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### ASPEC

#### The Aff doesn’t specify the branch that implements the plan – USFG means 3 branches.

Babylon.com, ‘7

(http://www.babylon.com/definition/United\_States\_federal\_government/English)

This article describes the government of the United States. For other issues, see Politics of the United States. The federal government of the United States is the United States governmental body that carries out the roles assigned to the federation of individual states established by the Constitution. The federal government has three branches: the executive, legislative, and judicial.

#### (B) This is a voter --

#### 1. CP Ground – Specifying in the plan is key to Agent CP competition and agent comparison is crucial to policy education.

Stoddard, ‘97

(Professor of law at New York University, 72 New York University Law Review 967)

Many of my colleagues seeking social justice have deliberately avoided legislatures in recent decades, both because of the difficulty of making change there and because of the perception that politicians will not be receptive to their claims. They have turned by and large to the courts. While applauding the changes these lawyer-activists have helped to bring about, and while acknowledging the shortcomings and frustrations of legislative change, I submit that those of us in the business of "culture-shifting" should upend our traditional preference for judicial activity and embrace the special advantages of legislative change. E.M. Forster appended to the title page of his novel Howard's End the enigmatic aphorism: "Only connect ..." n46 It is an apt injunction to lawyers like me. If we lawyer-activists truly seek deep, lasting **change, we have to "connect" with the public**. We have to accord as much attention to public attitudes as we do to the formal rules that purport to guide or mold those attitudes. **That means thinking as concertedly about process as we do about substance. Process matters. How a new rule comes about may, in the end, be as important as what it says.**

### T

**Interpretation - Only production restrictions are topical, the plan is an export restriction**

**Shih ‘9** (Shih 9 Wen-chen Shih is an associate professor of law in the Department of International Trade at National Chengchi University, Taiwan. "ARTICLE: Energy Security, GATT/WTO, and Regional Agreements" Natural Resources Journal Spring, 2009 Natural Resources Journal 49 Nat. Resources J. 433 lexis

Such an argument has been questioned by others. Broome cautions that a **material distinction remains** between **export restrictions** and **production restrictions**. n91 He argues that oil in its natural state--oil still in the ground--cannot be characterized as a "product" within the meaning of Article XI, as it has not gone through a production process. n92 Only oil in commerce--oil that is extracted and produced for consumption can be regarded as falling under the GATT jurisdiction. n93 Therefore, only when OPEC countries restrict the quantity of oil in commerce made available for export to foreign consumers could they then violate Article XI:1. n94 He further points out that, while the jurisprudence tends to interpret Article XI:1 broadly, absurd and unintended consequences could arise if the panel or the Appellate Body **does not pay attention to such differences**; when a WTO Member took some measure to reduce domestic production in a particular industry, any WTO Member could complain that the country was violating Article XI:1 by influencing prices via supply restrictions. n95 In other words, "**any measure** that prevents an industry from operating at maximum capacity might constitute an export restriction." n96 Broome, thus, concludes that the production quotas maintained by OPEC countries should not constitute quantitative restrictions that contravene Article XI:1. n97

**Violation - Exon-Florio is not a restriction on production—it’s a regulation on foreign investment**

**Nigh ’98** (Douglas William Nigh 98, associate professor of international business at the University of South Carolina, and Douglas P. Woodward, associate professor of economics at the University of South Carolina, Foreign Ownership and the Consequences of Direct Investment in the United States: Beyond Us and Them, 1998, p. 144

How did the U.S. government respond to the influx of FDI that dates from the 1970s? The answer is “favorably,” with only nominal institutional constraints on investment flows. At the federal level, the institution directly responsible for addressing issues relating to FDIUS is the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS). Created by President Gerald Ford as an oversight body in 1975, **CFIUS monitors and regulates FDIUS** from the standpoint of protecting national security. It is an interagency body composed of officials from the Departments of State, Commerce, Defense, and Justice, the Office of the United States Trade Representative, the Office of Management and Budget, and the Council of Economic Advisers; it is usually chaired by a Treasury official.

**Vote neg**

**1- Ground- the aff isn’t tied to production, but just any energy action- makes negative ground impossible**

**2- Including any energy regulations allows a huge number of affs which crushes predictable limits**

**Doub 76** Energy Regulation: A Quagmire for Energy Policy Annual Review of Energy Vol. 1: 715-725 (Volume publication date November 1976) DOI: 10.1146/annurev.eg.01.110176.003435LeBoeuf, Lamb, Leiby & MacRae, 1757 N Street NW, Washington, DC 20036 http://0-www.annualreviews.org.library.lausys.georgetown.edu/doi/pdf/10.1146/annurev.eg.01.110176.003435 Mr. Doub is a principal in the law firm of Doub and Muntzing, which he formed in 1977. Previously he was a partner in the law firm of LeBoeuf, Lamb, Leiby and MacRae. He was a member of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission in 1971 - 1974. He served as a member of the Executive Advisory Committee to the Federal Power Commission in 1968 - 1971 and was appointed by the President of the United States to the President's Air Quality Advisory Board in 1970. He is a member of the American Bar Association, Maryland State Bar Association, and Federal Bar Association. He is immediate past Chairman of the U.S. National Committee of the World Energy Conference and a member of the Atomic Industrial Forum. He currently serves as a member of the nuclear export policy committees of both the Atomic Industrial Forum and the American Nuclear Energy Council. Mr. Doub graduated from Washington and Jefferson College (B.A., 1953) and the University of Maryland School of Law in 1956. He is married, has two children, and resides in Potomac, Md. He was born September 3, 1931, in Cumberland, Md.

FERS began with the recognition that federal energy policy must result from concerted efforts in all areas dealing with energy, not the least of which was the manner in which energy is regulated by the federal government. Energy selfsufficiency is improbable, if not impossible, without sensible regulatory processes, and effective regulation is necessary for public confidence. Thus, the President directed that "a comprehensive study be undertaken, in full consultation with Congress, to determine the best way to organize all energy-related regulatory activities of the government." An interagency task force was formed to study this question. **With 19 different federal** departments and **agencies contributing**, the task force spent **seven months** deciphering the present organizational makeup of the federal energy regulatory system, studying the need for organizational improvement, and evaluating alternatives. **More than 40 agencies were found to be involved** with making regulatory decisions on energy. Although only a few deal exclusively with energy, **most of the 40 could significantly affect** the availability and/or cost of **energy.** For example, in the field of gas transmission, there are five federal agencies that must act on siting and land-use issues, seven on emission and effluent issues, five on public safety issues, and one on worker health and safety issues-all before an onshore gas pipeline can be built. The complexity of energy regulation is also illustrated by the case of Standard Oil Company (Indiana), which reportedly must file about 1000 reports a year with 35 different federal agencies. Unfortunately, this example is the rule rather than the exception.

### CP

#### The United States Supreme Court should rule that it is unconstitutional for the united states federal government to exclude crude oil and natural gas production from Exon-Florio reviews. as applied

#### Courts can effectively rule to invalidate restrictions on all forms of energy production

Simon 7

[Christopher A. Simon - Director, Master of Public Administration, Political Science Department, University of Utah, Professor, Political Science, “Alternative Energy: Political, Economic, and Social Feasibility”]

THE COURTS

The institutional power of the federal courts regarding energy policy is not ex- plicit in Article III. The role of energy and the intra- and interstate transporta- tion of fuels and electricity in the United States is, for the most part, a late nine- teenth- and early twentieth-century phenomenon. Early energy policy-related cases were argued within the confines of the judiciary’s narrowly defined enu- merated powers. In the late nineteenth century, the court system remained timid in terms of taking energy and material related cases. Post-Loehner (1905). the judiciary showed itself more willing to enter into disputes between state government and citizens. Although the case had nothing to do with en- ergy policy, the Supreme Court—by taking the case—opened the doors to the expansion of one of its enumerated Article III powers in a way that more di- rectly scrunitized policymaking at the state and local levels and de facto ex- panded the notion that federal court decisions were linked to the national gov- ernment’s supremacy. The 1937 case West Coast Hotel u Parrish confirmed the judiciary’s interest in scrutinizing public policy at all levels of government. Constitutionally, legal theory was now open to an enlarged analysis of the in- terchange between national regulatory powers and policymaking authority and state and local powers. In essence, the Court more fully disclosed acceptance of judicial positivism in method and decision making rather than a strict con- structionist approach.

Over the years, the courts have had a significant role in energy policy. The Court has been particularly interested in regulation of safety with regard to energy policy, as safety issues are central to the public good aspect of energy. While not directly related to energy policy. New Jersey Steam Navigation Company v. Merchants' Bank of Boston 47 U.S. 344 (1848) does illustrate the Court's particular and early interest in issues related to energy safety. The case involved the destruction by fire of a steam-operated commercial boat. In the end, the Court sided with the plaintiffs and the decision of a lower court to award damages. The case ultimately turned on the issue of fuel safety as the boat was fitted for wood-burning energy production, but was burning a much hotter “modem” fuel for boats of the time—anthracite coal. Although other deficiencies had been noted in terms of safety equipment that ultimately tied to the issue of the federal court's “admirality jurisdiction,” the case provides early evidence that the Court saw a role for itself in re- viewing aspects of energy safety, particularly in terms of transportation safety—albeit tangentially and quite possibly with little emphasis beyond the nature of the case.

The Court, however, tightened its level of scrutiny in term of energy- related safety issues in Champlin Refining Co. v. Corporation Commission of Oklahoma et al. 286 U.S. 210 (1932). In this case, one of the earliest cases involving the regulation of safety issues related to petroleum refinement, the Court dismissed broadly defined environmental restrictions on the extraction and refining of petroleum. In essence, the Court demonstrated that an early state-level effort to protect the environment from the impact of oil drilling and processing could only occur if statutes were written narrowly and were essentially based on scientific principles related to environmental safety. One could argue that by taking the case and deciding it, the Court opened further the door to national regulation of environmental policy as is most di- rectly related to the issue of energy resource development, processing, and distribution.

The 1970s, a decade in which the petroleum-based energy paradigm expe- rienced a major shock, saw the Court dealing with two prominent cases re- lated to energy safety issues. In Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. Nat- ural Resources Defense Council, Inc., et alia 435 U.S. 519 (1978), the Court dealt with questions related to “the proper scope of judicial review of the Atomic Energy Commission’s procedures with regards to the licensing of nu- clear power plants.” In lower court decisions, the commission's rule-making procedures related to nuclear energy fuel management and safety issues were overturned through court decision. In essence, this would have opened the door to further court scrutiny of the nuclear energy process in terms of safety. In a unanimous decision, the late William Rehnquist wrote that the Court of Appeals has improperly developed its own conception of safe reactor process and remanded the case to a lower court to scrutinize the commission’s regu- latory clarity. The case is significant because it effectively maintained nuclear energy policy as viable as long as rule making and regulatory processes gov- erning this form of alternative energy were rationally constructed and com- plete. The Court looked to administrative solutions to any lack of clarity or completeness first but was fairly definitive in removing the judicial system from the process or filling in areas of vagueness or rewriting significant por- tions of regulation and process-related nuclear energy policy.

In the same year, the Court decided the so-called trans-Alaska pipeline rate cases. The Court sought to clarify rate change policies related to the shipment of crudc oil and natural gas. In essence, the Court solidified the authority of Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC) in its efforts to manage the pipeline. The commission’s ability to adjust rates for rational economic reasons and to require pipeline operators to refund excess rate charges to customers was rec- ognized by the Court. The pipeline cases were critical to the legitimacy of the commission’s authority over the transportation of petroleum from Alaska. In a broader sense, the Court established precedence of the ICC to regulate pe- troleum transportation. Appellate court decision has further solidified its po- sition on pipeline rates in BP West Coast Products, LLC v. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission 376 F. 3d 1223 (2004). The Court was careful to bal- ance this decision in relation to the states’ power to regulate intrastate energy policy issues.

In Exxon Corp. et alia v. Governor of Maryland et alia 437 U.S. 117 (1978), the Court recognized the power of state government to regulate gaso- line markets within its borders. The Court found that neither the interstate commerce clause nor the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment were violated by Maryland's regulations on petroleum producers’ ability to establish gas stations and policy efforts to ensure equity within the gasoline market across various corporate concerns operating fueling station in-state. In essence, the Court established a balance between the interests of the national government in regulating energy transportation and use and the interests of the state in advancing goals not inconsistent with national constitutional in- terpretation and national policy priorities.

#### It’s competitive --- doesn’t reduce restrictions, just rules them unenforceable

Treanor & Sperling 93

William - Prof Law at Fordham. Gene - Deputy Assistant to President for Economic Policy. “PROSPECTIVE OVERRULING AND THE REVIVAL OF "UNCONSTITUTIONAL" STATUTES,” Columbia Law Review, Dec 93, lexis

Unlike the Supreme Court, several state courts have explicitly addressed the revival issue. The relevant state court cases have concerned the specific issue of whether a statute that has been held unconstitutional is revived when the invalidating decision is overturned. n42 With one exception, they have concluded that such statutes are immediately enforceable. The most noted instance in which the revival issue was resolved by a court involved the District of Columbia minimum wage statute pronounced unconstitutional in Adkins. After the Court reversed Adkins in West Coast Hotel, President Roosevelt asked Attorney General Homer [\*1913] Cummings for an opinion on the status of the District of Columbia's statute. The Attorney General responded,¶ The decisions are practically in accord in holding that the courts have no power to repeal or abolish a statute, and that notwithstanding a decision holding it unconstitutional a statute continues to remain on the statute books; and that if a statute be declared unconstitutional and the decision so declaring it be subsequently overruled the statute will then be held valid from the date it became effective. n43¶ Enforcement of the statute followed without congressional action. n44¶ When this enforcement was challenged, the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in Jawish v. Morlet n45 held that the decision in West Coast Hotel had had the effect of making the statute enforceable. The court observed that previous opinions addressing the revival issue proceed on the principle that a statute declared unconstitutional is void in the sense that it is inoperative or unenforceable, but not void in the sense that it is repealed or abolished; that so long as the decision stands the statute is dormant but not dead; and that if the decision is reversed the statute is valid from its first effective date. n46¶ The court declared this precedent sound since the cases were "in accord with the principle "that a decision of a court of appellate jurisdiction overruling a former decision is retrospective in its operation, and the effect is not that the former decision is bad law but that it never was the law.' " n47 Adkins was thus, and had always been, a nullity. The court acknowledged that, after Adkins, it had been thought that the District of Columbia's minimum wage statute was unconstitutional. As the court put it, " "Just about everybody was fooled.' " n48 Nonetheless, the court's view was that since the minimum wage law had always been valid, although for a period judicially unenforceable, there was no need to reenact it. n49¶ Almost all other courts that have addressed the issue of whether a statute that has been found unconstitutional can be revived have reached the same result as the Jawish court, using a similar formalistic [\*1914] analysis. n50 The sole decision in which a court adopted the nonrevival position is Jefferson v. Jefferson, n51 a poorly reasoned decision of the Louisiana Supreme Court. The plaintiff in Jefferson sought child support and maintenance from her husband. She prevailed at the trial level; he filed his notice of appeal one day after the end of the filing period established by the Louisiana Uniform Rules of the Court of Appeals. The Court of Appeals rejected his appeal as untimely, even though the Louisiana Supreme Court had previously found that the applicable section of the Uniform Rules violated the state constitution. One of Ms. Jefferson's arguments before the state Supreme Court was that that court's previous ruling had been erroneous and that the rules should therefore be revived. In rejecting this claim and in finding for the husband, the Court stated:¶ Since we have declared the uniform court rule partially unconstitutional, it appears to be somewhat dubious that we have the right to reconsider this ruling in the instant case as counsel for the respondent judges urges us to do. For a rule of court, like a statute, has the force and effect of law and, when a law is stricken as void, it no longer has existence as law; the law cannot be resurrected thereafter by a judicial decree changing the final judgment of unconstitutionality to constitutionality as this would constitute a reenactment of the law by the Court - an assumption of legislative power not delegated to it by the Constitution. n52¶ The Louisiana Court thus took a mechanical approach to the revival question. According to its rationale, when a statute is found unconstitutional, it is judicially determined never to have existed. Revival therefore entails judicial legislation and thereby violates constitutionally mandated separation of powers: because the initial legislative passage [\*1915] of the bill has no legitimacy, the bill's force is considered to be purely a creature of judicial decision-making.¶ Jefferson has little analytic appeal. Its view of the separation of powers doctrine is too simplistic. Contrary to the Jefferson rationale, a "revived" law is not the pure product of judicial decision-making. It is, instead, a law that once gained the support of a legislature and that has never been legislatively repealed. Its legitimacy rests on its initial legislative authorization. Moreover, the view that a statute that has been found unconstitutional should be treated as if it never existed may have had some support in the early case law, but it has been clearly rejected by the Supreme Court. Instead of treating all statutes that it has found unconstitutional as if they had never existed, the Court has recognized a range of circumstances in which people who rely on an overturned decision are protected. Indeed, as will be developed, the doctrine of prospective overruling evolved to shield from harm those who relied on subsequently overruled judicial decisions. n53 In short, the one case in which there was a holding that a statute did not revive does not offer a convincing rationale for nonrevival.

### DA

#### Immigration passes now

Dionne 2-6 (EJ, Columnist – Washington Post, “GOP Will Back Immigration Reform,” 2013, <http://www.goerie.com/article/20130206/OPINION09/302069992/EJ-Dionne%3A-GOP-will-back-immigration-reform>)

That's the comparison to keep in mind to understand the extraordinary transformation of Beltway politics on immigration reform. Until Obama was re-elected, party competition translated into Republican efforts to block virtually everything the president wanted to accomplish. On immigration, at least, the parties are now competing to share credit for doing something big. It's wonderful to behold. Republicans who always held views on immigration similar to the president's -- notably Sen. John McCain -- are now free to say so. Other Republicans who thought a hard line on the issue was a political winner have been forced by the electoral facts to change their minds. Democrats, aware of how important Latino votes are to their party's future, are determined to get immigration reform done. Nothing is certain in Washington, especially in the Republican-led House of Representatives, but the odds that we will finally fix a broken immigration system are very high. The behind-the-scenes wrangling over the choreography of last week's twin immigration announcements -- by a bipartisan group of senators and by the president in a speech in Nevada -- shows how strong the bias toward action has become. We've become so accustomed to the politics of obstruction that we forget there is still such a thing as legislative craftsmanship. The Jan. 25 proposal by eight senators of their ideas for reform was months in the making as Sens. Charles Schumer, D-N.Y., and Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., worked closely with their colleagues to prepare for this moment. But Obama felt compelled to make clear early on that immigration reform was one of his highest priorities. The Senate negotiators worried that if Obama got out front with positions more progressive than theirs, particularly on a speedier path to citizenship for illegal immigrants, he could foil their efforts to reach accord. This fear reflected the GOP's Obama-can't-win response to whatever he does. Until now, Republicans criticized him for not taking "leadership" in pushing for immigration reform. But as soon as he was ready to speak out, the GOP switched direction, warning that his leadership was the last thing they wanted -- and could get in the way of a compromise. Thus did House Speaker John Boehner use a spokesman to instruct Obama to be "careful not to drag the debate to the left and ultimately disrupt the difficult work that is ahead in the House and Senate." As it happened, by letting it be known that he planned to give an immigration speech, Obama sped up the timetable of the Senate group, said a House Democrat active on the issue, and even encouraged a small collection of House Republicans eager for reform to let it be known that they, too, were working toward compromise. Obama sought to thread the political needle by laying out his principles while holding off on proposing a bill of his own. He would send up legislation only "if Congress is unable to move forward in a timely fashion." A relieved Schumer, using words almost never heard in Washington, declared that the president "is handling this perfectly." There will be much posturing over the next several months. By going slightly to the progressive side of the senators, Obama may ease the way for Republicans to strike a deal since they will be able to claim they stayed to the president's right. Conservative supporters of reform, such as Sen. Marco Rubio of Florida, will keep saying critical things about the president to preserve their credibility with the right. And if Boehner is interested in reform, he, too, must play a delicate game of distancing himself from Obama to persuade his most conservative colleagues to acquiesce to a vote on a bill. But make no mistake: This is immigration reform's time. It was poignant to hear McCain state plainly and eloquently what he has always felt. "We have been too content for too long," he said, "to allow individuals to mow our lawn, serve our food, clean our homes and even watch our children, while not affording them any of the benefits that make our country so great." Thanks to an election, those words are no longer politically incorrect inside John McCain's party.

#### Anti-China lobby outweighs – ideology first

Brown 10 – satellite journalist from Maine USA (Peter J., 07/16, “Asia takes stock of new US space policy,” http://www.atimes.com/atimes/South\_Asia/LG16Df02.html)

However, ideology and not the threat of industrial espionage in space is the key driver here. "The most concern I have heard voiced has been by those who do not want to work with a communist government," said Johnson-Freese. This explains why no meaningful export reforms with respect to high technology items in general and so-called dual-use space hardware exports to China in particular have materialized despite promises made during Obama's presidential campaign. "The strong anti-China lobby in Congress, which includes [Speaker of the US House of Representatives] Nancy Pelosi as well as conservative Republicans and Democrats will continue to oppose, for example, satellite launches by China," said Ghoshroy. Opening the door to greater cooperation with China in space - a move that is supported by the Russians and Europeans - will require Japan's nod of approval, too, and thus far Tokyo has not given it.

#### Obama popularity Key

LA Times 2-4

“Obama Takes Second Term Agenda to the Campaign Trail,” <http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/nation/la-na-obama-20130204,0,3889723.story>

Fresh off his first inauguration, Obama spent his political capital diving into healthcare reform, a bruising effort that took more than a year. His efforts to negotiate a far-reaching budget deal with the House speaker yielded nothing. But when he took to the road, he was able to win an extension of the payroll tax break and lower interest rates on federal student loans.¶ "They're making up for a major error of the first term, that he didn't use the bully pulpit as effectively to set the national debate," said Allan Lichtman, a presidential historian at American University. "He let a lot of the healthcare debate take place in Congress, so you had Congress setting the terms."¶ "In the second term, if he's going to get anything done, he has to get the public behind him," Lichtman continued. "Congress operates on fear and greed. The only way you get Congress to work with him is if they believe he has a big public movement behind him."¶ The president's approval ratings have risen in the four months since his reelection, but it's too soon to see whether he's boosted support for his signature issues. Obama has seized on issues that already have solid public support.¶ Whether a president has the power to generate a tide of public sentiment remains a matter of debate among political scientists and historians. Historians periodically examine whether President Reagan brought about a revolution in American politics or was the beneficiary of one already underway.¶ George C. Edwards III, a presidential scholar and political scientist at Texas A&M University, studied hundreds of polls on presidents and concluded that even the most accomplished orators usually failed to win public support for their top initiatives.¶ Despite Reagan's opposition to spending on social programs, for instance, public support for them rose during his tenure. Still, Reagan persuaded Democrats to pass his bills to cut taxes in 1981 and 1986, which some see as clear evidence that his skillful public diplomacy had an effect on his negotiations with Congress.¶ "Ronald Reagan was the great communicator because he was very powerful in selling ideas that people thought were crazy," Lichtman said. "Who would have thought an across-the-board tax cut would be adopted when it was? It was the persuasiveness of Ronald Reagan, talking about getting the government off your back."¶ With Obama, though, his opponents do not seem worried about the effect of his words, however eloquently delivered.

**Insert plan unpopular**

#### Citizenship solves the deficit

Tucker 10

Cynthia is a columnist for The Atlanta Journal-Constitution. “We need immigrants to help pay the deficit,” Nov 19, http://blogs.ajc.com/cynthia-tucker/2010/11/19/we-need-immigrants-to-help-pay-the-deficit/

Recommendations for taming the deficit include raising the retirement age, raising the federal gas tax and ending the mortgage interest deduction for homeowners. Ouch!¶ But there is a palliative that would ease the pain: Put 11 million illegal immigrants on a path to legalization. And don’t touch birthright citizenship!¶ Yes, you heard that right: Granting legal residency to illegal immigrants will eventually help sop up some of the federal budget’s red ink. I know that’s counterintuitive since so many citizens have come to believe that Mexican landscapers and Guatemalan maids are a drain on the treasury. But the fact is that their relative youth is just what the U.S. economy needs.¶ The explosion of the long-term deficit is largely the consequence of an aging population, with more retirees depending on taxes from fewer workers. While the recession, two unfunded wars and Bush-era tax cuts fueled the immediate deficit, a tsunami of long-term red ink will swamp the budget in about ten years, as a massive wave of baby boomers leaves the workplace.¶ So we need as many younger workers as we can find to help support the coming crush of senior citizens. The U.S. is lucky enough to have a higher birthrate than many other Westernized democracies, even among native-born women. Immigrants are an added demographic bonus.¶ “When some people think of immigrants, they think of people coming in and immediately absorbing our resources,” said Emory economist Jeffrey Rosensweig. “Most immigrants come here to work. They’re young workers, and they’re paying taxes.” Why not add all of them to the federal tax rolls?

#### Long Term Deficit kills hegemony causes nuclear war

Khalilzad 11

Zalmay Khalilzad, the United States ambassador to Afghanistan, Iraq, and the United Nations during the presidency of George W. Bush and the director of policy planning at the Defense Department from 1990 to 1992, February 8, 2011, “The Economy and National Security; If we don’t get our economic house in order, we risk a new era of multi-polarity,” online: <http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/259024/economy-and-national-security-zalmay-khalilzad>

Without faster economic growth and actions to reduce deficits, publicly held national debt is projected to reach dangerous proportions. If interest rates were to rise significantly, annual interest payments — which already are larger than the defense budget — would crowd out other spending or require substantial tax increases that would undercut economic growth. Even worse, if unanticipated events trigger what economists call a “sudden stop” in credit markets for U.S. debt, the United States would be unable to roll over its outstanding obligations, precipitating a sovereign-debt crisis that would almost certainly compel a radical retrenchment of the United States internationally.¶ Such scenarios would reshape the international order. It was the economic devastation of Britain and France during World War II, as well as the rise of other powers, that led both countries to relinquish their empires. In the late 1960s, British leaders concluded that they lacked the economic capacity to maintain a presence “east of Suez.” Soviet economic weakness, which crystallized under Gorbachev, contributed to their decisions to withdraw from Afghanistan, abandon Communist regimes in Eastern Europe, and allow the Soviet Union to fragment. If the U.S. debt problem goes critical, the United States would be compelled to retrench, reducing its military spending and shedding international commitments.¶ We face this domestic challenge while other major powers are experiencing rapid economic growth. Even though countries such as China, India, and Brazil have profound political, social, demographic, and economic problems, their economies are growing faster than ours, and this could alter the global distribution of power. These trends could in the long term produce a multi-polar world. If U.S. policymakers fail to act and other powers continue to grow, it is not a question of whether but when a new international order will emerge. The closing of the gap between the United States and its rivals could intensify geopolitical competition among major powers, increase incentives for local powers to play major powers against one another, and undercut our will to preclude or respond to international crises because of the higher risk of escalation.¶ The stakes are high. In modern history, the longest period of peace among the great powers has been the era of U.S. leadership. By contrast, multi-polar systems have been unstable, with their competitive dynamics resulting in frequent crises and major wars among the great powers. Failures of multi-polar international systems produced both world wars.¶ American retrenchment could have devastating consequences. Without an American security blanket, regional powers could rearm in an attempt to balance against emerging threats. Under this scenario, there would be a heightened possibility of arms races, miscalculation, or other crises spiraling into all-out conflict. Alternatively, in seeking to accommodate the stronger powers, weaker powers may shift their geopolitical posture away from the United States. Either way, hostile states would be emboldened to make aggressive moves in their regions.¶ As rival powers rise, Asia in particular is likely to emerge as a zone of great-power competition. Beijing’s economic rise has enabled a dramatic military buildup focused on acquisitions of naval, cruise, and ballistic missiles, long-range stealth aircraft, and anti-satellite capabilities. China’s strategic modernization is aimed, ultimately, at denying the United States access to the seas around China. Even as cooperative economic ties in the region have grown, China’s expansive territorial claims — and provocative statements and actions following crises in Korea and incidents at sea — have roiled its relations with South Korea, Japan, India, and Southeast Asian states. Still, the United States is the most significant barrier facing Chinese hegemony and aggression.

### Investment

**Don't solve China FDI – other areas**

**Marchick 12**

(David M. Marchick is a managing director at the Carlyle Group, where he is global head of external affairs. He is the author of U.S. National Security and Foreign Direct Investment. Daniel R. Bowles is an associate at the Carlyle Group and assisted in the preparation of this article, Council on Foreign Relations, February 2012, "Fostering Greater Chinese Investment in the United States", <http://www.cfr.org/china/fostering-greater-chinese-investment-united-states/p27310>)

A number of hurdles to investment in the United States are internal to China. State-owned enterprises (SOEs) accounted for approximately 70 percent of China's global OFDI stock in 2009. Most SOEs are internally focused, risk-averse, and lack professional management capabilities to run complex international operations. SOEs also require government approval of specific overseas investments, a process in conflict with the frequent fast pace of bidding processes for companies. Outside of SOEs, many successful Chinese companies remain small. Their expansion plans are typically limited to neighboring cities or provinces, not distant continents. They have neither the wherewithal nor the desire to invest heavily in the United States.

**Free trade doesn’t solve war**

**Layne ‘98**

(Christopher, prof of international politics and military strategy at the Naval Postgraduate School, consultant to the RAND Corp, World Policy Journal, “Rethinking American grand strategy: hegemony or balance of power in the twenty-first century?” v15 n2 p8(21), infotrac)

These arguments notwithstanding, international **economic interdependence does not cause peace.** In fact, it has very serious adverse security consequences that its proponents either do not understand or will not acknowledge. **Economic relations** (whether domestic or international) **never take place in a vacuum**; on the contrary, they occur within a politically defined framework. International **economic interdependence requires** certain conditions in order to flourish, including a maximum degree of political order and **stability**. Just as the market cannot function within a state unless the state creates a stable “security” environment in which economic exchange can occur (by protecting property rights and enforcing contracts), the same is true in international relations. Because there is no world government, it falls to the dominant state to create the conditions under which economic interdependence can take hold (by providing security, rules of the game, and a reserve currency, and by acting as the global economy’s banker and lender of last resort). **Without a dominant power to perform these tasks, economic interdependence does not happen.** Indeed, free trade and interdependence have occurred in the modern international system only during the hegemonies of Victorian Britain and postwar America.

**Trade conflicts won’t escalate**

**Nye 96** (Joseph, Dean of the Kennedy School of Government – Harvard University, Washington Quarterly, Winter)

**The low likelihood of direct great power clashes does not mean that there will be no tensions** between them. Disagreements are likely to continue over regional conflicts, like those that have arisen over how to deal with the conflict in the former Yugoslavia. Efforts to stop the spread of weapons of mass destruction and means of their delivery are another source of friction, as is the case over Russian and Chinese nuclear cooperation with Iran, which the United States steadfastly opposes. The sharing of burdens and responsibilities for maintaining international security and protecting the natural environment are a further subject of debate among the great powers. Furthermore, in contrast to the views of classical Liberals, **increased trade and** economic **interdependence can increase as well as decrease conflict and competition among trading partners. The main point,** however, **is that such** **disagreements are very unlikely to escalate to military conflicts.**

**Dispute with China inevitable**

**A. Solar tariff**

**Rex-Kiss 8/17**

(Endre, green technology advocate and freelance copywriter in topics of sustainability and social media, “Are solar panels about to start a new trade war between China and the West?”, <http://www.earthtimes.org/green-blogs/green-living/solar-panel-trade-war-china-west-17-Aug-12/> – Kurr)

Tensions are always running high between **Chinese and western manufacturers**, but it seems those **tensions have finally spilled over into the solar industry**. The business world has been alight in recent days discussing the anti-dumping complaint that **a group of 25 European solar panel manufactures filled in Brussels this week, asking if it means a trade 'war' between the West and China**. We answer your questions below How did the 'trade war' begin? Earlier this year **the USA placed a 31% and higher tariff on Chinese-made solar panels**, claiming that the Chinese were overproducing and flooding the American market with their solar panels. By selling at what the US has deemed 'below fair value', Chinese solar panel makers have pushed prices down and therefore pushed many American solar panel makers out of business. Overproduction can be normal fare in trade, but **what has angered US panel makers most are the questions over whether the Chinese government is illegally subsiding solar panel** makers to help them undercut their prices. This is a claim that the Chinese have vigorously denied. There are now fears that the Chinese will also raise tariffs against countries who have placed tariffs on their products, starting a trade war and damaging the entire industry. How has the crisis spread to the EU? **A German solar panel manufacturer backed by 24 others from around the EU has now filed a complaint in Brussels, asking the EU to investigate if China is also selling solar cells in the EU at below-production prices**. If the Commission takes up the case and decides to take measures similar to that of the US, it could be devastating for the Chinese solar industry. EU countries make up over 60% of the market for Chinese solar panels, with Germany being the country with the largest number of total installations of solar panels. US tariffs have wounded, but EU tariffs could be fatal. How has China responded? **The Chinese are contending that US and European panel makers are incorrect in the dumping claims, and therefore the tariff is unfair and protectionist**. They also feel the moves are highly hypocritical given all the pushing the West has given for China to embrace clean energy. China have hit back by opening their own anti-dumping investigation, accusing the US and South Korea of dumping polysilicon, a key ingredient in solar panels, in the Chinese market. **The Chinese have also condemned the EU investigation, but it is yet to be seen if they will find a way to hit back at the EU through trade legislation**. If they do, it would only deepen the crisis.

**B. Automobile dispute**

**AP 9/17**

(China challenges US anti-dumping measures in WTO, adding to growing trade disputes <http://www.washingtonpost.com/business/china-files-challenge-to-us-anti-dumping-measures-adding-to-growing-trade-disputes/2012/09/17/a0b5ab02-00b8-11e2-bbf0-e33b4ee2f0e8_story.html> – Kurr)

BEIJING — **China filed a World Trade Organization (WTO) case Monday challenging U.S. anti-dumping measures on billions of dollars** of kitchen appliances, paper and other goods, adding to worsening trade strains as global demand weakens. **Beijing’s move came shortly before the Obama administration filed its own WTO case accusing China of improperly subsidizing exports of automobiles and auto parts**. **China and the U.S. have clashed over complaints about market barriers and subsidies for goods including autos, solar panels, tires, steel and chicken**. Political pressures on both sides are worsening as demand for their goods cools, raising the threat of job losses in export industries. As campaigning for the U.S. presidency intensifies ahead of a November vote, President Barack Obama and Republican nominee Mitt Romney have traded barbs on China, accusing each other of backing policies that would move American jobs overseas. **The Chinese Ministry of Commerce said its latest WTO complaint centers on the U.S. Congress’s passage of a law this year that retroactively gave the Commerce Department power to impose anti-dumping duties on Chinese goods**. That came after a U.S. court reversed earlier duties imposed under rules covering countries such as China and Vietnam that are deemed to be “non-market economies.” “This practice puts Chinese enterprises in an uncertain legal environment, in violation of the relevant rules of the WTO transparency and due process,” ministry spokesman Shen Danyang said in a statement. The ministry said U.S. measures being challenged cover 24 types of products worth $7.2 billion. It gave no details, but a statement from the WTO in Geneva said they include paper, steel, tires, magnets, chemicals, kitchen appliances, wood flooring and wind towers. The Chinese filing Monday requests consultations to settle the dispute, the first stage in a WTO complaint. If no resolution is found after 60 days, Beijing can ask for the case to be handed over to a WTO panel for judgment. Depending on the outcome, China might be allowed to request sanctions. The two governments, along with other members of the Group of 20 major rich and emerging economies, have pledged to avoid taking steps that might hamper trade and global growth. Despite that, they have traded accusations they are improperly subsidizing a range of industries or shielding them from foreign competition in violation of WTO commitments. In July, **Washington filed a WTO case challenging anti-subsidy tariffs imposed by Beijing on imports of American automobiles**. Chinese authorities imposed the charges after concluding the financial rescue of General Motors Co. and Chrysler LLC violated rules against subsidies. **Among other complaints, the United States, the European Union and Japan are challenging China’s controls on exports of rare earths needed by manufacturers of mobile phones and other high-tech products**. Washington also is investigating complaints that Beijing is improperly subsidizing its producers of solar panels, wiping out American jobs.

### China-Iran

**China is divesting from Iran now**

**Xinhua 9/28**/2012

(Xinhua Economic News Service, “CNPC pulls out of Iran's South Pars gasfield, report,” Lexis – Kurr)

The China National Petroleum Corp. (**CNPC**), the parent company of **China's top oil and gas producer** PetroChina (PTR.NYSE; 00857.HK; 601857.SH), **has pulled out of Iran's South Pars gasfield**, according to a report by 21st Century Business Herald on Friday, **citing a source from PetroChina's Research Institute of Petroleum Exploration and Development** (RIPED). **The CNPC quit the project due to concerns on possible huge losses given the grave situation faced by Iran domestically and internationally**, according to the source. The company had held talks with the Iranian side recently regarding the issue, said the report. Iran had agreed that the CNPC could pull out from South Pars gasfield and had given an alternative block to CNPC, said industry sources. Iran also agreed to tweak clauses unfavorable to the CNPC in repurchase agreements. At present, **the CNPC even could not access offshore oil and gas development equipment from the international market due to the embargo** imposed on Iran, said the source with RIPED. It was reported in July that the CNPC would give up its operations in South Pars gasfield after long-term delays of planned explorations.

**Secret talks prove sanctions are working**

**Pillar 10/21**/2012

(Paul, 28-year veteran of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), a visiting professor at Georgetown University for security studies and a member of the Center for Peace and Security Studies; “Secret, Deniable and Useful” National Interest, <http://nationalinterest.org/blog/paul-pillar/secret-deniable-useful-7643> - Kurr)

The **bilateral format**—as a supplement to, not a replacement for, the negotiations involving the P5+1—**would be useful because the United States is the most important player** in the process, because **achieving the flexibility necessary to reach an agreement would be aided by not having to reach a multilateral consensus on each concession** and because **secrecy could be better preserved with a smaller forum.** Secrecy would be useful because both sides are boxed in by their own hard-line statements and by pressure from those wanting to make the lines even harder. **For the Iranian leadership**, **doing any direct business** with the Great Satan **is a matter of considerable delicacy** and risk. **For the U.S. leadership, doing anything that anyone could describe as being nice and reasonable toward Iran is also fraught with political risk**. Former Israeli intelligence chief Efraim Halevy perceptively noted that the Iranians “would like to get out of their conundrum” given how much sanctions are hurting, but that “both Israel and the US governments have tied our own hands. In the end, you create an inherent disadvantage for yourself.” The current government of Israel, which is the prime mover in agitating on the Iranian nuclear issue and which disdains the whole idea of negotiating with Iran, is the principal force creating political risk for any U.S. administration that talks with Iran. The Israeli ambassador to the United States said on Saturday, “We do not think Iran should be rewarded with direct talks,” thereby invoking the old fallacy that negotiations are some sort of reward for one side rather than what they really are, which is a tool for both sides. The Israeli government, as a principal potential saboteur of progress toward an agreement, ought to be excluded through secrecy from any opportunity to commit such sabotage. **The other—not unrelated—source of political risk and possible sabotage for the U.S. side is the domestic political opposition** to the current administration. An anonymous “GOP strategist” said Saturday that for the United States to accept any Iranian offer of direct talks “would be a dream come true for the Iranian leadership to hold power, and maybe even get concessions on their nuclear program,” thereby invoking the old fallacy (which Richard Nixon, Ronald Reagan and the subsequent history of the USSR should have put to rest) that negotiating and reaching agreements with an adversary somehow contributes to the adversary's domestic strength and longevity. Note also the use of “concessions” as a dirty word, a usage that implicitly rules out any agreement because concessions by both sides will be necessary to reach one. **There is ample historical demonstration of how secret bilateral negotiations—because they are more conducive to achieving the necessary negotiating flexibility and because they cut out the naysayers and saboteurs—can achieve positive results when other mechanisms cannot**. Some of that history has been in the not-very-distant past of the United States. **The secret negotiations between Henry Kissinger and Le Duc Tho** (who shared a Nobel Peace Prize **for** their efforts) **that finally got the United States out of the Vietnam quagmire are a prime example. Nixon's and Kissinger's secret diplomacy with China also comes to mind.**

**China will never get on board for sanctions**

**Maloney 11**

Suzanne Maloney, Brookings Saban Center Middle East Policy Senior Fellow, Nov 2011, The Self-Limiting Success of Iran Sanctions , www.brookings.edu/research/articles/2011/11/iran-sanctions-maloney-takeyh

Few countries other than the United States have consistently treated the Islamic Republic as a pariah state; on the contrary, important international actors such as China and Russia have invested significantly in developing a deep relationship with a country viewed by many as the region’s natural powerhouse. And while energy interests and other economic enticements, including Iran’s role as a market for Russian arms, have proved powerful binding forces, dismissing international resistance to sanctions as purely mercenary is overly simplistic. In Moscow, Beijing and other capitals, Iran remains a useful interlocutor in a critical region of the world, and these countries are loath to jeopardize their relationship with this important agent. They also share a resentment of American prerogatives and a mistrust of Washington’s intentions. Achieving international consensus on tough sanctions is further complicated by divergent perspectives on the likely consequences. Traditionally, Washington has argued that increasing the costs of Iranian malfeasance can alter the regime’s policy calculus and dissuade it from adopting problematic policies. This view of sanctions as an instrument that can affect a recalcitrant regime is not widely shared within the international community. In particular, Moscow and Beijing have repeatedly raised concerns that, rather than inducing moderation, sanctions might provoke further Iranian radicalization and retaliation, either via direct actions against governments that adhere to any boycott or by accelerating their nuclear activities and withdrawing from the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. **Moscow’s and Beijing’s reluctance to follow the US line** is also informed by their long memories of their own countries’ experiences with sanctions and other forms of western economic pressure. In recent years, Russia and China have drawn the lion’s share of attention and recriminations for hindering progress on sanctions, and yet ambivalence runs deep throughout much of the rest of the international community. Even within many European polities, the legacy of three decades of ‘constructive engagement’—an approach that endeavoured to moderate Iranian policies by drawing the regime into a more mutually beneficial network of relationships—has left a residue of discomfort among some leaders with sanctions as the primary policy instrument. In addition, Iran’s neighbours in the Persian Gulf region, who revile the Shi’i theocracy and would prefer almost any outcome to a nuclear-capable Iran, remain somewhat ambivalent about directly confronting the Islamic Republic with anything short of devastating force.15 Their trepidation is based on fears of Iranian retaliation and concerns about preserving their own economic stability in the midst of profound global uncertainty. In any negotiations involving multiple parties and interests, a single, influential hedger can dissuade other fence-sitters from signing up to an agreement. Such selfreinforcing mistrust within the international community persistently undercuts efforts to achieve a comprehensive sanctions regime. Today, European companies grumble about pressure to forfeit opportunities to their Chinese competitors, who will quickly take their places with impunity. Tehran has exploited this dynamic, seeking to expand its economic ties in ways that complicate any prospects for western leverage. Iranian leaders have also used the opportunities afforded by the rise of ambitious new powers on the international scene, through mechanisms such as the May 2010 ‘Trilateral Declaration’ with Brazil and Turkey that sought to undercut progress on the latest round of UN sanctions.

**Iran already has nuke capacity**

**Rothman 2-6-13**

http://www.mediaite.com/online/iranian-president-claims-islamic-republic-has-already-achieved-nuclear-capability/

Iran has already crossed the nuclear threshold, according to claims by Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad. While on an official visit to Egypt, Ahmadinejad told local reporters that the Islamic Republic has the technology and materials necessary to create a nuclear weapon. Iran is “already a nuclear state,” Ahmadinejad told the Egyptian newspaper Al-Ahram. He says that the world must now refer to Iran as an atomic power. He insisted that all of Iran’s nuclear capabilities are defensive and they have no desire to seek an armed confrontation with the state of Israel.

**Israel won’t attack Iran**

**Johannsen** ‘1-23-**13**, Senior Research Fellow at the Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy

Margaret <http://english.ruvr.ru/2013_01_23/Israeli-polls-to-reconfirm-right-wing-tendency-expert/>

So, what do we need to expect of the Israeli foreign policy in the coming years? Do we need to expect a strike on Iran?

I doubt it. Israel will not strike on Iran on its own, without any partner or without the consent of the USA, and I don’t believe that this will happen. In the last weeks the issue of Iran was not an issue that was openly debated in Israel. All of a sudden a certain quiet fell upon this issue. And it also seems that the Israeli security community is not wholeheartedly behind any attack on Iran. There are dissenting opinions and so they are not united behind anybody who would favour such a strike. So, I think it is not a very probable scenario.

### China Gas

**Relations are resilient- single disputes don’t spiral out of control**

**Economy ‘12**

[Elizabeth C. Economy, C.V. Starr Senior Fellow and Director for Asia Studies, Council on Foreign Relations. Interviewed by Bernard Gwertzman, Consulting Editor, CFR.org. <http://www.cfr.org/china/maturing-us-china-relations/p28184> ETB]

In many respects, this was a fairly astonishing set of discussions that these two countries managed to have in the midst of this emerging crisis surrounding Chen Guangcheng. **The fact that Beijing and Washington were able not only to conduct the** two days of **discussions but also** to **arrive at** some **concrete agreements was a sign that there may be** an emerging **maturity in the relationship. Both sides are** clearly **committed to maintaining stability in the relationship and were** very **unwilling to allow** this **one** striking and important **incident to cause the relationship to spiral downward, or to cause a real deterioration in the relationship.** So perhaps ironically, in some respects, **this strategic and economic dialogue demonstrated a**s **positive a state in the relationship** as we've seen in a while.

**No US-China War – econ, deterrence, resilient relations**

**Harding 12**

(Harry, American political scientist specializing in Chinese politics and foreign affairs, founding dean of the Batten School of Leadership and Public Policy at the University of Virginia, previously served as dean of the Elliott School of International Affairs, advised several US Presidents on developments in the PRC; August, “American Visions of the Future of U.S.-China Relations: Competition, Cooperation, and Conflict,” in Tangled Titans, ed. David Shambaugh, Rowland & Littlefield, p. 406 – Kurr)

Fortunately, **an essentially confrontational relationship is also unlikely, especially in the sense of a direct military conflict. The high degree of economic interdependence** between the two countries **has already created a relatively resilient relationship** since the **costs of a** fundamental **break** between the two countries **would be very high** for each of them.24 Equally important, **the cost of military conflict**, especially given the fact that both China and the U.S. are nuclear powers, **will be a significant deterrent against military conflict**. Although China and the U.S. may not be compelled to cooperate, in other words, **they may be compelled to avoid confrontation**. Moreover, **the probability of** the most worrying of the triggers events identified above – a unilateral declaration of **independence by Taiwan** – **is presently quite low, as is the risk that China would try to compel unification** through the use of force. In this case a system of **mutual deterrence prevents any party from crossing any of the other’s “red lines,”** which have been clearly identified and communicated. **Another possible trigger event, the collapse of the North Korean regime**, has a somewhat higher probability, and the two countries’ red lines are less clear, **but their ability to communicate quickly and avoid open conflict over that issue**, while worth bolstering, **is** probably **adequate**, unless the overall relationship had deteriorated further prior to the event. Here again, **mutual deterrence will play an important role in preventing the descent into military confrontation.**

**China just opened up tons of land for bidding**

**Hook 9/10**/2012

(Leslie, Financial Times Beijing Correspondent, “China opens shale gas to foreign bidders,” <http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/fe651540-fb35-11e1-87ae-00144feabdc0.html#ixzz2A02yK100> – Kurr)

**Beijing has invited foreign joint ventures to bid for shale gas exploration licences** in a new tender process**, a milestone policy change that will allow foreign energy companies to play a greater role in developing China’s rich potential reserves of shale gas**.¶ China’s shale gas reserves are estimated to be the largest in the world, according to the US Energy Information Administration, and if they are successfully developed it could radically alter energy markets in the world’s biggest energy consumer. Shale gas is typically trapped in shale rock and extracted by cracking the rock open with highly pressurised water, a process known as hydraulic fracturing or “fracking”. On Monday, China’s Ministry of Land and Resources announced its second tender for bids for shale gas blocks in southern China, following a smaller tender process last year that was limited to domestic companies and elicited a feeble response. **The ministry said that Chinese-controlled foreign joint ventures would be allowed to bid in the tender process, which covers 20 shale gas blocks in southern China.** Beijing hopes domestic shale gas could eventually help China reduce its dependence on imported coal and oil and make China more self-sufficient in energy – much as the shale gas revolution has done in the US. **Western energy companies including BP and Royal Dutch Shell have been involved in exploratory joint ventures in shale gas prospects in China but until now have not been able to participate directly in bidding for blocks**. Despite China’s potential reserves, **the sector has faced a number of challenges, including lack of pipeline infrastructure, challenging geology, poor pricing incentives for shale gas and lack of technical expertise.** Analysts question whether Beijing will be able to reach its shale gas goals, which include producing 6.5bn cubic metres of gas by 2015 and 60bn by 2020, up from zero commercial production of shale gas today. The Ministry of Land and Resources this year acknowledged that economic prospects for shale development were “relatively poor” and urged Chinese oil companies to acquire further expertise in shale gas production. By assigning exploration blocks through public tender, Beijing is trying to encourage competition between companies that must now vie for the licences to explore the blocks. Historically, state-owned oil groups such as CNPC and Sinopec have dominated onshore oil and gas exploration; however, this year more than 70 domestic companies have registered with regulators to participate in the shale gas tender process, according to an official statement. **The new tender aims to “speed up progress in China’s shale gas sector through the mechanism of market competition”, the ministry says. It also describes shale gas as a “new light” in the global oil and gas sector.**

**No SCS war**

Gupta 11

Rukmani Gupta, Associate Fellow at the Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses,10/23/11, South China Sea Conflict? No Way, the-diplomat.com/2011/10/23/south-china-sea-conflict-no-way/

These suggestions to recalibrate Indian policy towards the South China Sea and its relationship with Vietnam are premature at best. Despite the rhetoric, conflict in the South China Sea may well not be inevitable. If the history of dialogue between the parties is any indication, then current tensions are likely to result in forward movement. In the aftermath of statements by the United States, and skirmishes over fishing vessels, ASEAN and China agreed upon the Guidelines on the Implementation of the Declaration on the Conduct of Parties in the South China Sea at the Bali Summit in July 2010. And recent tensions may well prod the parties towards a more binding code of conduct. This isn’t to suggest that territorial claims and sovereignty issues will be resolved, but certainly they can become more manageable to prevent military conflict.

There’s a common interest in making the disputes more manageable, essentially because, nationalistic rhetoric notwithstanding, the parties to the dispute recognize that there are real material benefits at stake. A disruption of maritime trade through the South China Sea would entail economic losses – and not only for the littoral states. No party to the dispute, including China, has thus far challenged the principle of freedom of navigation for global trade through the South China Sea. The states of the region are signatories to the UNCLOS, which provides that ‘Coastal States have sovereign rights in a 200-nautical mile exclusive economic zone (EEZ) with respect to natural resources and certain economic activities, and exercise jurisdiction over marine science research and environmental protection’ but that ‘All other States have freedom of navigation and over flight in the EEZ, as well as freedom to lay submarine cables and pipelines.’ The prospect of threats to SLOCS thus seems somewhat exaggerated.

**And that’s the main problem their ev talks about – here’s the paragraph before their 1AC card**

**Knowledge @ Wharton 12** (China’s Underground Race for Shale Gas, aug 21, http://knowledge.wharton.upenn.edu/arabic/article.cfm?articleid=2851)

Though international oil giants, such as Royal Dutch Shell, Chevron, BP, and others are partnered in preliminary ventures with Chinese companies, **the Chinese government is reluctant to grant too many shale gas development rights to foreign firms, notes Kevin Tu, senior associate for Energy and Climate at the Carnegie Endowmen**t for International Peace in Washington, D.C. "But **If China is serious about shale gas development, sooner or later it needs to open this sector to international companies, especially U.S. developers**," he says.The first auction of exploration rights in June 2011 was open only to Chinese state-owned enterprises. The upcoming auction is open to both domestic state-owned enterprises and private-sector companies. Foreign companies now participate by partnering with domestic bid winners.

**THEIR CARD BEGINS**

Meanwhile, in the U.S., shale gas leaders, such as Devon Energy and Chesapeake Energy, have been reluctant to impart their technology know-how to the firms' Chinese investors, Sinopec and the China National Offshore Oil Corporation (CNOOC), respectively, notes Bo Kong, assistant research professor at the Johns Hopkins University School for Advanced International Studies (SAIS) in Washington, D.C. The Chinese and U.S. companies designed deals giving the Chinese passive, minority stakes to avoid disapproval by the Committee on Foreign Investment in the U.S. (CFIUS), which axed CNOOC's 2005 bid for Unocal. Also, the Sinopec-Devon and CNOOC-Chesapeake deals were struck at a time when the U.S. shale gas industry was at its peak. Today, with gas prices declining and companies such as Chesapeake struggling financially, Chinese companies may be able to negotiate better terms, says CATF's Sung.

**Europe solves Chinese shift**

**Zhang** **10**

(Yue, Analyst, International Market & Strategy Analysis Group, Institute of Energy Economics, Japan; June “The Shale Gas Boom Shift to China,” http://eneken.ieej.or.jp/data/3179.pdf)

Besides the US, recently, **European majors** seeing shale gas exploration positively **are** also **working** together **actively in Chinese companies to develop shale** gas reserves **in China**. After Shell and PetroChina signed an agreement on shale gas development in the Sichuan area last December, since the beginning of this year, **BP and Sinopec have been discussing developing shale** gas reserves **in Guizhou** province **and Jiangsu** province as well.

# 2NC

## Iran

### 2NC China Divesting

#### And Sinopec is already moving investments to the US – Chesapeake Deal proves

Helman 6/21/2012

(Christopher, Forbes Staff, “What To Expect From A Sinopec-Chesapeake Deal,” Lexis – Kurr)

The rumors that Sinopec is nearing a deal with Chesapeake are even louder than those that preceded Carl Icahn‘s investment in the beleagured natural gas giant. And we know how that turned out. So let’s assume that a deal will happen and that it will mean a few more billion towards Chesapeake’s remaining $7 billion funding gap for this year. To get a sense of what Sinopec might want to buy, it’s worth looking at what Chairman Fu has already acquired in the U.S., both during his tenure at Sinopec as well as his days running Cnooc. Cnooc has done two JVs with Chesapeake. In 2010 it bought a 33% position in Chesapeake’s Eagle Ford shale position for $1.1 billion. Then in 2011 it added a 33% stake in Chesapeake’s Colorado acreage in the Niobrara shale for $1.3 billion. And since Fu joined Sinopec in mid-2011 he has also cut a big deal with Chesapeake’s cross-town rival Devon Energy. In January Sinopec agreed to pay Devon $2.5 billion for stakes in five plays: the Niobrara, the Utica shale in Ohio, and lesser-known positions in Louisiana, Oklahoma and Michigan. Taken together, these acqusitions give the Chinese state-controlled giants experience in many of America’s prominent liquids-rich shale plays. It would make sense that Fu wants to get a look at as many different geologies as possible. China is thought to have even more potential shale plays than the United States, and China’s best hope for efficiently unlocking them is to understand how American drillers have done it over here. With that in mind, it would make sense for Fu to make his next investment in a new region, such as the Permian basin of Texas, where Chesapeake has shown eagerness to sell its entire position for upwards of $6 billion. But would Sinopec (NYSE:SNP) want to take on the risk of buying a 100% stake in a big U.S. play? Not only would that be risky from an operational standpoint (it doesn’t yet operate any U.S. drilling campaigns itself), but from a political one as well. Recall the outcry in 2004 when Fu, then at Cnooc, attempted to purchase Unocal for $18 billion. But the world has changed since then. Neither the U.S. (nor Chesapeake) can afford to turn down Chinese investments. It only makes sense that the Chinese would want to exchange some of their $1 trillion in U.S. treasuries for more intrinsically valuable U.S. assets. Besides, in recent years we’ve seen a spate of foreign companies grabbing giant pieces of shale. BHP Billiton Petroleum in 2011 acquired Chesapeake’s Fayetteville shale position for $5 billion, then followed that up by gobbling Eagle Ford pioneer Petrohawk Energy for $15 billion. Statoil, the Norwegian state oil company, bought Brigham Exploration last year for $4.5 billion. Like Sinopec, Statoil is majority owned by its home government. If no one made a peep about Statoil’s deal, they can’t very well try to block Sinopec.

#### Sinopec divesture uniquely forces Iranian cooperation on nukes

Downs 6/18/2012

(Erica, an expert on China’s state-owned energy companies at the Brookings Institution; “U.S. and China Headed for Fight Over Iran Oil? Not So Fast.” WSJ, <http://blogs.wsj.com/chinarealtime/2012/06/18/u-s-and-china-headed-for-fight-over-iran-oil-not-so-fast/> - Kurr)

CRT: How much influence does Sinopec have over Chinese government policy toward Iran and the U.S.? ED: Sinopec is a powerful company that, at times, undoubtedly lobbies the Chinese government to take actions to advance Sinopec’s interests. But China’s national oil companies ultimately follow the guidance issued by China’s leaders, especially on sensitive foreign policy issues. For example, in 2010, the Chinese government reportedly told China’s national oil companies (NOCs) to slow down their upstream activities in Iran. Even though China’s NOCs may have been tempted to take over some of the projects abandoned by European and Japanese oil companies, they didn’t do so. Moreover, they have made so little progress on their own projects in Iran that the Iranians have threatened to void at least one of the contracts unless work is sped up. CRT: Can Sinopec commercially afford to reduce crude imports from Iran? ED: Washington’s efforts to get buyers of Iranian crude to reduce their purchases has put Sinopec in a tough position. Last year, China imported more than 550,000 barrels per day from Iran. Most — if not all — of this oil ended up in Sinopec’s refineries. It would be difficult for Sinopec to replace such a large volume of crude. CRT: Will Sinopec’s crude trade with Iran jeopardize its current or future energy investments in the U.S.? In my view, one of the major geopolitical benefits to Washington of the recent upstream investments made by Sinopec and Cnooc Ltd. in the U.S. is that these investments will likely make both companies even more cautious with respect to Iran. Fu Chengyu, the chairman of Sinopec, is acutely aware of how getting on the wrong side of Congress can scuttle a deal; he was the head of Cnooc when Cnooc made its ill-fated bid for Unocal Corp in 2005. Fu undoubtedly knows that if Sinopec steps up its upstream activities in Iran or dramatically increases its oil purchases from Iran, such moves would jeopardize Sinopec’s chances to expand in the U.S. And the U.S., with its booming shale gas industry, is an attractive destination for Sinopec, which plans to expand the role of natural gas, including shale gas, in its portfolio.

### Hagel stops strikes

#### Hagel stops Iran strikes

AFP 1-10-13

Chuck Hagel, the nominee for the next US defence secretary, will seek to rein in Israel over any attempt to carry out a unilateral strike against Iran's nuclear facilities, Israeli observers believe.

Hagel's nomination by US President Barack Obama must still be confirmed by the US Senate, but the prospect of the former senator assuming the top Pentagon post has already stirred concern in Israel.

Analysts and commentators note that Hagel is known for a non-interventionist approach to foreign policy, and is believed to be strongly opposed to the use of military force to tackle Iran's nuclear programme.

"The road to Iran stops at Hagel," wrote commentator Bradley Burston in yesterday's Haaretz newspaper.

"Obama's message to [Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin] Netanyahu on Iran is succinct enough to be spelled out in 10 letters: Chuck Hagel."

"The message to Jerusalem is clear: it won't be easy from now on getting a green light from Washington to embark on an adventure in Iran," commentator Orly Azulai wrote a day earlier in the top-selling Yediot Aharonot daily.

### Public opinion stops strikes

#### No war; Public opinion

Brzezinski ’13 (national security adviser to President Jimmy Carter)

Zbigniew The Washington Post 1-4-13

It follows that a failure to reach a satisfactory negotiated solution with Iran should not be viewed as the trigger for a new U.S.-initiated war that is not likely to be confined just to Iran. A more prudent and productive course for the United States would be to continue the painful sanctions against Iran while formally adopting for the Middle East the same policy that for decades successfully protected America's European and Asian allies against the much more dangerous threats emanating from Stalinist Russia and lately from nuclear-armed North Korea. An Iranian military threat aimed at Israel or any other U.S. friend in the Middle East would be treated as if directed at the United States itself and would precipitate a commensurate U.S. response.¶ A serious discussion of these issues by the Foreign Relations Committee may help generate a firmer national consensus that a reckless shortcut to war - which is favored now by neither the American people nor the Israeli public - is not the wisest response to a potentially grave crisis. Indeed, could Meir Dagan, the former head of Israel's Mossad, have been right when he bluntly said that an attack on Iran is "the stupidest thing I have ever heard"? Fortunately, there is a better, even if not a perfect, option.

### Iran intentions are peaceful

#### Aff ev is media spin: Iran has NO intentions of attack

Ditz 2-6-13

Jason <http://news.antiwar.com/2013/02/06/ahmadinejad-iran-wont-attack-israel/>

Spinning and respinning stories into something more alarmist is nothing new as it relates to Iran, but media outlets were doing heavy duty spin today after Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, in an interview with Egypt’s al-Ahram paper, said Iran had no interest in attacking Israel but was ready to retaliate if attacked.¶ The statements were reported as made in the Israeli press, but by the time they got to the US media they were completely unrecognizable, with some taking his comments bragging about industrial progress, including in their civilian nuclear program, as a claim that Iran “already has the ability to create nuclear weapons.”¶ But that’s not all. Other outlets took his statement explicitly saying Iran wasn’t going to attack Israel, and the comments on retaliation, and ended up declaring that Ahmadinejad had threatened to destroy Israel in the interview.¶ Lost in all of this is that Ahmadinejad has essentially zero to do with Iranian military policy and that Iran has spent the past several decades facing US and Israeli threats to attack and has obviously designed their military around retaliating against such attacks, not against launching attacks of their own.

### Iran already crossed the threshold

#### Iran already has nuke capacity

Rothman 2-6-13

http://www.mediaite.com/online/iranian-president-claims-islamic-republic-has-already-achieved-nuclear-capability/

Iran has already crossed the nuclear threshold, according to claims by Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad. While on an official visit to Egypt, Ahmadinejad told local reporters that the Islamic Republic has the technology and materials necessary to create a nuclear weapon. Iran is “already a nuclear state,” Ahmadinejad told the Egyptian newspaper Al-Ahram. He says that the world must now refer to Iran as an atomic power. He insisted that all of Iran’s nuclear capabilities are defensive and they have no desire to seek an armed confrontation with the state of Israel.

#### Already have tech, 4-6 months, WHENEVER THEY WANT

AP 2-4-13

http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2013-02-04/world/36737747\_1\_nuclear-program-nuclear-bomb-iran

A former chief of Israeli military intelligence says Iran could develop a nuclear weapon within the next four to six months.¶ Amos Yadlin says Iran already has all the necessary components needed to build a nuclear bomb. He says from the moment it decides to do so, it could complete the task between four to six months.¶ Yadlin made the assessment Monday at a news conference announcing the strategic outlook of Tel Aviv’s Institute of National Security Studies, which Yadlin heads.

### Israel won’t attack: Don’t believe there is urgency/Sanctions solve now

#### Israel believes Iran is slowing development

Frenkel 1-28

http://www.miamiherald.com/2013/01/28/3205199/israel-iran-slowing-nuclear-program.html#storylink=cpy

Israeli intelligence officials now estimate that Iran won’t be able to build a nuclear weapon before 2015 or 2016, pushing back by several years previous assessments of Iran’s nuclear ambitions.¶ Intelligence briefings given to McClatchy over the last two months have confirmed that various officials across Israel’s military and political echelons now think it’s unrealistic that Iran could develop a nuclear weapons arsenal before 2015. Others pushed the date back even further, to the winter of 2016.¶ "Previous assessments were built on a set of data that has since shifted," said one Israeli intelligence officer, who spoke to McClatchy only on the condition that he not be identified. He said that in addition to a series of "mishaps" that interrupted work at Iran’s nuclear facilities, Iranian officials appeared to have slowed the program on their own.¶ "We can’t attribute the delays in Iran’s nuclear program to accidents and sabotage alone," he said. "There has not been the run towards a nuclear bomb that some people feared. There is a deliberate slowing on their end."¶ Reports that Iran’s nuclear facility at Fordow had been damaged in a nuclear explosion were still being investigated Monday, Israeli officials said. Satellite imagery shared with McClatchy showed that new fortifications had been built around the perimeter of the facility.¶ "This is already Iran’s most heavily fortified facility," said another intelligence officer, based in Israel’s central command. "The new construction we are seeing here is meant to prevent access to the facility through land routes."¶ He speculated that Iran had taken special care to protect its facilities in Fordow because it was a "highly attractive target for an attack."¶ "Despite repeated efforts by Iran to reinforce and protect their nuclear facilities, there have been accidents that some call sabotage that may have been carried out by a number of interested parties," he said, listing Iranian dissident groups that he said would try to attack Iranian military and nuclear facilities. "One way or another, Iran has been forced to slow down."¶ Writing in Israel’s Hebrew-language daily newspaper Yediot Ahronot, military correspondent Alex Fishman said, "Officials responsible for assessing the state of the Iranian nuclear program, both in the West and in the International Atomic Energy Agency, believe that while the Iranians have continued to pursue their nuclear program, they have been doing so cautiously and slowly, making sure not to cross the point of no return."¶ Fishman wrote that Israel’s allies in the West, including Europe and the United States, had been notified of the new calculations that Iran couldn’t possess nuclear weapons before 2015.¶ That assessment, he said, has been unpopular in Israel’s highest political echelons. Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu repeatedly has called 2013 a "decisive year" for Iran’s nuclear program. During his speech at the United Nations General Assembly in September, Netanyahu displayed a rudimentary bomb diagram to illustrate Iran’s progress toward a nuclear weapon.¶ "By next spring, at most next summer, at current enrichment rates, they will have finished the medium enrichment and moved on to the final stage,” Netanyahu said, laying out a timeline for the summer of 2013. “From there it’s only a few months, possibly a few weeks, before they get enough enriched uranium for the first bomb.”¶ Netanyahu, who’s forming his country’s next government despite disappointing results in national elections, has continued to emphasize a sense of urgency on Iran’s nuclear program, citing it first among his new government’s priorities in his election victory speech.¶ Israeli officials, however, have said there’s a widening gulf between Netanyahu’s remarks and the intelligence reports he receives.¶ "There is a question we have to ask ourselves, of ‘Did we cry wolf too early?’ ” the intelligence officer said.¶ An official in Israel’s Foreign Ministry who spoke with McClatchy on the condition of anonymity said that international pressure and sanctions on Iran had made a tremendous difference.¶ "Iran is progressing carefully, and we think that is because of international pressure led by the U.S.," the official said. He added that Israel was very pleased with the tightening of sanctions, especially the recent move to block money that Iran receives for exporting oil to Asian markets.¶ Last week, President Barack Obama signed the latest round of restrictions into law, imposing sanctions against international companies that do business with Iranian firms while blocking Iran from obtaining key materials necessary for its automobile industries.

## Pass

### 2NC Key to Economy

#### Immigration key to economy- boosts all sectors

Klein 1-29

Ezra is a Bloomberg and Washington Post Columnist, “To Fix the U.S. Economy, Fix Immigration,” <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-01-29/to-fix-the-u-s-economy-fix-immigration.html>

¶ Washington tends to have a narrow view of what counts as “economic policy.” Anything we do to the tax code is in. So is any stimulus we pass, or any deficit reduction we try. Most of this mistakes the federal budget for the economy.¶ The truth is, the most important piece of economic policy we pass -- or don’t pass -- in 2013 may be something we don’t think of as economic policy at all: immigration reform.¶ ¶ Congress certainly doesn’t consider it economic policy, at least not officially. Immigration laws go through the House and Senate judiciary committees. But consider a few facts about immigrants in the American economy: About a tenth of the U.S. population is foreign-born. More than a quarter of U.S. technology and engineering businesses started from 1995 to 2005 had a foreign-born owner. In Silicon Valley, half of all tech startups had a foreign-born founder.¶ Immigrants begin businesses and file patents at a much higher rate than their native-born counterparts, and while there are disputes about the effect immigrants have on the wages of low-income Americans, there’s little dispute about their effect on wages overall: They lift them.¶ The economic case for immigration is best made by way of analogy. Everyone agrees that aging economies with low birth rates are in trouble; this, for example, is a thoroughly conventional view of Japan. It’s even conventional wisdom about the U.S. The retirement of the baby boomers is correctly understood as an economic challenge. The ratio of working Americans to retirees will fall from 5-to-1 today to 3-to-1 in 2050. Fewer workers and more retirees is tough on any economy.¶ Importing Workers¶ There’s nothing controversial about that analysis. But if that’s not controversial, then immigration shouldn’t be, either. Immigration is essentially the importation of new workers. It’s akin to raising the birth rate, only easier, because most of the newcomers are old enough to work. And because living in the U.S. is considered such a blessing that even very skilled, very industrious workers are willing to leave their home countries and come to ours, the U.S. has an unusual amount to gain from immigration. When it comes to the global draft for talent, we almost always get the first-round picks -- at least, if we want them, and if we make it relatively easy for them to come here.¶ From the vantage of naked self-interest, the wonder isn’t that we might fix our broken immigration system in 2013. It’s that we might not.¶ Few economic problems wouldn’t be improved by more immigration. If you’re worried about deficits, more young, healthy workers paying into Social Security and Medicare are an obvious boon. If you’re concerned about the slowdown in new company formation and its attendant effects on economic growth, more immigrant entrepreneurs should cheer you. If you’re worried about the dearth of science and engineering majors in our universities, an influx of foreign-born students is the most obvious solution you’ll find.¶ Politicians of both parties recognize this. “Our goal is to advance policies that make a difference in peoples’ lives, and that means we want to advance pro-growth reforms that are good for the economy,” Republican Representative Paul Ryan said at a recent Wall Street Journal breakfast. The first pro-growth reform he named? Immigration.¶ Many immigration opponents object to “amnesty” -- allowing people who broke the law to reap the benefits of legal status. That’s a moral question, and while I prefer not to stand on principle when we have 11 million people already living in the shadows in the U.S., it’s beyond the scope of this column. The main economic concern about allowing more immigration or legalizing the status of those who are already here is that immigrants will undermine the wages of the least-skilled Americans. In reality, it’s not clear that will happen.¶ Complementary Skills¶ In addition to growing the size of the national pie, unskilled immigrants tend to have what economists call complementary skills to U.S. workers. If one worker speaks English and another doesn’t, for example, they generally don’t pursue the same job.¶ In that way, it’s useful again to compare immigration with native birth rates. Increasing the number of native-born workers leads to more direct competition, because two native-born workers are probably more similar than an immigrant and a native worker. Yet most everyone cheers if they hear that the U.S. birth rate has ticked up.¶ Some workers are hurt by immigration, but they are typically already struggling. The best way to help them is with more training, better health care, a more generous earned income tax credit and so on. Those benefits are easier to provide in a growing economy with more young workers than in a sluggish one with chronic budget deficits. Immigration isn’t what really ails them, and it isn’t what stands in the way of aiding them.¶ Will immigrants use those same social services, as some immigration opponents contend, adding to the cost of the nation’s welfare state? Yes, but not as often as they’ll pay into it. In 2007, the Congressional Budget Office analyzed the issue while assessing President George W. Bush’s proposed immigration reforms. It found that legalizing undocumented immigrants would increase federal revenue by $48 billion while costing only $23 billion in increased public services -- and that’s before accounting for the broader economic benefits of immigration.¶ There are few free lunches in public policy. But taking advantage of our unique position as a country where the world’s best, brightest and hardest-working desperately want to live is surely one. In the end, economies aren’t mainly about budgets and tax codes, though Congress occasionally pretends otherwise. They’re about workers and business owners. Immigration reform is a way to get more of both.

### Hege Good- Econ/ Trade

#### Hege key to the global economy and preventing trade wars

Yetiv ‘12

[Steve Yetiv, professor of political science @ Old Dominion University. [http://www.csmonitor.com/Commentary/Opinion/2012/0313/Six-reasons-to-keep-America-as-No.-1-superpower/Keeping-the-Asian-balance-of-power](http://www.tnr.com/article/politics/magazine/99521/america-world-power-declinism) ETB]

America supports a free-trading global regime, bolsters financial stability, and has a giant domestic market. Beijing can play a larger role, but it’s much less of a free-trader, has less influence in international institutions like the International Monetary Fund, and the yuan would uncomfortably substitute for the [dollar](http://www.csmonitor.com/tags/topic/U.S.+Dollar). If China were to sell more of its yuan, its currency would strengthen, hurting its exports, which drive its economy. How long would Beijing tolerate that at any major level? A weakened America might also resort to more protectionist practices to create more jobs at home, triggering dangerous trade wars.

### Hege Good- ME Peace Agreement

#### Hege key to middle east peace agreement

Yetiv ‘12

[Steve Yetiv, professor of political science @ Old Dominion University. [http://www.csmonitor.com/Commentary/Opinion/2012/0313/Six-reasons-to-keep-America-as-No.-1-superpower/Keeping-the-Asian-balance-of-power](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/02/21/rotting_from_the_inside_out) ETB]

If Israel perceives any weakness in [America](http://www.csmonitor.com/tags/topic/United+States)’s regional role, it will be far less likely to make peace, because it can only make major concessions for peace if it feels strong.

Don’t get me wrong. American foreign policy should be primarily multilateral in a complex, interconnected world. And [Washington](http://www.csmonitor.com/tags/topic/Washington%2c+DC) must accommodate the rise of powers such as [China](http://www.csmonitor.com/tags/topic/China), [Brazil](http://www.csmonitor.com/tags/topic/Brazil), and [India](http://www.csmonitor.com/tags/topic/India), and try to see how they can contribute more to global security – especially China which has the financial wherewithal to do so and should contribute much more than it does.

### Hege Good- Great Power Wars

#### Collapse of hege causes great power wars

GFP ‘12

[German Foreign Policy. Ulrich Speck, PhD Modern History, Frankfurt am Main and associate fellow at FRIDE, a think tank in Madrid. [http://www.german-foreign-policy.com/en/fulltext/58298/print?PHPSESSID=k3naj55aifpjbsas0j88i65ko4](http://www.tnr.com/article/politics/magazine/99521/america-world-power-declinism?PHPSESSID=k3naj55aifpjbsas0j88i65ko4) ETB]

At worst, according to Speck, "the withdrawal of US hegemonic power" could cause a "political power vacuum." "Wherever the overwhelming US presence is choking off any idea of power competition," "local and regional players" could become active and feud with one another. If no one is "strong enough to prevail and establish durable territorial dominance," that respective region of the world would be faced with "chaos and anarchy," similar to Somalia, today. In that case, the future would be determined by a "return to a culture of violence, long since considered outlived historically and with the development of civilization," - by "terror," "civil war" and the "certain demise of a global economy."[4]

World War Conceivable

In a second doomsday scenario, Speck outlines a future of several hegemonic powers - a "multipolar order." One should not imagine "a balance power, in which several poles of power maintain order and compete for dominance" as being "in any way peaceful and stable - and certainly not fair." One should rather expect a fierce struggle for "spheres of interests" - as in "Europe preceding World War I." "The outbreak of a major war again becomes conceivable," according to the author; "at least, proxy wars can be expected." Should a "multipolar global order" evolve, a "Darwinist competition of the strongest" would be imminent, in which "the weak would be tossed around by the strong."[5] In fact, we have long since reached a situation, in which the weaker countries have become pawns in the hands of major powers, in this archaic, western dominated world order.

### 2NC Will Pass

#### More Reasons it passes:

#### A Insiders agree

National Journal 2-2

“Insiders Optimistic About Immigration Reform,” <http://www.nationaljournal.com/blogs/hotlineoncall/2013/02/insiders-optimistic-about-immigration-reform-02>

Cautious optimism: That's the best way to describe how both Democratic and Republican Political Insiders feel about the chances of comprehensive immigration reform, including a pathway to citizenship, passing Congress this year.¶ A majority of Democrats and Republicans think it's either very or somewhat likely that such legislation passes in the 113th Congress, while only 3 percent of Democratic Insiders and 2 percent of the Republican Insiders say it's very unlikely.¶ What is the likelihood of comprehensive immigration reform, including a pathway to citizenship, passing Congress this year?¶ Democrats¶ (107 votes) Republicans¶ (94 votes)¶ Very likely 39% 25%¶ Somewhat likely 50% 53%¶ Somewhat unlikely 8% 20%¶ Very unlikely 3% 2%¶ Democrats view Republicans as finally having to accept a political reality after losing decisively in 2012 and eager to jab the GOP over what they see as a political winner for their party.¶ "The GOP has gone from bigotry to opportunism faster than Sarah Palin can take down a caribou," said one Democratic Insider.¶ Indeed, some Democrats argue their opponents will be forced to back immigration reform because of demographic realities.¶ "Enough Republicans have seen the light to make it happen," said another Democratic Insider.¶ Republicans don't disagree but, as you would expect, they put it differently.¶ "Republicans get over their headache, after banging into the wall for years," said one Republican.

#### B Polling Edge

Washington Post 2-7

“Poll Shows Growing Support for Obama Immigration Reforms,” <http://www.heraldextra.com/news/national/poll-shows-growing-support-for-obama-s-immigration-reforms/article_029a631f-9df2-5d41-8d41-8075280a0ad3.html>

Americans have given President Barack Obama a major ratings boost on immigration as he and Congress debate the biggest immigration reforms in decades, according to a new Washington Post-ABC News poll.¶ By 49 to 44 percent, slightly more Americans now approve than disapprove of Obama on immigration. In July, Obama was deep underwater, with just 38 percent offering positive ratings and 52 percent negative.¶ Even after the shift, though, Obama's immigration marks continue to trail his overall approval rating, which stood at 55 percent in a January Post-ABC poll.¶ In addition, two key elements of current reform discussions receive even broader support than Obama: 83 percent support stricter border security, and 55 percent back a path to citizenship for illegal immigrants.

#### C Christians give cover

Politico 2-6

“Immigration’s Latest Ally: Christian Right,” <http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=DE17CC0D-F93D-4765-BBCA-054B710A5BD4>

The usual suspects pushing immigration reform have a new ally in the fight this time — the religious right.¶ Christian conservatives, who stayed on the sidelines in 2006 or opposed reform outright, have sprung into action for the cause.¶ (PHOTOS: At a glance: The Senate immigration deal)¶ They’re talking to their congregations from the pulpit. They’re urging lawmakers in private meetings to support reform. And they’re even calling for change publicly.¶ The efforts have dramatically changed the dynamics of the debate, so much so that Republicans anxious to vote yes on a deal might have the political cover to do it.**¶** “I think it is night and day, particularly among social conservatives,” Faith and Freedom Coalition’s Ralph Reed told POLITICO of the support for immigration reform.¶ (Also on POLITICO: House GOP takes piecemeal approach on immigration)¶ Reed’s group released a letter Tuesday that outlines broad goals for reform, like keeping families together, reforming the visa system and securing the border.¶ High profile leaders are also weighing in. Mathew Staver, vice president of Liberty University, the college started by former TV minister Jerry Falwell, is on board. Focus on the Family, which for years has focused on issues like opposing abortion rights and gay marriage, is supporting immigration reform for the first time in its history — even using its radio broadcast that reaches millions to push its message.¶ “The issues had been so demagogued for the last five or six years, it was hopeless to get seriously into this,” said Tom Minnery or Focus on the Family. “It seems the time is better. The time has changed…That’s why we’ve become more active.”¶ Social conservatives are directly targeting GOP offices and trying to show that they can give cover to lawmakers in the South, West and Midwest, who are worried about facing retaliation at the ballot box in 2014.**¶** “Many of the most hostile critics got beat, a fact not lost on the other House members,” said Richard Land of the Southern Baptist Convention, referring to Republicans who have lost their seats since 2006. “I think there’s a bigger coalition in the House for immigration reform than people think.”

#### D Business & Labor Support

AP 2-6

“Business, Labor Agree on Immigration Reform,” <http://www.trivalleycentral.com/casa_grande_dispatch/national_news/business-labor-agree-on-immigration-reform/article_aad043c0-7072-11e2-854b-001a4bcf887a.html>

Unlikely allies, business and labor leaders joined in support of the White House’s immigration overhaul efforts Tuesday while also launching high-stakes negotiations to overcome an issue that has split them before — creating a guest-worker program to ensure future immigrants come to the U.S. legally.¶ The broad agreement on a need for immigration changes and a pathway to citizenship for an estimated 11 million illegal immigrants already here is driven largely by self-interest. Both business and labor see an overhaul of the nation’s broken immigration system as a way to boost economic competitiveness with other nations while increasing the ranks of workers and union members.¶ For President Barack Obama, a partnership between factions that have often been at odds — both with each other and with the White House — allows him to turn up pressure on Congress and try to isolate congressional Republicans who oppose parts of an immigration overhaul. Obama held separate private meetings at the White House on Tuesday with labor leaders and top business executives.

### A2: Gay Unification

#### Obama not pushing for gay unification

Bloomberg 2-7

“White House to Wait on Same-Sex Immigration, Biden Says,” <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-02-07/white-house-to-wait-on-same-sex-immigration-biden-says.html>

Vice President Joe Biden said the White House will “wait and see” what the Senate comes up with before determining whether to insist that equal treatment for same-sex couples be included in a rewrite of immigration laws.¶ “We’re going to wait and see what the Senate bill and the bipartisan group presents, and we’ll make our judgments,” Biden said in an interview today as he was leaving the U.S. Capitol in Washington. “We made it clear what we think should be done, and we’ll see.”

### 2NC Approval High

#### Default to issue specific uniqueness- approval is high enough for GOP to support now.

#### Obama approval high now- aggregate polling proves

Bernstein 2-8

Jonathan is a political scientist and Salon columnist, “C’mon Folks, Polling Averages, Remember,” <http://plainblogaboutpolitics.blogspot.com/2013/02/cmon-folks-polling-averages-remember.html>

Ron Fournier on one reason Barack Obama may refocus his State of the Union message:¶ Though Obama's team would dismiss its significance, Democratic allies took notice of Quinnipiac University's new poll that showed Obama's approval rating dropping since his election, from a 53 percent approval rating in December to 46 percent.¶ C'mon. Did we all learn nothing from the last election cycle? Polling averages, folks, not single polls. Heading over to Pollster, guess what? Obama's approval rating, including that Q poll, is rising, not falling. In fact, there were a total of polls with surveys ending February 4: the approval ratings on those were 46, 46, 52, and 54. And the three polls after that Q poll? Approval readings of 49, 52, 52. Conclusion: the Q poll was a bit of an outlier, or at least it was at the low range of the average.¶ (Even then, 46% approval is misleading; the two 46% polls both had high undecideds, so Quinnipiac had Obama with a net 1% positive approval score, and YouGov had him dead even. That's worse than Gallup and the others, but not as much as looking at just the approval would suggest).¶ Polling averages are not just for election season. Be wary -- very wary, on issue polling -- of single polls on any subject, at any time. I don't know whether the fault here is with Fournier or his sources, but everyone needs to learn this very, very, simple lesson.

### Thumper 2NC

#### Thumpers aren’t Responsive for 2 Reasons:

#### A Nothing Thumps Now- Obama has proposed popular legislation, losing the public costs him immigration

Ball 1-29

Molly covers Politics for the Atlantic, “Obama’s Permanent Campaign: Can he Use His Reelection to Change Washington?” <http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2013/01/obamas-permanent-campaign-can-he-use-his-reelection-playbook-to-change-washington/272587/>

A week ago, President Obama launched his second term with a set of lofty goals -- climate change legislation, immigration reform, and gun control among them.¶ Around the same time, Obama's former campaign apparatus announced it would morph into a new group called Organizing for Action, a nonprofit group to promote Obama's policy goals.¶ The inaugural address's ambitious promises have been pronounced far-fetched; the new nonprofit has been viewed as an intriguing sidelight. But taken together, Organizing for Action could be the key to enacting the president's agenda. Obama's best hope for his aggressive program may lie in the same innovative campaign techniques of grassroots mobilization and data-based field organizing that got him reelected in November. And if he pulls it off, he could revolutionize lawmaking the way he's already revolutionized campaigns.¶ Politicians talk about an outside game, but no president has ever commanded a standing army of organized supporters who could be summoned at a moment's notice to put pressure on Washington at his command. That is what Obama is proposing to do, said Addisu Demissie, who served as political director of Organizing for America, the heir to Obama's 2008 campaign organization.¶ "A lot of the things the president has proposed are popular -- pieces of gun safety, immigration, and so on," Demissie said. "The people are with him. But those people have to be heard, to step up and be counted, particularly in Republican congressional districts."¶ To be sure, there's a network of progressive advocacy organizations who are active on a wide range of issues. "But none of them have the sole job of mobilizing on behalf of the president's agenda," Demissie said. Obama's grassroots supporters "have been trained now, through two presidential election cycles, to work and organize and do the hard work of politics. Now, Obama can really use that power and those skills."¶ Particularly with the House in Republican hands, Demissie said, "I don't see how he can get that ambitious agenda through Congress without playing an outside game. Having a grassroots army could be the whole ballgame."¶ The president has, in recent months, signaled repeatedly that he plans to count on mobilizing his supporters to get things done, and that he regrets not having done so more aggressively during his first term. In his victory speech on Election Night, Obama told the audience his reelection was not the end of the road, telling his supporters that getting him reelected "doesn't mean your work is done." Even before the election, he was ridiculed for asserting, "You can't change Washington from the inside," calling it "the most important lesson I've learned." Interviewed by The New Republic last week, Obama said he planned on "spending a lot more time in terms of being in a conversation with the American people as opposed to just playing an insider game here in Washington."¶ Jen Psaki, who served as deputy White House communications director and worked for both Obama presidential campaigns, says it's wisdom the president learned the hard way, by getting bogged down and burned in Washington battles. "One of the greatest lessons of the first [Obama] term is you can't govern in a bubble," Psaki said. "Sitting across the table from other elected officials in a fancy room in Washington doesn't move an agenda, because there's no impetus for them to move."¶ The millions of rank-and-file Obama supporters who not only voted for him but devoted hours of their time and portions of their hard-earned paychecks to his campaign didn't just do it to get him elected -- they did it because they believed in the things he promised to do, and many of them are now itching to continue the fight. "The simple fact is there were millions of people actively engaged in the campaign," Psaki said. "They might not be engaged on every single issue moving forward, but they may care deeply about gun control, immigration, climate change or something else."¶ Insiders are calling Organizing for Action "OFA 4.0" -- the fourth iteration of the acronym. OFA 1.0 was the first presidential campaign; 2.0 was its successor, Organizing for America, which became an arm of the Democratic National Committee in 2009; 3.0 was the reelection campaign.¶ OFA 2.0 is the most direct precedent for the current effort -- and a cautionary tale. Organizing for America was largely blamed for having squandered the momentum of Obama's first victory, allowing the president to get mired in D.C. deal-making and leaving his rank-and-file supporters out in the cold.¶ Veterans of the group bristle a bit at this characterization, but most acknowledge that Organizing for America took too long to get started, lacked a focused mission, didn't play well with other actors (such as local Democratic parties) and, because of its affiliation with the DNC, suffered from conflicting imperatives. Was its job to push Obama's plans, or was it to get more Democrats elected?¶ "The biggest problem with being inside the DNC was that we couldn't put pressure on Democrats," one Organizing for America veteran told me. Though Democrats commanded a 54-seat House majority and 60-vote Senate supermajority, it became clear early in Obama's first term that they would need some cajoling to go along with plans like the stimulus bill and especially the health-care legislation.¶ "On health care, we really needed to hold Democrats accountable for standing up on the issue, but they could just call up the DNC if we caused any headache for them," the former OFA 2.0 staffer said. "When your paycheck is coming from the organization whose job it is to reelect these people, they can reasonably expect that you're not going to give them a hard time."¶ Nonetheless, Organizing for America had some success. In particular, staffers credit it with salvaging the health-care push during its darkest hour, when it was in danger of failing altogether.¶ It was the summer of 2009, and health-care legislation had gotten badly sidetracked in a maze of congressional horse-trading. The newly energized Tea Party was showing up at congressional town halls across the country to voice its vehement objections to the legislation. Faced with the images on the news of representatives getting shouted down and accused of wanting to kill Grandma, many Democrats withdrew, canceling events and reevaluating their support for the legislation, which suddenly looked politically toxic.¶ "We called on dedicated Obama supporters to come out, and we were able to mobilize within a few days to a week," said Evan Sutton, who served as Organizing for America's field director in Nevada. "Democrats were able to come out of hiding, and by the end of August, we were showing up at events and outnumbering the Tea Party folks 3 to 1 or 5 to 1 or 10 to 1 depending on the area." That substantially altered the dynamic -- and the story -- about the town halls from being about voter anger over health care to being about a more balanced debate between two sides.¶ "In 2005, President Bush tried to privatize Social Security, and Democrats basically did what the Tea Party did in 2009 -- organized people and flooded town halls," said Sutton, who now works for the New Organizing Institute, a progressive training group. "Bush didn't have anything to apply pressure back the other way, and as a result, the party backed off the issue and it died."¶ If Organizing for Action works, then, it could be the difference between the downward slide, in effectiveness and popularity, of Bush's second term and a more successful forecast for Obama's.¶ OFA 4.0 is being run by Jon Carson, the field director of Obama's 2008 campaign and director of the White House's Office of Public Engagement in the president's first term. From those two roles, insiders say, Carson has both an understanding of how Washington works and a deep facility with campaign mechanics. The group's chairman is Jim Messina, Obama's 2012 campaign manager.¶ What will Organizing for Action actually do? That's still up in the air. The Obama campaign model relies on a simple concept -- people reaching out to their friends and neighbors -- made effective with sophisticated use of data, targeting, and online tools.¶ Thus far, attempts to rally the Obama troops have been tentative at best. The millions-strong Obama campaign email list, which helped the president raise hundreds of millions of dollars online in 2012, has mostly been used to hawk inaugural merchandise and for a couple of tentative-seeming call-your-congressman campaigns around the fiscal cliff and, last week, gun control. The gun-control push, which came on a Friday afternoon when an anti-abortion rally had taken many GOP members out of their offices, did not exactly inspire a panic on Capitol Hill.¶ Supporters believe there are an array of tactics available to OFA 4.0, starting with the kinds of humble activities -- spread the word on Facebook! Hold a house party with your neighbors! -- that, brought to mass scale, accrued so powerfully for Obama's campaigns. Many of Obama's "liberal" policy proposals are broadly popular, his opposition is disorganized and diffuse, and lawmakers do respond to outpourings of public pressure.¶ Still, it's not clear how effective the Obama machine can be when it doesn't have the concrete goal of turning people out to vote as its end point. Will call-in campaigns be a satisfying means of political engagement? Will supporters be called on to hold rallies, raise money, write letters to the editor?¶ Plenty of other potential pitfalls await Obama in his new push. If he does turn his organizational muscle on Republican legislators, they are likely to respond with outrage and claims that they're being bullied. Turning the big guns on Democrats could be even more delicate for Obama's relationships in Washington.¶ And supporters will only stay engaged as long as they believe OFA 4.0 is true to the principles they believe in, pointed out Howard Dean, the former DNC chairman, who has his own experience refashioning a presidential campaign apparatus under a new acronym: Democracy for America, the heir to the 2004 Dean for America campaign, still exists as a supporter of progressive causes.¶ Dean believes OFA 2.0 "fell apart" when Obama backed off of the public option for health-care reform, dispiriting his progressive base and making them reluctant to rally to his side. If the president doesn't hold fast to the "inspiring" promises he made in his second inaugural, Dean said, his supporters will fall away once again.¶ Dean also worried that if OFA 4.0 accepts corporate dollars, it will undermine the president's ideals. And by being separate from the DNC, he said, it could siphon needed donations away from Democrats, weaken the party, and create resentment among allies.¶ But if the OFA 4.0 gambit is successful in bringing Obama's grassroots army to bear on the battles of Washington, it could change the political dynamic irrevocably, bringing a whole new meaning to the notion of the "permanent campaign."¶ "Lots of presidents have tried to rally the public on an ad hoc basis," Dean said, pointing to Ronald Reagan exhorting Americans to call their members of Congress in support of his tax proposals -- a ploy that worked. "But I don't believe any president has ever maintained a standing grassroots army .... Obama built the best grassroots campaign I've ever seen by a mile. Nobody has done this successfully before, but if anyone can do it, he can."

#### B Immigration is the next issue anyway- 1NC Harder says he is transitioning to that.

### 2NC CFIUS

#### Being tough on China is key

Stokes & Wite 9-19

Bruce Stokes is director of Global Economic Attitudes at the Pew Research Center. Richard Wike is associate director of the Pew Global Attitudes Project, “China: The Partisan Campaign Concern,” <http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2012/09/19/china_the_partisan_campaign_concern_115491.html>

In a presidential election campaign so far dominated by domestic economic concerns, debate over international matters has largely been an afterthought. With the outbreak of anti-American violence in some Muslim-majority countries, this may begin to change, but it is still too soon to tell.¶ What is clear, however, is that China will be on voters’ minds come Election Day, in part because it is a crossover issue. Sino-American relations clearly fall in the foreign policy realm, but voters’ interest in China is driven largely by domestic economic worries. This was underscored by the Obama administration’s Sept. 17 unfair trade case at the World Trade Organization against alleged Chinese subsidies of auto parts exports.¶ So voters can expect to hear more about China as an economic competitor as the campaign progresses, especially from GOP nominee Mitt Romney, in part because Republican voters are more concerned about China than are Democrats.¶ Most Americans describe relations between the U.S. and China as good and most consider China a competitor rather than an enemy or partner, according to a new survey by the Pew Research Center.¶ At the same time, when asked which country represents the greatest danger to the U.S., more Americans volunteer China (26 percent) than name any other country, including Iran and North Korea. And about half (52 percent) view China’s emergence as a world power as a major threat to the United States.¶ But, Republicans are more concerned than Democrats about the impact of China’s rise. Six-in-10 Republicans believe Beijing’s emergence as a world power poses a major threat to the U.S., compared with 48 percent of Democrats. And Republicans are more likely (74 percent) than Democrats (61 percent) to say China cannot be trusted.¶ Moreover, contrary to the popular narrative that Democrats are protectionists and Republicans are free traders, far more Republicans (71 percent) than Democrats (54 percent) see the U.S. trade deficit with China as a very serious problem for the United States. Similarly, GOP members (76 percent) are more likely than Democrats (67 percent) to worry about the loss of U.S. jobs to China. And Republicans (87 percent) are more concerned than Democrats (75 percent) about the large amount of American debt held by the Asian nation.¶ With such concerns, it is hardly surprising that Republicans are also far more likely to favor toughness with China on economic and trade issues. Democrats are more likely to say building a strong relationship with China is a top priority. About two-thirds of Republicans (68 percent) say it is very important for Washington to be tough with Beijing, compared with 53 percent of Democrats. At the same time, 59 percent of Democrats believe building a strong bilateral relationship with China should be a top priority, while only 48 percent of Republicans agree.¶ And GOP voters also think their party can do a better job than the Obama administration in dealing with China. Republicans (65 percent) are nearly twice as likely as Democrats (35 percent) to say the president should be tougher on Beijing. Meanwhile, roughly half (51 percent) of Democrats say that Obama’s dealings with China are about right.¶ This critique may, in part, simply reflect a partisan belief typical of those out of power that they can always do better than those in power. A decade ago, 40 percent of Democrats said then-President George W. Bush was not being tough enough on China, while just 34 percent believed his dealings with China were about right. In contrast, only 32 percent of Republicans criticized Bush for not being tough enough; 57 percent said his administration’s handling of China was about right.¶ Security issues involving China are less of a public concern or a partisan issue. Only about half the public is worried about cyber attacks from China (50 percent) or Beijing’s growing military power (49 percent) and just 27 percent are concerned about tensions between China and Taiwan. And there is no real difference between the party faithful on Beijing’s military ambitions or regarding its relations with Taipei.¶ Despite the recent upsurge in anti-American violence in much of the Muslim world, domestic economic issues are likely to dominate the U.S. presidential campaign over the next six weeks. The lone international economic exception may be China. Because in many voters’ minds, China is a domestic economic concern seen through a partisan lens.

#### Bipartisan support for CFIUS Review

Barron, 12

Mint Press's New York Correspondent. She has worked for leading news organizations, including Time, Inc., CNN, CNBC and CBS News, in Europe, Asia, Africa, South America and the Middle East as well as in the United States (Lisa, “Republicans, Democrats Come Together To Oppose Chinese Oil Deal” Mint Press News, 7/30, <http://www.mintpress.net/chinese-oil-deal-becoming-political-football-in-u-s/>)

(NEW YORK) MintPress — It seems that Congressional Democrats and Republicans have finally found something on which they can agree. Both parties are coming out against a bid by Chinese energy giant CNOOC for Canadian oil company Nexen.¶ CNOOC, owned by the Chinese government and based in Beijing, agreed on July 23 to pay $15.1 billion for Calgary-based Nexen, which operates in the U.S. portion of the Gulf of Mexico. It is CNOOC’s biggest North American deal since it walked away from Unocal under pressure from Congress in 2005.¶ This time around, Sen. Charles Schumer (D-N.Y.), who is a frequent critic of China’s trade and currency policy, has sent a letter to Treasury Secretary asking the U.S. government to block the Nexen deal.¶ “I respectfully urge you, in your capacity as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS), to withhold approval of this transaction to ensure U.S. companies reciprocal treatment,” Schumer wrote.¶ Schumer pointed to the 2012 Strategic and Economic Dialogue in which the U.S. committed to a fair review process by the CFIUS and, in return, China committed to “fair treatment to foreign investors in China.”¶ “I urge you not to miss this opportunity – the largest foreign acquisition ever by a Chinese company – to hold China to the commitments it has made to provide a level playing field for U.S. companies seeking to access Chinese markets,” Schumer said.¶ His sentiments were shared by the Democratic leader in the House of Representatives, Nancy Pelosi. “This deal prompts great concern about the Chinese government’s continued attempts to use its state-owned enterprises to acquire global energy resources,” spokesman Drew Hamill said in a statement.¶ Republican reaction¶ A similar response came from Sen. David Vitter (R-La.). “I’m concerned because it’s really a trend, particularly in the Gulf of Mexico,” he said. “I do think the far better alternative is for us to play offense, and for us to be developing, taking advantage of these energy resources.”¶ And Sen. John Hoeven (R-N.D.), whose home state is the country’s second-largest oil producer, told a news conference, “Do we really want to be buying our oil or Canadian oil back from the Chinese? If we don’t take action to develop our resources and work with our closest friends and ally Canada, that’s exactly what’s going to happen.”¶ Hoeven and other Republicans have unveiled a package of proposals that would allow for more drilling on government-owned land, reduce regulations, streamline drilling permits and approve TransCanada’s Keystone project.¶ In January, Obama refused to approve the proposed Canada-to-Texas pipeline because he said Congress cut short the environmental review process.¶ Republicans branded his decision as a job-killer that undermines energy independence. “It is time for President Obama to stop putting politics ahead of struggling families and small businesses and approve the Keystone XL pipeline,” House Speaker John Boehner, the top congressional Republican, said in a statement in February.¶ 2012 elections¶ CFIUS lawyers have said they believe the deal will not face regulatory obstacles, but it’s not clear whether the transaction could become a political issue in a tight election year.¶ One of the main driving forces behind the company’s problem with Unocal in 2005 was the fact that it was competing against Chevron, a U.S. oil major with strong allegiances on Capitol Hill.¶ CNOOC does not have a U.S. rival in the Nexen deal. And in May, it hired Hill & Knowlton Strategies to lobby Congress on issues relating to the environment and natural gas.¶ It is clearly going to remain a divisive issue. Both sides may want to seize the opportunity to look tough on China, but foreign investment overall helps the economy and investment in the oil and gas sector in particular helps the U.S. become less dependent on oil from overseas.

### China Lobby link work

#### Anti-China lobby strong

Laurence ‘08 (independent political analyst and a contributing editor to The Star)

Patrick The Star (South Africa)

Banks' losses, due in large measure to household debt, are similarly huge, giving rise to consumer fears for the safety of their deposits, a rush of withdrawals and, short of a government rescue package, the collapse of even established banks.¶ Another symptom of the financial crisis in the US is the large and mounting deficit in its overall balance of payments, due in great degree to its unfavourable bilateral trade balance with China.¶ Mindful of the 1929 Wall Street crash and the subsequent depression in the 1930s, many American citizens, fearing that the US is on the brink of a similar depression, are looking around for a scapegoat. The chances are their eyes will fall on China.¶ The odds are that the anti-China lobby will act to intensify demands for high tariffs on Chinese imports and/or an upward revaluation of China's currency.¶ Punitive measures - including one pressing for China's expulsion from the World Trade Organisation - may be submitted for adoption by the US Congress. The consequences will be devastating for China.

### A2: Winners Win

#### Obama influence is finite

Cillizza 2-6

Chris writes the Fix and Covers Politics for the Washington Post, “President Obama is Enjoying a Second Political Honeymoon. But how Long will it Last?” <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2013/02/06/president-obama-is-enjoying-a-second-political-honeymoon-but-how-long-will-it-last/>

President Obama is enjoying a sort of second political honeymoon in the wake of his re-election victory last November with a series of national polls showing his job approval rating climbing from the middling territory where it lagged for much of the last several years.¶ President Obama is in the midst of a second honeymoon.¶ In the latest Real Clear Politics rolling average of all national polling, Obama approval is at 52 percent while his disapproval is at 43 percent. That may not seem like much but it marks a significant improvement over where he was for much of 2010 and 2011.¶ Here’s a look at Obama’s job approval trend line in Washington Post-ABC News polling from January 2011 until now:¶ Judging from his actions of late — most notably his surprising confrontational (and liberal) inaugural address — President Obama is well aware of the fact that he is enjoying a polling boom at the moment. And, even Republicans are tacitly acknowledging that Obama is living in a second honeymoon period by backing down on major legislative fights like the fiscal cliff and the debt ceiling.¶ The pertinent question then is how long it will last — and what the president can get done between now and when the good times (for him, at least) stop rolling.¶ Gallup has done considerable work on the lengths of political honeymoons and has concluded that they ain’t what they used to be. Here’s their chart documenting the relative honeymoon lengths — as defined by a job approval rating above the 55 percent mark — of presidents in their first terms:¶ As Gallup’s Jeffrey Jones wrote:¶ “Only one of the last six presidents — George H.W. Bush — had a honeymoon that extended beyond his ninth month in office. Bush’s ratings actually climbed for much of his first year and a half in office as the economy remained strong, several communist regimes fell in Europe, and the U.S. military was able to capture Panamanian dictator Manuel Noriega and remove him from power.”¶ The explanations for the shortening of presidential honeymoons vary.¶ One theory is that modern presidents operate in a hyper-partisan world where the opposition party never rallies (or comes close to rallying) behind them. (In Gallup polling, nine of the ten most polarizing years of a presidency – as defined by the gap between presidential job approval among Democrats and job approval among Republicans — have come during the presidencies of George W. Bush and Obama.)¶ Because of that partisan division, modern presidents’ approval ratings start at a lower high point; that means the pace at which they dip below the 56 percent “honeymoon” mark is significantly hastened. The one and only Nate Silver makes just that point when examining second term presidential honeymoons in this post and accompanying chart:¶ Another factor contributing to the truncation of political honeymoons is that in the world of 24-hour cable networks, Twitter and the fracturing of the traditional media, the attention span of the American public is much shorter than it once was — meaning that momentum simply dies away much faster nowadays.¶ Regardless of the reason, it’s clear that Obama has a limited time — six months perhaps? — to take legislative advantage of his second political honeymoon.¶ He seems committed to taking on three separate and distinct fights during that time: 1) gun control 2) immigration reform 3) debt and spending. Each of those legislative scraps will shorten his honeymoon as he expends political capital to try to get what he wants out of a Congress — particularly in the House — that seems likely to be resistant.¶ And, it’s possible — given the glacially slow pace at which Congress works and the aforementioned partisanship that seems to seize any and every issue — that Obama’s honeymoon will fade well before he gets all three of those priorities accomplished.¶ A look back at the trend line on his job approval in his first term is telling in that regard.¶ Even though Obama started off considerably higher in his first term than he began his second term, by August 2009 he had dropped to 54 percent approval in WaPo-ABC polling — thanks to the bailout of the American auto industry, the fight over the economic stimulus package and the earlier positioning over his health-care bill.¶ Considering that Obama is — at best — in the mid-50s in terms of job approval at the moment and the fact that the past showdowns on fiscal issues have revealed the massively different approaches advocated by the two parties, it’s not at all far fetched to assume that taking on just one of those fights might be enough to end the president’s second term honeymoon.¶ In short: The time is now for Obama to act on his legislative priorities. His political honeymoon will almost certainly be over by the time Congress recesses for its month-long August break this summer.

### 2NC Agencies

#### Obama is made of Velcro - everything from his administration sticks to him

Los Angeles Times 10

7-30-10, p. <http://articles.latimes.com/2010/jul/30/nation/la-na-velcro-presidency-20100730>

Reporting from Washington — If Ronald Reagan was the classic Teflon president, Barack **Obama is made of Velcro.**¶ Through two terms, Reagan eluded much of the responsibility for recession and foreign policy scandal. In less than two years, **Obama has become ensnared in blame.**¶ Hoping to better insulate Obama, **White House aides have sought to give other Cabinet officials a higher profile and additional public exposure**. They are also crafting new ways to explain the president's policies to a skeptical public.¶ But **Obama remains the colossus of his administration — to a point where trouble anywhere in the world is often his to solve.**¶ **The president is on the hook to repair the Gulf Coast oil spill disaster, stabilize Afghanistan, help fix Greece's ailing economy and do right by Shirley Sherrod, the Agriculture Department official fired as a result of a misleading fragment of videotape.**

#### Agency action links to politics

Thomas McGarity, Endowed Chair in Administrative Law, University of Texas School of Law, May 2012, ARTICLE: ADMINISTRATIVE LAW AS BLOOD SPORT: POLICY EROSION IN A HIGHLY PARTISAN AGE, 61 Duke L.J. 1671

The interchange-fee rulemaking experience illustrates how stakeholders in high-stakes rulemakings have begun going beyond the conventional responses to rulemaking initiatives by adopting a new toolbox of strategies better suited to the deeply divided political economy. If the players on one side of the policy debate perceive that they are unlikely to prevail in the administrative arena, they will move the implementation game to another arena - the White House, a congressional hearing, a political fundraising dinner, a think-tank white paper, talk-radio programs, attack advertising, telephone solicitation and "push polls," or Internet blogs. Many of these new venues were amply used in the battle that accompanied the interchange-fee rulemaking. In addition, although lawyers for the stakeholders employ the careful language of administrative law in arenas in which that language is expected, spokespersons and allies also employ the heated rhetoric of modern political discourse in arenas in which that language is more likely to succeed. This Part probes these, among other, contours of blood-sport rulemaking.

#### We have the best new studies

Thomas McGarity, Endowed Chair in Administrative Law, University of Texas School of Law, May 2012, ARTICLE: ADMINISTRATIVE LAW AS BLOOD SPORT: POLICY EROSION IN A HIGHLY PARTISAN AGE, 61 Duke L.J. 1671

In this Article, I raise the possibility that the nation has entered a period in which the population is so deeply divided about the proper role of government, regulated industries are so willing to spend millions of dollars to vindicate their interests, and political discourse is so unrestrained that an even more expansive model of implementation may be warranted, at least in the context of high-stakes rulemaking initiatives. n23 First, the implementation game has spread to arenas that are far less structured and far more political than the agency hearing rooms and appellate courtrooms of the past. Second, the roster of players has expanded beyond agency and OIRA staffs, advocates for the regulated industry and beneficiary groups, and congressional aides to include individuals and organizations with broad policy agendas, such as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, think tanks, grassroots organizations, media pundits, and Internet bloggers. Third, because many parties play the implementation game in multiple arenas, the game has become far more strategic and the range of allowable tactics has widened rather dramatically. Finally, in this deeply divided political economy, the players in the implementation game no longer make a pretense of separation between the domains of politics and administrative law, and they are far less restrained in the rhetoric they employ to influence agency policymaking. n24¶ In this new milieu, "winning" can mean more than compelling unreasonable delays in agency action, invoking APA procedures to impede the policymaking process, or persuading the agency to accept a particular position on the relevant law and facts. Winning can consist of extracting promises from nominees during the confirmation process, preventing the confirmation of disfavored nominees, or preventing the confirmation of any agency leaders until the administration has agreed to change the agency's decisionmaking structure. Winning can also mean incapacitating the agency by reducing its annual appropriation, repealing the agency's organic act, or whittling away its regulatory authority through rifle-shot riders attached to must-pass legislation. n25 The players are less reluctant to attack agencies and the statutes those agencies administer head on. The players launch their attacks much earlier in the evolution of regulatory programs, and they feel free to go beyond attacks on the agencies as institutions to launch ad hominem attacks on agency decisionmakers.¶ In short, I raise the possibility that, for some high-stakes rulemaking initiatives in some areas of regulation, implementation is not so much "politics by other means" as it is "politics as usual." And because politics is so very different from the deliberative, lawyer-dominated domain of traditional administrative law, the word "law" may no longer be an accurate descriptor. Former U.S. [\*1681] Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) Chairman Arthur Levitt referred in 2010 to federal regulation as a "kind of a blood sport" in which the regulated industries attempt "to make the particular agency" promulgating an unwelcome regulation "look stupid or inept or venal." n27 If the implementation of regulatory statutes has become a blood sport in important contexts, and if the goal of administrative law extends beyond ensuring procedural regularity to a concern about the effective implementation of legislation, then it would behoove administrative-law scholars to pay attention to the larger setting in which informal rulemaking now takes place and to begin thinking about the implications of these developments for the field.

#### Obama is responsible for agencies Ellis 94

ELLIS, PROF OF GOV @ BERKELEY, 1994 PRICHARD, “PRESIDENTIAL LIGHTENING ROD, PG 2]

This argument seems plausible enough. But so too does the opposite case, argued by Harold Laski in his class *The American Presidency,* published in the same year (1940) as Herring’s treatise, **An American president**. Laski maintains, **cannot deflect blame unto subordinates. A president’s position as head of the executive branch**, Laski insists, “**makes him a target to be attacked by ever person or interest at all critical of his purposes. He is, there in all cases, to be blamed**; and there is no one, in any real sense, who can help to bear the burden of the blame. In contrast to England, where we blame an anonymous entity “the Government” **if things go wrong**, in the United States **it is the president who is blamed**. A decision of the Supreme Court is regarded as adverse to his policy; a defeat in Congress is a blow to *his* presidency; the mid-term congressional elections protect *his* policy, good or ill. NO one thinks of them in terms of their effects upon his cabinet.

**Perceived as figurehead**

**Edwards & Wayne 99**PROF @ TEXAS A&M AND PROF @ GEORGETOWN, 1999 [GEORGE AND STEPHEN, “PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP: POLITICS AND POLICY MAKING, PG 327]

**The hierarchical structure of the executive branch**, with the president at the pinnacle, **forces the president to take responsibility for the entire executive branch.** Moreover, when the president exercises power, it is clear who is acting and who should be held accountable. Congress, on the other hand, is not responsible for implementing polices, and each member is relatively obscure compared to the president. Since Congress is so decentralized, any member can disclaim responsibility for policies or their consequences. **Members of Congress**, therefore, **can**, and do, **make irresponsible or self serving decisions and then let the president take the blame.**
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## FDI

#### No impact on FDI – 20 years of experience

Merrill 11

(Margaret, B.A. Tufts University; J.D. Columbia Law School; “Overcoming CFIUS Jitters: A Practical Guide for Understanding the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States” 30 Quinnipiac L. Rev. 1)

Fortunately, over twenty years of experience has made the CFIUS [\*41] filing and review processes less opaque than it once was. There is now enough information available to understand how parties to a proposed covered transaction should conduct themselves in order to successfully maneuver through the CFIUS process. Understanding the nuances of the CFIUS mandate and proactively engaging the Committee and relevant media and lobbying sources makes surviving CFIUS review readably achievable. This type of preparation gives parties to a proposed FDI transaction a competitive edge by reducing unexpected compliance costs and, more importantly, by greatly minimizing the risk that the transaction will be blocked or frustrated by CFIUS and its review process.

#### Excluding specific industries turns investment in other industries

Mostaghel 07

(Deborah M., Director of Legal Research and Writing, The University of Toledo College of Law; J.D. 1988, University of Utah College of Law.; “Dubai Ports World Under Exon-Florio: A Threat to National Security or a Tempest in a seaport?” 70 Alb. L. Rev. 583 – Kurr)

Congress should refrain from changing Exon-Florio without careful thought. In particular, Congress should not require CFIUS to make protection of specific industries a factor. First, the drafters of the regulations considered and rejected this approach originally. They considered lists of industries and multifactor tests that might be applied to determine if particular industries belong on or off the list; at the same time they limited the authority of the President to protect national security. Such protection of specific industries may also have the effect of driving away foreign investment in related industries and in general. Congress should not incorporate longer timeframes than already exist. Unless CFIUS itself indicates that longer timeframes are necessary, the longer a proposed transaction is kept open, the greater the uncertainty and risk for the parties. Congress should not bar foreign ownership of U.S. companies as Duncan Hunter has called for. n296 CFIUS review works effectively now on a case-by-case basis to exclude risky transactions. Barring foreign ownership would unnecessarily deny us potentially advantageous opportunities for partnership. It could lead to closing the door to U.S. companies that wish to enter transactions with companies abroad.

#### Minimal effect on investment

Plotkin & Fagan 06

(Mark E. Plotkin , partner in Covington Burling’s Washington office, chairs the firm’s Electronic Commerce and Information Technology practice, David M. Marchick, leading authority on the Exon-Florio amendment to the Defense Production Act of 1950, and David N. Fagan, associate - Covington Burling, Foreign Investment Laws and National Security: Lessons from Exon-Florio, May, 2006, http://www.cov.com/files/Publication/8fdb961b-d279-4e73-802e-e6de0555af86/Presentation/PublicationAttachment/2696e4d4-1d5f-4c9d-8589-f1b433c93009/oid14563.pdf)

The flexibility in the CFIUS process has produced at least three, related results. First, at a high-level, Exon-Florio appears to have had a minimal impact on the overall flow of FDI into the United States, which remains the leading recipient of FDI in the world. Indeed, over the last 17 years, only about ten percent of all FDI in the United States has been subject to even a minimal level of review by CFIUS, less than one percent of those transactions have been fully investigated, and only one transaction in history has been formally rejected by the President - a 1990 investment by a Chinese state-owned company in a U.S. defense contractor in the aviation sector.

#### Doesn’t restrict investment

Tyson 8/2/2012

(Laura Tyson, a former chair of the US President's Council of Economic Advisers, is a professor at the Haas School of Business at the University of California, Berkeley, Project Syndicate, August 2, 2012, "The Benefits of Chinese FDI", http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/the-benefits-of-chinese-fdi-by-laura-tyson)

Many Chinese investors view the CFIUS screening process as protectionist and targeted at them, but there is no evidence of this. The United Kingdom, Canada, France, and Israel accounted for more than half of all CFIUS cases reviewed in 2008-2010, while China accounted for only about 5%. Only a small fraction of Chinese FDI in the US is subject to CFIUS review, and most of these projects, like most reviewed by CFIUS, are approved, sometimes with mitigation measures. CFIUS does not review greenfield investments, which account for about 50% of Chinese FDI in the US.

#### No impact —- CFIUS approves 99.9% of all transactions

Marchick 07

(David, partner at Covington %26 Burling, where he advises companies on the CFIUS process, "Swinging the Pendulum too Far: An Analysis of the CFIUS Process Post-Dubai Ports World," Jan, http://www.nfap.net/researchactivities/studies/NFAPPolicyBriefCFIUS0107.pdf)

In the 18 years that Exon-Florio has been in force, there have been slightly more than 1700 CFIUS filings. Only one transaction has formally been blocked by the President — a 1990 aerospace investment by a Chinese company. From the data, one would think that CFIUS has merely been a rubber stamp, approving 99.9 percent of the acquisitions. The data belie actual practice, since tough restrictions are imposed by CFIUS as a condition for approval — typically through “mitigation” or “national security” agreements. In addition, parties typically will abandon a transaction in the face of a possible rejection rather than force the President to formally block a proposed acquisition. The public relations damage to a company if a President were to block an acquisition would be substantial.

#### Congress and the public will backlash regardless of CFIUS --- scuttles deals before they reach review --- empirically proven

Byrne 06

(Matthew R. Byrne, J.D., The Ohio State University Moritz College of Law, expected 2007, Protecting National Security and Promoting Foreign Investment: Maintaining the Exon-Florio Balance, Ohio State Law Journal, 2006, http://moritzlaw.osu.edu/students/groups/oslj/files/2012/04/67.4.byrne\_.pdf)

CNOOC’s attempt to acquire Unocal occurred in the summer of 2005. After a much-publicized bidding and public relations war for control of Unocal between CNOOC and another major U.S. oil company, Chevron, Inc., CNOOC’s bid was ultimately defeated by political pressure applied by the United States Congress. 8 Many members of Congress had publicly and forcefully expressed grave reservations about the possible national security repercussions if China’s state-owned company gained control of Unocal’s oil reserves. 9 This debate led to discussion of not only national security, but also economic security. 10 Even though CFIUS never initiated a review of the CNOOC transaction, let alone gave the transaction its approval, numerous members of Congress who feared that the Committee would not block the transaction began to suggest that changes to the Exon-Florio statute were in order as a means to address these concerns. 11 This debate over changes to Exon-Florio resumed in early 2006, when DPW attempted to purchase Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Co. (“P&O”), a British firm, in a $6.8 billion deal. 12 With the acquisition of P&O, the Dubai-based company would have acquired operational control of certain terminals at six U.S. ports. 13 The revelation that CFIUS had approved the deal set off a firestorm of criticism on Capitol Hill as members and leaders of both political parties in Congress denounced the merger. 14 Though DPW and the Bush Administration agreed to conduct an additional fortyfive-day investigation under the CFIUS statute, the House Appropriations Committee voted 62–2 to effectively block the transaction, and under intense political pressure DPW agreed to transfer its U.S. ports interests to an American buyer. 15 In the midst of the ports controversy, legislation was proposed in Congress not only to block the deal, but also to make substantial changes to the Exon-Florio statute in an attempt to strengthen the CFIUS review process. 16 As of the time this Note goes to publication, committees in both the House and Senate have approved legislation that would modify the Exon-Florio statute. 17 The full bodies have not yet approved these bills, their significant differences have not been reconciled in a conference committee, and the President has not signed a bill. Therefore, these bills’ proposed changes to the statute are still mere possibilities, not certainties

Tons of restrictions on non-energy

Jackson 11

(James K. Jackson, Specialist in International Trade and Finance, Congressional Research Service, March 30, 2011, "The Exon-Florio National Security Test for Foreign Investment", http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/RL33312.pdf)

This broad definition is enhanced to some degree by other provisions of the act, which identify certain sectors of the economy that are likely candidates for consideration as components of the national critical infrastructure. These sectors include telecommunications, energy, financial services, water, transportation sectors, 28 and the “cyber and physical infrastructure services critical to maintaining the national defense, continuity of government, economic prosperity, and quality of life in the United States.” 29 The following year, Congress adopted the language in the Patriot Act on critical infrastructure into The Homeland Security Act of 2002. 30

## China Gas

### A2 Kentucky Specific (Mandel-Forbes-Wu)

#### Their Mandel ev doesn’t say US assistance key—it concludes that Chinese experts don’t know whether they’ll push gas at all

Chinese shale interests, including both government and industry players, are undecided on how to move forward and how much to focus on domestic development versus lower-cost production overseas. "I don't think they have reached a conclusion one way or the other," he said. As a result, the country pursues "a two legs walking approach -- on the one side they want to explore domestic possibilities, on the other they want to explore possibilities with lower ... prices" elsewhere. That likely means a timeline of a decade, at a minimum, before Chinese shale gas resources are well-understood and a clear path to their development emerges, and potentially as long as two decades, observers say. In the meantime, the Chinese will continue to pursue contracts for natural gas imports to satisfy the strong and growing demand.

#### Forbes doesn’t say that US experience is critical to Chinese production—just that is provides some lessons

#### She agrees with our argument: most of what is needed to develop any oil or gas play is local “know-how,”

#### Their Wu card IS NOT ABOUT GAS—it’s about clean energy

#### Recent forum proves that partnerships are already formed for Chinese development of shale

Lefebvre 9/11/2012

(Ben, energy reporter for WSJ; “ConocoPhillips Looking to Enter Shale Gas in China,” WSJ – Kurr)

SAN ANTONIO, Texas—U.S. oil company ConocoPhillips COP -1.41% is looking into expanding its China operations to include shale gas, a company executive said Tuesday. A move by ConocoPhillips would help China—a country with no commercial shale gas production in 2011—along on its ambitious target to produce 229.5 billion cubic feet a year of shale gas by 2015. ConocoPhillips, which currently holds stakes in Chinese offshore drilling projects, is "looking into expanding into shale" in the country, Mark Nelson, ConocoPhillips's vice president of commercial and sustainable development, said. Mr. Nelson spoke on the sidelines of the U.S.-China Oil & Gas Industry Forum in San Antonio, where Chinese government officials and energy executives met with their U.S. counterparts to discuss energy policy and attempt to form partnerships. During the forum, ConocoPhillips took three buses of Chinese delegates on a tour of the Eagle Ford shale region south of San Antonio, where oil rigs and hydraulic-fracturing work crews dot the drought-stricken landscape. The area's booming oil patch has been instrumental in bringing U.S. oil production to its highest level in more than a decade. China is expected to put 17 domestic shale-gas blocks up for auction in the coming weeks, hoping to entice U.S. energy firms to form partnerships with domestic companies and kickstart the sort of shale-gas revolution that the U.S. has undergone in the past decade. ConocoPhillips, Chesapeake Energy Corp., CHK -3.57% EOG Resources EOG -1.46% and others have used advances in drilling technology to unlock natural gas from shale formations throughout the U.S., sending the country's natural-gas output to 66 billion cubic feet a day in 2011, up from 56 billion cubic feet a day in 2001, according to the U.S. Energy Information Administration. Without shale gas, which accounts for about 40% of domestic natural-gas output, production of the commodity would have declined and the U.S. would have had to import massive quantities of liquefied natural gas, experts say.

**European fracking will reduce Russia’s leverage**

**Blas 12**—Commodities Editor [Javier Blas, “Russia faces challenge to gas supremacy,” Financial Times, Last updated: April 17, 2012 3:25 pm, pg. http://tinyurl.com/97e36nr

The **biggest risk** for Russia is not the US shale gas but the potential of the development of similar reserves in neighbouring **Bulgaria, Romania, Poland and Ukraine**. ¶ Eastern European countries are racing to tap shale deposits using the same technology—hydraulic fracturing, known as fracking, and horizontal drilling—used in the US gas industry. ¶ Gazprom supplies Europe with about 20 per cent of its gas needs, so the development of shale deposits in its backyard is a serious long-term threat.¶ Until now, European companies have found it difficult to renegotiate their expensive contracts with Gazprom because the lack of alternative suppliers. Over the next decade, the development of the European shale industry could give the Continent’s natural gas consumers a bit **more leverage**.

#### Downward price pressure in 2013

Rapier 12/31/12

[It's hard to imagine anyone better suited to covering the energy-investment waterfront than Robert Rapier. Robert is no armchair analyst—he has two decades of in-the-trenches experience in a wide range of fossil fuel and biofuel technologies, including refining, natural gas production, gas-to-liquids, ethanol production and butanol production. During a six-year stretch at ConocoPhillips, Robert ran a team of engineers in Scotland working on oil and gas projects in the North Sea. For two years, Robert was an efficiency expert in a Texas petrochemical plant. The process changes he implemented saved the facility $9 million a year. He later worked as the Engineering Director for a Dutch environmental-technology company and provided engineering support for a Chinese facility the company was constructing. In all, Robert has spent more than a dozen years working on liquid fuels technologies. Along the way he's picked up five patents, including one for a breakthrough way to convert ethane into ethylene (U.S. Patent 7,074,977). Robert travels the world evaluating startup energy companies for deep-pocketed investors. Robert earned his master of science in chemical engineering and a bachelor of science in chemistry and mathematics (double major) at Texas A&M University. He tells us he was "this close" to finishing his Ph.D. before he decided he was having a lot more fun making money in energy stocks. Robert consults for a number of energy projects, including biodiesel, ethanol, butanol and biomass gasification facilities. <http://www.investingdaily.com/16039/new-years-outlook> ETB]

The primary downward drivers for WTI prices in 2013 will be another year of expanding domestic oil production, and significant risk of continued weak domestic demand. The US government is almost certainly going to implement higher taxes and cut spending — perhaps substantially — and this will weaken demand for crude oil.

**Price collapse inevitable**

**Paikin 12**

Zach Paikin is a columnist for Canada's iPolitics and contributes research on international affairs to several Washington-based think tanks and institutes, April 11, 2012, “Coping in an increasingly competitive global economy”, http://www.ipolitics.ca/2012/04/11/zach-paikin-coping-with-less-revenues-in-an-increasingly-competitive-global-economy/

It gets worse. **The price of oil is about to collapse due to the increasing extraction of unconventional oil**. Roughly **250 billion barrels of oil shale** — and possibly as much as twice that figure **— have been discovered in Israel and will begin to flow into the global market** in about a decade **at an estimated $30-40 per barrel**, merely one third of the current price of oil. This gives Israel the third largest oil shale reserves in the world after the United States and China. **The U.S. has already become a net exporter of gasoline and could surpass both Russia and Saudi Arabia as the world’s largest supplier of oil in the near future** thanks to its unconventional oil reserves.¶ **The upcoming decline in the price of oil will result in the near-total collapse of non-diversified economies,** **such as the Middle East’s oil-exporting countries. For instance**, roughly 75 per cent of **Saudi Arabia**’s governmental revenue and 90 per cent of its export earnings come from the oil industry. **Natural gas doesn’t provide these Mid-East states with much solace: Canadian exports of natural gas to the United States last year alone accounted for half the rate of all natural gas exports from the Middle East and North Africa**

#### Chinese shale development key to displace their coal use—renewables cant be scaled up fast enough.

Hanger 12 (John, Special Counsel at the law firm Eckert Seamans, and former Secretary of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection and Commissioner of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, “China Gets Cracking on Fracking: The Best Environmental News Of The Year?,” Aug 14, http://johnhanger.blogspot.com/2012/08/china-gets-cracking-on-fracking-good.html)

China sits on natural gas reserves that are estimated to be 50% higher than the massive gas reserves in the USA. http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/energy/2012/08/120808-china-shale-gas/. Despite this gargantuan gas resource, coal provides China 80% of its electricity, compared to 34% in the USA, as of May 2012. Why the difference? The shale gas boom that is now more than 10 years long in the USA is just getting started in China and so the Chinese remain heavily reliant on coal to make electricity and for their total energy. Around the world, the basic energy choice is coal or gas. China is just the biggest example of this fundamental fact. China's reliance on coal means that its economic growth brings skyrocketing carbon emissions and other air pollution. Indeed, Chinese air quality is infamous around the world, and smog has been so thick that Beijing airport has been unable to land planes for short periods. As of 2011, China was responsible for 29% of the world's carbon emissions, while the US produced 16%, even though the US economy is still considerably bigger than China's. Moreover, US carbon emissions are declining to 1992 levels, but China's emissions skyrocket. Though China is building substantial new wind, solar, and nuclear generation, those investments are not enough to cut Chinese coal consumption, given economic growth that is still 7% in what some describe as an economic slowdown. Shale gas, however, could be big enough to actually displace significant amounts of coal in China. More gas in China means less mercury, soot. lead, smog, and carbon emissions. China's energy plans call for shale gas to provide 6% of its total energy as soon as 2020. If it achieves that goal, China will avoid more than 500 million tons of carbon pollution per year or about 1.5% of today's total carbon emissions.

**Mobius 9/17**

Mobius, executive chairman of the Templeton Emerging Markets Team, 9/17/2012¶ (Mark, “Personal wealth: The next stage in Russiaâ s economy,” The Edge Singapore, Lexis)

Turmoil in Europe (and the prospect of slower growth elsewhere this year) contributed to oil-price declines this spring and summer, but our team doesnâ t anticipate a dramatic fall in oil prices. **Many individual companies in Russia have been able to prosper regardless of the dips**, **because the cost of commodity production there is so low that each company can still continue to capture profits**. **We believe a worst-case oil-price scenario could already be priced into the valuations of Russian oil companies**. Of course, if there is a severe depression in Europe or the US, it would likely have a negative price impact, not just on oil but also on other commodities â " but we donâ t think thatâ s likely to happen in the near term.

\

### A2 – Bio Weapons

#### No impact to biological attack

#### Easterbrook ‘3

(Gregg, senior fellow at The New Republic, July, Wired, “We’re All Gonna Die!” http://www.wired.com/wired/archive/11.07/doomsday.html?pg=2&topic=&topic\_set=)

3. Germ warfare!Like chemical agents, biological weapons have never lived up to their billing in popular culture. Consider the 1995 medical thriller Outbreak, in which a highly contagious virus takes out entire towns. The reality is quite different. Weaponized smallpox escaped from a Soviet laboratory in Aralsk, Kazakhstan, in 1971; three people died, no epidemic followed. In 1979, weapons-grade anthrax got out of a Soviet facility in Sverdlovsk (now called Ekaterinburg); 68 died, no epidemic. The loss of life was tragic, but no greater than could have been caused by a single conventional bomb. In 1989, workers at a US government facility near Washington were accidentally exposed to Ebola virus. They walked around the community and hung out with family and friends for several days before the mistake was discovered. No one died. The fact is, evolution has spent millions of years conditioning mammals to resist germs. Consider the Black Plague. It was the worst known pathogen in history, loose in a Middle Ages society of poor public health, awful sanitation, and no antibiotics. Yet it didn’t kill off humanity. Most people who were caught in the epidemic survived. Any superbug introduced into today’s Western world would encounter top-notch public health, excellent sanitation, and an array of medicines specifically engineered to kill bioagents. Perhaps one day some aspiring Dr. Evil will invent a bug that bypasses the immune system. Because it is possible some novel superdisease could be invented, or that existing pathogens like smallpox could be genetically altered to make them more virulent (two-thirds of those who contract natural smallpox survive), biological agents are a legitimate concern. They may turn increasingly troublesome as time passes and knowledge of biotechnology becomes harder to control, allowing individuals or small groups to cook up nasty germs as readily as they can buy guns today. But no superplague has ever come close to wiping out humanity before, and it seems unlikely to happen in the future.