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### 1

#### Text: The United States Federal Government should obtain, through alternative financing, electricity from small modular reactors for military bases in the United States.

#### DOD is key – solves commercialization, overcomes restrictions and doesn’t link to politics.

Madia, Chairman of the Board of Overseers and Vice President for the SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory at Stanford University, ‘12

[William, Spring, "Small Modular Reactors: A Potential Game-changing Technology", energyclub.stanford.edu/index.php/Journal/Small\_Modular\_Reactors\_by\_William\_Madia]

To determine if SMRs hold the potential for changing the game in carbon-free power generation, it is imperative that we test the design, engineering, licensing, and economic assumptions with some sort of public-private development and demonstration program. Instead of having government simply invest in research and development to “buy down” the risks associated with SMRs, I propose a more novel approach. Since the federal government is a major power consumer, it should commit to being the “first mover” of SMRs. This means purchasing the first few hundred MWs of SMR generation capacity and dedicating it to federal use. The advantages of this approach are straightforward. The government would both reduce licensing and economic risks to the point where utilities might invest in subsequent units, thus jumpstarting the SMR industry. It would then also be the recipient of additional carbon-free energy generation capacity. This seems like a very sensible role for government to play without getting into the heavy politics of nuclear waste, corporate welfare, or carbon taxes.¶ If we want to deploy power generation technologies that can realize near-term impact on carbon emissions safely, reliably, economically, at scale, and at total costs that are manageable on the balance sheets of most utilities, we must consider SMRs as a key component of our national energy strategy.

#### SMRs solve manufacturing – only sustainable energy force for the economy.

Johnson ‘12 (John, Nuclear Energy Insider, April 25, "US Campaign Trail: is nuclear in the equation?", analysis.nuclearenergyinsider.com/new-build/us-campaign-trail-nuclear-equation)

U.S. Energy Secretary Steven Chu said when the program was announced. ¶ ¶ “Through the funding for small modular nuclear reactors, the Energy Department and private industry are working to position America as the leader in advanced nuclear energy technology and manufacturing.” ¶ ¶ John Keeley, manager of media relations for the Nuclear Energy Institute, said that the Obama administration has done what it can to support the deployment on new build-outs in the United States to build out nuclear, as well as supporting research and development efforts, such as those in the small reactor space. ¶ ¶ Research support¶ ¶ In addition, the U.S. has invested $170 million in research grants at more than 70 universities, supporting research and development into a full spectrum of technologies, from advanced reactor concepts to enhanced safety design.¶ ¶ “The President was explicit in his State Of The Union speech about the virtues of nuclear as a technology and its role in clean air generation,” said Keeley. “And he has been supportive of developing more nuclear plants in this country. Those initiatives have to be identified as significant evidence of support for the nuclear sector.”¶ ¶ There are currently 104 nuclear power reactors operating in the U.S. in 31 states, operated by 30 different utilities. There are four new nuclear reactors being built in the U.S., including two in George at total expected cost of $14bn. ¶ ¶ In another sign of the U.S support for the industry, the federal government provided utility company Southern with an $8.3bn loan guarantee for the Vogtle Units 3 and 4, the first new nuclear plants to be built in the U.S. in the last 30 years. They are expected to be operational in 2016 and 2017.¶ ¶ The U.S. Energy Department has also supported the Vogtle project and the development of the next generation of nuclear reactors by providing more than $200m through a cost-share agreement to support the licensing reviews for the Westinghouse AP1000 reactor design certification. ¶ ¶ In addition to the Vogtle plants, SCANA, a subsidiary of South Carolina Electric & Gas Co. plans to add two reactors to its nuclear power plant near Jenkinsville, S.C., by 2016 and 2019.¶ ¶ “There is certainly political consensus in support of clean generation, and large scale cultural consensus as well,” said Keeley. ¶ ¶ Political benefits of nuclear support¶ ¶ As gas prices in the U.S. continue to soar, it’s possible that the tide will turn more in favor of nuclear and other clean energy sources, especially as electric cars take a stronger foothold. In addition, the job creation benefits from nuclear could work their way into the political landscape as well.¶ ¶ The two new Vogtle nuclear plants are expected to create approximately 5,000 on-site jobs during the peak of construction, with 800 high paying jobs remaining over the life of the plant.

#### SMRs solve warming – it’s the only source that can scale.

Palley, ‘11

[Reese, The London School of Economics, 2011, The Answer: Why Only Inherently Safe, Mini Nuclear Power Plans Can Save Our World, p. 168-71]

That conclusion brings the book to the problems and the solutions inherent in nuclear power, the only energy source that can guarantee us a reasonable future that might be resistant to CO2 warming. Here the argument returns once again to the problem of scale of nuclear reactors, especially as the size of these reactors is related to the brief time left to us to get a grip on calamitous climate changes. The beginnings of nuclear energy lay in the demands of war. The battle between good and evil characterized by the Second World War gave hurried birth to a discovery that had the inherent power to both destroy and salvage. The power to destroy required plutonium on an enormous scale, which was projected forward into the postwar development of civilian reactors. The demand for scarce plutonium for the bombs of the cold war defined the type of reactors that were being developed. These were the breeder reactors, which spewed out plutonium measured in tons that had previously been available only in ounces, and would continue to do so when the wartime need was far behind us. What was once precious, rare, and desirable has become dangerous nuclear waste, and the imperfectly perceived scale of the waste problem has seriously inhibited the logical growth and development of nuclear power. By some unthinkable universal coincidence, nuclear power became available to man for war at the same time that it could prove to be the solution to man’s greatest peacetime challenge. But the gigawatt nuclear power plants that emerged from the war had within them the seeds of their own severe limitation. The scale of the risks, real and imagined, grew exponentially as the scale of energy output grew only linearly. These risks, some merely perceived, some dangerously real and some financial, have conspired to restrict the enormous expansion of nuclear power that is needed to quickly replace our present consumption of energy from fossil fuels. The present rate of replacement of fossil with nuclear sources is at a pace that will have little impact on ultimately dealing with the CO2 imbalance. This slow rate of change is compounded of public fears, bureaucratic regulatory mechanisms resistant to novel solutions, and a private capital market that is unable to conjure with the imagined and real risks of the huge gigawatt reactors that dominate the industry. It is a Gordian knot that cannot be unraveled but which can only be cut by a political sword that, alas, still lacks the edge to do the job. By another rare act of cosmic fortuity, there is a parallel existing nuclear technology that, barring political interference, is capable of addressing the scale problems inherent in gigawatt reactors. From the beginning of the nuclear era, researchers such as Weinberg and Wigner and Teller developed small, inherently safe nuclear reactors that did not breed plutonium. This was reason enough for the military, balancing urgent demands on research and development budgets, to consign the concept of “smaller and safer is better” to dusty shelves in our national science attic. This book has argued that small reactors, that produce a tenth of the energy of the giants also generate inordinately less of the risk that inhibits growth of the industry. Construction of small reactors is a fraction of the cost of construction of gigawatt reactors. Thus the number of years that scarce capital is tied up and at risk is substantially reduced. The book argues that a 100 MWe reactor88 is a much bigger hardware bargain than a gigawatt reactor, which, from start to output, can cost $15 billion. It is not only the hardware costs that contribute to the devilish details of risk. The problem is the inability of the market to accurately or even approximately estimate the real cost of the capital that would be tied up for over a decade in a project that, through technological advancements, could be obsolete before it ever joins the grid.

### 2

#### 1. CIR will pass now – vote count.

Martinez 1/24 (Gueillermo, columnist for the florida sun sentinel and on the editorial board, 2013, http://www.sun-sentinel.com/news/opinion/fl-gmcol-oped0124-20130124,0,4256316.column)

Obama, White House officials, and even members of Congress say that this time it is different. And one can hope that is the case, for since Ronald Reagan last approved an amnesty program in 1986, immigration has been relegated to the all-talk-and-no-action category in American politics.¶ This year, after Hispanic voters helped put Obama in the White House with 70 percent of its vote, that is the least the administration can do for a group that desperately seeks security for its family members; who want their relatives to come out of the shadows, work, and pay taxes. In other words, live a normal life.¶ Even many of the better-known Republicans in Congress and conservative commentators in the media understand the party has to change its stand on this issue or lose the Hispanic vote for years to come.¶ Sen. Marco Rubio, R-Fla., understands it so well he has been busy outlining his own plan to reform immigration law. It includes tougher enforcement on the border, a verification program, an increase in visa to scientists, and an agricultural workers program. And yes, it also addresses the issue of living in this country without papers.¶ So far Rubio's unwritten proposal has the approval of Congressman Paul Ryan, the Republican candidate for Vice President last November. It also has been praised by commentators like Sean Hannity and Bill O'Reilly. Grover Norquist, president of Americans for Tax Reform, has called Rubio's plan a "step in the right direction."¶ However, some question his proposal on how to grant undocumented workers in this country a pass to legal residency and eventually citizenship. His plan does both, but has undocumented workers waiting in line for others who enter the country legally before they would be granted the much desired status.¶ Some liberals feel this would make undocumented workers spend years, if not decades, before they can apply for legalization. Rubio said he does not have an answer yet.¶ Still, this is the first time in decades when there is actually an opportunity to solve the problem of the millions who live in our midst without papers.¶ The 2012 presidential elections readied an awful lot of people. These conservative and Republicans now understand the demographics of the Hispanic vote is against the GOP and they must adapt or forever be a minority party.¶ This is the time for President Obama to prioritize the issue and not allow other equally important parts of his agenda distract from his promise to enact immigration reform in the first year of his second term, as he did four years ago.¶ At this point this is doable. The whipping Latinos gave Republicans in the last election is still fresh in everyone's mind. There should be enough Republican votes in the House and Senate to pass legislation.

#### 2. Obama’s political capital is key.

Hesson 1/2 (Ted, Immigration Editor at ABC News, Analysis: 6 Things Obama Needs To Do for Immigration Reform, http://abcnews.go.com/ABC\_Univision/News/things-president-obama-immigration-reform/story?id=18103115#.UOTq55JIAho)

On Sunday, President Barack Obama said that immigration reform is a "top priority" on his agenda and that he would introduce legislation in his first year.¶ To find out what he needs to do to make reform a reality, we talked to Lynn Tramonte, the deputy director at America's Voice, a group that lobbies for immigration reform, and Muzaffar Chishti, the director of the New York office of the Migration Policy Institute, a think tank. Here's what we came up with.¶ 1. Be a Leader¶ During Obama's first term, bipartisan legislation never got off the ground. The president needs to do a better job leading the charge this time around, according to Chishti. "He has to make it clear that it's a high priority of his," he said. "He has to make it clear that he'll use his bully pulpit and his political muscle to make it happen, and he has to be open to using his veto power." His announcement this weekend is a step in that direction, but he needs to follow through.¶ 2. Clear Space on the Agenda¶ Political priorities aren't always dictated by the folks in D.C., as the tragic Connecticut school shooting shows us. While immigration had inertia after the election, the fiscal cliff and gun violence have been the most talked about issues around the Capitol in recent weeks. The cliff could recede from view now that Congress has passed a bill, but how quickly the president can resolve the other issues on his agenda could determine whether immigration reform is possible this year. "There's only limited oxygen in the room," Chishti said.

#### 3. Obama can’t win on natural gas policy – will make everyone angry.

Politico, ‘12

[“When it comes to natural gas, Obama can’t win”, <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0512/76402_Page2.html>, RSR]

President Barack Obama talked up natural gas in his State of the Union address, his top aides have held dozens of meetings with natural gas industry leaders and his administration has given the industry what it wanted on two big regulatory issues. What he’s gotten in return: a giant headache. Industry backers have hammered away at virtually all of the White House’s rule-making efforts while pouring millions of dollars into campaigns fighting Obama’s reelection. At the same time, environmentalists and even some Republicans have complained that natural gas is too cozy with the White House. The gas industry’s had plenty of access. This year, the White House Office of Management and Budget held at least a dozen meetings on fracking with senior officials from companies like ExxonMobil, Anadarko and BP, as well as Republican congressional staffers, tribal leaders and industry lobby shops. But the White House seems unable to decide how close it wants to be to the industry. Obama and Cabinet officials like Energy Secretary Steven Chu, Interior Secretary Ken Salazar and EPA chief Lisa Jackson consistently praise natural gas. And recent headlines have trumpeted the newfound closeness; Bloomberg, for instance, went with “Obama Warms to Energy Industry by Supporting Natural Gas” while National Journal chose: “White House’s Coziness With Big Oil Irks GOP.” White House energy adviser Heather Zichal insisted Monday that the relationship isn’t that simple. “It’s safe to say the notion that we rolled out the welcome mat or have this hunky-dory relationship where we’re all holding hands and singing ‘Kumbaya’ is not exactly where we’re at today,” Zichal said at an American Petroleum Institute event.

#### 4. Immigration reform is key to food security

Fitz 12 (Marshall Fitz is the Director of Immigration Policy at the Center for American Progress, Time to Legalize Our 11 Million Undocumented Immigrants, November 14th, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/immigration/report/2012/11/14/44885/time-to-legalize-our-11-million-undocumented-immigrants/)

Nowhere is the tension between immigrant labor and the economy more obvious than in agriculture. By most estimates, undocumented immigrants make up more than half of the workers in the agriculture industry. Likewise the U.S. Department of Agriculture has estimated that each farm job creates three “upstream” jobs in professions such as packaging, transporting, and selling the produce, meaning that what happens in the agricultural sector affects the economy as a whole.¶ Agriculture is particularly susceptible to the whims of the labor market, since crops become ripe at a fixed time and must be picked quickly before they rot. Migrant laborers often travel a set route, following the growing season as it begins in places such as Florida and works its way north. Disrupting this flow of pickers can be devastating to local economies and the nation’s food security.¶ After the passage of Georgia’s anti-immigrant law, H.B. 87, for example, the Georgia Agribusiness Council estimated that the state could lose up to $1 billion in produce from a lack of immigrant labor. A survey of farmers conducted by the Georgia Department of Agriculture found 56 percent of those surveyed were experiencing difficulty finding workers—a devastating blow to the state. Even a program by Gov. Nathan Deal (D-GA) to use prison parolees to fill the worker shortage quickly fell apart, with most walking off the job after just a few hours.¶ Creating a process for legalizing these undocumented workers would help stabilize the agricultural workforce and enhance our nation’s food security. It would also diminish the incentive of states to go down the economically self-destructive path that Georgia, Alabama, Arizona, and others have pursued.

#### 5. Food shortages lead to extinction.

Brown, founder of the Worldwatch Institute and the Earth Policy Institute, ‘9

[Lester, “Can Food Shortages Bring Down Civilization?” Scientific American, May]

The biggest threat to global stability is the potential for food crises in poor countries to cause government collapse. Those crises are brought on by ever worsening environmental degradation One of the toughest things for people to do is to anticipate sudden change. Typically we project the future by extrapolating from trends in the past. Much of the time this approach works well. But sometimes it fails spectacularly, and people are simply blindsided by events such as today's economic crisis. For most of us, the idea that civilization itself could disintegrate probably seems preposterous. Who would not find it hard to think seriously about such a complete departure from what we expect of ordinary life? What evidence could make us heed a warning so dire--and how would we go about responding to it? We are so inured to a long list of highly unlikely catastrophes that we are virtually programmed to dismiss them all with a wave of the hand: Sure, our civilization might devolve into chaos--and Earth might collide with an asteroid, too! For many years I have studied global agricultural, population, environmental and economic trends and their interactions. The combined effects of those trends and the political tensions they generate point to the breakdown of governments and societies. Yet I, too, have resisted the idea that food shortages could bring down not only individual governments but also our global civilization. I can no longer ignore that risk. Our continuing failure to deal with the environmental declines that are undermining the world food economy--most important, falling water tables, eroding soils and rising temperatures--forces me to conclude that such a collapse is possible. The Problem of Failed States Even a cursory look at the vital signs of our current world order lends unwelcome support to my conclusion. And those of us in the environmental field are well into our third decade of charting trends of environmental decline without seeing any significant effort to reverse a single one. In six of the past nine years world grain production has fallen short of consumption, forcing a steady drawdown in stocks. When the 2008 harvest began, world carryover stocks of grain (the amount in the bin when the new harvest begins) were at 62 days of consumption, a near record low. In response, world grain prices in the spring and summer of last year climbed to the highest level ever.As demand for food rises faster than supplies are growing, the resulting food-price inflation puts severe stress on the governments of countries already teetering on the edge of chaos. Unable to buy grain or grow their own, hungry people take to the streets. Indeed, even before the steep climb in grain prices in 2008, the number of failing states was expanding [see sidebar at left]. Many of their problem's stem from a failure to slow the growth of their populations. But if the food situation continues to deteriorate, entire nations will break down at an ever increasing rate. We have entered a new era in geopolitics. In the 20th century the main threat to international security was superpower conflict; today it is failing states. It is not the concentration of power but its absence that puts us at risk.States fail when national governments can no longer provide personal security, food security and basic social services such as education and health care. They often lose control of part or all of their territory. When governments lose their monopoly on power, law and order begin to disintegrate. After a point, countries can become so dangerous that food relief workers are no longer safe and their programs are halted; in Somalia and Afghanistan, deteriorating conditions have already put such programs in jeopardy.Failing states are of international concern because they are a source of terrorists, drugs, weapons and refugees, threatening political stability everywhere. Somalia, number one on the 2008 list of failing states, has become a base for piracy. Iraq, number five, is a hotbed for terrorist training. Afghanistan, number seven, is the world's leading supplier of heroin. Following the massive genocide of 1994 in Rwanda, refugees from that troubled state, thousands of armed soldiers among them, helped to destabilize neighboring Democratic Republic of the Congo (number six).Our global civilization depends on a functioning network of politically healthy nation-states to control the spread of infectious disease, to manage the international monetary system, to control international terrorism and to reach scores of other common goals. If the system for controlling infectious diseases--such as polio, SARS or avian flu--breaks down, humanity will be in trouble. Once states fail, no one assumes responsibility for their debt to outside lenders. If enough states disintegrate, their fall will threaten the stability of global civilization itself.

### 3

#### The United States Federal Government should substantially reduce restrictions on offshore natural gas production in the Gulf of Mexico, Artic and Pacific regions.

#### The plan says offshore natural gas restrictions – that means the Atlantic, Arctic, Pacific and Gulf of Mexico Coast areas.

EIA, ‘5

[Energy Information Administration, Office of Oil and Gas, September 2005, “Overview of U.S. Legislation and Regulations Affecting Offshore Natural Gas and Oil Activity” ]

Offshore natural gas and oil exploration, drilling, production, and transportation have all been affected. Legislative action has ranged from imposition of a wide range of requirements on operations in the offshore to complete removal of access to offshore resources. Today natural gas and oil drilling is prohibited in all offshore regions along the North Atlantic coast, most of the Pacific coast, parts of the Alaska coast, and most of the eastern Gulf of Mexico. The central and western portions of the Gulf of Mexico therefore account for almost all current domestic offshore natural gas and oil production.

#### Gulf of Mexico alone solves your aff.

Griles 3

[Lisa, Deputy Secretary—Department of the Interior, “Energy Production on Federal Lands,” Hearing before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, 4-30]

Vast resources of oil and natural gas lie, we hope, beneath these sheets of salt in the OCS in the Gulf of Mexico. But it is very difficult to get clear seismic images. We are also working to create a process of reviewing and permitting alternative energy sources on the OCS lands. We have sent legislation to Congress that would give the Minerals Management Service of the Department of the Interior clear authority to lease parts of the OCS for renewable energy. The renewables could be wind, wave, or solar energy, and related projects that are auxiliary to oil and gas development, such as offshore staging facilities and emergency medical facilities. We need this authority in order to be able to truly give the private sector what are the rules to play from and buy, so they can have certainty about where to go.

#### Drilling in the Atlantic will happen quickly—they risk irreversible damage to the entire marine ecosystem.

NRDC 12 [Natural Resources Defense Council, “Deep Sea Treasures Protecting the Atlantic Coast's Ancient Submarine Canyons and Seamounts,” March 2012

Out at Sea, But Not Out of¶ Harm’s Way

The Atlantic canyons and seamounts remain largely¶ unscathed by humans. Because of their depth and¶ ruggedness, they have been out of reach to destructive¶ bottom trawling, a type of fishing using heavily weighted¶ nets to target bottom-dwelling fish, crushing, ripping, and¶ ultimately destroying fragile bottom habitats in the process.¶ So far the oil and gas industry has not been allowed to¶ commercially develop oil resources on the Eastern seaboard.

But that could quickly change. Elsewhere, so-called¶ “canyon buster” and “rock hopper” trawl gear are opening up challenging seascapes to fishermen seeking out new populations or species to catch. These bottom trawl nets¶ can remove in minutes what took nature centuries to build,¶ leaving barren, scarred clay, mud, and rock where rich gardens of corals, sponges, and anemones once thrived.¶ With the moratoria against oil and gas development in¶ the Atlantic now lifted, full-scale commercial drilling in the canyons is possible. Proposals for oil and gas exploration are already under consideration, threatening the canyons’¶ sensitive resources. Seismic surveys are used to detect the¶ presence of oil and gas and use high-decibel acoustic energy¶ pulses blasted from ships. Surveys can damage or kill fish and fish larvae and have been implicated in whale beaching¶ and stranding incidents.10 The auditory assault disrupts and displaces vital behaviors, leaving marine animals unable to locate prey or mates or communicate with each other, and pushing animals out of critical migratory corridors and their¶ nursery, foraging, and breeding habitat.11

After the Deepwater Horizon and Exxon Valdez disasters,¶ we now all know the widespread ecological devastation that results from a well blow-out or a catastrophic spill. Even small oil spills can kill marine organisms and disrupt marine ecosystems. Marine mammals like dolphins and whales can also inhale oil when they surface to breathe, which causes¶ damage to mucous membranes and airways and can be¶ fatal.12 Aside from posing a spill risk, each drilled well also generates drilling muds and cuttings, and produces water that contains toxic metals, such as lead, chromium, mercury, and carcinogens like toluene and benzene.13

The Atlantic’s Submarine Canyons¶ and Seamounts Need Our Protection

We have a unique opportunity now to protect the rich and¶ vulnerable resources of the Atlantic canyons and seamounts before irreversible harm is done. To date, only four of these¶ canyons have been protected from bottom trawling. None¶ of the canyons or seamounts are protected from oil and gas¶ exploration activities. We need to fully protect these special¶ places for the future before it is too late.

#### Drilling will destroy numerous biological hotspots

Gravitz 9—Oceans Advocate for Environment America [Michael Gravitz, Statement at the Department of Interior Hearing On Offshore Ocean Energy Development in Atlantic City, New Jersey, April 6, 2009, pg. http://tinyurl.com/cxkzanz]

3. When deciding whether to approve seismic testing or exploration and production off the east coast, your department needs to balance the safety of those special areas against the potential for damage from oil drilling. The only way to adequately assess the balance would be for your department (with the participation of NOAA and possibly the National Academy of Science) to do a comprehensive census of those special places and analyze possible impacts on them from drilling. 1. The Ocean: More Like A Diverse Forest Than A Desert Many people look at the ocean and see it as a pretty, shiny surface. They may imagine a few fish swimming below the surface and a plain featureless bottom. This is not an accurate picture of the ocean in most places. Unless the bottom is sandy and continually disturbed by wind, wave or current the bottom of the ocean is filled with communities of diverse creatures. Depending on depth, penetration of light, type of bottom (i.e., muddy, sandy, pebbles, boulders) and other factors, the ocean’s floor is teaming with diverse communities of plants, invertebrates, shellfish, crustaceans and fish. Numerous kinds of fish live on the bottom. Other fish swim above the bottom in the water column at different levels. Thousands of types of phytoplankton, zooplankton and larvae at the base of most food chains ‘float’ around. Marine mammals, sea turtles and sea birds spend most of their time at or near the surface of the ocean. All of these creatures are sensitive to the impacts of oil and pollution from oil and gas drilling; some are more sensitive than others. But none are immune to the short or long term effects of oil. With this as background, it is important to recognize the special places in the ocean that are unique, especially sensitive to pollution or those that are especially productive. These include: submarine canyons cutting across the continental shelf; deep water coral gardens; plateaus where the floor of the ocean rises and becomes unusually productive because deeper nutrient rich waters come closer to the warmer temperatures and light of the surface; migratory pathways for marine mammals and sea turtles; and areas where fish aggregate to spawn or where larval stages of animals are concentrated. Finally, the margins of the ocean: beaches, bays and marshes are often unusually sensitive to oil pollution. 2. Special Places in the Atlantic Ocean Deserving of Protection Based on the Environmental Sensitivity Index (ESI) and a crude measure of marine productivity that your own department uses, the New England, Mid Atlantic and South Atlantic planning areas are all very environmentally sensitive and highly productive. The South Atlantic planning area and Mid Atlantic have the first and third most environmentally sensitive coastlines, respectively, of all 22 MMS planning areas. New England comes in at #11. The South Atlantic and Mid Atlantic are ranked first and second respectively in terms of primary productivity among all the planning areas with North Atlantic being #12. There are 14 submarine canyons between Massachusetts and Virginia that slice through the continental shelf (See attached list). Submarine canyons, some with a mouth as wide as eight to ten miles and 30-40 miles long, are important because they shelter unusual species, provide hard bottoms and sidewalls for creatures to attach to or burrow in, provide nursery areas for many commercially important fish and bring nutrients from the deep ocean up to more shallow waters. Sea life in these canyons is unusually diverse which is why drilling in or near submarine canyons with their risk from spills and chronic pollution from production would be a very bad idea. There are a number of important underwater plateaus and reefs off the eastern seaboard which serve as fish baskets, places of unusual marine productivity where very high populations of fish reproduce and grow. Often these are called ‘banks’ or ‘reefs’ with names like Georges Bank, Stellwagen Bank, Gray’s Reef or Occulina Bank. Some of these areas of the ocean are shallow enough to allow sunlight to penetrate to the seafloor and nutrients from the deeper ocean feed a richer abundance of life. These banks and reefs sometimes offer the only hard substrate for creatures to attach in a wide area. . Drilling in biological hot spots like these and jeopardizing productive commercial and recreational fisheries would make no sense. Like on land, certain areas of the ocean support migration corridors for fish, marine mammals, sea turtles and sea birds. For much of the Mid Atlantic there is a coastal corridor extending out 20 miles from shore in which endangered marine mammals like the northern right whale, various sea turtles and migratory fish travel. For example, the last 350 northern right whales on earth travel each year from the Georgia-Florida border where they give birth and nurse their calves to an area off Cape Cod where they spend the summer feeding. Loggerheads, leatherback and Kemp’s ridley turtles all use this corridor at various times of the year. Another corridor, farther offshore at the edge of the continental shelf break and slope provides food for various endangered sea turtles and other kinds of whales and dolphins. Whales and dolphins are typically migratory and each is only seasonally present but taken together the area is important year round to these marine mammals. There are four more hotspots of marine diversity and unusual productivity off the Mid Atlantic caused by ocean currents, type of bottom, [and] submarine canyons and other special characteristics. These include: the coastal waters off North Carolina near and south of Cape Hatteras, the mouth of the Chesapeake and Delaware Bays and off New York harbor. Coastal waters and sandy bottoms off New Jersey support a large and economically important clam and scallop industry.

#### Human survival is at risk

Nautiyal & Nidamanuri 10—Centre for Ecological Economics and Natural Resources @ Institute for Social and Economic Change & Department of Earth and Space Sciences @ Indian Institute of Space Science and Technology [SUNIL NAUTIYAL1 & RAMA RAO NIDAMANURI “Conserving Biodiversity in Protected Area of Biodiversity Hotspot in India: A Case Study,” International Journal of Ecology and Environmental Sciences 36 (2-3): 195-200, 2010

The hotspots are the world’s most biologically rich areas hence recognized as important ecosystems not important¶ only for the rich biodiversity but equally important for the human survival as these are the homes for more than¶ 20% of the world’s population. India got recognition of one of the mega-diversity countries of world as the country¶ is home of the two important biodiversity hotspots: the Himalaya in north and the Western Ghats in the southern¶ peninsula. Policy makers and decision takers have recognized the importance of biodiversity (flora and fauna) and¶ this has resulted to segregate (in the form of protected areas) the rich and diverse landscape for biodiversity¶ conservation. An approach which leads towards conservation of biological diversity is good efforts but such¶ approaches should deal with humans equally who are residing in biodiversity hotspots since time immemorial. In¶ this endeavor, a study was conducted in Nagarahole National Park of Nilgiri Biosphere Reserve, in Karnataka. Our¶ empirical studies reveal that banning all the human activities in this ecosystem including agriculture, animal¶ husbandry has produced the results opposite to the approach ‘multiple values’ of national park. To monitor the¶ impact, existing policies have been tested from an economic and ecological view-point. Unfortunately, the local¶ livelihoods (most of them belongs to indigenous tribes) in the area have received setbacks due to the¶ implementation of the policies, though unintentionally. However, the ecological perspective is also not showing¶ support for the approach and framework of the current policies in the hotspots. Satellite data showed that the¶ temporal pattern of ecosystem processes has been changing. An integrated approach for ecosystem conservation and¶ strengthening local institutions for sustainable ecosystem management in such areas is therefore supported by this¶ study.

### 4

#### The purposes and possibilities for energy generation are channeled through technological thinking; all Beings can be reduced to an energy source

O’Brien 4 (Mahon, Professor of Philosophy at University College, Cork, Ireland, “Commentary on Heidegger’s ‘The Question Concerning Technology,” Thinking Together. Proceedings of the IWM Junior Fellows' Conference, http://www.iwm.at/publ-jvc/jc-16-01.pdf)

It is a charge which many are wont to make and one which is facilitated by the widespread conviction that it is entirely reasonable to both bracket certain features of Heidegger’s thought with a view to reappropriating them or to distinguish be- tween Sein und Zeit and much of his subsequent work. 50 **With respect to the revelatory capacity of modern technology, Heidegger is not simply bemoaning the loss of the world of yesteryear in misty-eyed sentimentality, this is not a doleful, nostalgic essay – “there is no demonry of technology” to begin with. Rather Heidegger is trying to discover what the exclusive feature of modern technology is which distinguishes it essentially from earlier types. To recapitulate, the difference pertains to the way in which modern technology** reveals**, the manner in which it allows us, and seemingly** compels us, to view the world **we live in and the Earth we live on. 51 Where once a windmill relied on the wind for its operative success or lack of it, now energy is** unlocked **from air currents, “a tract of land is** challenged **into the putting out of coal and ore. The earth now reveals itself as a coal mining district, the soil as a mineral deposit**.” 52 One might object that this is to ignore the various ways in which we tradition- ally, even in our capacity as agriculturalists, challenged the Earth to provide us with a bountiful harvest, a harvest which emerged through human manipulation and contrivance of a technological, though admittedly more primitive and rustic nature. Farmers reaped what they sowed, not what the Earth chanced to grant them through multiple windfalls. How then do we reconcile this claim with Heidegger’s thoughts on technology? That is, where do we draw the line between earlier manifestations of technology, with their concomitant attempt to provide for ourselves in a way that required our very own peculiar intervention, and the modern technological attitude toward the world? In a way, the question will always resist any attempt to demarcate things rigidly – there will always be a penumbra where it is not yet clear if the transition has already been made in any genealogical account. That is not to say however, that along a spectrum we cannot notice degrees of difference which ultimately resolve into a completely new type or kind – a categorically different thing which at one end of the spectrum is easy to set in relief against the other end. Of course, part of Heidegger’s strategy in this essay is to show that such problems stem from our inability to move out from under the shadow of Enframing and some of its more conspicuous offspring such as the instrumental definition of technology. With respect to agriculture for instance: The field that the peasant formerly cultivated and set in order [be- stellte] appears differently than it did when to set in order still meant to take care of and maintain. The work of the peasant does not challenge the soil of the field. In the sowing of the grain it places the seed in the keeping of the forces of growth and watches over its increase. But meanwhile even the cultivation of the field has come under the grip of another kind of setting-in-order, which sets upon [stellt] nature. It sets upon in the sense of challenging it. Agriculture is now the mechanized food industry. 53 **What Heidegger seems very much concerned with is this imposition on the Earth**, that the Earth is set upon in a way which is disturbing from the standpoint of the sheer scale of its intrusiveness, its lack of reverence for that which it dismantles. **We no longer are part of the Earth but look to exploit it as a resource rather than seeing it as our wonderful, at times numinous home. We disassemble the natural configuration and look to manipulate and to disintegrate until something is no longer the structural item it once was but is a collection of forces, reduced to nothing but energy and resource to be exhausted or stock-piled**. There is a difference, not just in degree or intensity here, but in kind – what is revealed through modern technology is very different from what is revealed through older, cruder methods of, among other things, agriculture. For instance, Heidegger would almost certainly insist that there are important differences between the revealing which occurs within traditional planting and harvesting and that which is undertaken in genetic engineering and scientific intensive farming. Another feature which Heidegger believes is unique to the setting-upon which obtains within the essence of modern technology is the fact that it stockpiles materials and resources: The coal that has been hauled out in some mining district has not been supplied in order that it may simply be present somewhere or other. It is stockpiled; that is, it is on call, ready to deliver the sun’s warmth that is stored in it. 54 The world around us is something that we view rather differently, Heidegger argues, than earlier peoples were given to perceive, our perceptual goggles, if you will, have radically different filtration systems.

#### The rapacious drive to secure energy is a symptom of “challenging-forth,” a mindset that renders everything as disposable. Only through rejecting challenging forth and embracing bringing forth can we avoid this hollowing out of Being

Waddington 5 A Field Guide to Heidegger: Understanding 'The Question concerning Technology' more by David Waddington Educational Philosophy and Theory, Vol. 37, No. 4, 2005 http://concordia.academia.edu/DavidWaddington/Papers/538046/A\_Field\_Guide\_to\_Heidegger\_Understanding\_The\_Question\_concerning\_Technology

Most essays on technology focus primarily on practical issues surrounding the use of particular technologies . Heidegger’s essay, however, does not—instead, it focuses on the ways of thinking that lie behind technology. Heidegger (1977, p. 3) thinks that by coming to understand these ways of thinking, humans can enter into a ‘free relationship’ with technology. After dismissing the conventional account of technology, which supposedly states that technology is simply a means to an end, Heidegger commences a discussion on ancient craftsmanship. He suggests that the ancient craftsmanship involves the four Aristotelian causes: material, formal, ﬁnal, and efﬁcient. Intuitively, one might think that the efﬁcient cause of a given craft-item (the craftsman) was the most signiﬁcant of the four. However, although the craftsman has an important role in that she unites the four causes by considering each of them carefully, each of the four causes is equally co-responsible for the particular craft-item that is produced. Heidegger comments, ‘The four ways of being responsible bring something into appearance. They let it come forth into presencing’ (1977, p. 9). Appropriately enough, Heidegger names this process bringing-forth . Notably, bringing-forth is not merely a descriptive genus under which the four causes are subsumed—rather, it is a uniﬁed process, ‘a single leading-forth to which [each of the causes] is indebted’ (Lovitt, 1972, p. 46).Heidegger writes that bringing-forth ‘comes to pass only insofar as something concealed comes into unconcealment’ (1977, p. 11). Thus, instead of the craft-item being created by the craftsman, as one would think, it was revealed or unconcealed .In ‘The Thing’, Heidegger comments on the making of a jug, The jug is not a vessel because it was made; rather, the jug had to be made because it is this holding vessel. The making … lets the jug come into its own. But that which in the jug’s nature is its own is never brought about by its making. (1971, p. 168)Clearly, revealing/unconcealing in the mode of bringing-forth contains strong hints of Platonism. Bringing-forth is the mode of revealing that corresponds to ancient craft. Modern technology, however, has its own particular mode of revealing, which Heidegger calls challenging-forth . Thinking in the mode of challenging-forth is very different from thinking in the mode of bringing-forth: when challenging-forth, one sets upon the elements of a situation both in the sense of ordering (i.e. setting a system upon) and in a more rapacious sense (i.e. the wolves set upon the traveler and devoured him). In bringing-forth, human beings were one important element among others in the productive process; in challenging-forth, humans control the productive process. Efﬁciency is an additional important element of thinking in the mode of challeng-ing forth; the earth, for example, is set upon to yield the maximum amount of ore with the minimum amount of effort. Essentially, challenging-forth changes the way we see the world—as Michael Zimmerman pointedly remarks, ‘To be capable of transforming a forest into packaging for cheeseburgers, man must see the forest not as a display of the miracle of life, but as raw material, pure and simple’ (1977, p. 79).Production in the mode of challenging-forth reveals objects that have the status of standing-reserve . Objects that have been made standing-reserve have been reduced to disposability in two different senses of the word: (1) They are disposable in the technical sense; they are easily ordered and arranged. Trees that once stood chaotically in the forest are now logs that can be easily counted, weighed, piled, and shipped. (2) They are also disposable in the conventional sense; like diapers and cheap razors, they are endlessly replaceable/interchangeable and have little value. For the most part, challenging things forth into standing-reserve is not a laudable activity, and thus it makes sense to wonder what drives human beings to think in this way. Heidegger’s answer to this motivational question is unconventional— instead of suggesting that the origins of this motivation are indigenous to human beings, he postulates the existence of a phenomenon that ‘sets upon man to order the real as standing-reserve’ (1977, p. 19). Heidegger calls this mysterious phenomenon enframing ( Ge-stell in German). The word ‘Ge-stell’ gathers together several meanings of the -stellen family of German verbs: in Ge-stell, humans are ordered ( bestellen ), commanded ( bestellen ), and entrapped ( nachstellen ) (Harries 1994,p. 229). Heidegger thinks that our default state is that of being trapped by Ge-stell; this is what he means when he writes, ‘As the one who is challenged forth in this way, man stands within the essential realm of [Ge-stell]. He can never take up a relationship to it only subsequently’ (1977, p. 24; Sallis, 1971, p. 162). According to Heidegger (1977, p. 25), there are different ‘ordainings of destining’ for human beings. Although the default destining is that of Ge-stell, it is possible to choose an alternate road. Heidegger thinks that human beings have been granted the special role of ‘Shepherds of Being’—we have been granted the power to reveal the world in certain ways (Ballard, 1971, p. 60). Trapped in Ge-stell, we tend to reveal things in the mode of challenging-forth, but we can also choose to reveal things in the mode of bringing-forth. Heidegger comments, ‘Placed between these possibilities, man is endangered from out of destining’ (1977, p. 26). However, by carefully considering the ways of thinking that lie behind technology, we can grasp the ‘saving power’. We can realize that we, the Shepherds of Being, have a choice : we can bring-forth rather than challenge-forth. Thus, once we understand the thinking behind technology, we become free to choose our fate—‘… we are already sojourning in the open space of destining’ (Heidegger, 1977, p. 26).

### Solvency

#### Obama’s 5 year lease plan solves the case without opening up the Arctic or the Atlantic seaboard to drilling.

Taylor 12—Environmental and Energy Policy reporter [Phil Taylor, “Interior to proceed with 'targeted' Arctic leases,” Greenwire: Tuesday, June 26, 2012, pg. http://www.eenews.net/public/Greenwire/2012/06/26/3

The Obama administration today said it will finalize a plan to offer new leases in the Arctic Ocean but will take precautions to protect sensitive waters, wildlife and Alaskan subsistence hunters. The announcement by Interior Department officials from Norway signals the administration's commitment to long-term development of the Arctic -- a region believed to be flush with oil, but which environmentalists and some Alaska Natives warn is too fragile, remote and risky to drill. In addition, Interior Secretary Ken Salazar said he believed it was "probable" that Royal Dutch Shell PLC would be issued final permits to drill in both the Beaufort and Chukchi seas, the strongest indication yet that drilling could commence as early as mid-July. Salazar said the agency's final leasing plan for the next five years will include potential lease sales in the Chukchi Sea in 2016 and in the Beaufort Sea in 2017. The plan would postpone by two years a sale in the Beaufort that was initially [planned](http://www.boem.gov/uploadedFiles/Proposed_OCS_Oil_Gas_Lease_Program_2012-2017.pdf) for 2015 ([Greenwire](http://www.eenews.net/Greenwire/2011/11/08/archive/3), Nov. 8, 2011). "We want to make sure we get it right, so we are not going to rush to process," Interior Deputy Secretary David Hayes said. In contrast to recent Gulf of Mexico leases that included virtually all of the federal planning areas, the size and location of the Arctic sales will be determined by factors including resource potential, subsistence use and environmental conditions, Salazar said. "We are taking a different approach -- a more strategic approach -- than the past," Salazar said in prepared remarks at a roundtable on Arctic development in Trondheim, Norway. "We intend to gather information from industry, Native Alaskan communities, the scientific community and the public to identify specific high-resource, low-conflict areas that are best suited for exploration and development." Salazar said the agency will maintain a 25-mile buffer along the Chukchi coast put in place under the George W. Bush administration to protect Native Alaskan communities. He said the new plan would also include an additional area north of Barrow that has attracted minimal industry interest but that has very high subsistence value. Today's announcement advances a five-year leasing plan first announced last November that also includes a dozen sales in the western, central and eastern Gulf, but excluded the entire Atlantic and Pacific seaboards -- to industry and most Republican lawmakers' chagrin. Interior officials said that East Coast states lack infrastructure to respond to potential oil spills and that West Coast states do not support offshore development. Federal agencies also lack adequate resource data to proceed with development in either ocean, the agency said.

#### No human capital—50% of workforce going to retire.

Ebinger et al., ‘12

[Charles, Kevin Massy and Govinda Avasarala, Brookings Energy Security Initiative Policy Brief, "Liquid Markets: Assessing the Case for US Exports of Liquefied Natural Gas" www.brookings.edu/~~/media/research/files/reports/2012/5/02%20lng%20exports%20ebinger/0502\_lng\_exports\_ebinger.pdf]

Human capital in the unconventional oil and gas development sectors is also in short supply. According to the National Petroleum Council (NPC), there has been a 75 percent decrease in petrochemical-related course enrollment since 1982 in the United States. 37 Moreover, within the next ten years, about 50 percent of the workforce in this industry will be eligible for retirement. The high demand for petroleum engineers, reflected in the high salaries of recent graduates in the field, is set to continue, with the NPC warning of a “considerable human resource challenge” in the oil and gas industry. 38 Faculty at leading universities with petroleum-engineering departments point to a lack of research and development (R&D) funding, which they say is negatively affecting their capacity to adequately train people for jobs in the hydrocarbons sector. While some of the shortfall in public R&D funding has been made up by private-sector support, academics note the frequent mismatch between the specific needs of individual companies and the long-term needs of the sector. Even if sufficient funding for R&D and training is now provided, there may also be a time lag before there is an adequate supply of petroleum engineers in the market.

#### No solvency - companies ignoring 72% of current lease potential.

Bronson, ‘12

[Mackenzie, 10-23-12, Energy policy team at the Center for American Progress, "Use it or lose it: report shows oil and gas companies sitting on thousands of unused leases"thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/10/23/1072351/use-it-or-lose-it-report-shows-oil-and-gas-companies-sitting-on-thousands-of-unused-leases/, RSR]

Mitt Romney, the American Petroleum Institute, and other fossil fuel allies constantly agitate to open more federal lands and waters to drilling, claiming that they aren’t getting enough access. But a new report from Representative Edward Markey titled “Use It or Lose It” finds that 131 oil and gas companies have 3,684 idle leases in the Gulf of Mexico alone. The Big Five oil companies — BP, Chevron, Shell, ExxonMobil, ConocoPhillips — are responsible for 40 percent of the 20.7 million acres “not undergoing exploration, development, or production” in the region. According to the report, a majority of offshore leases and onshore leases are not being used by oil companies: Oil companies have failed to explore, develop or produce these leases while simultaneously calling on Congress and the Interior Department to lease more federal offshore lands. This issue, which has been hotly debated in recent years, came up in last Tuesday’s presidential debate when Republican nominee Mitt Romney wrongly accused President Obama of curtailing oil and gas drilling off America’s coasts and on public land. In fact, oil and gas production from public lands is higher than it was during the last three years of the George W. Bush administration, and the Obama administration is trying to further boost production through “use it or lose it” policies for idle federal drilling leases. Oil and gas companies are currently not using 72 percent of the total acres leased offshore and 56 percent of the total acres leased onshore.

### Warming

#### Leaks don’t trigger methane release – only the massive drilling of the aff can trigger the impact.

Morningstar 11 [Cory Morningstar, “Destination—Hell. Are we there yet?,” Huntington News, Sunday, March 27, 2011—01:09, pg. http://www.huntingtonnews.net/2768

US Department of Energy meeting summary: "Alternatively, an undersea earthquake today, say off the Blake Ridge or the coast of Japan or California might loosen and cause some of the sediment to slide down the ridge or slump, exposing the hydrate layer to the warmer water. That in turn could cause a chain reaction of events, leading to the release of massive quantities of methane. Another possibility is drilling and other activities related to exploration and recovery of methane hydrates as an energy resource. The hydrates tend to occur in the pores of sediment and help to bind it together. Attempting to remove the hydrates may cause the sediment to collapse and release the hydrates. So, it may not take thousands of years to warm the ocean and the sediments enough to cause massive releases, only lots of drilling rigs. Returning to the 4 GtC release scenario, assume such a release occurs over a one-year period sometime in the next 50 years as result of slope failure. According to the Report of the Methane Hydrate Advisory Committee, “Catastrophic slope failure appears to be necessary to release a sufficiently large quantity of methane rapidly enough to be transported to the atmosphere without significant oxidation or dissolution.” In this event, methane will enter the atmosphere as methane gas. It will have a residence time of several decades and a global warming potential of 62 times that of carbon dioxide over a 20-year period. This would be the equivalent of 248 GtC as carbon dioxide or 31 times the annual man-made GHG emissions of today. Put another way, this would have the impact of nearly 30 years worth of GHG warming all at once. The result would almost certainly be a rapid rise in the average air temperature, perhaps as much as 3°F immediately. This might be tolerable if that’s as far as things go. But, just like 15,000 years ago, if the feedback mechanisms kick in, we can expect rapid melting of Greenland and Antarctic ice and an overall temperature increase of 30°F."

#### Extraction of nat gas releases methane – causes warming.

Romm, Senior Fellow at American Progress, editor of Climate Progress, assistant secretary of energy for energy efficiency and renewable energy in 1997, Ph.D. in physics from MIT, ‘11

[Joe, “Natural Gas Bombshell: Switching From Coal to Gas Increases Warming for Decades, Has Minimal Benefit Even in 2100,” 9-9-11,

http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2011/09/09/315845/natural-gas-switching-from-coal-to-gas-increases-warming-for-decades/]

A key finding of the NCAR study is: In summary, our results show that the substitution of gas for coal as an energy source results in increased rather than decreased global warming for many decades — out to the mid 22nd century for the 10% leakage case. This is in accord with Hayhoe et al. (2002) and with the less well established claims of Howarth et al. (2011) who base their analysis on Global Warming Potentials rather than direct modeling of the climate…. The most important result, however, in accord with the above authors, is that, unless leakage rates for new methane can be kept below 2%, substituting gas for coal is not an effective means for reducing the magnitude of future climate change. What is the leakage rate for methane? Well, as I’ve written, we don’t know exactly because the gas companies won’t release all of their data. We do know that total life-cycle leakage and fugitive emissions from extraction, production, transport, and consumption is higher for shale gas than conventional gas. The controversial — but peer-reviewed — paper by Cornell’s Robert Howarth, which I wrote about here, seeks to quantify the impact of the leakage from the best available data. It concluded: Natural gas is composed largely of methane, and 3.6% to 7.9% of the methane from shale-gas production escapes to the atmosphere in venting and leaks over the life-time of a well. These methane emissions are at least 30% more than and perhaps more than twice as great as those from conventional gas. The higher emissions from shale gas occur at the time wells are hydraulically fractured — as methane escapes from flow-back return fluids — and during drill out following the fracturing. Methane is a powerful greenhouse gas, with a global warming potential that is far greater than that of carbon dioxide, particularly over the time horizon of the first few decades following emission.

#### Status quo nat gas doesn’t trigger the link but any increase threatens renewables as a solution to warming.

Reuters, ‘12

[“Gas glut threatens climate battle-IEA,” 9-13-12,

<http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/09/13/energy-iea-gas-idUSL5E8KD4ZJ20120913>, RSR]

A new "golden age of gas" could derail global efforts to fight climate change as indebted governments mull a switch to the cheaper fuel, the International Energy Agency's chief economist said on Thursday. Government subsidies designed to promote renewable energy currently amount to around $70 billion globally, he said. But governments may be tempted to drop them as new shale gas and export facilities of liquefied natural gas (LNG) in east Africa and Australia pressure prices lower. "Governments are feeling more and more uncomfortable to put m oney in renewables especially in the days of austerity, and some governments are cutting their support," Fatih Birol from the West's energy watchdog said at an energy conference in Berne, Switzerland. "The availability of cheap or lower gas prices are putting additional pressure on renewable energies," he added. Currently, natural gas prices of many exporters such as Russia, Norway and Qatar are high because they are sold under long-term contracts that are linked to oil, but suppliers are coming under increasing pressure by customers to reduce prices or allow more flexible pricing based on movements in the freely traded spot gas markets. But Birol said that new supplies will undermine their ability to charge high prices in the long term. In North America, a boom in unconventional shale gas exploration has led to sharp drops in domestic natural gas prices and the U.S. is expected to begin exporting LNG by 2015, putting pressure on global gas prices and established pipeline suppliers such as Russia's Gazprom and Norway's Statoil. "You will see more and more, even in Europe, gas available outside of major current gas exporters which can put downward pressure on prices and give more flexibility on importers to negotiate long-term contracts," he later told Reuters. Other analysts, however, say that shale gas exploration in Europe will not be big enough to break the dominance of established pipeline suppliers, and that the development of renewables will therefore remain important in order to meet energy demand and Europe's emmissions reduction targets. Birol said that any reduction in investment in renewable energy would increase the risk of an increase in global temperatures by 6 degree Celsius this century, describing the current trend as "catastrophic". "If there are no urgent and bold policies put in place the door to a 2 degrees trajectory, the door to a normal life for us and for our children, will be closed and will be closed forever," he said.

#### Best models prove the crowd out.

Inman 12 (Mason Inman, January 17, 2012, “Shale Gas: A Boon That Could Stunt Alternatives, Study Says,” http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/energy/2012/01/120117-shale-gas-boom-impact-on-renewables/)

Shale gas has transformed the U.S. energy landscape in the past several years—but it may crowd out renewable energy and other ways of cutting greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, a new study warns. A team of researchers at Massachusetts Institute of Technology used economic modeling to show that new abundant natural gas is likely to have a far more complex impact on the energy scene than is generally assumed. If climate policy continues to play out in the United States with a relatively weak set of measures to control emissions, the new gas source will lead to lower gas and electricity prices, and total energy use will be higher in 2050. Absent the shale supply, the United States could have expected to see GHG emissions 2 percent below 2005 levels by 2050 under this relatively weak policy. But the lower gas prices under the current shale gas outlook will stimulate economic growth, leading GHG emissions to increase by 13 percent over 2005. And the shale gas will retard the growth of renewable energy's share of electricity, and push off the development of carbon capture and storage technology, needed to meet more ambitious policy targets, by as long as two decades. "Shale gas is a great advantage to the U.S. in the short term, for the next few decades," said MIT economist Henry Jacoby, lead author of the new study. "But it is so attractive that it threatens other energy sources we ultimately will need."

### Prices

#### Manufacturing high now – the plan is not key.

Suchecki 2012[Paul, works with Manufacturing Crossing which is a job consolidation service specifically for manufacturing jobs and with PRWeb which is the leading online news distribution site for small businesses organizations, “USA Today and ManufacturingCrossing Report Sharp Increase in Manufacturing Jobs in Several Key Areas”, December 2 2012, http://www.prweb.com/releases/2012/12/prweb10194266.htm]

**Manufacturing jobs have made a rapid comeback in 2012.** **This was reported by USA Today. The site reports that high skilled manufacturing jobs have increased 16% from 2010 to 2012**. The increase is in sharp contrast to the decline that the sector had witnessed from 2007 to 2009. The data is based on studies conducted across more than 90 national and state sources. **The USA Today report observes that this increase in jobs is related to the energy, production, technology and transportation industries. The report also found that a lot of these new jobs are in areas earlier hit by the recession such as Detroit and Phoenix.** The jobs data findings from ManufacturingCrossing a leading job site focusing only on manufacturing jobs seconds the USA today report**. ManufacturingCrossing reports an increasing number of job openings in the manufacturing sector, listing 22,000 manufacturing jobs on its site**. In terms of location, California is the leader with over 2,000 jobs followed by Indiana, Ohio and Pennsylvania, with each of them having around 1,000 jobs. ManufacturingCrossing CEO Harrison Barnes is quite optimistic about the jobs trends in the manufacturing field and observes, “**This reflects the overall positive feel in the employment sector. There is a lot of hope and we remain committed to helping people get jobs and enhance their careers**.”

#### Long term trends go neg – manufacturing will remain strong.

WSJ 2011 [It’s the Wall Street Journal… “U.S. Factories Buck Decline”, January 19 2011, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704029704576088412618821224.html#]

U.S. manufacturing, viewed as a lost cause by many Americans, has begun creating more jobs than it eliminates for the first time in more than a decade. As the economy recovered and big companies began upgrading old factories or building new ones, the number of manufacturing jobs in the U.S. last year grew 1.2%, or 136,000, the first increase since 1997, government data show. That total will grow again this year, according to economists at IHS Global Insight and Moody's Analytics. Among others, major auto makers—both domestic and transplants—are hiring. Ford Motor Co. announced last week it planned to add 7,000 workers over the next two years. The economists' projections for this year—calling for a gain of about 2.5%, or 330,000 manufacturing jobs—won't come close to making up for the nearly six million lost since 1997. But manufacturing should be at least a modest contributor to total U.S. employment in the next couple of years, these economists say. After a steep slump during the recession, manufacturing is "the shining star of this recovery," says Thomas Runiewicz, an economist at IHS. He expects total U.S. manufacturing jobs this year to rise to about 12 million. Currently, manufacturing jobs account for about 9% of all U.S. nonfarm jobs; the average pay for those jobs is roughly $22 an hour, or nearly twice the average for service jobs, according to government data. Despite the upbeat forecasts, job growth may remain modest because many companies are finding ways to increase production through greater efficiency and automation, without adding many workers. In the third quarter, U.S. manufacturing productivity increased as output rose 7.1% from a year earlier and hours worked grew just 3%. Conrad Winkler, a vice president at the consulting firm Booz & Co. who focuses on manufacturing, says manufacturers are being very cautious in their hiring, partly to avoid the risk of having to lay off people later on. "Manufacturing is going to be a significant source of job growth over the next decade," says Mark Zandi, chief economist at Moody's Analytics. He says U.S. manufacturers that survived the brutal 2008-09 recession are now very competitive, with much lower labor costs and debt burdens, and so can afford to expand. While they will keep building factories overseas to address demand in emerging markets, they also will invest in U.S. plants, Mr. Zandi says. He expects manufacturing job growth to average about 2% a year through 2015.

#### Gas not key to manufacturing – energy is not a large enough.

Plumer, Former Associate Editor at the New Republic, ‘12

[Brad, May 2012, “Will cheap shale gas revive U.S. manufacturing? Not so fast”, http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/ezra-klein/post/will-cheap-natural-gas-revive-us-manufacturing/2012/05/21/gIQAOORZfU\_blog.html]

That last claim comes via a recent report from PricewaterhouseCoopers. But over at the Council on Foreign Relations, Michael Levi casts a more skeptical eye on arguments that the age of cheap natural gas from shale will really lead to a dramatic revival of U.S. manufacturing. There are reasons to think the overall impact will be fairly muted. Energy costs are still a small factor for many manufacturers. Levi points to a 2009 paper (pdf) by Joseph Aldy and William Pizer finding that “only one tenth of U.S. manufacturing involved energy costs exceeding five percent of the total value of shipments.” Aldy and Pizer estimated that a carbon tax, which raises energy prices, would affect manufacturing employment slightly — less than 3 percent — in the most energy-intensive industries like aluminum, cement, glass, and steel. The flipside is that lower energy costs, thanks to cheap natural gas, would have a similarly marginal impact.

#### Even massive economic decline has zero chance of war

Jervis 11 (Robert Jervis 11, Professor in the Department of Political Science and School of International and Public Affairs at Columbia University, December 2011, “Force in Our Times,” Survival, Vol. 25, No. 4, p. 403-425

Even if war is still seen as evil, the security community could be dissolved if severe conflicts of interest were to arise. Could the more peaceful world generate new interests that would bring the members of the community into sharp disputes? 45 A zero-sum sense of status would be one example, perhaps linked to a steep rise in nationalism. More likely would be a worsening of the current economic difficulties, which could itself produce greater nationalism, undermine democracy and bring back old-fashioned beggar-my-neighbor economic policies. While these dangers are real, it is hard to believe that the conflicts could be great enough to lead the members of the community to contemplate fighting each other. § Marked 15:13 § It is not so much that economic interdependence has proceeded to the point where it could not be reversed – states that were more internally interdependent than anything seen internationally have fought bloody civil wars. Rather it is that even if the more extreme versions of free trade and economic liberalism become discredited, it is hard to see how without building on a preexisting high level of political conflict leaders and mass opinion would come to believe that their countries could prosper by impoverishing or even attacking others. Is it possible that problems will not only become severe, but that people will entertain the thought that they have to be solved by war? While a pessimist could note that this argument does not appear as outlandish as it did before the financial crisis, an optimist could reply (correctly, in my view) that the very fact that we have seen such a sharp economic down-turn without anyone suggesting that force of arms is the solution shows that even if bad times bring about greater economic conflict, it will not make war thinkable.

#### Data disproves hegemony impacts.

Fettweis, Department of Political Science at Tulane University, ‘11

[Christopher, 9/26/11, Free Riding or Restraint? Examining European Grand Strategy, Comparative Strategy, 30:316–332, EBSCO]

It is perhaps worth noting that there is no evidence to support a direct relationship between the relative level of U.S. activism and international stability. In fact, the limited data we do have suggest the opposite may be true. During the 1990s, the United States cut back on its defense spending fairly substantially. By 1998, the United States was spending $100 billion less on defense in real terms than it had in 1990. 51 To internationalists, defense hawks and believers in hegemonic stability, this irresponsible “peace dividend” endangered both national and global security. “No serious analyst of American military capabilities,” argued Kristol and Kagan, “doubts that the defense budget has been cut much too far to meet America’s responsibilities to itself and to world peace.” 52 On the other hand, if the paciﬁc trends were not based upon U.S. hegemony but a strengthening norm against interstate war, one would not have expected an increase in global instability and violence. The verdict from the past two decades is fairly plain: The world grew more peaceful while the United States cut its forces. No state seemed to believe that its security was endangered by a less-capable United States military, or at least none took any action that would suggest such a belief. No militaries were enhanced to address power vacuums, no security dilemmas drove insecurity or arms races, and no regional balancing occurred once the stabilizing presence of the U.S. military was diminished. The rest of the world acted as if the threat of international war was not a pressing concern, despite the reduction in U.S. capabilities. Most of all, the United States and its allies were no less safe. The incidence and magnitude of global conﬂict declined while the United States cut its military spending under President Clinton, and kept declining as the Bush ramped the spending back up. No complex statistical analysis should be necessary to reach the conclusion that the two are unrelated. Military spending ﬁgures by themselves are insufﬁcient to disprove a connection between overall U.S. actions and international stability. Once again, one could presumably argue that spending is not the only or even the best indication of hegemony, and that it is instead U.S. foreign political and security commitments that maintain stability. Since neither was signiﬁcantly altered during this period, instability should not have been expected. Alternately, advocates of hegemonic stability could believe that relative rather than absolute spending is decisive in bringing peace. Although the United States cut back on its spending during the 1990s, its relative advantage never wavered. However, even if it is true that either U.S. commitments or relative spending account for global paciﬁc trends, then at the very least stability can evidently be maintained at drastically lower levels of both. In other words, even if one can be allowed to argue in the alternative for a moment and suppose that there is in fact a level of engagement below which the United States cannot drop without increasing international disorder, a rational grand strategist would still recommend cutting back on engagement and spending until that level is determined. Grand strategic decisions are never ﬁnal; continual adjustments can and must be made as time goes on. Basic logic suggests that the United States ought to spend the minimum amount of its blood and treasure while seeking the maximum return on its investment. And if the current era of stability is as stable as many believe it to be, no increase in conﬂict would ever occur irrespective of U.S. spending, which would save untold trillions for an increasingly debt-ridden nation. It is also perhaps worth noting that if opposite trends had unfolded, if other states had reacted to news of cuts in U.S. defense spending with more aggressive or insecure behavior, then internationalists would surely argue that their expectations had been fulﬁlled. If increases in conﬂict would have been interpreted as proof of the wisdom of internationalist strategies, then logical consistency demands that the lack thereof should at least pose a problem. As it stands, the only evidence we § Marked 15:12 § have regarding the likely systemic reaction to a more restrained United States suggests that the current peaceful trends are unrelated to U.S. military spending. Evidently the rest of the world can operate quite effectively without the presence of a global policeman. Those who think otherwise base their view on faith alone.

## 2NC

### Immigration Politics

**Open immigration key to US aging transition – solves global aging.**

**Haas, '7** (Political Science Professor -- Duquesne, International Security, Summer)

**The more the U**nited **S**tates **maintains its enviable demographic position** (compared with the other great powers) **and relatively superior ability to pay for the costs of its elderly** population, **the more it will** be able both to **preserve its own position of international power dominance and** to **help other states address their aging** (and other) **problems** when it is in U.S. interests to do so. A critical implication of these facts is that such domestic policies as means-testing Social Security and Medicare payments, raising the retirement age to reflect increases in life expectancies, **maintaining largely open immigration policies to help keep the United States’ median age relatively low,** encouraging individual behaviors that result in better personal health, **and** perhaps above all **restraining the rising costs of its health-care system are critical international security concerns.** A defining political question of the twenty-first century for U.S. international interests is whether U.S. leaders have sufficient political will and wisdom to implement these and related policies. **The more proactive U.S. leaders are in minimizing** the scope of its **aging** population **and** the **costs associated** with it, **the more protected U.S. international interests will be. To ignore these costs, or even to delay** implementing various **reforms designed to limit their size, will jeopardize the level of global influence and security that the U**nited **S**tates enjoys today.

**Multiple nuclear wars.**

**Jackson & Howe, 11** (Senior Fellow – CSIS & Senior Associate – CSIS, http://csis.org/files/publication/110104\_gai\_jackson.pdf)

**A number of demographic storms are now brewing in different parts of the developing world**. The moment of maximum risk still lies ahead—just a decade away, in the 2020s. Ominously, this is the same decade when the developed world will itself be experiencing its moment of greatest demographic stress. Consider China, which may be the first country to grow old before it grows rich. For the past quarter-century, **China has been “peacefully rising,” thanks** in part **to a one-child**-per-couple **policy** that has lowered dependency burdens and allowed both parents to work and contribute to China’s boom. **By** the **2020**s, however, **the huge Red Guard generation**, which was born before the country’s fertility decline, **will move into retirement**, **heavily taxing the** resources of their children and **the state.** **China’s coming age wave**—by 2030 it will be an older country than the United States—**may weaken the t**wo pillars of the current **regime’s legitimacy**: rapidly rising GDP and social stability. Imagine workforce growth slowing to zero while tens of millions of elders sink into indigence without pensions, without health care, and without large extended families to support them. **China could careen toward social collapse**—**or**, in reaction, toward an **authoritarian clampdown**. The arrival of China’s age wave, and the turmoil it may bring, will coincide with its expected displacement of the United States as the world’s largest economy in the 2020s. According to “power transition” theories of global conflict, this moment could be quite perilous. By the 2020s, **Russia**, along with the rest of Eastern Europe, **will be in the midst of an extended population decline** as steep or steeper than any in the developed world. The Russian fertility rate has plunged far beneath the replacement level even as life expectancy has collapsed amid a widening health crisis. Russian men today can expect to live to 60—16 years less than American men and marginally less than their Red Army grandfathers at the end of World War II. By 2050, Russia is due to fall to 16th place in world population rankings, down from 4th place in 1950 (or third place, if we include all the territories of the former Soviet Union). Prime Minister Vladimir Putin flatly calls Russia’s demographic implosion “the most acute problem facing our country today.” **If the problem is not solved, Russia will weaken progressively, raising the nightmarish specter of a** failing or **failed state with nuclear weapons**. Or **this cornered bear may lash out** in revanchist fury rather than meekly accept its demographic fate. Of course, **some regions** of the developing world **will remain extremely young** in the 2020s. Sub-Saharan Africa, which is burdened by the world’s highest fertility rates and is also ravaged by AIDS, will still be racked by large youth bulges. So will a scattering of impoverished and chronically unstable Muslim-majority countries, including Afghanistan, the Palestinian territories, Somalia, Sudan, and Yemen. **If the correlation between extreme youth and violence endures, chronic unrest and state failure could persist** in much of sub-Saharan Africa and parts of the Muslim world through the 2020s, or even longer if fertility rates fail to drop. Meanwhile, many fast-modernizing countries where fertility has fallen very recently and very steeply will experience a sudden resurgence of youth in the 2020s. It is a law of demography that, when a population boom is followed by a bust, it causes a ripple effect, with a gradually fading cycle of echo booms and busts. In the 2010s, a bust generation will be coming of age in much of Latin America, South Asia, and the Muslim world. But by the 2020s**, an echo boom will follow**—dashing economic expectations and perhaps **fueling political violence, religious extremism, and ethnic strife**. These echo booms will be especially large in Pakistan and Iran. In Pakistan, the decade-overdecade percentage growth in the number of people in the volatile 15- to 24-year-old age bracket is projected to drop from 32 percent in the 2000s to just 10 percent in the 2010s, but then leap upward again to 19 percent in the 2020s. In Iran, the swing in the size of the youth bulge population is projected to be even larger: minus 33 percent in the 2010s and plus 23 percent in the 2020s. **These echo booms will be occurring in countries whose social fabric is already strained by rapid development**. **One country teeters on the brink of chaos, while the other aspires to regional hegemony. One already has nuclear weapons, while the other seems likely to obtain them**.

#### Will pass – bipartisanship

Economic Times 1/27 (http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/nri/visa-and-immigration/us-lawmakers-optimistic-about-immigration-reform/articleshow/18212224.cms)

WASHINGTON: Bitterly divided US lawmakers on Sunday expressed optimism that they could unite on immigration reform that would provide a pathway to citizenship for more than 10 million illegal migrants.¶ "I'm confident, guardedly optimistic, that this time we can get it done," Republican Senator John McCain told ABC News, confirming that Republican and Democratic senators had been meeting on the issue in recent weeks.¶ McCain, who once championed comprehensive reform but backtracked during his failed 2008 presidential run, said there was a greater willingness to address the issue after last year's election, in which the increasingly important Hispanic vote swung strongly behind President Barack Obama's Democrats.¶ "I'll give you a little straight talk -- look at the last election," McCain, who represents the border state of Arizona, told interviewer Martha Raddatz.¶ "We are losing dramatically the Hispanic vote, which we think should be ours, for a variety of reasons, and we've got to understand that."¶ He added that "we can't go on forever with 11 million people living in this country in the shadows in an illegal status.¶ "We cannot forever have children who were born here -- (or) who were brought here by their parents when they were small children -- to live in the shadows as well. So I think the time is right."¶ Democratic Senator Robert Menendez of New Jersey, who attended a meeting on Friday between Obama and congressional Hispanic leaders, said he too was "cautiously optimistic."¶ "I see the right spirit. I see things that were once off the table for agreement and discussion being on the table with a serious pathway forward," he told ABC News' Raddatz.¶ Obama will travel to the state of Nevada next week to push for rapid immigration reform, one of his top priorities for the next four years.¶ During the trip, his first since being sworn in last week for a second term, Obama will "redouble the efforts to work with Congress to fix the broken immigration system this year," the White House said Friday

#### Will pass – momentum

Watt 1/23 (brian, reporter for KPCC Southern California Public radio, http://www.scpr.org/programs/airtalk/2013/01/23/30204/majority-in-the-gop-now-support-path-to-citizenshi/)

The reelection of recently inaugurated President Obama is a telltale sign of a greater shift in perspective among Americans on many issues including immigration policy. A newly released poll conducted by Associated Press-GfK indicates that 6 in 10 Americans now support allowing illegal immigrants to eventually become United States citizens, a significant increase driven by a turn in many Republicans’ positions since the 2012 elections. A majority in the GOP - 53 percent - now favor blazing a more inclusive trail toward citizenship. That’s a 22 percent increase from 2010.¶ The Republicans’ shift in their approach to immigration policy comes as the GOP seeks to increase its lackluster support among Latino voters, who rallied behind President Obama in November. In his inaugural speech on Monday, Obama declared, “Our journey is not complete until we find a better way to welcome the striving, hopeful immigrants who still see America as a land of opportunity; until bright young students and engineers are enlisted in our workforce rather than expelled from our country." Moreover, David Axelrod, one of Obama’s top advisors, stated on Monday that immigration reform will be a high priority for the Obama administration that will be prompted early on during the president’s second term.

Immigration Reform Could Be the Only Thing the GOP and Democrats Agree On In 2013

Will pass – signs of progress

Policy Mic 1/26 (http://www.policymic.com/articles/24163/immigration-reform-could-be-the-only-thing-the-gop-and-democrats-agree-on-in-2013)

Immigration Reform Could Be the Only Thing the GOP and Democrats Agree On In 2013¶ Immigration reform is set to become the next big policy push in Washington.¶ Ever since President Obama won re-election with the help of Latinos —who overwhelmingly voted for the president over Republican Mitt Romney, especially in critical battle ground states — politicians have acknowledged that this demographic as critical to the success of both parties.¶ Republicans likely lost key Hispanic votes in 2012 because of tough immigration talk, prompting the GOP to soul search on the issue. RNC Chairman Reince Priebus earlier this week called for the Republican Party to be more inclusive, a sign that they’re open to retooled ideas on the issue.¶ Gone are the days of “self-deport” and Arizona-style “papers please” immigration control policies, as both parties seek to capitalize on the Hispanic vote by working towards broad immigration reform. ¶ A bi-partisan group in Congress is set to unveil policies that would represent the most substantive efforts towards immigration legislation in years. The working group of senators from both parties is nearing agreement on broad principles for overhauling the nation’s immigration laws; they are expected to call for normalizing the status of the nation’s 11 million undocumented immigrants, including allowing those with otherwise clean criminal records to obtain legal work permits, officials said. The group is also likely to endorse stricter border controls and a better system for employers to verify the immigration status of workers.¶ The three Democrats and three Republicans, who have been meeting quietly in recent months, plan to announce a final agreement as early as next Friday.¶ This comes as President Obama announced after a meeting with the Congressional Hispanic Caucus on Friday that he will lay out some of his plans for immigration reform on Tuesday in Las Vegas.¶ Members of the caucus who were present at the meeting said Obama assured them that he shares the group's basic beliefs about immigration reform, specifically making a pathway to citizenship for undocumented immigrants — which some Republicans oppose.

#### Will pass – hispanic voters

Markley 1/24 (Stephen, http://www.redeyechicago.com/news/markley/redeye-how-obama-can-win-round-2-20130124,0,1106061.story)

Immigration reform: This is Obama’s best chance for victory. The Republican establishment understands that they cannot continue to get savaged in the Hispanic vote and expect to win a presidential election. They need immigration reform more than the Democrats to dispel the perception (well, reality) that their party harbors a bunch of xenophobic rednecks. Senator Marco Rubio is trying to get out ahead by proposing his own immigration plan, which has so far been kinda, sorta endorsed by the likes of Paul Ryan and Bill O’Reilly. The hilarious part here is that the centerpiece of the Rubio plan (essentially a path to citizenship for the 11 million undocumented workers living in the United States) is exactly the Obama plan from 2009. It’s also the Bush-Kennedy plan from 2007 that got rode out of town as “amnesty.” Call it the Rubio Plan all you want, at the end of the day it’s the bill Obama proposed, and if he signs the Rubio Immigration Reform and Republicans Are All Super Nice and Love Mexicans Act of 2013, it will constitute a major legislative victory for the president.

#### Will pass – Obama is influencing process

WSJ 10/24 (Obama May Talk Immigration Overhaul Next Week, http://www.4-traders.com/news/Obama-May-Talk-Immigration-Overhaul-Next-Week--15965509/)

One person familiar with events said that the White House has told allies that the purpose of the speech is to show that Mr. Obama is engaged in the issue and not just sitting back, waiting for Congress to act.¶ "He wants to try and influence the process and move it forward," said Angela Kelley, an immigration expert at the liberal think tank Center for American Progress. "He wants to nudge this along."¶ White House Press Secretary Jay Carney said Thursday that Mr. Obama wanted to work with people from both parties to move legislation to his desk.¶ "I think you can expect him to be true to his word, which is to take up this issue very early in his second term," he said.¶ He said the White House put out details of what the president would like to see in a bill long ago. "He does absolutely believe that we need to do this in a comprehensive way," Mr. Carney said of the president.¶ Many, though not all, Democrats have supported a multi-pronged immigration bill, but other issues took precedence. Before the November election there was little support or urgency among Republican lawmakers for a broad immigration bill. But after Mr. Obama won reelection with overwhelming support from Hispanics, many Republicans said they would support the effort, giving it new life in Congress.

#### Immigration reform will pass, Obama is key, and it’s the top priority

Maestas 1/25 (http://politic365.com/2013/01/25/chc-meets-with-president-on-immigration-signaling-top-legislative-priority/)

Congressman Gutierrez said the following in a statement after the meeting, “Immigrants need action now and immigration reform cannot wait. We have a unique opportunity to finally put our government on the side of hard-working immigrants. We all need to work together — the President and Congress, Republicans and Democrats — to get something done right away.”¶ “The President is the quarterback and he will direct the team, call the play, and be pivotal if we succeed. I am very optimistic based on conversations with Republicans in the House and Senate that we will do more than just talk about the immigration issue this year. The President putting his full weight and attention behind getting a bill signed into law is tremendously helpful. We need the President and the American people all putting pressure on the Congress to act because nothing happens in the Capitol without people pushing from the outside.”¶ Gutierrez also mentioned what the immigration legislation will likely include, “We need a secure border and an electronic employment verification system that is combined with a generous and rigorous legalization program to get immigrants already living here on-the-books and in the system. We also need visas and visa reform for the people waiting decades to come here and a system for the future that people and employers will actually use and not try to go around. All of this is achievable if Republicans work with Democrats and that work has already begun.”¶ The White House released the following in a statement after the meeting, “The President was pleased to hear from CHC members and noted that they share the same vision, including that any legislation must include a path to earned citizenship. The President further noted that there is no excuse for stalling or delay. The President made it clear he will continue to lead on this issue, and that he looks forward to working with the Congressional Hispanic Caucus and other key Members of Congress in a bipartisan process to move this debate forward at the earliest possible opportunity.”¶ On Tuesday, President Obama is expected to travel to Nevada to deliver an immigration speech to signal his commitment to achieving legislation on this topic.¶ Also of note today, The Washington Post has reported that a bipartisan working group of senators has come close to an agreement on a broad set of principles that will guide the immigration reform legislation.

#### Obama’s top priority

Cramer 1/25 (Ruby, Buzzfield staff, http://www.buzzfeed.com/rubycramer/obama-tells-hispanic-caucus-immigration-is-my-top)

President Barack Obama met Friday morning with members of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus to assure them that comprensive immigration reform would be his "top legislative priority," Representative Linda Sánchez told BuzzFeed. Sánchez, along with six members of Congress, convened in the Roosevelt Room with Obama and members of his senior staff, including advisors Cecilia Muñoz, Valerie Jarrett, and Rob Nabors.¶ "In his opening remarks he said, 'This is my top legislative priority,' and that resonated with us. We know he's serious about this. It was a very positive meeting," said Sánchez.¶ Sánchez — a key member of immigration talks who has been working toward reform legislation for more than 10 years — said specifics were not discussed at the meeting.

#### Top of the docket.

Weber 1/1 (2013, Joseph, Guns, immigration, fiscal issues emerge as top priorities for Obama, new Congress, Fox News, p. <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/01/01/gun-control-immigration-reform-fiscal-issues-emerge-as-top-issues-for-new/>)

But in the near term, immigration legislation appears to be high on the docket in the next Congress and second Obama administration term. Washington has tried for years to change the country's immigration policy -- to strengthen border security and stem the flow of illegal immigrants into the U.S.; to reform the visa system for the benefit of those legal immigrants following the rules; and figure out how to address the millions of illegal immigrants already here. Legislative efforts by Democrats and Republicans on comprehensive immigration reform had reached a standstill -- until the issue re-emerged during this election cycle when Obama suspended deportation for many young immigrants brought to the U.S. illegally by their parents. Republicans have since signaled their intentions to be the first to introduce and pass more comprehensive legislation to deal with the roughly 11 million illegal immigrants in the United States, especially after Obama won re-election with roughly 71 percent of the Hispanic vote. However, Obama appeared to re-stake his turf Sunday, saying he would introduce legislation next year to fix “our broken immigration system.”

#### Obama supporting bans on both coasts

The Hill 12 ( 8/28, [http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/245863-gop-platform-block-carbon-regs-expand-drilling\*\*](http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/245863-gop-platform-block-carbon-regs-expand-drilling%2A%2A))

Interior’s 2012-2017 offshore plan does not allow oil-and-gas leasing off the Atlantic and Pacific coasts even though formal bans expired in 2008, focusing instead on more lease sales in the Gulf of Mexico and, in the plan's latter years, off Alaska's coast.¶ Obama also opposes drilling in ANWR, while proponents say the industry is capable of tapping large amounts of oil while protecting the fragile ecosystem.

#### Obama is increasing drilling regulation and closing off public lands

State News Service 1/25 (http://www.elp.com/news/2013/01/25/mr-president-where-are-the-jobs.html)

As many media outlets have pointed out, the one issue most notably absent from President Obama's inaugural address this week was jobs . With unemployment at 7.8 percent and the economy and jobs still topping the list of Americans' greatest concerns, it's baffling why the President chose not to mention this in his first speech of his second term.¶ Even more baffling, is why the Obama Administration continues to block good-paying jobs that could be created through new American energy production on public lands and waters. Jobs in the oil and natural gas industry rose more than 6 percent last year, and are up 27 percent since 2008, largely due to the expansion of natural gas production on private and state lands.¶ But instead of replicating this model on public lands, the Obama Administration is closing areas, proposing new regulations, and delaying projects - jeopardizing thousands of American energy jobs. For example:¶ The Obama Administration implemented a 5-year offshore drilling plan that places 87 percent of offshore areas off-limits and cancelled the Virginia offshore lease sale, the first sale proposed in the Atlantic in nearly 30 years. Tens of thousands of jobs could be created by opening more of America's offshore for energy production.

#### Obama is pushing drilling restrictions

Toplansky 12 (Eileen, staff writer for the American Thinker, July 19th , http://www.americanthinker.com/2012/07/obama\_continues\_to\_despise\_american\_energy.html#ixzz2JCQVojCk)

The recent Supreme Court decision on ObamaCare gave sufficient cover to the administration to release a five-year plan for offshore drilling which will continue to depress the economy and eliminate energy independence in this country.¶ This new plan "resinstitutes a 30-year moratorium on offshore energy exploration" in the United States. Thus, the 44th president has now denied "access to nearly 98% of America's vast energy potential on the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS)."¶ Thomas J. Pyle, president of the Institute for Energy Research explains that the "Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act or OCSLA of 1953 provided the interior secretary with the authority to administer mineral exploration and development off our nation's coastlines." In effect, this Act allows the interior secretary to "provide oil and gas leases to the highest-qualified bidder while establishing guidelines for implementing an oil and gas exploration-and-development program for the Outer Continental Shelf."¶ In 1978, the Act was amended to require a series of five-year plans that would provide a schedule for the sale of oil and gas leases in order to better meet America's national energy needs.¶ Since 2008, President Obama and former U.S. Sen. Kenneth L. Salazar of Colorado, the current interior secretary, have restricted access to American offshore oil and gas resources. These restrictions include:¶ Canceling lease sales¶ Delaying lease sales¶ Creating an uncertainty about offshore development that has caused job-creators to look for other countries' waters to transport their offshore rigs¶ Restricting Alaska's development of its 24 billion barrels of oil reserves¶ Prohibiting Virginians from unlocking their offshore resources of 130 million barrels of offshore oil and 1.14 trillion cubic feet of natural gas¶ In addition, shale oil development is being blocked by this administration. In effect, Obama has "embargoed nearly 200 years of domestic oil supply."¶ As a result of these draconian restrictions, the government has lost considerable revenue from offshore lease sales in the last three years. In 2008, during the last year of George W. Bush's administration, the revenue was $9.48 billion. In 2011 it was down to $36 million. Oil production on federal lands has also dropped as has the number of annual leases.

#### Key Senators oppose offshore drilling

McClatchy News 12 (sept, 26, http://www.mcclatchydc.com/2012/09/26/169792/democratic-senators-want-a-stop.html#storylink=cpy)

WASHINGTON — A group of Democratic senators is calling for the Interior Department to halt future Alaska offshore drilling leases, saying the president hasn’t made the case that drilling in the environmentally sensitive region is safe.¶ “Challenges with infrastructure and spill response are unprecedented in the Arctic’s remote, undeveloped region,” the senators wrote Interior Secretary Ken Salazar.¶ Senators signing the letter this week were Richard Durbin of Illinois, Barbara Boxer of California, Frank Lautenberg of New Jersey, Patrick Leahy of Vermont, Jeff Merkley of Oregon and Sheldon Whitehouse of Rhode Island. They questioned the oil spill response capabilities in the Arctic and said there needs to be a better scientific monitoring plan. They also want more areas off limits.

#### Those Senators are key players in the immigration debate and are on the fence now

AP 1/26 (http://www.newsday.com/news/nation/obama-senators-launching-immigration-push-1.4514347)

WASHINGTON - President Barack Obama will launch a campaign next week aimed at overhauling the nation's flawed immigration system and creating legal status for millions, as a bipartisan Senate group nears agreement on achieving the same goals.¶ The proposals from Obama and lawmakers will mark the start of what is expected to be a contentious and emotional process with deep political implications. Latino voters overwhelmingly backed Obama in the 2012 election, leaving Republicans grappling for a way to regain their standing with an increasingly powerful pool of voters.¶ The president will press his case for immigration changes during a trip to Las Vegas Tuesday. The Senate working group is also aiming to outline its proposals next week, according to a Senate aide.¶ Administration officials say Obama's second-term immigration push will be a continuation of the principles he outlined during his first four years in office but failed to act on. He is expected to revive his little-noticed 2011 immigration "blueprint," which calls for a pathway to citizenship for illegal immigrants that includes paying fines and back taxes; increased border security; mandatory penalties for businesses that employ unauthorized immigrants; and improvements to the legal immigration system, including giving green cards to high-skilled workers and lifting caps on legal immigration for the immediate family members of U.S. citizens.¶ "What has been absent in the time since he put those principles forward has been a willingness by Republicans, generally speaking, to move forward with comprehensive immigration reform," White House press secretary Jay Carney said. "What he hopes is that that dynamic has changed."¶ The political dynamic does appear to have shifted following the November election. Despite making little progress on immigration in his first term, Obama won more than 70 percent of the Latino vote, in part because of the conservative positions on immigration that Republican nominee Mitt Romney staked out during the GOP primary. Latino voters accounted for 10 percent of the electorate in November.¶ The president met privately Friday morning with the Congressional Hispanic Caucus to discuss his next steps on immigration. Among those in the meeting was Rep. Linda Sanchez, D-Calif., who said Obama told lawmakers "immigration reform is his number one legislative priority."¶ That could bump back the president's efforts to seek legislation enacting stricter gun laws, another issue he has vowed to make a top second term priority.¶ The Senate immigration group is also pressing for quick action, aiming to draft a bill by March and pass legislation in their chamber by August, said the aide, who requested anonymity in order to discuss private deliberations. The Republican-controlled House would also need to pass the legislation before it went to the White House for the president's signature.¶ Senate lawmakers working on the immigration effort include Democrats Charles Schumer of New York, Dick Durbin of Illinois and Robert Menendez of New Jersey; and Republicans John McCain of Arizona, Lindsey Graham of South Carolina and Marco Rubio of Florida, according to Senate aides.¶ Democrat Michael Bennet of Colorado, and Republicans Jeff Flake of Arizona and Mike Lee of Utah have also been involved. It's not clear whether all those involved will sign on to the principles the group hopes to roll out next week.¶ Those principles are expected to include a process toward legalizing the status of unauthorized immigrants already in the country; border security; verification measures for employers hiring workers and ways for more temporary workers to be admitted into the country.¶ It's unclear whether the group will back the pathway to full citizenship that the president is seeking. Schumer and Graham have previously supported requiring illegal immigrants to admit they broke the law, perform community service, pay fines and back taxes, pass background checks and learn English before going to the back of the line of immigrants already in the system in order to legalize their immigration status.¶ Several of the senators negotiating the immigration principles are veterans of the failed comprehensive immigration reform effort under then-President George W. Bush. That process collapsed in 2007 when it came up well-short of the needed votes in the Senate, a bitter outcome for Bush and the late Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, the Democrats' leader on the legislation.

#### Relaxing drilling restrictions causes backlash --- no risk of offense.

Broder, Writer for the NYT, ‘10

[John, “Obama to Open Offshore Areas to Oil Drilling for First Time,” March 31, http://www.nytimes.com/2010/03/31/science/earth/31energy.html?\_r=0]

But while Mr. Obama has staked out middle ground on other environmental matters — supporting nuclear power, for example — the sheer breadth of the offshore drilling decision will take some of his supporters aback. And it is no sure thing that it will win support for a climate bill from undecided senators close to the oil industry, like Lisa Murkowski, Republican of Alaska, or Mary L. Landrieu, Democrat of Louisiana.¶ The Senate is expected to take up a climate bill in the next few weeks — the last chance to enact such legislation before midterm election concerns take over. Mr. Obama and his allies in the Senate have already made significant concessions on coal and nuclear power to try to win votes from Republicans and moderate Democrats. The new plan now grants one of the biggest items on the oil industry’s wish list — access to vast areas of the Outer Continental Shelf for drilling.¶ But even as Mr. Obama curries favors with pro-drilling interests, he risks a backlash from some coastal governors, senators and environmental advocates, who say that the relatively small amounts of oil to be gained in the offshore areas are not worth the environmental risks.

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

Walsh, TIME Senior Editor, ‘11

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

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

#### Natural gas unpopular – everything gets assocated with fracking

Everley 12 (Steve, Energy In Depth Spokesperson, July 13, “Misinformation Campaign Targets Hydraulic Fracturing,” Lexis, d/a 7-20-12, ads)

And recent polling backs them up: A survey by Louisiana State University found that only 34.5 percent of respondents who heard the word fracking thought the process was safe, and only 38.6 percent of those who heard the word said there should be more drilling. When the respondents were given a description of the process instead of the word fracking, however, the percentage who said the process is safe jumped by nearly ten points, and support for more drilling climbed by more than 12 points into a clear majority. Imagine that: a fact- based discussion leads to different results than one based on semantics and talking points.**¶** That gap in public support is also why opponents describe everything happening in oil and gas development -- from initial geological surveying to well pad preparation to pipeline construction -- as fracking. Never mind that the impacts they cite are not due to hydraulic fracturing. Since hydraulic fracturing is one part of the process, they claim, all of the impacts can be attributed to fracking. Its a politically convenient (and intellectually lazy) effort to scapegoat a process that opponents do not really understand, but that they know sounds destructive.

### Solvency

#### Gas productivity decrease because of shortages – newest numbers go neg.

Alegria, ‘12

[Andrea, “Labor Shortages: A Reality”, June 2012, IBIS World, RSR]

Buoyant demand from emerging markets and strong commodity prices has reinvigorated investment in the US mining industry, and many firms are looking to expand production. From drilling shale and natural gas drilling to mining gold, silver and other metals, firms are increasingly looking to explore and mine new sites. This, in turn, is driving demand for skilled workers, including miners, engineers, geologists, mechanics and other trades people needed to operate a mining business. The demand for mining workers outnumbers the available pool of qualified employees, though. Aging baby boomers who are currently in the mining profession are nearing retirement, and slow growth in the availability of skilled employees will make it increasingly difficult for mining firms to fill job openings. The mining sector includes these industries (and their respective IBISWorld reports): • Oil Drilling and Gas Extraction (21111) • Coal Mining (21211) • Iron Ore Mining (21221) • Gold and Silver Ore Mining (21222) • Copper, Nickel, Lead and Zinc Mining (21223) • Molybdenum and Metal Ore Mining (21229) • Stone Mining (21231) • Sand and Gravel Mining (21232) • Mineral and Phosphate Mining (21239) • Mining Services (21311) IBISWorld estimates that these industries will employ about 661,809 workers in 2012. In the next five years, the mining sector will need to add an estimated 54,495 jobs in order to meet anticipated demand, with employment growing at an average rate of 1.6% per year to 716,304 workers in 2017. Intensified competition for skilled talent poses a threat to the industry, and could mean not only increased costs, but also a reduction in productivity and difficulty meeting contractual obligations.

#### Plan doesn’t create certainty.

MarEx 11 [Maritime Executive, “Gas-Only Drilling in Offshore Moratorium Areas Suggested,” January 19, http://www.maritime-executive.com/article/2005-10-20gas-only-drilling-in-offshore-moratori]

Oil and gas industry groups are criticizing a provision in House offshore drilling legislation that would allow the government to offer "natural gas-only" leases in areas that are currently off-limits to new production. The criticism is included in wider comments by petroleum producers to the Minerals Management Service (MMS), which has begun collecting public comments as it begins preparing an outer continental shelf leasing plan for 2007-2012. MMS asked for comment on the gas-only concept. Gas-only leasing was included in a bill by House Resources Committee Chairman Richard Pombo (R-CA.) that allows states to "opt-out" of offshore leasing bans. States exercising the option could allow gas-only leasing, or oil and gas leasing. Senate legislation by Senator Lamar Alexander (R-TN.)—and supported by chemical companies and other industries that rely on the costly fuel—also accepts the idea. However, the American Petroleum Institute (API), in comments this week to MMS, says gas-only and gas-preference leasing would offer the "false promise" of future supplies. The group says the concept would create uncertainties that could dampen investment, since it is impossible to predict with certainty what types of resources will be in an area. "A company might spend up to $80 million to buy a lease, conduct seismic testing, obtain the necessary permits, and drill a well(s) to determine whether any resources are present in amounts that make the prospect economic," the group says. "A company is unlikely to know if it had met the gas only or gas preference requirement until the capital investment had been made. Companies will be reluctant to spend tens of millions of dollars to explore for and develop a prospect, only to be forced to abandon the resource, stranding substantial investments."

### Prices

#### Concerns about manufacturing are misreported – jobs are being reshored.

Forbes 2012[Leading economics magazine, “Manufacturing Jobs Changing but No Severe Job Skills Gap in USA”, October 18 2012, http://www.forbes.com/sites/tjmccue/2012/10/18/manufacturing-jobs-changing-but-no-severe-job-skills-gap-in-usa/]

**Manufacturing jobs stand poised for a rebound as jobs get reshored from China — creating 2.5 million to 5 million U.S. jobs in manufacturing and support jobs**. **Worries about a severe job skills gap are largely misreported according to results from a Boston Consulting Group (BCG) analysis**  – part of the firm’s ongoing series entitled *Made in America, Again.* Despite recent stories at *NPR* this week that state manufacturing jobs are not coming back, **BCG believes that a rebound is not only possible, but likely, by the end of the decade.**

#### America is experiencing a manufacturing revival.

Foroohar 2012[Rana, TIME magazine’s assistant managing editor for economics and business, “Is U.S. Manufacturing Really Back?” January 23 2012, http://business.time.com/2012/01/23/is-manufacturing-really-back/]

**Is America in the middle of a manufacturing job revival? The latest numbers would make it seem so. The U.S. has added more net manufacturing jobs since the start of 2010 than the rest of the G7 nations put together**, with only two other economies, Germany and Canada, increasing factory employment at all. **The jump is due to a number of factors, including American productivity growth** (which has outpaced Europe as a whole), **compressed wages, and higher energy costs** (which make it more costly to ship products back from locations with cheaper labor, like Asia). As the FT recently reported, from 2002-10, **U.S. manufacturing unit labor costs in dollar terms fell 11 percent, compared with rises of 3 percent rise in Japan and 41 percent in Germany. Companies that are now bringing jobs back home include some of America’s largest blue chip multinationals, like Ford, GE, and United Technologies**.

#### Overall economic competitiveness inevitable - strong demand and comparative advantage

Gordon 12 (Kate, American Progress Senior Fellow, and Hart, Center for American Progress Policy Analyst for Chinese Energy and Climate Policy, Melanie, May 16, “5 Myths and Realities About U.S.-China Solar Trade Competition,” <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2012/05/china_solar.html>, d/a 8-2-12, ads)

One assumption underlying the cost argument is that we are not good at manufacturing—that China will always have lower costs and weaker regulations, and therefore it does not make sense to rock the boat in an effort to protect US manufacturing.¶ In reality, our nation is still a global manufacturing powerhouse. In 2010 manufacturing contributed [$1.7 trillion](http://www.bea.gov/industry/gdpbyind_data.htm) to the U.S. economy. Manufacturing accounts for [60 percent of all U.S. exports](http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&frm=1&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CFgQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.nist.gov%2Fmep%2Fupload%2FFINAL_NAM_REPORT_PAGES.pdf&ei=kFatT6CcLIrr0gHwoJGaAQ&usg=AFQjCNHz_zvvHNfCLmw4a8BBGqYVVvivqw).. The country was also the third-largest exporter of manufactured goods to the world in 2009. The United States [ranks first](http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/04/manufacturing.html) in the world in manufacturing value added, meaning that the raw materials and processes used by the manufacturing sector result in products that add more value to the overall U.S. economy than is the case in any other country. Despite drops in employment the U.S. share of global manufacturing output since 1970 has [remained fairly constant](http://www.compete.org/images/uploads/File/PDF%20Files/USMCI_Make.pdf) at around 22 percent.¶ Clean energy investments are particularly good for manufacturing. As The Brookings Institution notes, over a quarter of all the jobs created in clean energy industries are in the manufacturing sector. Between 2004 and 2009, when federal support for wind energy was stable and installed capacity grew from 6.7 megawatts to 35,000 megawatts, manufacturing in that sector grew correspondingly, to nearly [250 facilities](http://www.greentechmedia.com/articles/read/the-birth-of-a-u.s.-wind-power-manufacturing-industry). By 2010 the wind sector had more than 400 U.S.-based [manufacturing facilities](http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R42023.pdf).¶ While the solar industry has had a more turbulent time with manufacturing, perhaps in part because of unfair competition from China, domestic production in this sector also increased dramatically in 2010. According to the Solar Energy Industry Association, this demand [was due primarily](http://www.seia.org/galleries/pdf/SMI-YIR-2010-ES.pdf) to strong growth in demand for solar, both globally and domestically, as well as to increases in manufacturing capacity.

#### Drilling won’t create jobs – it will only suck them from the rest of the economy

Levi 12 (Michael, senior fellow for energy and environment at the Council on Foreign Relations, July/August, “Think Again: The American Energy Boom: Yes, oil and gas made in the USA is surging. But does that really liberate us from the Middle East?”, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/06/18/think\_again\_the\_american\_energy\_boom?)

"The U.S. Energy Boom Will Create Millions of New Jobs." Overstated. The U.S. oil and gas boom has come at an auspicious time. With record numbers of Americans out of work, hydrocarbon production is helping create much-needed jobs in communities from Pennsylvania to North Dakota. Shale gas production alone accounted for an estimated 600,000 U.S. jobs as of 2010, according to the consultancy IHS CERA. It's much harder, though, to extrapolate into the future. In a deeply depressed economy, new development can put people to work without reducing employment elsewhere. That's why boom states have benefited massively in recent years. The same is not true, though, in a more normal economy. Unemployment rates are typically determined by fundamental factors such as the ease of hiring and firing and the match between skills that employers need and that workers have. The oil and gas boom won't change these much. That's why we should be skeptical about rosy projections of millions of new jobs. Wood MacKenzie, for example, claims that the energy boom could deliver as many as 1.1 million jobs by 2020, while Citigroup forecasts a whopping 3.6 million. Unless the U.S. economy remains deep in the doldrums for another decade, these will mostly come at the expense of jobs elsewhere

## 1NR

### SMR CP

#### The Navy is no longer useful to prevent conflict.

Goure, Vice President, Lexington Institute, PhD , ‘10

[Daniel, 2 July 2010, Can The Case Be Made For Naval Power?,

http://www.lexingtoninstitute.org/can-the-case-be-made-for-naval-power-?a=1&c=1171]
This is no longer the case. The U.S. faces no great maritime challengers. While China appears to be toying with the idea of building a serious Navy this is many years off. Right now it appears to be designing a military to keep others, including the United States, away, out of the Western Pacific and Asian littorals. But even if it were seeking to build a large Navy, many analysts argue that other than Taiwan it is difficult to see a reason why Washington and Beijing would ever come to blows. Our former adversary, Russia, would have a challenge fighting the U.S. Coast Guard, much less the U.S. Navy. After that, there are no other navies of consequence. Yes, there are some scenarios under which Iran might attempt to close the Persian Gulf to oil exports, but how much naval power would really be required to reopen the waterway? Actually, the U.S. Navy would probably need more mine countermeasures capabilities than it currently possesses.
More broadly, it appears that the nature of the security challenges confronting the U.S. has changed dramatically over the past several decades. There are only a few places where even large-scale conventional conflict can be considered possible. None of these would be primarily maritime in character although U.S. naval forces could make a significant contribution by employing its offensive and defensive capabilities over land. For example, the administration’s current plan is to rely on sea-based Aegis missile defenses to protect regional allies and U.S. forces until a land-based variant of that system can be developed and deployed. The sea ways, sometimes called the global commons, are predominantly free of dangers. The exception to this is the chronic but relatively low level of piracy in some parts of the world. So, the classic reasons for which nations build navies, to protect its own shores and its commerce or to place the shores and commerce of other states in jeopardy, seem relatively unimportant in today’s world.

#### Naval power resilient – no challengers to overwhelming U.S. power.

Posen, Professor of Political Science – Massachusetts Institute of Technology, ‘3

[Barry, “Command of the Commons: The Military Foundation of U.S. Hegemony”, International Security, 28(1), Ebsco]

Command of the commons is the military foundation of U.S. political preeminence. It is the key enabler of the hegemonic foreign policy that the United States has pursued since the end of the Cold War. The military capabilities required to secure command of the commons are the U.S. strong suit. They leverage science, technology, and economic resources. They rely on highly trained, highly skilled, and increasingly highly paid military personnel. On the whole, the U.S. military advantage at sea, in the air, and in space will be very diffcult to challenge—let alone overcome. Command is further secured by the worldwide U.S. base structure and the ability of U.S. diplomacy to leverage other sources of U.S. power to secure additional bases and overflight rights as needed.

### PIC

#### We will control the impact framing debate—You must focus on preserving biological hotspots

Kunich 1—Professor of Law @ Roger Williams University School of Law [John Charles Kunich, “ARTICLE: Fiddling Around While the Hotspots Burn Out,” Georgetown International Environmental Law Review Winter, 2001 14 Geo. Int'l Envtl. L. Rev. 179]

Thus, this author has called the hotspots the "womb of the unknown species." [n15](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348161499045&returnToKey=20_T15575614965&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.693104.9208654866" \l "n15) The intention is to draw a parallel between the phrase "womb of the unknown species" and the well-known "Tomb of the Unknown Soldier." Just as the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier contains the remains of unidentified American soldiers who died in various wars, the hotspots and the unidentified species they harbor are both the womb and, potentially, the tomb for species we cannot call by name. And if the hotspots are home to millions of unknown species, with potentially immense utilitarian worth for humankind, it is of the utmost importance that effective conservation measures be implemented to prevent their degradation and destruction. It makes sense, from an efficiency standpoint, to focus the effort to preserve biodiversity on the hotspots, at least initially. The number of different species, and the number of individuals from each species, would be much higher than in most other eco-regions. Given limited conservation resources, both financial and political, it is prudent and rational to devote these resources to the places where they will do the greatest good for the greatest number.

#### Preserving US marine ecosystems is key to human survival

Craig 03—Associate Dean for Environmental Programs @ Florida State University [Robin Kundis Craig, “ARTICLE: Taking Steps Toward Marine Wilderness Protection? Fishing and Coral Reef Marine Reserves in Florida and Hawaii,” McGeorge Law Review, Winter 2003, 34 McGeorge L. Rev. 155

Biodiversity and ecosystem function arguments for conserving marine ecosystems also exist, just as they do for terrestrial ecosystems, but these arguments have thus far rarely been raised in political debates. For example, besides significant tourism values—the most economically valuable ecosystem service coral reefs provide, worldwide—coral reefs protect against storms and dampen other environmental fluctuations, services worth more than ten times the reefs' value for food production. [n856](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348077471187&returnToKey=20_T15565363878&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.167770.63840861383#n856) Waste treatment is another significant, non-extractive ecosystem function that intact coral reef ecosystems provide. [n857](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348077471187&returnToKey=20_T15565363878&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.167770.63840861383#n857) More generally, "ocean ecosystems play a major role in the global geochemical cycling of all the elements that represent the basic building blocks of living organisms, carbon, nitrogen, oxygen, phosphorus, and sulfur, as well as other less abundant but necessary elements." [n858](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348077471187&returnToKey=20_T15565363878&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.167770.63840861383#n858) In a very real and direct sense, therefore, human degradation of marine ecosystems impairs the planet's ability to support life. Maintaining biodiversity is often critical to maintaining the functions of marine ecosystems. Current evidence shows that, in general, an ecosystem's ability to keep functioning in the face of disturbance is strongly dependent on its biodiversity, "indicating that more diverse ecosystems are more stable." [n859](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348077471187&returnToKey=20_T15565363878&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.167770.63840861383#n859) Coral reef ecosystems are particularly dependent on their biodiversity. [\*265] Most ecologists agree that the complexity of interactions and degree of interrelatedness among component species is higher on coral reefs than in any other marine environment. This implies that the ecosystem functioning that produces the most highly valued components is also complex and that many otherwise insignificant species have strong effects on sustaining the rest of the reef system. [n860](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348077471187&returnToKey=20_T15565363878&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.167770.63840861383#n860) Thus, maintaining and restoring the biodiversity of marine ecosystems is critical to maintaining and restoring the ecosystem services that they provide. Non-use biodiversity values for marine ecosystems have been calculated in the wake of marine disasters, like the Exxon Valdez oil spill in Alaska. [n861](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348077471187&returnToKey=20_T15565363878&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.167770.63840861383#n861) Similar calculations could derive preservation values for marine wilderness. However, economic value, or economic value equivalents, should not be "the sole or even primary justification for conservation of ocean ecosystems. Ethical arguments also have considerable force and merit." [n862](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348077471187&returnToKey=20_T15565363878&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.167770.63840861383#n862) At the forefront of such arguments should be a recognition of how little we know about the sea—and about the actual effect of human activities on marine ecosystems. The United States has traditionally failed to protect marine ecosystems because it was difficult to detect anthropogenic harm to the oceans, but we now know that such harm is occurring—even though we are not completely sure about causation or about how to fix every problem. Ecosystems like the NWHI coral reef ecosystem should inspire lawmakers and policymakers to admit that most of the time we really do not know what we are doing to the sea and hence should be preserving marine wilderness whenever we can—especially when the United States has within its territory relatively pristine marine ecosystems that may be unique in the world.

#### It’s the most probable impact - The risk of drilling multiplies with each additional drillers—you must account for the systemic risk of ecosystem collapse.

Craig 11—Associate Dean for Environmental Programs @ Florida State University [Robin Kundis Craig, “Legal Remedies for Deep Marine Oil Spills and Long-Term Ecological Resilience: A Match Made in Hell,” Brigham Young University Law Review, 2011, 2011 B.Y.U.L. Rev. 1863

Systemic risk is as important as individual risk. Notwithstanding the National Environmental Policy Act's requirement that federal permitting agencies consider cumulative impacts to the environment, [n188](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348065909828&returnToKey=20_T15563238106&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.735297.7128077165#n188) we currently evaluate the risks of offshore oil drilling primarily with respect to individual oil drilling operations in connection with individual permits and leases. As the Deepwater Horizon Commission recognized, however, the larger systemic context of such drilling is also important, and perhaps arguably more so. From a resilience perspective, a drilling operation that uses the only oil rig in a pristine marine environment is an inherently different risk problem than the Deepwater Horizon's situation of being one of thousands of similar rigs in a pervasively and multiply stressed Gulf. As Clark, Jones, and Holling have suggested, our trial-and-error experiments with Nature in our first-sense resilience [\*1895] dependence mode "now threaten errors larger and more costly than society can afford." [n189](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348065909828&returnToKey=20_T15563238106&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.735297.7128077165#n189) Resilience thinking should more forcibly insist on multilayered systemic awareness, promoting limits on how much exploitation should be occurring simultaneously and encouraging more gradual resource development over longer periods of time. . Risk to the environment should be presumed, even when all actors follow all best practices. Our current first-sense resilience dependency produces laws that assume that ecosystems can be fixed—and, perhaps more importantly, as embodied in the OPA natural resource damages regulations, that natural processes will often be able to restore themselves without human effort. Resilience thinking, in contrast, effectively assumes that ecosystems could suddenly shift to a new regime at any time for any number of reasons that we do not understand and may not even be able to anticipate—the combined potential of the second and third conceptions of resilience. In the words of Clark, Jones, and Holling, "if a system has multiple regions of stability, then Nature can seem to play the practical joker rather than the forgiving benefactor." [n190](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348065909828&returnToKey=20_T15563238106&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.735297.7128077165#n190) To exaggerate the differences in outlook just a bit, our current paradigm presumes that most ecosystems can cope with most human activities, while resilience thinking presumes that all changes to an ecosystem are at least potentially completely destabilizing—i.e., inherently risky, with the outer limits of that risk being potentially massive. To translate this change in presumption into legalese, full resilience thinking promotes a policy framework where most human activities in the environment could be—and perhaps should be—considered inherently dangerous activities. [\*1896] As every first-year law student learns, engaging in inherently dangerous activities tends to subject the actor to strict and fairly absolute liability for the kinds of harm that made the activity inherently dangerous. [n191](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348065909828&returnToKey=20_T15563238106&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.735297.7128077165#n191) Under resilience thinking, those kinds of harm would include all of the unpredictable and unexpected changes to the ecosystem that might occur as a result of a disaster like the Deepwater Horizon oil spill, up to and including a substantial shift in ecosystem regime or ecosystem collapse. While full implementation of an "inherently dangerous activity" legal regime for all marine activities is unlikely, the case is fairly strong for deep sea oil exploration and drilling. It is at least worth pondering what such a consequence of resilience thinking might mean for risk assessment and behavioral incentives in this context. If nothing else, one would predict under such a new view of potential liability that oil companies' insurers might begin charging premiums that more accurately reflect the potentially catastrophic liability that resilience-minded regulations and policies would make legally cognizant—and might insist on the much more precautionary and safety-minded approach to offshore oil drilling that a multitude of commentators and the Deepwater Horizon Commission have sought in the wake of the Deepwater Horizon disaster. V. Conclusion The second and third senses of resilience, and the socio-ecological risks for humans that they underscore, should not be foreign concepts in the regulation of the marine environment, including (and perhaps especially) when it comes to regulating the offshore oil and gas exploration and drilling taking place at ever-increasing depths. Nor should the possibility that the cumulative stresses to the Gulf of Mexico have pushed its ecosystems to the brink of ecosystem thresholds be ignored in our regulatory regimes. By acknowledging that ecosystems are dynamic and subject to sudden and fairly catastrophic (at least from a human perspective) changes, full resilience thinking provides a path away from the trap of first-sense resilience dependence. Specifically, full resilience thinking recognizes that exploitative activities that affect the Gulf—not just deep sea oil drilling but also fishing and farming up the Mississippi River—put all of the human beings who depend on the ecosystem services, as well as the ecosystems themselves, at collective risk of catastrophic ecosystem collapse. A liability regime based on these unavoidable and potentially massive environmental risks would likely protect the Gulf of Mexico better than our current regime of natural resource damages, especially when injury occurs in the Gulf's murky depths.

#### Also, the OCS includes the Atlantic region.

Wikipedia No Date [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Outer\_Continental\_Shelf]

The United States OCS has been divided into four leasing regions:[2]

Gulf of Mexico OCS Region

Atlantic OCS Region

Pacific OCS Region

Alaska OCS Region

#### Tech failure is inevitable—they will fracture in the Ocean floor.

Pravica 12—Professor of Physics and Astronomy @ [University of Nevada](http://content.usatoday.com/topics/topic/Organizations/Schools/University%2Bof%2BNevada), Las Vegas [Michael Pravica, “Letters: Science, not profit, must lead deep water drilling,” USA Today, Updated 4/24/2012 8:43 PM , pg. http://tinyurl.com/9g8x28q

There are a few critical points not mentioned in the USA TODAY editorial on the BP oil spill that should have been addressed ("[Editorial: 2 years after BP spill, lower risks](http://www.usatoday.com/news/opinion/editorials/story/2012-04-19/BP-Deepwater-oil-spill/54419466/1)"). First of all, deep water drilling represents a "brave new world" of oil exploration and novel technology as humans probe depths of water, oil and rock that sustain thousands of atmospheres of pressure. At these levels, the technology used to drill and extract oil can easily fail as we approach the yield strengths of many of the confining materials subjected to extreme conditions. There is also a high chance of significant fracture of the cean/sea floor in drilling and hole erosion from gushing, hot and high pressure oil (along with particulates and other mineral-rich fluids) that could make repair nearly impossible and could permanently poison our waters. The greatest lesson from the BP oil spill is that politicians and businessmen cannot solve problems created by our advanced technology. Only scientists and engineers can. We must listen to them and adopt a more rational approach to drilling that places safety above profit.

#### They incentivize mindless all-out exploitation that makes disaster inevitable.

Flournoy 11—Professor and Director of the Environmental and Land Use Law Program @ University of Florida Levin College of Law [Alyson C. Flournoy, “ARTICLE: THREE META-LESSONS GOVERNMENT AND INDUSTRY SHOULD LEARN FROM THE BP DEEPWATER HORIZON DISASTER AND WHY THEY WILL NOT,” Boston College Environmental Affairs Law Review, 2011, 38 B.C. Envtl. Aff. L. Rev. 281

C. How to Learn from the Context of the Disaster: United States' Energy Policy A third meta-lesson from the BP Deepwater Horizon disaster is that the drilling of that particular offshore well is the result not just of private choice, but of a broader national policy on energy. MMS's oil leasing and permitting decisions reflect executive branch decisions about the disposition of publicly owned oil and gas resources. [n115](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095" \l "n115) BP's decisions about exploration in that area were not made in a vacuum, but in the context of a set of laws and appropriations that create a variety of incentives that affect industry's behavior. Thus, to understand why the disaster occurred, it would be wise to look at the policy context that has produced the increasing rush to develop oil resources in deepwater, and increasingly in ultra-deepwater--areas that increase the complexity, risks, and uncertainty of drilling operations and potential accidents. [n116](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095" \l "n116) The most visible leadership on this issue comes from statements of the Oil Spill Commission and its Co-Chair Bob Graham, who has repeatedly noted that the lack of an energy policy is an important issue related to the work of the Oil Spill Commission and one that must be addressed by the legislative and executive branches. [n117](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095" \l "n117) [\*301] The current energy policy provides hefty subsidies for the highly profitable oil and gas industries to continue with their unwavering focus on producing more oil and gas. [n118](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095" \l "n118) Although some say that the United States lacks an energy policy, it is more accurate to say that our leaders don't clearly articulate the operative energy policy. Perhaps this is because it is not a coherent one or because on close inspection it is difficult to justify in light of other stated priorities. A primary and often overlooked component of energy policy is the national policy on the privatization of public natural resources. U.S. policy is to give away its natural resources at bargain prices presumably to promote exploitation and development. [n119](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095" \l "n119) A 2008 report by the Government Accountability Office compared U.S. royalty rates to those of 103 other jurisdictions, and only eleven had royalty rates lower than those of the United States. [n120](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095" \l "n120) Moreover, the Government Accountability Office has made repeated reports of problems with uncollected royalties and with MMS's royalty-in-kind program that has led to underestimation of the royalties owed. [n121](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095" \l "n121) Another significant component of the national energy policy is tax policy that directly affects investment in oil extraction. A 2005 Congressional Budget Office Report showed that many capital investments for oil extraction are taxed at a rate of nine percent, which ranks among [\*302] the lowest rates for any industry. [n122](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095" \l "n122) Tax deductions and credits for the oil extraction industry amount to roughly $ 4 billion per year. [n123](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095" \l "n123) Looked at as a whole, the current energy policy strongly encourages all-out exploitation of remaining domestic fossil fuel resources, and deepwater oil reserves in particular. If the public and elected officials believe that the risks that produced the Macondo Well blowout are unacceptable, an energy policy that will move us towards a clean energy path is a logical response. This could include increased government support for lower carbon, lower-risk energy paths. Despite the clear political opportunity provided by the Deepwater Horizon disaster for the President and Congress to focus attention on a broad clean energy policy, there have been few signs of any significant movement in that direction. [n124](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095" \l "n124) The CLEAR Act included provisions that would eliminate some of the royalty relief for deepwater drilling, eliminate the disastrous royalty-in-kind program, and require BOEMRE to study global royalty payments to inform U.S. royalty policy. [n125](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095" \l "n125) These are very positive steps that would reduce the mindless incentives for deepwater drilling and the unintended windfalls to oil companies. However, that Act has languished in the Senate. Moreover, even those proposed changes fail to address the broader question of whether policy should create incentives towards a cleaner energy path. In the wake of the November 2010 election, it seems highly unlikely that the Administration or Congress will have interest in this topic. [n126](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1347732562226&returnToKey=20_T15531026576&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633384.4211442095" \l "n126) CONCLUSION There is much that can be learned from the BP Deepwater Horizon disaster. Unfortunately, even learning the most specific lessons has proved a contentious and uncertain process. This Article suggests first that both industry and government must fundamentally rethink their approaches to safety and develop a culture that encourages and facilitates learning from mistakes. Second, it identifies the phenomenon of [\*303] hollow government, characterized by government lacking the resources and authority to protect the public interest and a policy process dominated by powerful economic interests, as a root cause of the BP disaster and a contributing factor to other recent national disasters, including the financial crisis. Hollow government also makes it unlikely that we will learn the third meta-lesson and address the longstanding need for a coherent energy policy. These lessons could help to avert future disasters and better enable government to protect public health, safety, and the environment. However, absent changes to address the underlying obstacles to learning, there seems little likelihood that the lessons will be learned.

#### They weaken safety and environmental review—it green lights to the drillers to throw caution to the wind.

Goldstein 11—Director of Government Affairs @ Natural Resources Defense Council [Dr. David Goldstein (Former project director for the Bipartisan Policy Center), “Casting Oil Upon the Waters: The House Drilling Bills,” Switchboard, Posted May 2, 2011, pg. http://tinyurl.com/3syxpcl

This week, the House could vote on three bills to expand offshore oil and gas drilling. It is remarkable enough that the House would take up such measures before Congress has done a thing to make drilling safer. But what is truly astounding about these bills is that they would actually make the system that governs offshore drilling weaker than it was before the disaster in the Gulf of Mexico. This is legislation that should give pause even to the most ardent proponents of offshore drilling. These bills are more than a Big Oil wish list; they are a sort of oil utopia—and they could make sense only in a utopian world in which oil spills could never ever happen, in which there are never conflicts between the oil industry and other economic interests like fishing and tourism, and in which oil companies always take environmental and safety concerns fully into account. It’s as if Rep. Doc Hastings (R-WA), the bills’ sponsor, set out to prove how apt it is to talk about the U.S. “addiction” to oil. Under these bills, the U.S. would truly be acting like an addict, willing to sell out any principle, dispense with any caution, endanger any asset to get its next fix. Again, these bills ought to be seen as irresponsible even by supporters of increased drilling. So what would the bills actually do? Let’s start with the most egregious one of all, H.R. 1231. The bill is designed to ensure that oil drilling occurs off the East Coast from Maine to North Carolina, off the coast of Southern California and in the Arctic Ocean and Bristol Bay. That sweeping decision alone is breathtaking. But the bill does this by mandating that at least half the unleased area in each of those regions be put up for lease sales each and every time the government puts outer continental shelf territory up for lease. (Offshore territory available for lease is identified in five-year plans; the next one will cover 2012-2017.) Now think about that. The bill doesn’t simply reiterate that the government could make these areas available for oil drilling. It doesn’t just say that the government has to figure out which parts of those coastal waters would be appropriate for oil drilling and open those. It doesn’t even say that this administration has to open up a set amount of acreage for oil drilling, regardless of the specific concerns in any region. It says that, in perpetuity, each time waters are opened to drilling, at least half of the available acreage in each area needs to be opened up to drilling—until, presumably, every bit of acreage is being drilled. This is replacing oil policy with a kind of oil mania. Under this bill, neither this administration nor any future one could ever decide to limit drilling off the coast of New England, the Mid-Atlantic states, Southern California or Alaska because of economic or environmental concerns. No administration could decide to “take a breather” before opening up more leases to see how previously permitted activities were working out, or because there had been a spill, or because there was unexpected damage to the ecology or tourism, or because a state objected, or because there was no additional capacity to respond to an emergency, or because the agency overseeing drilling was too overwhelmed to properly review proposals. At least half the remaining unleased territory would have to be put up for leasing each and every time no matter what had happened, no matter what could happen, no matter what concerns states or scientists or fishermen or federal officials might have. The bill goes beyond earlier proposals to open up drilling, many of which had at least limited provisions for states to opt out of drilling off their states and which were not as prescriptive. The bill is titled “Reversing President Obama’s Offshore Moratorium Act,” demonstrating that partisan animus is behind this bill as much as any interest in energy. But the title is a misnomer in any event. The bill ought to be called “A bill to prevent any president or other official or the public from ever deciding not to drill for oil everywhere, no matter what the facts on the ground are.” Not so pithy, perhaps, but it’s what the bill actually does. The other two bills, while less sweeping—it would be just about impossible to be more sweeping—are based on the same compulsion to remove any judgment, discretion and balance from drilling decisions. H.R. 1230 mandates that the government conduct three lease sales in the next year—for oil and gas drilling in the central and western Gulf of Mexico and off the coast of Virginia. These are areas the administration decided not to lease after the Deepwater Horizon disaster. But as with H.R. 1231, the problem is not just opening up areas to oil and gas drilling. The bill short-circuits the environmental review for these sales. Specifically, the bill blocks court review of the Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) prepared for the lease sales in the Gulf of Mexico. It does this by having Congress deem that the EISs have met the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act. This deeming, of course, is simply a political judgment, based on nothing more than the wish that it be so. (The Virginia lease is treated differently, apparently because the military may have concerns with it. For the sponsors, court reviews are only legitimate when someone they like is bringing a lawsuit.) Shutting down the courts is particularly wrongheaded in this instance for two reasons. First, the environmental review for these leases was done by the pre-Gulf disaster Minerals Management Service, an agency notorious for its close relationship to the oil industry. Second, these environmental reviews did not take into account the damage caused by the Deepwater Horizon blowout (and therefore what could happen under these leases) because such a disaster was thought of as impossible at the time. So under H.R. 1230, what is Congress’ reaction to the Gulf disaster? It is mandating that the administration and the courts act as if it had never happened. This ought to be a dictionary definition of irresponsibility. H.R. 1229 is another effort to make the review of oil and gas drilling weaker than it was before the Gulf disaster. The bill sets an arbitrary time limit of 30 days for reviewing drilling permit applications and grants automatic approvals if no action has been taken within 60 days. Was the message of the Gulf spill to ensure that safety reviews be shorter and conducted “under the gun”? In fact, the National Oil Spill Commission recommended that Congress extend another 30-day review limit—and that one didn’t even have an automatic approval provision. H.R. 1229 also tries to make it harder to challenge any oil drilling decision related to the Gulf of Mexico by eliminating the ability of those who challenge the federal government successfully from having their legal fees reimbursed. Current law does not encourage frivolous suits—the fees are only paid if the suit is successful—but it does enable citizen groups to challenge bad decisions. And H.R. 1229 also has provisions to stack the decks against any plaintiff who still manages to sue. So the first bills on drilling to come before the Republican-controlled House since the Gulf disaster try to wish away that catastrophic event. They would open almost all the waters of the U.S. to oil drilling; prevent any judgments from being made about where and when and how to drill; tie the hands of this and future administrations and the courts; and weaken the system of safety and environmental review. Quite a legacy. As my colleagues have noted, additional drilling will have no impact on gasoline prices. This is not a solution to our problems, it is a way to create new ones. This is a bill written by people who are so hell-bent on drilling that they can’t even admit that there are consequences to be considered. This is not policymaking; it’s a new kind of magical thinking.

### Warming

#### **No advantage – natural gas is worse for greenhouse gas emissions**

Howarth et al. 11 (Robert, Renee Santoro, Anthony Ingraffea, 12 April, “Methane and the greenhouse-gas footprint of natural gas from shale formations”, Climatic Change)

6 Shale gas versus other fossil fuels¶ Considering the 20-year horizon, the GHG footprint for shale gas is at least 20%¶ greater than and perhaps more than twice as great as that for coal when expressed per¶ quantity of energy available during combustion (Fig. 1a; see Electronic Supplemental¶ Materials for derivation of the estimates for diesel oil and coal). Over the 100-year¶ frame, the GHG footprint is comparable to that for coal: the low-end shale-gas¶ emissions are 18% lower than deep-mined coal, and the high-end shale-gas emissions¶ are 15% greater than surface-mined coal emissions (Fig. 1b). For the 20 year horizon,¶ the GHG footprint of shale gas is at least 50% greater than for oil, and perhaps 2.5-¶ times greater. At the 100-year time scale, the footprint for shale gas is similar to or¶ 35% greater than for oil.¶ We know of no other estimates for the GHG footprint of shale gas in the peer reviewed¶ literature. However, we can compare our estimates for conventional gas¶ with three previous peer-reviewed studies on the GHG emissions of conventional¶ natural gas and coal: Hayhoe et al. (2002), Lelieveld et al. (2005), and Jamarillo et al.¶ (2007). All concluded that GHG emissions for conventional gas are less than for¶ coal, when considering the contribution of methane over 100 years. In contrast, our¶ analysis indicates that conventional gas has little or no advantage over coal even¶ over the 100-year time period (Fig. 1b). Our estimates for conventional-gas methane¶ emissions are in the range of those in Hayhoe et al. (2002) but are higher than those¶ in Lelieveld et al. (2005) and Jamarillo et al. (2007) who used 1996 EPA emission¶ factors now known to be too low (EPA 2010). To evaluate the effect of methane, all¶ three of these studies also used global warming potentials now believed to be too low¶ (Shindell et al. 2009). Still, Hayhoe et al. (2002) concluded that under many of the¶ scenarios evaluated, a switch from coal to conventional natural gas could aggravate¶ global warming on time scales of up to several decades.