal state jobs in addition to the jobs created during the initial investment phase. Again, the total increase in U.S. employment in all states (including those in the interior) resulting from increased OCS production is 340,000 greater, for a total of approximately 1,190,000 jobs be sustained for the entire OCS production period. Increased investment and production in previously unavailable OCS oil and gas extraction and the ancillary industries that support the offshore industry would produce thousands of new jobs in stable and valuable industries. Among the 271,572 jobs created in the investment phase and sustained during the first seven years of the investment cycle. The majority of new positions (162,541 jobs, or 60 percent) would be created in high-skills fields, such as health care, real estate, professional services, manufacturing, administration, finance, education, the arts, information, and management. Although the largest total increase in employment in the production phase would occur (quite naturally) in the mining industry, significant numbers of jobs would be created in other industries. Again, many of these new jobs would be created in high-skills fields, representing approximately 49 percent of all new jobs and approximately 61 percent of all new non-mining jobs. C. Opening OCS Planning Areas can Release Trillions of Dollars of Wages to Workers Hit by Recession Those jobs pay wages. OCS development is estimated to yield approximately $10.7 billion in new wages in coastal states each year. OCS production would yield approximately $1.406 trillion in additional wage income to workers in coastal states over the lifetime of the fields (or $46 billion per year over 30 years). Across the U.S., the investment phase would generate approximately $15.7 billion in additional annual wages per year for the first seven years and $70 billion per year for the next thirty years, or approximately $2.1 trillion in additional wage income. BLS data suggest that all four broad industry classifications related to oil and gas extraction pay higher wages and similar jobs in other industries. Jobs in: (1) Oil and Gas Extraction, (2) Pipeline Transportation of Crude Oil, (3) Petroleum and Coal Products Manufacturing, and (4) Support Activities for Mining, typically pay higher wages than the average American job. Taking this broader measure, the average job created by increased offshore oil and gas production pays approximately 28 percent more than the average U.S. job. D. Opening OCS Planning Areas can Contribute Trillions of Dollars in Taxes and other Public Revenues to Local, State, and Federal Governments Greater output, more jobs, and higher wages translate into higher tax collections and increases in other sources of public revenues. The MMS Report to Congress suggests that public revenues derived from OCS extraction are significant--the U.S. federal government has collected more than $156 billion in lease and levy payments for OCS oil and natural gas production. Note that this amount counts only lease and royalty payments and thus does not include any sales and income taxes paid by firms or workers supported by OCS production. Conservative estimates suggest that seven years of initial annual exploration and refining investments would produce approximately $4.8 billion annually in coastal state and local tax revenue and $11.1 billion in U.S. federal tax income. Over thirty years of production, I estimate that the extraction phase of OCS development would yield approximately $561 billion ($18.7 billion per year) in coastal state and local tax revenue and approximately $1.64 trillion ($54.7 billion per year) in new U.S. federal tax income.

#### Strong chemical industry prevents extinction

Baum 99 – Baum, Founder of Chemical and Engineering News Washington, 12-6-99 (Rudy, “MILLENNIUM SPECIAL REPORT,” C&EN Washington, Volume 77, Number 49, http://pubs.acs.org/cen/hotarticles/cenear/991206/7749spintro2.html)

Computers and the Internet are clearly one of the driving forces shaping all aspects of society at the turn of the millennium. But despite the stock market's insistence that "tech stocks" equal "computer stocks," we here at C&EN believe that chemistry in all its permutations remains a vital component of high technology. Which brings me to this "Millennium Special Report: Chemistry In The Service Of Humanity." The pace of change in today's world is truly incomprehensible. Science is advancing on all fronts, particularly chemistry and biology working together as they never have before to understand life in general and human beings in particular at a breathtaking pace. Technology ranging from computers and the Internet to medical devices to genetic engineering to nanotechnology is transforming our world and our existence in it. It is, in fact, a fool's mission to predict where science and technology will take us in the coming decade, let alone the coming century. We can say with finality only this: We don't know. We do know, however, that we face enormous challenges, we 6 billion humans who now inhabit Earth. In its 1998 revision of world population estimates and projections, the United Nations anticipates a world population in 2050 of 7.3 billion to 10.7 billion, with a "medium-fertility projection," considered the most likely, indicating a world population of 8.9 billion people in 2050. According to the UN, fertility now stands at 2.7 births per woman, down from 5 births per woman in the early 1950s. And fertility rates are declining in all regions of the world. That's good news. But people are living a lot longer. That is certainly good news for the individuals who are living longer, but it also poses challenges for health care and social services the world over. The 1998 UN report estimates for the first time the number of octogenarians, nonagenarians, and centenarians living today and projected for 2050. The numbers are startling. In 1998, 66 million people were aged 80 or older, about one of every 100 persons. That number is expected to increase sixfold by 2050 to reach 370 million people, or one in every 24 persons. By 2050, more than 2.2 million people will be 100 years old or older! Here is the fundamental challenge we face: The world's growing and aging population must be fed and clothed and housed and transported in ways that do not perpetuate the environmental devastation wrought by the first waves of industrialization of the 19th and 20th centuries. As we increase our output of goods and services, as we increase our consumption of energy, as we meet the imperative of raising the standard of living for the poorest among us, we must learn to carry out our economic activities sustainably. There are optimists out there, C&EN readers among them, who believe that the history of civilization is a long string of technological triumphs of humans over the limits of nature. In this view, the idea of a "carrying capacity" for Earth—a limit to the number of humans Earth's resources can support—is a fiction because technological advances will continuously obviate previously perceived limits. This view has historical merit. Dire predictions made in the 1960s about the exhaustion of resources ranging from petroleum to chromium to fresh water by the end of the 1980s or 1990s have proven utterly wrong. While I do not count myself as one of the technological pessimists who see technology as a mixed blessing at best and an unmitigated evil at worst, I do not count myself among the technological optimists either. There are environmental challenges of transcendent complexity that I fear may overcome us and our Earth before technological progress can come to our rescue. Global climate change, the accelerating destruction of terrestrial and oceanic habitats, the catastrophic loss of species across the plant and animal kingdoms—these are problems that are not obviously amenable to straightforward technological solutions. But I know this, too: Science and technology have brought us to where we are, and only science and technology, coupled with innovative social and economic thinking, can take us to where we need to be in the coming millennium. Chemists, chemistry, and the chemical industry—what we at C&EN call the chemical enterprise—will play central roles in addressing these challenges. The first section of this Special Report is a series called "Millennial Musings" in which a wide variety of representatives from the chemical enterprise share their thoughts about the future of our science and industry. The five essays that follow explore the contributions the chemical enterprise is making right now to ensure that we will successfully meet the challenges of the 21st century. The essays do not attempt to predict the future. Taken as a whole, they do not pretend to be a comprehensive examination of the efforts of our science and our industry to tackle the challenges I've outlined above. Rather, they paint, in broad brush strokes, a portrait of scientists, engineers, and business managers struggling to make a vital contribution to humanity's future. The first essay, by Senior Editor Marc S. Reisch, is a case study of the chemical industry's ongoing transformation to sustainable production. Although it is not well known to the general public, the chemical industry is at the forefront of corporate efforts to reduce waste from production streams to zero. Industry giants DuPont and Dow Chemical are taking major strides worldwide to manufacture chemicals while minimizing the environmental "footprint" of their facilities. This is an ethic that starts at the top of corporate structure. Indeed, Reisch quotes Dow President and Chief Executive Officer William S. Stavropolous: "We must integrate elements that historically have been seen as at odds with one another: the triple bottom line of sustainability—economic and social and environmental needs." DuPont Chairman and CEO Charles (Chad) O. Holliday envisions a future in which "biological processes use renewable resources as feedstocks, use solar energy to drive growth, absorb carbon dioxide from the atmosphere, use low-temperature and low-pressure processes, and produce waste that is less toxic." But sustainability is more than just a philosophy at these two chemical companies. Reisch describes ongoing Dow and DuPont initiatives that are making sustainability a reality at Dow facilities in Michigan and Germany and at DuPont's massive plant site near Richmond, Va. Another manifestation of the chemical industry's evolution is its embrace of life sciences. Genetic engineering is a revolutionary technology. In the 1970s, research advances fundamentally shifted our perception of DNA. While it had always been clear that deoxyribonucleic acid was a chemical, it was not a chemical that could be manipulated like other chemicals—clipped precisely, altered, stitched back together again into a functioning molecule. Recombinant DNA techniques began the transformation of DNA into just such a chemical, and the reverberations of that change are likely to be felt well into the next century. Genetic engineering has entered the fabric of modern science and technology. It is one of the basic tools chemists and biologists use to understand life at the molecular level. It provides new avenues to pharmaceuticals and new approaches to treat disease. It expands enormously agronomists' ability to introduce traits into crops, a capability seized on by numerous chemical companies. There is no doubt that this powerful new tool will play a major role in feeding the world's population in the coming century, but its adoption has hit some bumps in the road. In the second essay, Editor-at-Large Michael Heylin examines how the promise of agricultural biotechnology has gotten tangled up in real public fear of genetic manipulation and corporate control over food. The third essay, by Senior Editor Mairin B. Brennan, looks at chemists embarking on what is perhaps the greatest intellectual quest in the history of science—humans' attempt to understand the detailed chemistry of the human brain, and with it, human consciousness. While this quest is, at one level, basic research at its most pure, it also has enormous practical significance. Brennan focuses on one such practical aspect: the effort to understand neurodegenerative diseases like Alzheimer's disease and Parkinson's disease that predominantly plague older humans and are likely to become increasingly difficult public health problems among an aging population. Science and technology are always two-edged swords. They bestow the power to create and the power to destroy. In addition to its enormous potential for health and agriculture, genetic engineering conceivably could be used to create horrific biological warfare agents. In the fourth essay of this Millennium Special Report, Senior Correspondent Lois R. Ember examines the challenge of developing methods to counter the threat of such biological weapons. "Science and technology will eventually produce sensors able to detect the presence or release of biological agents, or devices that aid in forecasting, remediating, and ameliorating bioattacks," Ember writes. Finally, Contributing Editor Wil Lepkowski discusses the most mundane, the most marvelous, and the most essential molecule on Earth, H2O. Providing clean water to Earth's population is already difficult—and tragically, not always accomplished. Lepkowski looks in depth at the situation in Bangladesh—where a well-meaning UN program to deliver clean water from wells has poisoned millions with arsenic. Chemists are working to develop better ways to detect arsenic in drinking water at meaningful concentrations and ways to remove it that will work in a poor, developing country. And he explores the evolving water management philosophy, and the science that underpins it, that will be needed to provide adequate water for all its vital uses. In the past two centuries, our science has transformed the world. Chemistry is a wondrous tool that has allowed us to understand the structure of matter and gives us the ability to manipulate that structure to suit our own purposes. It allows us to dissect the molecules of life to see what makes them, and us, tick. It is providing a glimpse into workings of what may be the most complex structure in the universe, the human brain, and with it hints about what constitutes consciousness. In the coming decades, we will use chemistry to delve ever deeper into these mysteries and provide for humanity's basic and not-so-basic needs.

#### Commercial shipbuilding’s key to naval power

NLUS 12 Navy League of the United States, “America’s Maritime Industry The foundation of American seapower”, 2012, <http://www.navyleague.org/files/americas-maritime-industry.pdf>, Date Verification – http://gsship.org/industry-links/

Defense Industrial Base: Shipbuilding The American Maritime Industry also contributes to our national defense by sustaining the shipbuilding and repair sector of our national defense industrial base upon which our standing as a seapower is based. History has proven that without a strong maritime infrastructure—shipyards, suppliers, and seafarers—no country can hope to build and support a Navy of sufficient size and capability to protect its interests on a global basis. Both our commercial and naval fleets rely on U.S. shipyards and their numerous industrial vendors for building and repairs. The U.S. commercial shipbuilding and repair industry also impacts our national economy by adding billions of dollars to U.S. economic output annually. In 2004, there were 89 shipyards in the major shipbuilding and repair base of the United States, defined by the Maritime Administration as including those shipyards capable of building, repairing, or providing topside repairs for ships 122 meters (400 feet) in length and over. This includes six large shipyards that build large ships for the U.S. Navy. Based on U.S. Coast Guard vessel registration data for 2008, in that year U.S. shipyards delivered 13 large deep-draft vessels including naval ships, merchant ships, and drilling rigs; 58 offshore service vessels; 142 tugs and towboats, 51 passenger vessels greater than 50 feet in length; 9 commercial fishing vessels; 240 other self- propelled vessels; 23 mega-yachts; 10 oceangoing barges; and 224 tank barges under 5,000 GT. 11 Since the mid 1990’s, the industry has been experiencing a period of modernization and renewal that is largely market-driven, backed by long-term customer commitments. Over the six-year period from 2000-05, a total of $2.336 billion was invested in the industry, while in 2006, capital investments in the U.S. shipbuilding and repair industry amounted to $270 million.12 The state of the industrial base that services this nation’s Sea Services is of great concern to the U.S. Navy. Even a modest increase in oceangoing commercial shipbuilding would give a substantial boost to our shipyards and marine vendors. Shipyard facilities at the larger shipyards in the United States are capable of constructing merchant ships as well as warships, but often cannot match the output of shipyards in Europe and Asia. On the other hand, U.S. yards construct and equip the best warships, aircraft carriers and submarines in the world. They are unmatched in capability, but must maintain that lead. 13

#### Naval power solves nuclear war

Conway et al 7 James – General, US Marine Corps, Commandant of the Marine Corps, Gary Roughead – Admiral, U.S. navy, Chief of Naval Operations, Thad Allen – Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Commandant of the Coast Guard, A Cooperative Strategy for 21st Century Seapower, p. http://www.navy.mil/maritime/MaritimeStrategy.pdf

No other disruption is as potentially disastrous to global stability as war among major powers. Maintenance and extension of this Nation’s comparative seapower advantage is a key component of deterring major power war. While war with another great power strikes many as improbable, the near-certainty of its ruinous effects demands that it be actively deterred using all elements of national power. The expeditionary character of maritime forces—our lethality, global reach, speed, endurance, ability to overcome barriers to access, and operational agility—provide the joint commander with a range of deterrent options. We will pursue an approach to deterrence that includes a credible and scalable ability to retaliate against aggressors conventionally, unconventionally, and with nuclear forces. Win our Nation’s wars. In times of war, our ability to impose local sea control, overcome challenges to access, force entry, and project and sustain power ashore, makes our maritime forces an indispensable element of the joint or combined force. This expeditionary advantage must be maintained because it provides joint and combined force commanders with freedom of maneuver. Reinforced by a robust sealift capability that can concentrate and sustain forces, sea control and power projection enable extended campaigns ashore.

#### Now is key---industry collapse causes South China Sea conflict

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.

#### That’s the most likely scenario for US-China war

Glaser 12 Bonnie S., Senior Fellow – Center for Strategic and International Studies, “Armed Clash in the South China Sea,” CFR, April, http://www.cfr.org/east-asia/armed-clash-south-china-sea/p27883

The risk of conflict in the South China Sea is significant. China, Taiwan, Vietnam, Malaysia, Brunei, and the Philippines have competing territorial and jurisdictional claims, particularly over rights to exploit the region's possibly extensive reserves of oil and gas. Freedom of navigation in the region is also a contentious issue, especially between the United States and China over the right of U.S. military vessels to operate in China's two-hundred-mile exclusive economic zone (EEZ). These tensions are shaping—and being shaped by—rising apprehensions about the growth of China's military power and its regional intentions. China has embarked on a substantial modernization of its maritime paramilitary forces as well as naval capabilities to enforce its sovereignty and jurisdiction claims by force if necessary. At the same time, it is developing capabilities that would put U.S. forces in the region at risk in a conflict, thus potentially denying access to the U.S. Navy in the western Pacific. Given the growing importance of the U.S.-China relationship, and the Asia-Pacific region more generally, to the global economy, the United States has a major interest in preventing any one of the various disputes in the South China Sea from escalating militarily. The Contingencies Of the many conceivable contingencies involving an armed clash in the South China Sea, three especially threaten U.S. interests and could potentially prompt the United States to use force. The most likely and dangerous contingency is a clash stemming from U.S. military operations within China's EEZ that provokes an armed Chinese response. The United States holds that nothing in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) or state practice negates the right of military forces of all nations to conduct military activities in EEZs without coastal state notice or consent. China insists that reconnaissance activities undertaken without prior notification and without permission of the coastal state violate Chinese domestic law and international law. China routinely intercepts U.S. reconnaissance flights conducted in its EEZ and periodically does so in aggressive ways that increase the risk of an accident similar to the April 2001 collision of a U.S. EP-3 reconnaissance plane and a Chinese F-8 fighter jet near Hainan Island. A comparable maritime incident could be triggered by Chinese vessels harassing a U.S. Navy surveillance ship operating in its EEZ, such as occurred in the 2009 incidents involving the USNS Impeccable and the USNS Victorious. The large growth of Chinese submarines has also increased the danger of an incident, such as when a Chinese submarine collided with a U.S. destroyer's towed sonar array in June 2009. Since neither U.S. reconnaissance aircraft nor ocean surveillance vessels are armed, the United States might respond to dangerous behavior by Chinese planes or ships by dispatching armed escorts. A miscalculation or misunderstanding could then result in a deadly exchange of fire, leading to further military escalation and precipitating a major political crisis. Rising U.S.-China mistrust and intensifying bilateral strategic competition would likely make managing such a crisis more difficult

#### Extinction

Lieven 12 Anatol, Professor in the War Studies Department – King’s College (London), Senior Fellow – New America Foundation (Washington), “Avoiding US-China War,” New York Times, 6-12, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/06/13/opinion/avoiding-a-us-china-war.html

Relations between the United States and China are on a course that may one day lead to war. This month, Defense Secretary Leon Panetta announced that by 2020, 60 percent of the U.S. Navy will be deployed in the Pacific. Last November, in Australia, President Obama announced the establishment of a U.S. military base in that country, and threw down an ideological gauntlet to China with his statement that the United States will “continue to speak candidly to Beijing about the importance of upholding international norms and respecting the universal human rights of the Chinese people.” The dangers inherent in present developments in American, Chinese and regional policies are set out in “The China Choice: Why America Should Share Power,” an important forthcoming book by the Australian international affairs expert Hugh White. As he writes, “Washington and Beijing are already sliding toward rivalry by default.” To escape this, White makes a strong argument for a “concert of powers” in Asia, as the best — and perhaps only — way that this looming confrontation can be avoided. The economic basis of such a U.S.-China agreement is indeed already in place. The danger of conflict does not stem from a Chinese desire for global leadership. Outside East Asia, Beijing is sticking to a very cautious policy, centered on commercial advantage without military components, in part because Chinese leaders realize that it would take decades and colossal naval expenditure to allow them to mount a global challenge to the United States, and that even then they would almost certainly fail. In East Asia, things are very different. For most of its history, China has dominated the region. When it becomes the largest economy on earth, it will certainly seek to do so. While China cannot build up naval forces to challenge the United States in distant oceans, it would be very surprising if in future it will not be able to generate missile and air forces sufficient to deny the U.S. Navy access to the seas around China. Moreover, China is engaged in territorial disputes with other states in the region over island groups — disputes in which Chinese popular nationalist sentiments have become heavily engaged. With communism dead, the Chinese administration has relied very heavily — and successfully — on nationalism as an ideological support for its rule. The problem is that if clashes erupt over these islands, Beijing may find itself in a position where it cannot compromise without severe damage to its domestic legitimacy — very much the position of the European great powers in 1914. In these disputes, Chinese nationalism collides with other nationalisms — particularly that of Vietnam, which embodies strong historical resentments. The hostility to China of Vietnam and most of the other regional states is at once America’s greatest asset and greatest danger. It means that most of China’s neighbors want the United States to remain militarily present in the region. As White argues, even if the United States were to withdraw, it is highly unlikely that these countries would submit meekly to Chinese hegemony. But if the United States were to commit itself to a military alliance with these countries against China, Washington would risk embroiling America in their territorial disputes. In the event of a military clash between Vietnam and China, Washington would be faced with the choice of either holding aloof and seeing its credibility as an ally destroyed, or fighting China. Neither the United States nor China would “win” the resulting war outright, but they would certainly inflict catastrophic damage on each other and on the world economy. If the conflict escalated into a nuclear exchange, modern civilization would be wrecked. Even a prolonged period of military and strategic rivalry with an economically mighty China will gravely weaken America’s global position. Indeed, U.S. overstretch is already apparent — for example in Washington’s neglect of the crumbling states of Central America.

### 1AC – Solvency

#### CONTENTION 4: SOLVENCY

#### Obama is expanding access now but the current plan is too restrictive

Reuters 12 June 28, 2012, “U.S. unveils final drilling plan, limits Arctic sales”, http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/06/28/us-usa-drilling-offshore-idUSBRE85R1MJ20120628?feedType=RSS&feedName=everything&virtualBrandChannel=11563

WASHINGTON (Reuters) – U.S. oil companies will be allowed to drill in more areas of the Gulf of Mexico but won only limited access to the Arctic under the final version of the Obama Administration’s five year drilling plan that was slammed by industry and some environmentalists.¶ The 2012-2017 plan calls for three potential lease sales in areas offshore Alaska but the auctions would not be held until the final years of the plan because of environmental concerns about operating in the Arctic.¶ “Put simply, this program opens the vast majority of known offshore oil and gas resources for development over the next five years and includes a cautious but forward-looking leasing strategy for the Alaska Arctic,” said Secretary Ken Salazar.¶ The plan was called “too restrictive” by the American Petroleum Institute and criticized by Republican lawmakers who are sure to blast the drilling blueprint on the campaign trail.¶ “Today, the Obama Administration has announced a bleak future for American energy production by keeping 85 percent of America’s offshore areas under lock and key and refusing to open any new areas to drilling,” said Doc Hastings, Republican chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee.

#### Arctic drilling’s inevitable---the US needs to take the lead

O’Keefe 12 William O'Keefe is CEO at the George C. Marshall Institute, a think tank that promotes better use of science in public policy, July 23, 2012, “Decision Isn't America's Alone To Make”, http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/07/is-arctic-oil-drilling-ready-f.php

The decision on whether Arctic oil drilling is ready for prime time is not the federal government’s to make. The United States does not have a monopoly on exploration and production in the Arctic Ocean.¶ Denmark, Canada, Norway, Russia, and the United States all have economic sovereignty in Arctic waters. The Arctic Ocean’s large resource potential, about 22 percent of the world’s undiscovered conventional oil and natural gas resources based on the US Geological Survey (USGS), ensures that it will be explored. Since the USGS believes that gas is the predominant resource there the rate of exploration is likely to be slow and deliberate because of the abundance of on-shore gas production and its current affordable price. But, in the end, the US can either be a leader or laggard in realizing the economic benefits of exploration.¶ The oil and gas industry has been drilling in hostile environments for decades and in the North Slope of Alaska since the late 1970s. Exploration there as well as in the North Sea and “Iceberg Alley” off the coast of Nova Scotia has provided the experience, knowledge, and technology for drilling in the Arctic Ocean.¶ Companies like Shell, Chevron, and ExxonMobil, just to name a few, are engineering technology companies. They have the talent, expertise, and the commitment to operating integrity and excellence to meet the challenges of the Arctic Ocean. Of course, much of the attention being given to the Arctic Ocean is a result of the government continuing to prohibit exploration in Alaska’s coastal plain, which might hold more oil and gas than Prudhoe Bay where over 11 billion barrels have been produced safely.¶ As we have seen over the past few years, domestic oil and gas development brings about important economic benefits. While the overall economy has been struggling to create jobs, the oil and gas industry has been creating them, 150,000 last year according to the energy consulting firm CERA. Those jobs and the investments that make them possible produce federal and state tax benefits. And, as has been said over and over, a barrel of oil produced here is a barrel that is not imported from unstable regions of the world.¶ It should be remembered that the oil industry has an excellent record in offshore exploration and production. Thousands of offshore wells, including deep-water ones, have been safely drilled around the world. From 1969 to 2010 when the Deepwater Horizon accident occurred, there were no major accidents. That is an impressive record. Environmental opposition to any energy development in Alaska, the Deep Horizon accident, and the general hostility of the Obama Administration to oil and gas development are factors that ensure that exploration will be done carefully and with an abundance of caution. Shell has no doubt demonstrated more than reasonable prudence in its engineering and operating plans to reduce risks as much as practical.¶ We do not live in a risk free world and no one or company can guarantee otherwise. Our advances in technology and innovation are the result of risk taking and our standard of living is better because of it. The point made at the beginning is worth repeating. Arctic Ocean oil resources will be developed. The only open question is by whom?

#### US leadership’s key---failure to drill in federal Alaskan waters causes other countries to fill in

Sullivan 12 Dan Sullivan, a former state attorney general, is the commissioner of Alaska's Department of Natural Resources, July 20, 2012, “It's time to develop our Arctic resources”, http://www.cnn.com/2012/07/20/opinion/sullivan-arctic-drilling/index.html

The United States is on the verge of an energy renaissance. We need to recognize and seize the opportunity.¶ This renaissance involves domestic production of natural resources ranging from clean renewables to hydrocarbons.¶ In particular, domestic hydrocarbon production -- both oil and gas -- is increasing dramatically, with some experts predicting that the United States could become the largest hydrocarbon producer in the word -- outstripping Saudi Arabia and Russia -- by 2020.¶ Increased domestic production of hydrocarbons is driven by two trends. First, new technology is unlocking unconventional resources such as shale-derived oil and gas. And second, investors and policy makers are recognizing that the U.S. still has an enormous resource base of conventional oil and gas, particularly in Alaska.¶ Federal agencies estimate that Alaska's North Slope and federal waters off Alaska's northern coast contain approximately 40 billion barrels of technically recoverable oil and more than 200 trillion cubic feet of conventional gas.¶ According to the U.S. Geological Survey, this region contains more oil than any comparable region located in the Arctic, including northern Russia.¶ However, the United States is lagging behind its Arctic neighbors in developing these resources. This is unfortunate, because we have some of the highest environmental standards in the world and we should be setting the bar for Arctic development.¶ Developing our Arctic resources will promote our nation's interests in many ways: securing a politically stable, long-term supply of domestic energy; boosting U.S. economic growth and jobs; reducing the federal trade deficit; and strengthening our global leadership on energy issues. Leading academic researchers and economists in Alaska have estimated that oil production from Alaska's outer continental shelf will bring federal revenues of approximately $167 billion over 50 years, and create 55,000 jobs throughout the country.¶ Developing U.S. resources in the Arctic has the added benefit of enhancing global environmental protection.¶ One of the arguments used by Arctic drilling opponents is that "we aren't ready," but it is obvious that no matter what preparations are made, they will argue that it isn't enough.¶ Shell, for example, has spent billions to prepare for drilling in the Arctic this summer, incorporating the lessons learned from the Deepwater Horizon spill in the Gulf of Mexico, state-of-the-art equipment and extensive scientific research. Recently, the Obama administration has publically expressed its confidence in the company's drilling plans.¶ The U.S. has created some of the highest standards in the world for environmental protection. When we delay or disallow responsible resource development, the end result is not to protect the environment, but to drive hydrocarbon investment and production to countries with much lower environmental standards and enforcement capacity.¶ Last year, it was reported that between 5 million and 20 million tons of oil leak in Russia per year. This is equivalent to a Deepwater Horizon blowout about every two months. Russia had an estimated 18,000 oil pipeline ruptures in 2010 -- the figure for the U.S. that year was 341.¶ If we do not pursue responsible development in the Arctic, countries such as Russia -- perhaps even China, which is interested in securing access to Arctic hydrocarbon resources -- will dominate energy production from the Arctic. Such a scenario does not bode well for the global environment.¶ By embracing the opportunities in the Arctic, the United States will show the world that it can be a strong leader in responsible energy development.

#### US must encourage oil production to ensure Arctic leadership---it’s safe and fears are hyperbolic and reactionary

Holt 1/21 David, President at Consumer Energy Alliance, "Arctic Exploration Vital to Our Future", 2013, energy.nationaljournal.com/2013/01/are-arctic-oildrilling-challen.php

The Obama Administration must remain steadfast in its support for Arctic offshore energy exploration while continuing to enforce strict safety standards over drilling operations. Recent calls to end Arctic exploration are overly reactionary, short-sighted and based on hyperbolic fears. The Obama Administration should ensure that the regulations in place can effectively minimize the risks of drilling without discouraging the most-capable operators from moving forward in this vital energy frontier. In undertaking this 60-day review, the Administration must understand that its actions could have sweeping, generational impacts for the future of Arctic energy. Its decision not only affects the prospects for Shell’s venture, but also efforts by other operators invested in the region, and America’s role as a global leader in Arctic development and Arctic policy.¶ The Alaskan Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) holds significant influence on the future of U.S. economic and energy security as well as global geopolitical relations. The U.S. Chukchi and Beaufort Seas could well be one of the most prolific energy reserves in North America, holding an estimated 27 billion barrels of oil and 132 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. Given its immense natural resource potential as well as strategic importance, it’s clear why the U.S. government declared that our nation has “broad and fundamental national security interests in the Arctic.”¶ Failure to increase Arctic oil production could force the premature closure of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System. TAPS – one of the most critical energy infrastructures in the United States – is averaging less than 600,000 barrels of throughput a day, down from a high of nearly 2 million barrels a day in 1988. Low throughput increases the likelihood of inoperability due to the hazards that compound with low volumes of warm oil in the pipeline. Closing the pipeline would strand Alaskan oil, which currently accounts for nearly 10 percent of U.S. production, and cause a supply crisis for consumers on the West Coast who consume over half a million barrels daily of Alaskan crude.¶ Additionally, the United States needs to be a leader in Arctic, particularly a leader in how to face environmental challenges with science, technology and thoughtful regulation. Premature calls to end exploration because the Arctic is too harsh, too unpredictable, or too risky for any type of economic activity will put the United States on the sidelines. Greenland and Norway, both of which have already established oil and gas programs, demonstrate that Arctic exploration, while challenging, can be accomplished safely. In fact, Norway’s even laid out a 20-year plan to expand its development of Arctic resources, noting it’s “a project of a generation.” This is the kind of determination and vision the United States projected when it launched its space program. One would only hope will still possess these attributes today.¶ The economics, technology and outlook all point to the viability of Arctic OCS development and the need for it. While it may be years before any meaningful production of oil comes online, the United States should be taking steps now to expand exploration and production in order to meet future demand – not to discourage it.¶ Energy security, economic growth, and scientific understanding and leadership are reasons to “do big things” in the Arctic. No one is trying to abdicate the responsibility for protecting the environment. But now is not the time to let fear drive public policy. Let’s take a leading role and make the Arctic with all of its economic and energy security benefits, a resource for all Americans.

#### Arctic drilling’s viable and effective---benefits outweigh minimal risks

Luthi 1/24 Randall, President of the National Ocean Industries Association, "Keep Cool Head on Arctic Energy Development", 2013, energy.nationaljournal.com/2013/01/are-arctic-oildrilling-challen.php

No one contests the need to proceed cautiously with energy exploration and development, whether it is in Alaskan waters or on the plains of North Dakota. However, calls to end Arctic oil and natural gas exploration often overstate the risks, understate the economic and energy potential, and inject hyperbolic claims into what should be a reasoned, fact-based policy making decision.¶ Opponents of Arctic energy exploration point to the accidental grounding of the Kulluk drilling rig, the near-grounding of the Noble Discoverer and flaws with one containment vessel, as justification to end all oil and natural gas exploration activities in the Arctic. While these were indeed unfortunate mishaps, none of them had direct connection to actual drilling activities. In fact, the actual (limited) drilling operations in the Arctic last year were conducted safely and without incident.¶ The Kulluk and Noble Discoverer mishaps were, rather, both examples of transportation accidents. That makes them more akin to an incident involving a cruise ship. However, if one of those runs aground, the cruise ship industry continues to operate, even in Alaska.¶ The flaws with the containment vessel were discovered during a test run. Identifying sticking points and incorporating their lessons into future designs is exactly why these tests are scheduled in the first place. Much like the space program, offshore energy exploration is a complex engineering feat. Testing and inspections, such as where the cited containment vessel failed, are a crucial part of a carefully planned and thorough process, and will make the overall operation safer and more secure once it actually occurs.¶ Admittedly, the Arctic is a challenging region in which to operate. Weather conditions, near-freezing water and distance from widespread infrastructure will require innovative solutions. In fact, one upside from the retreat of historic sea-ice levels is that the ice becomes less of a threat to sea-surface installations. In some respects, less sea ice makes operating in the Arctic less risky, not more.¶ Additional infrastructure for rapid spill response, worker housing, and an increased Coast Guard presence must be built. But there has to be offshore activity before such investments can be justified. When drilling commences, the fleets and equipment will be there, and are in fact required under the permitting process. Regulators are in the process of verifying that all containment, response and clean-up measures required will be in place during drilling. The companies are already responsible for any potential damages and mitigation and it is in their best interest to ensure the necessary facilities and technologies are there.¶ Finally, consider what is at stake. The Arctic has huge oil and gas reserves—90 billion barrels of oil and 1,670 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, according to U.S. Geological Survey estimates. Norway, Canada, Russia and other nations are already staking their claims to the immense energy potential in the region. Clearly, they do not share the same fear that arctic regions cannot be explored and developed safely.¶ The United States cannot afford to overlook the tremendous potential for the development of oil and natural gas from the Arctic. Yes, it is impossible to eliminate all risk. But the risks are minimal and the reward for the nation is incalculable. This development will generate necessary domestic jobs, send royalty revenue to the increasingly-strained federal treasury, offer a continued supply to ensure the Trans-Alaska Pipeline’s viability for decades to come, and strengthen our national security with an abundance of homegrown resources. This can all be done safely, under a rigorous system of inspections and oversight. It is most definitely NOT time to abandon the Arctic.
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## Leadership

### Icebreakers Add-On

#### Plan results in more icebreakers

Hobson 12 Margaret Kriz Hobson is the energy and environmental correspondent for the National Journal and from 2005 to 2006 was a Nieman Foundation Journalism Fellow at Harvard, June 27, 2012, “Calls for Arctic policy intensify as Shell nears final OK for exploration”, http://www.eenews.net/public/energywire/2012/06/27/1

Unlike the citizens of Canada, Norway and Russia, most Americans do not view the United States as an Arctic nation. However, that could change as drilling shines the spotlight on Alaska's Arctic.¶ If Shell is able to channel Arctic oil to the lower 48 states and international shipping companies begin to route their vessels through North Pole waters, new icebreakers might be considered a top national priority.¶ "People that are growing the wheat in North Dakota should care about how grain moves around the world and the opportunity the Arctic could present if we have shipping lanes that are open through a good portion of the year," Murkowski said. "We need to make it real to other people in the country in this tough budget climate."

#### Icebreakers key to US science diplomacy

NRC 7 National Research Council, “POLAR ICEBREAKERS IN A CHANGING WORLD: An Assessment of U.S. Needs, Committee on the Assessment of U.S. Coast Guard Polar Icebreaker Roles and Future Needs, Polar Research Board, Division on Earth and Life Studies NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMIES, 2007, http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record\_id=11753&page=R1

Until recently, the two Polar class icebreakers (sometimes together and sometimes separately depending on ice conditions) were used to break open a channel for resupply.4 However, more challenging ice conditions and the deteriorating status of the Polar class ships now adds uncertainty and risk of failure to the operation. The National Science Foundation (NSF) is concerned that the lack of reliable icebreaking support may make it increasingly difficult to maintain the permanent stations and associated science programs. Investigations of alternate logistics plans by NSF (discussed in Chapter 8) have reaffirmed that icebreaker support is necessary to the Antarctic resupply chain for now and in the foreseeable future. According to a representative of the Department of State assigned to Antarctic issues, if resupply of South Pole Station is not successful and the station were abandoned, this would jeopardize, and probably reduce, the influence of the United States in Antarctic governance. There would be significant consequences because abandonment of that key site would create a vacuum in leadership and likely result in a scramble for control. Abandoning it would be detrimental to the U.S. position as well as to the stability of the treaty system. To preserve the U.S. presence in Antarctica and hence its influential role in the Antarctic Treaty, it is paramount to maintain the three permanent research stations and their associated active research programs throughout the Antarctic continent. Icebreaker operations are critical to the continued existence of these stations and their associated outlying field sites.

#### Solves every impact

Fedoroff 8—Former Science and Technology Adviser to the Sec of State. Chaired Professor of Life Sciences and Evan Pugh Professor in the Biology Department and the Huck Institutes of the Life Sciences, Pennsylvania State University. (Nina, Statement before Subcommittee on Research and Science Education, Committee on S&T, USHR, http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CHRG-110hhrg41470/html/CHRG-110hhrg41470.htm)

Chairman Baird, Ranking Member Ehlers, and distinguished members of the Subcommittee, thank you for this opportunity to discuss science diplomacy at the U.S. Department of State. The U.S. is recognized globally for its leadership in science and technology. Our scientific strength is both a tool of “soft power” – part of our strategic diplomatic arsenal – and a basis for creating partnerships with countries as they move beyond basic economic and social development. Science diplomacy is a central element of the Secretary’s transformational diplomacy initiative, because science and technology are essential to achieving stability and strengthening failed and fragile states. S&T advances have **immediate and enormous influence** on national and global economies, and thus on the international relations between societies. Nation states, nongovernmental organizations, and multinational corporations are largely shaped by their expertise in and access to intellectual and physical capital in science, technology, and engineering. Even as S&T advances of our modern era provide opportunities for economic prosperity, some also challenge the relative position of countries in the world order, and influence our social institutions and principles. **America must remain at the forefront** of this new world **by maintaining its technological edge**, and leading the way internationally through science diplomacy and engagement. The Public Diplomacy Role of Science Science by its nature facilitates diplomacy because it strengthens political relationships, embodies powerful ideals, and creates opportunities for all. The global scientific community embraces principles Americans cherish: transparency, meritocracy, accountability, the objective evaluation of evidence, and broad and frequently democratic participation. Science is inherently democratic, respecting evidence and truth above all. Science is also a common global language, able to bridge deep political and religious divides. Scientists share a common language. Scientific interactions serve to keep open lines of communication and cultural understanding. As scientists everywhere have a common evidentiary external reference system, members of ideologically divergent societies can use the common language of science to **cooperatively address** both domestic and the increasingly trans-national and **global problems** confronting humanity in the 21st century. There is a growing recognition that science and technology will increasingly drive the successful economies of the 21st century. Science and technology provide an immeasurable benefit to the U.S. by bringing scientists and students here, especially from developing countries, where they see democracy in action, make friends in the international scientific community, become familiar with American technology, and contribute to the U.S. and global economy. For example, in 2005, over 50% of physical science and engineering graduate students and postdoctoral researchers trained in the U.S. have been foreign nationals. Moreover, many foreign-born scientists who were educated and have worked in the U.S. eventually progress in their careers to hold influential positions in ministries and institutions both in this country and in their home countries. They also contribute to U.S. scientific and technologic development: According to the National Science Board’s 2008 Science and Engineering Indicators, 47% of full-time doctoral science and engineering faculty in U.S. research institutions were foreign-born. Finally, some types of science – particularly those that address the grand challenges in science and technology – are inherently international in scope and collaborative by necessity. The ITER Project, an international fusion research and development collaboration, is a product of the thaw in superpower relations between Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President Ronald Reagan. This reactor will harness the power of nuclear fusion as a possible new and viable energy source by bringing a star to earth. ITER serves as a symbol of international scientific cooperation among key scientific leaders in the developed and developing world – Japan, Korea, China, E.U., India, Russia, and United States – representing 70% of the world’s current population. The recent elimination of funding for FY08 U.S. contributions to the ITER project comes at an inopportune time as the Agreement on the Establishment of the ITER International Fusion Energy Organization for the Joint Implementation of the ITER Project had entered into force only on October 2007. The elimination of the promised U.S. contribution drew our allies to question our commitment and credibility in international cooperative ventures. More problematically, it jeopardizes a platform for reaffirming U.S. relations with key states. It should be noted that even at the height of the cold war, the United States used science diplomacy as a means to maintain communications and avoid misunderstanding between the world’s two nuclear powers – the Soviet Union and the United States. In a complex multi-polar world, relations are more challenging, the threats perhaps greater, and the need for engagement more paramount. Using Science Diplomacy to Achieve National Security Objectives The welfare and stability of countries and regions in many parts of the globe require a concerted effort by the developed world to address the causal factors that render countries fragile and cause states to fail. Countries that are unable to defend their people against starvation, or fail to provide economic opportunity, are susceptible to extremist ideologies, autocratic rule, and abuses of human rights. As well, the world faces common threats, among them climate change, energy and water shortages, public health emergencies, environmental degradation, poverty, food insecurity, and religious extremism. These threats can undermine the national security of the United States, both directly and indirectly. Many are blind to political boundaries, becoming regional or global threats. The United States has no monopoly on knowledge in a globalizing world and the scientific challenges facing humankind are enormous. Addressing these common challenges demands common solutions and necessitates scientific cooperation, common standards, and common goals. We must increasingly harness the power of American ingenuity in science and technology through strong partnerships with the science community in both academia and the private sector, in the U.S. and abroad among our allies, to advance U.S. interests in foreign policy. There are also important challenges to the ability of states to supply their populations with sufficient food. The still-growing human population, rising affluence in emerging economies, and other factors have combined to create unprecedented pressures on global prices of staples such as edible oils and grains. Encouraging and promoting the use of contemporary molecular techniques in crop improvement is an essential goal for US science diplomacy. An essential part of the war on terrorism is a war of ideas. The creation of economic opportunity can do much more to combat the rise of fanaticism than can any weapon. The war of ideas is a war about rationalism as opposed to irrationalism. Science and technology put us firmly on the side of rationalism by providing ideas and opportunities that improve people’s lives. We may use the recognition and the goodwill that science still generates for the United States to achieve our diplomatic and developmental goals. Additionally, the Department continues to use science as a means to reduce the proliferation of the weapons’ of mass destruction and prevent what has been dubbed ‘brain drain’. Through cooperative threat reduction activities, former weapons scientists redirect their skills to participate in peaceful, collaborative international research in a large variety of scientific fields. In addition, new global efforts focus on improving biological, chemical, and nuclear security by promoting and implementing best scientific practices as a means to enhance security, increase global partnerships, and create sustainability.

## Solvency

### AT: SQ Solves

#### Squo drilling unsustainable---fields will be exhausted soon

EB 12/18 Econbrowser, Analysis of current economic conditions and policy, citing David Hughes of the Post-Carbon Institute, "Future production from U.S. shale or tight oil", 2012, www.econbrowser.com/archives/2012/12/future\_producti.html

I attended the American Geophysical Union meeting in San Francisco two weeks ago at which I heard a very interesting presentation by David Hughes of the Post Carbon Institute. He is more pessimistic about future production potential from U.S. shale gas and tight oil formations than some other analysts. Here I report some of the data on tight oil production that led to his conclusion.¶ A number of analysts have issued optimistic assessments of the future production potential of U.S. shale or tight oil. For example, the International Energy Agency recently predicted that the U.S. would be producing over 10 million barrels per day of oil and natural gas liquids by 2020 before resuming a gradual decline. Citigroup is even more optimistic.¶ David Hughes has been studying detailed data on each individual well in shale gas and tight oil formations in the United States as part of a study that will be released by the Post Carbon Institute in February. The most successful new oil-producing region is the Bakken in North Dakota and Montana, which currently accounts for 42% of the U.S. tight oil total and accounts for about 1/5 of the tight oil production that is projected by Citigroup for 2022. Hughes finds that once output from a typical Bakken well begins to decline, within 24 months its production flow is down to 1/5 the level achieved at its peak. This is in line with estimated decline rates separately published by the North Dakota Department of Mineral Resources.¶ Given the observed decline rates on existing wells, it is then a straightforward mechanical exercise to ask the following question. Suppose that no new wells were drilled after 2010. What would the path of Bakken oil production then look like?¶ Increasing the annual production thus requires not just new wells but an increasing number of new wells each year; Hughes estimates that 820 new wells are needed just to offset Bakken field decline. But a second feature in the data posing challenges for that plan is that while a few wells in the Bakken have proven to be very productive, the average well productivity is much lower. A limited number of lucrative sweet spots account for much of the success so far.¶ Hughes argues that there are limits to the number of new wells that will plausibly be drilled each year and the number of available well locations. These factors make achieving the IEA or Citigroup objectives difficult and mean a much more rapid decline in the production rate after the peak is reached. For example, here are Hughes' calculations if the current drilling rate were maintained-- 1500 new wells per year leading to a tripling in the number of operating wells-- and if the EIA's estimate of remaining productive locations is accepted. By contrast, the Citigroup projection of a continuous plateau after reaching peak production would require tens of thousands more well locations than estimated to be available by the EIA.¶ Oil produced from shale or tight formations is going to be very helpful to the U.S. economy. But this is an expensive way to try to get oil, and there may have been some overselling of how much these fields are actually going to deliver.

## CP

### 2AC SEP CP

#### SEPs create uncertainty and prevent environmental improvement

Bonorris 7 Steven, Associate Director for Research, Public Law Research Institute, UC Hastings College of the Law, 1/25, “Supplemental Environmental Projects: A Fifty State Survey with Model Practices,” <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/services/enforce/settlements/ABAHastingsSEPreport.pdf>

Another criticism of the SEP system is that it creates inconsistency in enforcement, apart from the problem of the opportunistic violator. Because regulators cannot accurately assess all of the relevant variables for penalty calculations (or the collateral economic benefits conferred to the violator), the resulting inaccuracy of penalty assessments creates inconsistency in the application of regulations. n167 The imposition of a SEP with its penalty calculations adds another layer of uncertainty and possibility of error to this enforcement picture. Apart from the inherent inequity in inconsistent penalties across violators, overly light penalties effectively confer unfair economic advantage over competitors, who have made the required expenditures to comply with environmental regulations. In addition, the possibility that some violators might receive lighter penalties could induce risk-tolerant would-be violators to adopt a different compliance strategy.¶ While some proponents of SEPs argue that SEPs encourage early adoption of innovative pollution prevention technology ("anticipatory compliance"); others opine, "SEP programs may actually discourage regulated entities from adopting environmental improvements on their own (that is, without government inducement)." n168 A violator that knows it may obtain reduced penalties [\*207] through SEP settlements might delay investments in environmentally beneficial projects until it has a civil penalty that it can be offset against. This violator may achieve a noncompliance benefit over its competitors by using those funds for other ventures; the violator later achieves its original plans for environmentally beneficial projects by carrying them out as a SEP. n169

#### That wrecks solvency

Chazan and Crooks 12 Guy Chazan and Ed Crooks, writers for the Financial Times, September 4, 2012, “Shell woes deter others from US Arctic”, http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/48b8471a-f6aa-11e1-9dff-00144feabdc0.html#axzz26B8B8Ak1

Royal Dutch Shell’s regulatory problems in the US Arctic, where it has faced repeated delays to an ambitious oil exploration campaign, **are deterring other energy groups** with licences in the US’s northern oceans, according to one of the most active companies in the region.¶ Tim Dodson, head of exploration at Norway’s Statoil, said Shell’s experience, which was a “bellwether” for the industry, had reduced the appeal of working in the Chukchi Sea north-west of Alaska.¶ “As long as Shell has not been able to show they can get the permits and start to drill, we’re a bit sceptical about moving forward,” he said in an interview. “**You need that kind of comfort that they will be allowed to do it in a predictable manner**.”

#### Perm do the CP – not enforcing a restriction removes it even if it remains on the books

Berger 1 - Justice for the Supreme Court of Delaware - Opinion, INDUSTRIAL RENTALS, INC., ISAAC BUDOVITCH and FLORENCE BUDOVITCH, Appellants Below, Appellants, v. NEW CASTLE COUNTY BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT and NEW CASTLE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF LAND USE, Appellees Below, Appellees. No. 233, 2000SUPREME COURT OF DELAWARE776 A.2d 528; 2001 Del. LEXIS 300April 10, 2001, Submitted July 17, 2001, Decided lexis

We disagree. HN2 Statutes must be read as a whole and all the words must be given effect. 3 HN3 The word "restriction" means "a limitation (esp. in a deed) placed on the use or enjoyment of property." 4 HN4 If a deed restriction has been satisfied, and no longer limits the use or enjoyment of the property, then it no longer is a deed restriction -- even though the paper on which it was written remains. [\*\*6] Thus, the phrase "projects containing deed restrictions requiring phasing…," in Section 11.130(A)(7) means presently existing deed restrictions. As of June 1988, the Acierno/Marta Declaration contained no remaining deed restrictions requiring phasing to coincide with improvements to the transportation system. As a result, the Acierno/Marta projects should not have been included in the scope of the Budovitches' TIS.

#### Won’t displace the penalty---if it does, causes businesses backlash

CG 96 Connecticut Government environmental policy division, February, “POLICY ON SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, ”http://www.ct.gov/dep/lib/dep/enforcement/policies/seppolicy.pdf

An SEP will not totally displace a monetary penalty2. A monetary penalty is still necessary in order to assure that the Department’s enforcement actions are effective in deterring future violations by this respondent and others in the regulated community. Penalties also help ensure a level playing field by ensuring that violators do not obtain an unfair economic advantage over their competitors who made the necessary expenditures to comply on time. Penalties also encourage companies to adopt pollution prevention and recycling techniques, so that they minimize their pollutant discharges and reduce their potential liabilities. Accordingly, a settlement of a case that warrants a penalty under the Department’s Enforcement Response Policy shall include a monetary penalty, calculated according to the Department’s Civil Penalty Policy, when adopted, which is set at a level that captures the respondents’s economic benefit of noncompliance plus some appreciable portion of the gravity component of the penalty.

#### **Businesses say no**

Brown 11 Mr. Brown holds an MBA from New York University and a BA from Brown University. Matthew Brown is President of InterEnergy Solutions, a consulting firm that focuses on clean energy policy and finance. 2011, "Brief #1: Funding Mechanisms for Energy Efficiency"ase.org/resources/brief-1-funding-mechanisms-energy-efficiency

Funds are not predictable because they depend on fines that state environmental agencies issue, as well as on the interest that industry may or may not have in paying for a particular project. Companies sometimes view SEPs as a cumbersome alternative **to simply paying a fine and moving on with business operations.¶** **Not likely to provide large amounts of funding.**

#### **The SEP will not be approved**

Bonorris 7 Steven, Editor, The Public Law Research Institute University of California, Hastings College of the Law, [http://www.ecy.wa.gov/services/enforce/settlements/ABAHastingsSEPreport.pdf](http://www.ecy.wa.gov/services/enforce/settlements/ABAHastingsSEPreport.pdf-http://www.ecy.wa.gov/services/enforce/settlements/ABAHastingsSEPreport.pdf)

Legal Principles¶ 1. A SEP will not be approved if the violator is otherwise legally required to perform¶ the proposed activity.¶ 2. SEPs should have a clear relationship to the violation. This relationship exists if the project reduces the overall environmental or public health impacts or risks to¶ which the violation contributes, or is designed to reduce the likelihood of similar violations in the future. A SEP may not be directly related to the violation if the¶ project is either: ¶ a. A pollution prevention project that provides significant environmental benefit; or¶ b. Some other multi-media or facility-wide activity that provides widespread¶ environmental benefit.

## DA

### 2AC Venture Capital DA

#### Non-unique VC in renewables now

Appleyard 12—Chief Editor, Renewable Energy World (10/1/12, David, Global Renewables Investment Sets New Record, http://www.renewableenergyworld.com/rea/news/article/2012/10/global-renewables-investment-sets-new-record?page=all)

Venture capital and private equity investment in renewable energy companies was resilient, at $1.4 billion worldwide in the first quarter, up from $1.1 billion in the previous quarter and $1.2 billion in the equivalent quarter of 2011. Solar and biofuels were the two dominant sectors for equity-raisings.¶ Public markets investment was just $473 million, down 46% from the end of 2011 and 87% from the equivalent period in 2011. This was not surprising given the poor performance of clean energy shares over the last few quarters, the authors conclude.¶ Breaking Investment¶ Different types of investment displayed very different fortunes during the year – venture capital investment, for instance, rose 5% to $2.5 billion, but government-funded and corporate research and development both fell back.

#### Zero link---global oil market makes plan irrelevant for prices

Fong 12 Jocelyn, Media Matters Blog, "20 Experts Who Say Drilling Won't Lower Gas Prices", March 22, mediamatters.org/blog/2012/03/22/20-experts-who-say-drilling-wont-lower-gas-pric/184040

In a pretty impressive act of journalism, the Associated Press recently conducted a "statistical analysis of 36 years of monthly, inflation-adjusted gasoline prices and U.S. domestic oil production." The result: "No statistical correlation between how much oil comes out of U.S. wells and the price at the pump." It's neat to see math cut through the talking points and get straight to the truth of the matter -- which is that expanding drilling is a fundamentally ineffectual response to gas price spikes.¶ Given that changes in U.S. oil production don't move gasoline prices, it should be clear that U.S. government policies related to drilling are of even smaller consequence. Indeed, 92 percent of economists surveyed by the Chicago Booth School of Business agreed this week that "changes in U.S. gasoline prices over the past 10 years have predominantly been due to market factors rather than U.S. federal economic or energy policies."¶ Still not convinced? How about another 20 economists and analysts from across the political spectrum who will tell you the same thing:¶ Ken Green, American Enterprise Institute, "If the U.S. produced more of its own oil, it would probably reduce imports, but it's not likely that it would reduce prices ... We probably cannot produce so much oil to exert downward pressure on prices compared to the world market."¶ Peter Van Doren and Jerry Taylor, Cato Institute: "Sure, more domestic oil creates the possibility of fewer refined imports tied to the price of Brent crude, but given that the price of Brent sets the price for crude generally, the result would be more profit for domestic crude producers rather than significantly lower gasoline prices for Americans (not that there's anything wrong with that)."¶ Doug Holtz-Eakin, American Action Forum: "Domestic action to increase production will not lower gas prices set on a global market."¶ Christopher Knittel, MIT economist: "There are not many markets where the United States can't impose its will on market outcomes ... This is one we can't, and it's hard for the average American to understand that and it's easy for politicians to feed off that."¶ Pinelopi Goldberg, Yale economist: "US domestic policy has only tiny effect on the world price of oil. US foreign policy is probably more relevant than energy policy."¶ Steve Koonin, Institute for Defense Analyses: "When you hear the international oil companies advocating for energy independence, it's really about making money, which isn't a bad thing ... If they produce a million more barrels a day, they're not going to change the global price much. And since they know the global price is going up, they'll just make more money. There's nothing wrong with that, but it doesn't solve the price problem or the greenhouse gas problem."¶ Michael Levi, Council on Foreign Relations: "The amount of oil you produce at home doesn't affect the price ... You can lower your vulnerability to price by lowering your consumption of oil, but not by increasing your production."¶ Severin Borenstein, UC Berkeley economist: "Producing more oil domestically will enrich the U.S. economy, particularly U.S. oil companies and their workers. With oil so valuable, it may be a good idea, though the value must be weighed against environmental consequences. But it will have no discernible impact on gas prices, because it will change the world's supply/demand balance for oil by less than 2 or 3 percent over a decade or more."¶ David Peterson, Duke statistician: "U.S. production and demand have little to do with the price of gasoline in the U.S."¶ Edward Melnick, NYU statistician: When U.S. production goes up, the price of gas "is certainly not going down ... The data does not suggest that whatsoever."¶ David Sandalow, former Brookings fellow: "Drilling offshore to lower oil prices is like walking an extra 20 feet per day to lose weight. ... It's just not going to make much of a difference."¶ Tom Kloza, Oil Price Information Service: "This drill drill drill thing is tired ... It's a simplistic way of looking for a solution that doesn't exist."¶ Richard Newell, former Administrator of Energy Information Administration: "We do not project additional volumes of oil that could flow from greater access to oil resources on Federal lands to have a large impact on prices given the globally integrated nature of the world oil market."¶ Dean Baker, Center for Economic and Policy Research: "There is almost no disagreement among economists that drilling everywhere all the time offshore will have almost no impact on the price of gas in the United States. The reason is that we have a world market for oil. The additional oil that might come from offshore drilling is a drop in the bucket in a world oil market of almost 90 million barrels a day."¶ Lou Crandall, Wrightson ICAP LLC: "Higher oil prices today are a global phenomenon, and the additional supply from increased drilling by the U.S. would not alter the global balance of supply and demand greatly. Gasoline prices at the pump would be higher either way. The only difference is that a somewhat larger share of the revenue would accrue to domestic interests (governmental and private) rather than to foreign suppliers."¶ Paul Bledsoe, Bipartisan Policy Center: "The notion that somehow we can produce so much domestically that we will move the global price is incorrect."¶ Tom O'Donnell, The New School: "The amount of extra oil that the U.S. would produce, as far as affecting the world price of oil, is almost insignificant."'¶ Deborah Gordon, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace: "We can drill doggedly in our own backyards, but the price of gasoline will remain more a matter of speculation over externally-driven factors than tapping new sources of oil at home."¶ Joseph Dukert, energy analyst: "Americans tend to exaggerate the price effects of fluctuations in domestic production in relation to the total amount of oil in global trade. On the larger stage, the perception of geopolitical risks is more important."¶ Phyllis Martin, Energy Information Administration: "In 2009, the U.S. produced about 7 percent of what was produced in the entire world, so increasing the oil production in the U.S. is not going to make much of a difference in world markets and world prices ... It just gets lost. It's not that much."

#### Clean tech fails

MacKellar 12 Richard, Managing Director at Chrysalix Energy Venture Capital, “Guest Post: Smart Grid, Dumb Investor?”, 3/9, http://www.greentechmedia.com/articles/read/guest-post-smart-grid-dumb-investor

To me, investing in the smart grid is a process that is hard and riddled with potholes. Why?¶ \* Drinking the Kool-Aid. Fifteen years ago I drank the Kool-Aid and began believing that change in the electric power industry would lead to investment returns like those in telecommunications. But the thesis was flawed. In 1978, a house had one phone line. Thirty years later, trillions of dollars of new wealth has been created from an explosion of new hardware and software services. In 1978, a house had one set of wires providing power and in 2050 it will still have one set of wires providing power. It’s a zero-sum game. Revenue to a new entrant is taken from another player who is sharing the rate-based pie.¶ \* Utility engineers aren’t dumb. Telecom executives often tell me how terrible the power industry is and how they are going to “revolutionize the power industry” like they did with telecommunications. When did a mobile phone company last provide 99.9985% up-time? We need to understand an industry before throwing rocks at it.¶ \* Regulatory nightmare. Utilities are one of the most regulated markets in the world. For a startup in this space, an alphabet soup of acronyms (e.g., PUC, NERC, FERC, ISO-MRC) are barriers to fast adoption, and the more there are, the harder and longer the path to success will be.¶ \* Startups and utilities make poor bedfellows. My good friend Fred Dennert is the Head of Distribution Engineering at the Canadian electric utility B.C. Hydro, and when it comes to his top five priorities, he cites “safety for the public, safety for my linemen, safety for other employees, safety for property and equipment, and reliability," adding, "The CEO only calls when the lights go out. Where does working with an unknown startup with unproven technology fit in? Why would I want anything on my network from a company that may not be around in five years?”¶ \* The adoption cycle is long. If a startup does make progress with a utility, they need to be able to survive the long and fickle adoption cycle of these customers. They bid, re-bid, change their minds, test seven different solutions, bid again, re-bid, pilot again, and pick the solution where the startup has a large strategic partner as an ally. This understandably takes time because the utility will live with the consequences for 30 years.¶ \* Vertical take-off. When the service rollout does occur, the startup needs to jump from $2 million in sales one year to $200 million the next year. It is like doing a 20-foot pole vault after having only jumped four feet in high school. Again, a utility will look at who the startup is partnered with before making a choice.

#### No internal—government funding solves modernization

McHale 12 (Allan, spans 40 years in the energy and building controls industries. During the past 20 years, McHale has managed a wide range of marketing strategy assignments for some major international companies. He has authored 40 published market studies and numerous papers on security, fire detection and energy related environmental controls and has lectured in the United States, Europe and the U.K. on business development. “Future investment In smart grid will dwarf current expenditure: Where will it come from?”, http://www.elp.com/index/allan-mchale-blog/blogs/elp-blogs/alan-mchale/post987\_6042380411334018898.html)

Government funding will be required

Smart grid is part of the “clean tech” business and, so far, it has only received a relatively small sum of investment from private and public sources compared with the largess heaped on other parts of the business. However, so far under government programs in the USA alone, some $4.5 billion has been awarded for investment in Smart Grid projects in the electrical utilities business. In addition at least 27 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) projects are being funded from the almost $5 billion allocated to the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) for grid modernization projects.¶ Our market sizing figures show that the United States is currently the global leader in investment in smart grid. In view of the size of its generating capacity and electrical transmission system this should not be a surprise, but the smart grid stimulus programs have pump primed investment and played a major part in taking the U.S. to the front.

### AT: Warming

#### No move to solve warming now

LeVine 12 Steve LeVine is a writer for Foreign Policy, JUNE 5, “Can We Survive the New Golden Age of Oil?”, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/06/05/can\_we\_survive\_the\_new\_golden\_age\_of\_oil?page=0,0

Intentionally or not, the golden-age scenario seems tailored for the current international political and economic landscape. In the United States, President Barack Obama's administration is muddling along in climate change discussions, as emissions containment has been out of political favor since the 2009 congressional failure to pass cap-and-trade legislation. The Republican Party has by and large branded climate change a hoax, and Democrats barely discuss it. World leaders are due to gather in two weeks in Rio de Janeiro for the 20th anniversary of the first Earth Summit, the precursor to the landmark 1997 Kyoto talks on climate change. But Obama, British Prime Minister David Cameron, and German Chancellor Angela Merkel have already sent their regrets. After the disappointment of 2009 Copenhagen climate change conference, they seem to have little stomach for another go at climate talks in an atmosphere of economic crisis and political dissonance. And in an election season, Obama hardly has the political strength to do much other than embrace the golden-age scenario.

#### No impact---mitigation and adaptation will solve

Robert O. Mendelsohn 9, the Edwin Weyerhaeuser Davis Professor, Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, Yale University, June 2009, “Climate Change and Economic Growth,” online: http://www.growthcommission.org/storage/cgdev/documents/gcwp060web.pdf

These statements are largely alarmist and misleading. Although climate change is a serious problem that deserves attention, society’s immediate behavior has an extremely low probability of leading to catastrophic consequences. The science and economics of climate change is quite clear that emissions over the next few decades will lead to only mild consequences. The severe impacts predicted by alarmists require a century (or two in the case of Stern 2006) of no mitigation. Many of the predicted impacts assume there will be no or little adaptation. The net economic impacts from climate change over the next 50 years will be small regardless. Most of the more severe impacts will take more than a century or even a millennium to unfold and many of these “potential” impacts will never occur because people will adapt. It is not at all apparent that immediate and dramatic policies need to be developed to thwart long‐range climate risks. What is needed are long‐run balanced responses.

### 2AC Immigration DA

#### **Won’t pass---both parties have incentives to prevent a deal**

Koons 2-1 – Andy Koons, writer for the Daily Iowan, February 1st, 2013, "Koons: Immigration reform not done" [www.dailyiowan.com/2013/02/01/Opinions/31576.html](http://www.dailyiowan.com/2013/02/01/Opinions/31576.html)

Immigration reform is not a done deal, though it should be. America’s immigration system has been a travesty for decades. Despite being a nation of immigrants, needing workers to fill unpopular jobs and needing to remain competitive in a global economy in which education and knowledge are paramount, we haven’t found it in ourselves to move to a more fair pro-economic growth immigration system.¶ Why has it been so difficult? **Powerful forces stand against fixing immigration. Democrats benefit from Latinos refusing to vote for anti-reform Republicans, businesses appreciate low cost under-the-table labor and the conservative base treasures American citizenship and is loath to give it to what they consider “lawbreakers.”**¶ I am concerned that current reform efforts will not be successful because those forces are still present. Reform is being considered now because of a single change in dynamics. National Republican leaders are stinging from Obama’s substantial re-election victory and know that they have a diminishing chance of winning future national elections unless the growing Latino vote is put in play.¶ The Latino vote will never be attainable by the right as long as national Republican nominees are pressured to position themselves against immigration reform. Is that realization by Republican leaders enough to pass reform? The conservative base is very skeptical about reform proposals — will they include enough border protection, be too lenient on undocumented immigrants, contain left-leaning provisions such as allowing foreign same-sex couples a pathway to citizenship — and don’t want to hand Obama another historic win.¶ And make no mistake: Obama will be given credit if immigration reform passes. A big win this early in his second term will strengthen the wind already at his back from his election. Obamacare passed after almost two years of work and sucked the president dry of electoral goodwill. If Republicans don’t use immigration to sap Obama’s political capital, Obama will have enough remaining momentum to take on climate change before the midterms.¶ Don’t discount the intelligence of Republican strategists either — they know that there is a real possibility that the Latino vote may never join the Republican big tent even after reforming immigration. That vote may be religious, generally, but they are also composed of a great deal of low-income workers who may feel more at home with Democrats and be against changing safety-net policies.¶ Republican **House members come from solidly conservative districts in which the only** re-election threats are challenges by people more extreme than themselves**.** Will those members risk their seats **to give party leaders a chance to win the presidency in four years? House Speaker John Boehner hasn’t had much luck leading his members so far.**¶ If we could stop politicking for a moment and let the right thing happen, immigration reform would pass — but **politics never ends**. The best that can be hoped is that the political balance has shifted enough after Obama’s re-election that Republican leaders feel vulnerable without reform and that Republican House members are receptive. I’m afraid that may be asking a lot.

#### Obama’s strategy means no passage

Munro 12-31 – Neil Munro, reporter for the Daily Caller, December 31st, 2012, "Obama promises new immigration plan but keeps endgame close to his vest" dailycaller.com/2012/12/31/obama-promises-new-immigration-plan-but-keeps-endgame-close-to-his-vest/?print=1

President Barack Obama promised Dec. 30 to introduce an immigration bill during 2013, but activists on all sides of the debate are trying to understand his strategy.¶ **He may be gunning for a victory in the mid-term elections by introducing** a bill so radical that it will **spark an emotional controversy from whites**, which would then **spur many angry Latino**s to vote Democratic in the 2014 midterm elections, said Robert de Posada, former head of a GOP-affiliated group, The Latino Coalition.¶ **“The word that I’ve heard from many, is [that** he will] submit a very, very liberal plan that most Republicans will not support, that most southern and moderate Democrats will not support**,”** he said.¶ When the bill fails**, “they can announce once again that they tried [and that Latinos] need to rally in the next election**,” said Posada, who helped President George W. Bush win 40 percent of the Latino vote in 2004, during the housing boom.

#### Rubio supports increased OCS drilling

TBT 10 Tampa Bay Times, May 4, "Rubio calls oil spill 'horrifying' but maintains push for more offshore drilling", May 4, www.tampabay.com/blogs/the-buzz-florida-politics/content/rubio-calls-oil-spill-horrifying-maintains-push-more-offshore-drilling

Marco Rubio called the oil spill a "horrifying" ecological and environmental problem but said it should not derail plans for more domestic oil production as part of an overall energy policy.¶ Rubio said the immediate focus must be on mitigating the damage andinvestigating the cause of the problem. But on oil drilling, "I ultimately think that still has to be part of our overall energy strategy."¶ “The issue of offshore drilling is not going away, because America and the world depends heavily on petroleum products," the Republican U.S. Senate candidate told the St. Petersburg Times this morning.

#### Rubio’s key to immigration

Drucker and Trygstad 1/30 David M and Kyle, "Rubio Must Sell Immigration Changes to GOP, Grass Roots", 2013, www.rollcall.com/news/rubio\_must\_sell\_immigration\_changes\_to\_gop\_grass\_roots-222044-1.html?pos=hftxt

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

#### Plan isn’t legislation

Janofsky 6 (Michael, Veteran Journalist, “Offshore Drilling Plan Widens Rifts Over Energy Policy,” New York Times, 4-9, http://www.nytimes.com/2006/04/09/washington/09drill.html)

A Bush administration proposal to open an energy-rich tract of the Gulf of Mexico to oil and gas drilling has touched off a tough fight in Congress, the latest demonstration of the political barriers to providing new energy supplies even at a time of high demand and record prices. The two-million-acre area, in deep waters 100 miles south of Pensacola, Fla., is estimated to contain nearly half a billion barrels of oil and three trillion cubic feet of natural gas, enough to run roughly a million vehicles and heat more than half a million homes for about 15 years. The site, Area 181, is the only major offshore leasing zone that the administration is offering for development. But lawmakers are divided over competing proposals to expand or to limit the drilling. The Senate Energy Committee and its chairman, Pete V. Domenici, Republican of New Mexico, are pushing for a wider drilling zone, while the two Florida senators and many from the state's delegation in the House are arguing for a smaller tract. Other lawmakers oppose any new drilling at all. The debate could go a long way toward defining how the nation satisfies its need for new energy and whether longstanding prohibitions against drilling in the Outer Continental Shelf, the deep waters well beyond state coastlines, will end. The fight, meanwhile, threatens to hold up the confirmation of President Bush's choice to lead the Interior Department, Gov. Dirk Kempthorne of Idaho. Mr. Kempthorne was nominated last month to replace Gale A. Norton, a proponent of the plan, who stepped down March 31. Like Ms. Norton, Mr. Kempthorne, a former senator, is a determined advocate of developing new supplies of energy through drilling. While environmental groups say that discouraging new drilling would spur development of alternative fuels, administration officials say that timely action in Area 181 and beyond could bring short-term relief to the nation's energy needs and, perhaps, lower fuel costs for consumers. "It's important to have expansions of available acres in the Gulf of Mexico as other areas are being tapped out," Ms. Norton said recently. She predicted that drilling in the offshore zone would lead to further development in parts of the Outer Continental Shelf that have been off-limits since the 1980's under a federal moratorium that Congress has renewed each year and that every president since then has supported. States are beginning to challenge the prohibitions. Legislatures in Georgia and Kansas recently passed resolutions urging the government to lift the bans. On Friday, Gov. Tim Kaine of Virginia, a Democrat, rejected language in a state energy bill that asked Congress to lift the drilling ban off Virginia's coast. But he did not close the door to a federal survey of natural gas deposits. Meanwhile, Representative Richard W. Pombo, Republican of California, the pro-development chairman of the House Resources Committee, plans to introduce a bill in June that would allow states to seek control of any energy exploration within 125 miles of their shorelines. Senators John W. Warner of Virginia, a Republican, and Mark Pryor of Arkansas, a Democrat, introduced a similar bill in the Senate last month. Currently, coastal states can offer drilling rights only in waters within a few miles of their own shores. Mr. Pombo and other lawmakers would also change the royalty distribution formula for drilling in Outer Continental Shelf waters so states would get a share of the royalties that now go entirely to the federal government. Senators from Alabama, Louisiana and Mississippi are co-sponsoring a bill that would create a 50-50 split. As exceptions to the federal ban, the western and central waters of the Gulf of Mexico produce nearly a third of the nation's oil and more than a fifth of its natural gas. But Area 181 has been protected because of its proximity to Florida and the opposition of Mr. Bush's brother, Gov. Jeb Bush. By its current boundaries, the pending lease area is a much smaller tract than the 5.9 million acres the Interior Department first considered leasing more than 20 years ago and the 3.6 million acres that the department proposed to lease in 2001. This year, two million acres of the original tract are proposed for lease as the only waters of the Outer Continental Shelf that the administration is making available for 2007-12. The proposal is an administrative action that does not require Congressional approval, but it is still subject to public comment before being made final. Unless Congress directs the administration to change course, the administration's final plan would lead to bidding on new leases in 2007.

#### Low PC inevitable and not key

Schier 11 Steven E. Schier is the Dorothy H. and Edward C. Congdon professor of political science at Carleton College, The contemporary presidency: the presidential authority problem and the political power trap. Presidential Studies Quarterly December 1, 2011 lexis

Implications of the Evidence¶ The evidence presented here depicts a decline in presidential political capital after 1965. Since that time, presidents have had lower job approval, fewer fellow partisans and less voting support in Congress, less approval of their party, and have usually encountered an increasingly adverse public policy mood as they governed.¶ Specifically, average job approval dropped. Net job approval plummeted, reflecting greater polarization about presidential performance.The proportion of fellow partisans in the public dropped and became less volatile. Congressional voting support became lower and varied more. The number of fellow partisans in the House and Senate fell and became less volatile. Public issue mood usually moved against presidents as they governed. All of these measures, with the exception of public mood, correlate positively with each other, suggesting they are part of a broader phenomenon.¶ That "phenomenon" is political authority. The decline in politicalcapital has produced great difficulties for presidential political authority in recent decades. It is difficult to claim warrants for leadership in an era when job approval, congressional support, and partisan affiliation provide less backing for a president than in times past.¶ Because of the uncertainties of political authority, recent presidents have adopted a governing style that is personalized, preemptive,and, at times, isolated. Given the entrenched autonomy of other elite actors and the impermanence of public opinion, presidents have had to "sell themselves" in order to sell their governance. Samuel Kernell (1997) first highlighted the presidential proclivity to "go public"in the 1980s as a response to these conditions. Through leveraging public support, presidents have at times been able to overcome institutional resistance to their policy agendas. Brandice Canes-Wrone (2001) discovered that presidents tend to help themselves with public opinion by highlighting issues the public supports and that boosts their congressional success--an effective strategy when political capital is questionable.¶ Despite shrinking political capital, presidents at times have effectively pursued such strategies, particularly since 1995. Clinton's centrist "triangulation" and George W. Bush's careful issue selection early in his presidency allowed them to secure important policy changes--in Clinton's case, welfare reform and budget balance, in Bush's tax cuts and education reform--that at the time received popular approval. This may explain the slight recovery in some presidential political capital measures since 1993. Clinton accomplished much with a GOPCongress, and Bush's first term included strong support from a Congress ruled by friendly Republican majorities. David Mayhew finds that from 1995 to 2004, both highly important and important policy changeswere passed by Congress into law at higher rates than during the 1947-1994 period. (2) A trend of declining political capital thus does not preclude significant policy change, but a record of major policy accomplishment has not reversed the decline in presidential political capital in recent years, either. Short-term legislative strategies can win policy success for a president but do not serve as an antidote to declining political capital over time, as the final years of both the Clinton and George W. Bush presidencies demonstrate.

#### Secretary of the Interior does the plan

OCS Lands Act 2K Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, December 29, 2000, http://epw.senate.gov/ocsla.pdf

SEC. 8. LEASING OF OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF.—(a)(1) The Secretary is authorized to grant to the highest responsible qualified bidder or bidders by competitive bidding, under regulations promulgated in advance, any oil and gas lease on submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf which are not covered by leases meeting the requirements of subsection (a) of section 6 of this Act. Such regulations may provide for the deposit of cash bids in an interestbearing account until the Secretary announces his decision on whether to accept the bids, with the interest earned thereon to be paid to the Treasury as to bids that are accepted and to the unsuccessful bidders as to bids that are rejected. The bidding shall be by sealed bid and, at the discretion of the Secretary, on the basis of— ¶ (A) cash bonus bid with a royalty at not less than 121⁄2 per centum fixed by the Secretary in amount or value of the production saved, removed, or sold;¶ (B) variable royalty bid based on a per centum in amount or value of the production saved, removed, or sold, with either a fixed work commitment based on dollar amount for exploration or a fixed cash bonus as determined by the Secretary, or both;¶ (C) cash bonus bid, or work commitment bid based on a dollar amount for exploration with a fixed cash bonus, and a diminishing or sliding royalty based on such formulae as the Secretary shall determine as equitable to encourage continued production from the lease area as resources diminish, but not less than 121⁄2 per centum at the beginning of the lease period in amount or value of the production saved, removed, or sold;¶ (D) cash bonus bid with a fixed share of the net profits of no less than 30 per centum to be derived from the production of oil and gas from the lease area;¶ (E) fixed cash bonus with the net profit share reserved as the bid variable;¶ (F) cash bonus bid with a royalty at no less than 121⁄2 per centum fixed by the Secretary in amount or value of the production saved, removed, or sold and a fixed per centum share of net profits of no less than 30 per centum to be derived from the production of oil and gas from the lease area;¶ (G) work commitment bid based on a dollar amount for exploration with a fixed cash bonus and a fixed royalty in amount or value of the production saved, removed, or sold;¶ (H) cash bonus bid with royalty at no less than 12 and 1⁄2 per centum fixed by the Secretary in amount or value of production saved, removed, or sold, and with suspension of royalties for a period, volume, or value of production determined by the Secretary, which suspensions may vary based on the price of production from the lease; or¶ (I) subject to the requirements of paragraph (4) of this subsection, any modification of bidding systems authorized in subparagraphs (A) through (G), or any other systems of bid variables, terms, and conditions which the Secretary determines to be useful to accomplish the purposes and policies of this Act, except that no such bidding system or modification shall have more than one bid variable.¶ (2) The Secretary may, in his discretion, defer any part of the payment of the cash bonus, as authorized in paragraph (1) of this subsection, according to a schedule announced at the time of the announcement of the lease sale, but such payment shall be made in total no later than five years after the date of the lease sale.¶ (3)(A) The Secretary may, in order to promote increased production on the lease area, through direct, secondary, or tertiary recovery means, reduce or eliminate any royalty or net profit share set forth in the lease for such area.

#### That shields politics

Dobkin 8—past Chairperson of the Immigration Law Section of the Oakland County (Michigan) Bar Association and has lectured and presented seminars on immigration in the U.S., Canada and the U.K. (Donald, THE RISE OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE STATE: APRESCRIPTION FOR LAWLESSNESS, [www.law.ku.edu/publications/journal/pdf/v17n3/dobkin.pdf](http://www.law.ku.edu/publications/journal/pdf/v17n3/dobkin.pdf))

Because an agency’s actions often receive far less media attention than the actions of the President, the general public is often unaware of political decisions being made at the agency level. This lack of accountability in general makes it easier to pursue a political agenda at the agency level. 25 President George W. Bush has also used the inattention to agency action to pursue some of the more unpopular aspects of his political agenda to avoid direct accountability. For example, rather than openly challenging environmental protections, President Bush has used agencies to help him pursue his anti-environmental agenda to ensure the “systematic dismantling of various environmental regulations.” 26 ¶ The White House’s tightening of control via executive orders had its origins in the alteration of the context of presidential leadership during the 1960’s and 1970’s: [table omitted]¶ In an era of growing budget deficits, divided government, a more open political process, and a general loss of public faith in “big government,” presidents beginning with Richard Nixon no longer saw unalloyed benefits in relying on “neutral” staff agencies. Instead, they sought greater political responsiveness. This meant relying more heavily on aides within the White House Office, and appointing political loyalists to exercise topdown control of the other Executive Office of the President (EOP) agencies. 27 ¶ The attached Table 1 illustrates the magnitude of the EOP, which by 2004 had reached 1,731 staffers ranging from everything to Homeland Security Staff, OMB, CEA, and other agencies:¶ During this same time period, “presidents have increased the number of political appointees at the upper levels of the non-White House EOP agencies, and brought the agencies more tightly under White House staff control.” 29 The appointment process has allowed presidents to use agencies as a means for major—and often unpopular—policy changes. For instance, President Reagan made “a series of fox-in-the-chicken-coop appointments to undermine public interest regulation,” notably of his infamous anti-environment interior secretary, James Watt. 30 Many commentators have noted that the current Bush Administration has made similar appointments. 31 These types of appointments make it difficult for agencies to exhibit expertise and to execute the law in an impartial manner. As a result, we are left with “a more thoroughly politicized, White House-dominated EOP, but one that is short on institutional memory, administrative expertise, and organizational continuity.” 32 ¶ The rise in the presidentially-led Administrative States merely reflects the growing use—and creation—of unilateral powers by the President:¶ To pursue a unilateral strategy, of course, presidents must be able to justify their actions on some blend of statutory, treaty or constitutional powers; and when they cannot, their only recourse is legislation. But given the ambiguity of Article II powers and the massive corpus of law that presidents can draw upon . . . the appeal of unilateral powers is readily apparent. 33 ¶ Although some would argue that a unilateral executive branch is justified based on the majoritarian “mandate” produced by a presidential election, it is difficult to take this notion very seriously when “a President can be elected without obtaining a majority of the popular vote—as in the cases of President Clinton in 1992 and 1996 and President George W. Bush in 2000.” 34 Indeed, in the 2000 election, the winning candidate did not even garner a plurality of the popular vote. 35 Furthermore, presidential elections often center on issues like national security, which are far removed from the everyday decisions of administrative agencies. 36 ¶ The situation is only likely to worsen. In the early days of President George W. Bush’s administration, Professor Kagan predicted that President Bush would continue Clinton’s “expansion of presidential administration.” 37 Professor Sargentich has noted that this prediction has undoubtedly “come to pass,” as exemplified by recent executive branch acts such as the OMB’s farreaching and controversial Peer Review Bulletin, which guides agency decisions. 38

#### Winner’s win

Hirsh 2/7 Michael, chief correspondent for National Journal; citing Ornstein, a political scientist and scholar at the American Enterprise Institute and Bensel, gov’t prof at Cornell, "There's No Such Thing as Political Capital", 2013, [www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207](http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207)

But the abrupt emergence of the immigration and gun-control issues illustrates how suddenly shifts in mood can occur and how political interests can align in new ways just as suddenly. Indeed, the pseudo-concept of political capital masks a larger truth about Washington that is kindergarten simple: You just don’t know what you can do until you try. Or as Ornstein himself once wrote years ago, “Winning wins.” In theory, and in practice, depending on Obama’s handling of any particular issue, even in a polarized time, he could still deliver on a lot of his second-term goals, depending on his skill and the breaks. Unforeseen catalysts can appear, like Newtown. Epiphanies can dawn, such as when many Republican Party leaders suddenly woke up in panic to the huge disparity in the Hispanic vote.¶ Some political scientists who study the elusive calculus of how to pass legislation and run successful presidencies say that political capital is, at best, an empty concept, and that almost nothing in the academic literature successfully quantifies or even defines it. “It can refer to a very abstract thing, like a president’s popularity, but there’s no mechanism there. That makes it kind of useless,” says Richard Bensel, a government professor at Cornell University. Even Ornstein concedes that the calculus is far more complex than the term suggests. Winning on one issue often changes the calculation for the next issue; there is never any known amount of capital. “The idea here is, if an issue comes up where the conventional wisdom is that president is not going to get what he wants, and he gets it, then each time that happens, it changes the calculus of the other actors” Ornstein says. “If they think he’s going to win, they may change positions to get on the winning side. It’s a bandwagon effect.”

#### **Gun control and debt sap PC**

Cillizza 2-6 Chris, writer for the Washington Post, 2013, "President Obama is enjoying a second political honeymoon. But how long will it last?" [www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2013/02/06/president-obama-is-enjoying-a-second-political-honeymoon-but-how-long-will-it-last/](http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2013/02/06/president-obama-is-enjoying-a-second-political-honeymoon-but-how-long-will-it-last/)

Regardless of the reason, it’s clear that Obama has a limited time — six months perhaps? — to take legislative advantage of his second political honeymoon.¶ He seems committed to taking on three separate and distinct fights during that time: 1) gun control 2) immigration reform 3) debt and spending. **Each of those legislative scraps will shorten his honeymoon as he** expends political capital to try to get what he wants out of a Congress — particularly in the House — that seems likely to be resistant.¶ And, it’s possible — given the glacially slow pace at which Congress works and the aforementioned partisanship that seems to seize any and every issue — that Obama’s honeymoon will fade well before he gets all three of those priorities accomplished.¶ A look back at **the trend line on his job approval in his first term is telling in that regard**.¶ 2013-02-06 Obama honeymoon 1Even though Obama started off considerably higher in his first term than he began his second term, by August 2009 he had dropped to 54 percent approval in WaPo-ABC polling — thanks to the bailout of the American auto industry, the fight over the economic stimulus package and the earlier positioning over his health-care bill.¶ Considering that Obama is — at best — in the mid-50s in terms of job approval at the moment and the fact that the past showdowns on fiscal issues have revealed the massively different approaches advocated by the two parties, it’s not at all far fetched to assume that taking on just one of those fights might be enough to end **the president’s second term honeymoon.**

#### Cyber veto

Jennifer Martinez 2-8, The Hill, “House panel to reintroduce controversial cyber bill, setting up White House fight”, http://thehill.com/blogs/hillicon-valley/technology/281963-house-intelligence-committee-leaders-to-re-introduce-cispa-next-week-

The leaders of the House Intelligence Committee plan to re-introduce on Wednesday a controversial cybersecurity bill that has faced pushback from the White House. House Intelligence Committee Chairman Mike Rogers (R-Mich.) and ranking member Rep. Dutch Ruppersberger (D-Md.) said Friday that they plan to re-introduce the Cyber Intelligence Sharing and Protection Act (CISPA) next week during a speech at the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington. The bill is aimed at improving information-sharing about cyber threats between government and industry so cyberattacks can be thwarted in real time. The bill that Rogers and Ruppersberger plan to introduce next week will be identical to the version of CISPA that passed the House last spring. The White House issued a veto threat against CISPA before it was taken up on the House floor last year, saying the president's top advisers would recommend that he veto the bill if it came to his desk. It's unclear whether the White House would issue a similar threat this time around due to its concern over a lack of privacy protections in the bill.¶ A spokeswoman for the White House did not respond to a request for comment on what action it planned to take.¶ The bill would allow the government, namely the intelligence community, to share classified cyber threat information with the private sector so companies can protect their computer systems and networks from cyberattacks. It would also encourage companies to share anonymous cyber-threat information with one another, and provide liability protection for businesses so they don't get hit with legal action for sharing data about cyber threats. ¶ In a statement, Rogers said the recent cyberattacks against U.S. banks and newspapers have highlighted the need for Congress to pass the information-sharing bill. “American businesses are under siege," Rogers said. "We need to provide American companies the information they need to better protect their networks from these dangerous cyber threats. It is time to stop admiring this problem and deal with it immediately.” The bill was "developed in close consultation with a broad range of private sector companies, trade groups, privacy and civil liberties advocates, and the executive branch," according to the House Intelligence Committee leaders. Last year CISPA enjoyed support from a range of industry groups and companies, including Facebook, AT&T and Oracle. But civil-liberties groups and privacy advocates rallied hard against CISPA last year, arguing that the measure lacked sufficient privacy protections and would increase the pool of people's electronic communications flowing to the military and secretive National Security Agency. Despite the veto threat and pushback that CISPA received, the bill boasted 112 co-sponsors from both sides of the aisle and cleared the House. The bill went untouched in the Senate, largely because the upper chamber was working on its own comprehensive measure last year. In a speech earlier this week, Rogers attempted to head off the privacy concerns raised about the bill last year. "We're talking about exchanging packets of information, zeroes and ones, if you will, one hundred millions times a second," he said. "So some notion that this is a horrible invasion of content reading is wrong. It is not even close to that." But privacy and civil-liberties advocates expect to revive their efforts to fight against the bill this year. Michelle Richardson, a legislative counsel in the American Civil Liberties Union's Washington office, argued that CISPA opponents have the White House veto threat on their side. Privacy advocates also backed the information-sharing section of a cybersecurity bill in the Senate last year, which the House Intelligence Committee could use as a template for their legislation, she said. "I think it's a different ballgame this time," Richardson said. "I feel emboldened after what happened in the Senate last fall and [with] the veto threat." "I don't think this sort of broad and unaccountable approach to information sharing [legislation] is going to go anywhere," she added.

#### **Nominations sap PC**

Thurlow 2-5 – Tom Thurlow, writer for Red State, February 5th, 2013, "Obama’s Political Capital" www.redstate.com/tfthurlow/2013/02/05/obamas-political-capital/

President Obama blows through his own political capital just as fast as he blows through America’s financial capital. Neither case of over-spending is sustainable, and we will just have to wait to see which spending spree is forced to end first.¶ But this further confirms my suspicion that President Obama’s brains are the most over-rated to occupy the Oval Office in generations. Take **his recent** nominations, which are a mess.¶ Last week’s Senate **hearings on Senator Hagel’s** confirmation as defense secretary were a disaster. Senator McCain pressed Senator Hagel to confirm or deny Hagel’s earlier statement that the Surge in Iraq was “the greatest foreign policy blunder since the Vietnam War.” Senator Ted Cruz pointed out that Senator Hegal, during an interview with the Al Jazeera English network in 2009 had agreed with a questioner who said that the United States appeared and acted like the world’s bully. As Paul Mirengoff at the Powerline Blog wrote, “if he were a Broadway play, Hagel would close after one performance.”¶ There were also a number of past anti-Semitic, or at least anti-Israel statements about which Senator Hagel was questioned. About the only thing about the hearing that was reassuring to those who take national defense seriously was that Hagel bumbled so much he sounded like he may have dementia. Let’s face it, a demented defense secretary may not be as bad as an anti-American defense secretary who is purposefully soft on defense and unconcerned about looming problems with Iran’s nuclear program.¶ Senator Lindsey Graham has threatened a hold on the Hagel nomination, and he should. Not only is a defense secretary an important policy position, but as has been pointed out by Republican critics that in any given foreign crisis, the defense secretary will be one of the few advisors in the room, advising the president.¶ Next up: **a nomination battle for a Treasury secretary nominee, Jacob Lew**, who has never worked in a bank except as an attorney for Citibank, and has held many different government jobs, most recently President Obama’s chief of staff. Definitely a financial industry lightweight. Lew has also been accused of misleading the public on deficits. About the only thing that stands out about Jacob Lew as Treasury secretary is the fact that his signature — which will appear on all of our currency – looks like a bunch of circles. Oddly enough, it doesn’t appear as if Lew has had any medical training.¶ After that, brace yourself for President Obama’s **nominee for director of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF), Todd Jones**. Jones is the current acting director of ATF and has been criticized by a local Democratic FBI office director as being politically well-connected but incompetent and soft on gun and violent crime prosecutions.¶ Past presidents have had difficult times in their second terms, but the difficulty is usually with big proposals. President George W. Bush unsuccessfully tried to pass privatization of Social Security and immigration reform in his second term. President Reagan spent his second term solidifying his victory in the Cold War and simplified the tax code, lowering the top marginal tax rate to 28%. Meanwhile, President Obama is trying to get Charles Hagel approved as defense secretary, Jacob Lew at Treasury secretary, and Todd Jones as ATF director, not grand plans by any means.¶ President Obama may get these nominees approved by a majority of senators. But the question is: why is he fighting these particular battles? He could have easily found better qualified nominees for these positions and fought bigger battles on some substantive legislative proposals. Why spend what remaining political capital he has on these problematic appointments? I have a theory, and here goes.

#### PC’s not key to immigration

Hirsh 2/7 Michael, chief correspondent for National Journal, previously served as the senior editor and national economics correspondent for Newsweek, has appeared many times as a commentator on Fox News, CNN, MSNBC, and National Public Radio, has written for the Associated Press, The New York Times, The Washington Post, Foreign Affairs, Harper’s, and Washington Monthly, and authored two books, "There's No Such Thing as Political Capital", 2013, [www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207](http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207)

Meanwhile, the Republican members of the Senate’s so-called Gang of Eight are pushing hard for a new spirit of compromise on immigration reform, a sharp change after an election year in which the GOP standard-bearer declared he would make life so miserable for the 11 million illegal immigrants in the U.S. that they would “self-deport.” But this turnaround has very little to do with Obama’s personal influence—his political mandate, as it were. It has almost entirely to do with just two numbers: 71 and 27. That’s 71 percent for Obama, 27 percent for Mitt Romney, the breakdown of the Hispanic vote in the 2012 presidential election. Obama drove home his advantage by giving a speech on immigration reform on Jan. 29 at a Hispanic-dominated high school in Nevada, a swing state he won by a surprising 8 percentage points in November. But the movement on immigration has mainly come out of the Republican Party’s recent introspection, and the realization by its more thoughtful members, such as Sen. Marco Rubio of Florida and Gov. Bobby Jindal of Louisiana, that without such a shift the party may be facing demographic death in a country where the 2010 census showed, for the first time, that white births have fallen into the minority. It’s got nothing to do with Obama’s political capital or, indeed, Obama at all.

#### Plan’s bipartisan

Russell 12 Barry Russell is President of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, August 15, 2012, “Energy Must Transcend Politics”, http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/08/finding-the-sweet-spot-biparti.php#2238176

There have been glimpses of great leadership, examples when legislators have reached across the aisle to construct and support common-sense legislation that encourages American energy production. Recent legislation from Congress which would replace the Obama administration’s five-year offshore leasing plan and instead **increase access America’s abundant offshore oil** and natural gas **is one example of such bipartisanship**. The House passed legislation with support from 25 key Democrats. The support from Republicans and Democrats is obviously not equal, but this bipartisan legislative victory demonstrates a commitment by the House of Representatives to support the jobs, economic growth and national security **over stubborn allegiance to political party**. The same is happening on the Senate side. Democratic Senators Jim Webb (VA), Mark Warner (VA), and Mary Landrieu (LA) cosponsored the Senate’s legislation to expand offshore oil and natural gas production with Republican Senators Lisa Murkowski (AK), John Hoeven (ND), and Jim Inhofe (OK). Senator Manchin (WV) is another Democratic leader who consistently votes to promote responsible energy development.

#### XO solves

Nakamura 1-6 – David Nakamura and Tara Bahrampour, January 6th, 2013 "Obama using authority for immigrant issues," Washington Post, [www.journalgazette.net/article/20130106/NEWS03/301069950/1066/NEWS03](http://www.journalgazette.net/article/20130106/NEWS03/301069950/1066/NEWS03)

WASHINGTON - 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. The steps also 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.

#### Dems won’t backlash or drain PC

Hughes 2/6 Brian, "Obama's base increasingly wary of drone program", 2013, washingtonexaminer.com/obamas-base-increasingly-wary-of-drone-program/article/2520787

"Democrats, they're going to want the president to succeed on domestic priorities and don't want to do anything to erode his political capital," said Christopher Preble, vice president for defense and foreign policy studies at the Cato Institute. "It's just so partisan right now. An awful lot of [lawmakers] think the president should be able to do whatever he wants."

### AT: Internal

#### Loss of PC still results in visas

Yglesias 1/15 Matthew, Slate, 2013, How the GOP Can Roll Obama on Immigration, www.slate.com/blogs/moneybox/2013/01/15/immigration\_reform\_will\_obama\_get\_rolled.html

Of the major policy issues under discussion in Washington, "immigration reform" stands out for having unusually undefined content. For the major immigration-advocacy groups, the goal is clear, a comprehensive bill that includes a path to citizenship for the overwhelming majority of unauthorized migrants already living in the United States. But many other aspects of immigration law are in the mix as part of a proposed deal, and it seems to me that there's a fair chance that a nimble Republican Party could essentially roll the Democratic coalition and pass an "immigration reform" bill that doesn't offer the path Latino advocacy groups are looking for.¶ Elise Foley has the key line from her briefing on the administration's thinking about immigration, namely that a piecemeal approach "could result in passage of the less politically complicated pieces, such as an enforcement mechanism and high-skilled worker visas, while leaving out more contentious items such as a pathway to citizenship for undocumented immigrants."¶ And indeed it could. But how can they stop it? The last House GOP effort to split the high-tech visas question from the path to citizenship question was an absurd partisan ploy. If Republicans want to get serious about it they should be able to make it work. The centerpiece would be something on increased immigration of skilled workers. That's something the tech industry wants very much, it's a great idea on the merits, and few influential people have any real beef with it. High tech visas will easily generate revenue to pay for some stepped-up enforcement. Then instead of adding on a poison pill so Democrats will block the bill, you need to add a sweetener. Not the broad path to citizenship, but something small like the DREAM Act. Now you've got a package that falls massively short of what Latino groups are looking for, but that I think Democrats will have a hard time actually blocking. After all, why would they block it? It packages three things—more skilled immigration, more enforcement, and help for DREAMers—they say they want. Blocking it because it doesn't also do the broad amnesty that liberals want and conservatives hate would require the kind of fanaticism that is the exact opposite of Obama's approach to politics.

### AT: Trade

#### Global trade is resilient---WTO collapse is inevitable and irrelevant

Daniel Altman 11 PhD Economics From Harvard, former London-based economics correspondent for the Economist "Goodbye and Good Riddance" 2/20 www.newsweek.com/2011/02/20/goodbye-and-good-riddance.html

Representatives of 153 nations and regions will meet in Geneva this week to try and salvage one of the longest and most laborious trade negotiations in modern times. For almost a decade, the World Trade Organization has been trying to lower trade barriers for thousands of goods and services, and now a self-imposed deadline is looming at the end of this year. But whether the WTO succeeds or not will make little difference to most people; indeed, trade negotiations would actually go much further if the WTO simply closed down its talks altogether.

The current trade talks, dubbed the Doha development round, are, at least in principle, intended to give developing countries a trade-fueled boost. Back in 2001, the WTO’s own experts estimated that halving trade barriers would inject $200 billion per year into developing countries, or about 2 percent of their total output today. Of course, most of the boost from any deal would go not to places like Niger and Nepal, but to big traders like China and Brazil—countries that have already made huge strides against poverty. Moreover, to make the deadline, negotiators will almost certainly have to settle for a deal that falls far short of the 2 percent figure.

WTO officials and political leaders have played the deadline game before, with no success. But it’s not as though trade negotiations have been paralyzed during the past 10 years. Countries have been signing free-trade agreements, both in pairs and at the regional level, more rapidly than ever before. And this is where the future of free trade lies: in pragmatic regional deals, not utopian global ones.

One of the WTO’s major problems is also touted as one of its virtues: every member has a veto. In theory, the veto means that no country can be coerced into a lousy deal. In practice, getting all 153 members to agree to lower trade barriers has been akin to teaching puppies synchronized swimming. A few countries have always taken an obstructive stance, either on principle or to push their own priorities. Canada, for example, has insisted that its unique system of supply management be enshrined in any global deal. And France won’t even entertain the idea of reducing its massive farm subsidies without major concessions from poor countries.

The only way forward is liberation from the WTO. The majority of nations can simply leave the obstructionists behind and move forward with regional trading partners. Eventually, most of the world’s trading nations will arrange themselves into just a few big blocs. These blocs will be diverse, including rich and poor countries, since these complementary groupings often unlock the biggest gains from trade; rich countries like to use cheap materials and labor in poor countries, and poor countries like to export their products to high-income consumers. In fact, the blocs may be so big and diverse that they won’t need to worry about lowering trade barriers.

Instead, the blocs will focus on lowering trade barriers among their own members. Those that lower barriers faster will create more gains from trade, and their incomes will rise more quickly. Incomes will probably rise most quickly in the poorest countries as their companies adopt new technologies and their people acquire more remunerative skills. As a result, blocs that lower trade barriers will see incomes converge; their members will start to look more and more like each other. When that happens, the blocs will have to look outside their borders to other countries for cheap materials and labor. They’ll find those countries in the blocs where incomes didn’t rise as much. All of a sudden, the big blocs will have a very strong economic motive to start talking to each other.

This is how global trade talks will work in the future. Trade barriers will fall, just as the WTO hoped, and with the same result that should have been its goal all along: its own obsolescence.

# 1AR

## Impact

### 1AR XT – No Impact

#### No overall economic benefit to legalization

Hill et al. 10 – Laura E. Hill is a research fellow at the Public Policy Institute of California. She has been a research associate at The SPHERE Institute and a National Institute of Aging postdoctoral fellow. She holds a Ph.D. in demography from the University of California, Berkeley AND\*\*\* Magnus Lofstrom is a research fellow at the Public Policy Institute of California. He also holds appointments as a research fellow at the Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA) at the University of Bonn and as a research associate at the Center for Comparative Immigration Studies at the University of California, San Diego. He has also served as a researcher and has taught at IZA and at the University of California, Irvine. He received his Ph.D. in economics from the University of California, San Diego. AND\*\*\* Joseph M. Hayes is a research associate at the Public Policy Institute of California, where he studies migration and population change throughout the state. He has studied migration in the Central Valley, the families of newly arrived immigrants to California, and the state’s prison population. He holds an M.S. in agricultural economics from the University of Wisconsin, Madison. 2010, “Immigrant Legalization Assessing the Labor Market Effects,” Public Policy Institute of California, [www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R\_410LHR.pdf#ppic](http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R_410LHR.pdf#ppic)

Legalization of the estimated 12 million unauthorized immigrants residing in the United States would lead to both **economic benefits and costs for the nation.** **Some arguments for comprehensive immigration reform suggest that legalizing immigrants will help end the current recession.** This seems unlikely. Our research suggests that earlier findings from the IRCA era may overstate anticipated earnings from a new reform, at least in the short run. ¶ We do expect occupational mobility to improve for formerly unauthorized immigrants with higher skill levels. When compared to the continuously legal, their occupational earnings growth was about 9 to 10 percent. These higher-skill unauthorized immigrants are more likely to be overstayers than crossers, but unauthorized immigrants with college degrees are found in both groups. **Lower-skill unauthorized immigrants are not likely to experience strong occupational mobility as a result of a legalization program** (although their occupational earnings grow over time in the United States). It will be important that any new legislation give legalized immigrants incentives to improve their skills, especially in English. ¶ The majority of studies investigating the effect of legalizing immigrants on natives’ earnings suggest that the effects are slightly negative for workers with low skill levels. Since we find no improvements in occupational mobility or wages for the lowest skill levels in the short run, we do not expect that legalizing immigrants would place any increased pressure on the wages of low-skill natives or low-skill legal immigrants. Tax revenues may increase, although **many unauthorized immigrants already file federal and state tax returns and pay sales and payroll taxes.** We found that about 90 percent of unauthorized immigrants filed federal tax returns in the year before gaining LPR status. We expect that increases in **tax revenues** resulting from increased earnings among the formerly unauthorized would be modest.

## Uniqueness

### 1AR XT – Won’t Pass

#### Won’t pass---no middle ground

Foley 2-7 – Elise Foley, writer for the Huffington Post, February 7th, 2013, "Raul Labrador: Immigration Reform With Pathway To Citizenship Won't Get House GOP Support" [www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/02/07/raul-labrador-immigration-reform\_n\_2638484.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/02/07/raul-labrador-immigration-reform_n_2638484.html)

Rep. Raúl Labrador (R-Idaho) warned on Thursday that he won't vote for a pathway to citizenship for undocumented immigrants and neither will his fellow House Republicans, a bad sign **from someone who is considered one of the more pro-reform Republicans in the chamber**.¶ "The people that came here illegally knowingly --- I don't think they should have a path to citizenship," he said on NPR, according to Talking Points Memo. "If you knowingly violated our law, you violated our sovereignty, I think we should normalize your status but we should not give you a pathway to citizenship."¶ Whether the estimated 11 million undocumented immigrants currently living in the United States should be given a pathway to become citizens is shaping up to be the most contentious issue in the immigration reform debate. Democrats and some Republicans insist such a provision must be a part of any reform bill, and a bipartisan Senate group dubbed the "gang of eight" released a framework that includes one.¶ A Quinnipiac University poll released on Thursday found that 56 percent of voters think undocumented immigrants should be allowed to stay in the United States and eventually apply for citizenship, while only 10 percent say they should be able to stay but not become citizens. Thirty percent say undocumented immigrants should be forced to leave the country.¶ But **Republicans control the House, and many of them are opposed to such a pathway.** Labrador, a former immigration lawyer, said he thinks undocumented immigrants should receive legal status but not the ability to become a legal permanent resident or citizen.¶ He said if Democrats push for a full pathway to citizenship, they will tank immigration reform and it will be for political reasons.¶ **"If they want a political victory they’re going to draw a fine red line and they’re going to say, either a pathway to citizenship or nothing else**," he told NPR. "They know that the Republicans in the House are not going to be able to vote for that, and then they’re going to be able to beat us over the head in 2014, and say, look, the Republicans don’t like immigrants. Which is not true."¶ Rep. Bob Goodlatte (R-Va.), who chairs the House Judiciary Committee that handles immigration reform, expressed similar concerns to USA Today earlier this week.¶ "When [Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid] says there has to be a path to citizenship, I wonder whether he's serious about doing immigration reform," he said. "You have to come at this with a willingness to look at all the options and find the common ground."

#### Won’t pass---no GOP support---Committee meeting proves

NYT 2-7 – New York Times, February 7th, 2013, "Immigration and the Middle Ground" www.nytimes.com/2013/02/07/opinion/immigration-reform-and-the-false-middle-ground.html?\_r=0&pagewanted=print

The House Judiciary Committee held its first hearing on immigration on Tuesday, and it was not encouraging.¶ In recent weeks, a bipartisan group of senators and President Obama have called for decisive action to fix the system. They seem to agree that an essential part of any overhaul should be legalizing 11 million undocumented immigrants. There are many questions over the details — when a path to green cards and citizenship should start, and how long and difficult it should be. But they agree that there should be a path to citizenship, which represents a real breakthrough in the long-stalled debate.¶ But House Republicans aren’t there yet. The tone at the hearing was set when the committee chairman, Representative Robert Goodlatte of Virginia, asked a witness: “Are there options that we should consider between the extremes of mass deportation and a pathway to citizenship for those not lawfully present in the United States?” **The false middle ground he and others on the committee seemed to be seeking was limbo: legal status without hope of citizenship. Or, second-class noncitizens.**¶ The witness, Mayor Julián Castro of San Antonio, responded that there was nothing extreme about turning immigrants into Americans. “If we look at our history,” he said, “Congress over time has chosen that option, that path to citizenship.”¶ **Republicans have been so estranged from a reasonable immigration discussion that it’s not surprising they don’t know what one looks like.** Since the last big bipartisan reform died in 2007, Republicans have dug into a trench on the far right, declaring that legalization in any form is anathema. The re-election of Mr. Obama and the dismal performance by Republicans among Hispanic voters rattled the party deeply and dislodged some Republicans from that noxious orthodoxy.¶ Judging from Tuesday’s hearing, many in the party still see immigrants as problems to be separated and contained. Republican committee members **seemed willing only to discuss making Americans of small subsets**, like “highly skilled” immigrants in technical fields, leaving aside most everyone else. Representative Spencer Bachus of Alabama and some like-minded witnesses dismissed citizenship as too “toxic” to discuss. Their defeatism was yet more evidence of a party deeply out of step with public opinion and American history, in which waves of newcomers have been absorbed into the republic without being forced into a permanent underclass.

## Thumpers

### 1AR XT – No Vote

#### Action does not match rhetoric---no vote until the summer

Voorhees 1-3 – Josh Voorhees is the editor of The Slatest. Before joining the magazine he reported on energy policy and politics for Politico and Greenwire and, before that, courts and crime for a South Carolina daily. January 3rd, 2013, "White House (Quietly) Promises Immigration Push" http://www.slate.com/blogs/the\_slatest/2013/01/03/obama\_s\_immigration\_plans\_white\_house\_officials\_suggest\_early\_2013\_won\_t.html

However, just because the administration is declaring that an unofficial launch to the immigration push is imminent doesn't mean anyone should expect major action anytime soon. The aides who laid out the plans to HuffPo cautioned that **it would probably take about two months to cobble together a bipartisan bill, and then another few before either chamber votes on it.** That would mean that if all goes as planned (something that is far from certain) it would likely be early or mid-summer **before any concrete actions are taken.**