### OCS Yes

#### Offshore natural gas drilling is restricted on federal lands- key to sustainable supply

New 2012 (Bill New, President of New Industires, June 30, 2012, “Letters: New Leasing Plan a Step Backward,” The Advocate, http://theadvocate.com/news/opinion/3484480-123/letters-new-leasing-plan-a)

In late June, the U.S. Department of the Interior released its long-awaited outer continental shelf leasing plan, which effectively blocks offshore oil and natural gas exploration in any new areas for the next five years. Unfortunately, the proposal is a step backward in our effort to achieve energy independence. Under the plan, 85 percent of America’s OCS would be off-limits at a time when exploring every possible energy source is critical to boosting our nation’s economy and creating jobs. Instead of finding out what might be available to us in expansive unexplored areas off our coasts, we will be left to search for oil and natural gas in the same, relatively small portion of the OCS we’ve been exploring for four decades. Not only does this plan run counter to President Barack Obama’s “all of the above” strategy for energy independence, but it shows an outright disregard for the requests of the Gulf Coast states –— including Louisiana — to increase domestic oil production when the Interior Department released a draft of the plan late last year. Interestingly, the Interior Department chose to release this latest version of the OCS plan on the day the Supreme Court announced its health care decision — a thinly veiled attempt to bury it in news coverage of the ruling. But that didn’t keep right-thinking lawmakers from taking notice and working on ways to get America’s economy going using sound energy policies. U.S. Rep. Doc Hastings, R-Wash., chairman of the House Natural Resource Committee, has written legislation that sensibly revises the plan. While the Interior Department’s plan is to hold just 12 oil and gas lease sales in the Gulf of Mexico, and three in offshore Alaska from 2012 to 2017, the Hastings plan would schedule 28 lease sales total, dramatically increasing drilling opportunities off the Alaskan coast and including a sale of offshore leases in a potentially rich area off the coast of Virginia. The United States is producing more oil and natural gas than ever thanks to increased production on state-owned or private land. However, production on federal onshore land is down 14 percent in the last two years, and down 17 percent on federal offshore areas. Imagine what could happen if we enact legislation that allows us to open new offshore areas.

### Chemical Industry

#### Increased natural gas supply = chemical industry coming back

Freed et al 2012 (Josh Freed is Vice President of the Third Way Clean Energy Program, Robert Walther is Deputy Director of the Third Way Clean Energy Program, Jeremy Twitchell is a former intern for the Third Way Clean Energy Program, “Keeping it affordable, stable, and accessible,” October/November 2012?, http://content.thirdway.org/publications/614/Third\_Way\_Report\_-\_American\_Shale\_Gas\_Keeping\_it\_Affordable\_Stable\_and\_Accessible.pdf)

Recent developments suggest the era of price volatility may be giving way to a period of price stability for natural gas. Analysts at Goldman Sachs and Jepsen are returning scenarios that show natural gas supply and demand balancing in the U.S., easing the price to the $4–$6 range for a prolonged period.44 The Energy Information Administration (EIA) went so far as to suggest prices could remain between $4 and $6 for at least another decade.45 And the manufacturing sector that was so badly burned by natural gas volatility that it sent jobs and capacity overseas is now coming back. Companies like Dow and DuPont, which rely on natural gas as a feedstock for chemical production and are extremely price sensitive, are moving facilities back to the U.S. or building new facilities to take advantage of persistent, low natural gas prices. As Dow CEO Andrew Liveris explained, “For the first time in over a decade, U.S. natural gas prices are affordable and relatively stable.”46

### Bridge

#### Natural gas key to renewables- solves barriers like intermittency

Podesta and Wirth 2009 (John Podesta, President and CEO of the Center for American Progress, and Timothy E. Wirth, steering committee for Energy Future Coalition and former U.S. senator from Colorado, August 10, 2009, “Natural Gas: A Bridge Fuel for the 21st Century,” Center for American Progress, http://goo.gl/Aw0Ob)

The recent development of technology that enables the affordable development of significant shale gas reserves in the lower 48 states could fundamentally alter the U.S. energy system and play a larger role in helping to more rapidly and cost-effectively speed the transition to a low-carbon economy and reduce global warming pollution. The Energy Information Administration estimates that the United States has approximately 1,770 trillion cubic feet (tcf) of technically recoverable gas, including 238 tcf of proven reserves. The Potential Gas Committee estimates total U.S. gas resources at 2,074 tcf. It is estimated that “technically recoverable unconventional gas” including shale gas accounts for nearly two-thirds of American onshore gas resources. At the current production rates, “the current recoverable resource estimate provides enough natural gas to supply the U.S. for the next 90 years.” These gas findings in Arkansas, Louisiana, Michigan, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas, and elsewhere have increased proven reserves of U.S. natural gas by 13 percent, and driven potential reserves even higher. Natural gas is “by the far the cleanest burning” fossil fuel, and produces slightly more than one-fifth of all U.S. energy. Oil and coal combined comprise about two thirds of all energy consumption. Their combustion produces substantially more global warming and other conventional pollution than natural gas. Combusting natural gas to make electricity produces about half of the global warming pollution of coal, and one-third of petroleum burned in cars. Given its domestic abundance and its lower pollutant levels, natural gas should play a larger role in our energy mix. Enhancing the role of natural gas is valuable for many reasons. Tens of gigawatts of highly efficient natural gas generation capacity were installed over the past two decades but only about two-fifths of this capacity is used at any given time. At little to no additional cost for infrastructure, natural gas generation can be easily substituted for existing coal-fired capacity without any new plant or transmission construction. In some parts of the country, a CO2 price of as little as $7 to $14 per ton would provide sufficient incentive to give priority to dispatch of gas-fired electricity into the grid over that of coal. Natural gas can serve as a bridge fuel to a low-carbon, sustainable energy future. In particular, natural gas can provide the critical low-carbon “firming” or back-up fuel that can enable deep market penetration of both wind power and concentrated solar thermal power. The marriage of gas and renewable energy in the form of hybrid wind-gas and solargas plants addresses the issue of renewable intermittency, greatly enabling low-cost/low emissions power generation.

### Barnhizer

#### Human nature

Barnhizer 2006 (David Barnhizer, Professor of Law at Ohio State University, Articles Editor of the Ohio State Law Journal and then served as a Reginald Heber Smith Community Lawyer Fellow in Colorado Springs Legal Services Office, a Ford Urban Law Fellow, and a Clinical Teaching Fellow at the Harvard Law School, Senior Advisor to the International Program of the Natural Resources Defense Council, a Senior Fellow for Earth Summit Watch, and General Counsel for the Shrimp Tribunal. He has served as Executive Director of The Year 2000 Committee, 2006 “waking from sustainability’s “impossible dream”” Georgetown environmental law review)

Devotees of sustainability pin their hopes on an awakening by an enlightened populace that will rise up and insist that business and government behave in ways that reflect the idea that "[a] sustainable society is one that can persist over generations, one that is far-seeing enough, flexible enough, and wise enough not to undermine either its physical or its social systems of support."81 This awakening is not going to happen. There will never be a populist revolution in the way humans value the environment, social justice, and other matters of moral consequence. We frequently "talk the talk," but rarely "walk the walk."82 This discrepancy is partly an individual failure, but it is even more a result of the powerful forces that operate within our culture. Residents of Western cultures are shaped by the system in which they live. They will never possess either the clarity of agenda or the political will essential to a coherent and coordinated shift in behavior due to a combination of ignorance, greed, sloth, and inundation by political and consumerist propaganda. This combination means there will be no values shift welling up from the people and demanding the transformation of our systems of production and resource use.

#### Elite interests short-term focus

Barnhizer 2006 David Barnhizer (Professor of Law at Ohio State University, Articles Editor of the Ohio State Law Journal and then served as a Reginald Heber Smith Community Lawyer Fellow in Colorado Springs Legal Services Office, a Ford Urban Law Fellow, and a Clinical Teaching Fellow at the Harvard Law School, Senior Advisor to the International Program of the Natural Resources Defense Council, a Senior Fellow for Earth Summit Watch, and General Counsel for the Shrimp Tribunal. He has served as Executive Director of The Year 2000 Committee) 2006 “waking from sustainability’s “impossible dream”” Georgetown environmental law review

My point should not be taken as a lack of concern with the kinds of conditions described by those who warn about impending catastrophes. We face a wrenching future, just as billions of people have been forced to deal with a wrenching past in terms of the tenuous quality of life they endure on a daily basis. The concern of this essay is with how we can best deal with what is within our power to influence or change and how to achieve the best possible outcomes within the context of the existing systems available to us. Because the perspectives of our leaders are short-term, and conditions appear relatively normal almost to the moment at which the so-called "chaos effects" manifest and the systems on which we rely fall apart, it is difficult to the point of improbability to mobilize the political power to make changes at an early enough point where the consequences of our actions can be avoided entirely or at least mitigated significantly.53 This situation is made more difficult by the fact that many key figures and institutions are benefiting from the existing arrangements. Even though their actions are ultimately responsible for harm to others, they refuse to surrender what they consider their rightful gains. Not only do they seek to reap their economic and political profits, they undermine others' efforts to avoid the impending harm. Those who warn of collapse and disaster are accused of being doomsayers and Cassandras.

### Security

#### No impact to securitization

Gray 2007 (Colin S. Gray, Professor of International Politics and Strategic Studies at the University of Reading, July 2007, “THE IMPLICATIONS OF PREEMPTIVE AND PREVENTIVE WAR DOCTRINES: A RECONSIDERATION,” http://www.ciaonet.org/wps/ssi10561/ssi10561.pdf)

7. A policy that favors preventive warfare expresses a futile quest for absolute security. It could do so. Most controversial policies contain within them the possibility of misuse. In the hands of a paranoid or boundlessly ambitious political leader, prevention could be a policy for endless warfare. However, the American political system, with its checks and balances, was designed explicitly for the purpose of constraining the executive from excessive folly. Both the Vietnam and the contemporary Iraqi experiences reveal clearly that although the conduct of war is an executive prerogative, in practice that authority is disciplined by public attitudes. Clausewitz made this point superbly with his designation of the passion, the sentiments, of the people as a vital component of his trinitarian theory of war.51 It is true to claim that power can be, and indeed is often, abused, both personally and nationally. It is possible that a state could acquire a taste for the apparent swift decisiveness of preventive warfare and overuse the option. One might argue that the easy success achieved against Taliban Afghanistan in 2001, provided fuel for the urge to seek a similarly rapid success against Saddam Hussein’s Iraq. In other words, the delights of military success can be habit forming.¶ On balance, claim seven is not persuasive, though it certainly contains a germ of truth. A country with unmatched wealth and power, unused to physical inse- curity at home—notwithstanding 42 years of nuclear danger, and a high level of gun crime—is vulnerable to demands for policies that supposedly can restore security. But we ought not to endorse the argument that the United States should eschew the preventive war option because it could lead to a futile, endless search for absolute security. One might as well argue that the United States should adopt a defense policy and develop capabilities shaped strictly for homeland security approached in a narrowly geographical sense. Since a president might misuse a military instrument that had a global reach, why not deny the White House even the possibility of such misuse? In other words, constrain policy ends by limiting policy’s military means.¶ This argument has circulated for many decades and, it must be admitted, it does have a certain elementary logic. It is the opinion of this enquiry, however, that the claim that a policy which includes the preventive option might lead to a search for total security is not at all convincing. Of course, folly in high places is always possible, which is one of the many reasons why popular democracy is the superior form of government. It would be absurd to permit the fear of a futile and dangerous quest for absolute security to preclude prevention as a policy option. Despite its absurdity, this rhetorical charge against prevention is a stock favorite among prevention’s critics. It should be recognized and dismissed for what it is, a debating point with little pragmatic merit. And strategy, though not always policy, must be nothing if not pragmatic.¶ We turn now to the quintessentially practical realm of strategy. The next section examines tersely the feasibility of developing a strategic theory of preventive war.