### Arctic

#### Arctic drilling is non-unique but won’t continue

Lavelle 3/2 (Marianne Lavelle, “Shell Suspends Arctic Drilling for 2013,” Energy Collective, http://theenergycollective.com/cnunez/192801/shell-suspends-arctic-drilling-plan-2013)

The troubles that roiled Shell’s rig, the Kulluk, off the coast of Alaska this past winter will reverberate through the summer; the oil company announced it would not seek to drill in U.S. Arctic waters in 2013. (Related: “In Kulluk’s Wake, Deeper Debate Roils on Arctic Drilling“)¶ “We’ve made progress in Alaska, but this is a long-term programme that we are pursuing in a safe and measured way,” said Marvin Odum, director of Shell’s Upstream Americas division. “Our decision to pause in 2013 will give us time to ensure the readiness of all our equipment and people following the drilling season in 2012.”¶ Shell never drilled into oil-bearing formations in the Arctic last year, but completed top-hole drilling on two wells in the Beaufort and Chukchi seas, marking the industry’s return to offshore drilling in the Alaskan Arctic after more than a decade. (Related: “Ice-Breaking: U.S. Oil Drilling Starts as Nations Mull Changed Arctic“) Shell noted the drilling was completed safely, with no serious injuries or environmental impact.

#### Arctic competition inevitable--- drilling solves independent of the coast guard

Talmadge 2012 (Eric Talmadge, AP, Huffington Post, “Arctic Climate Change Opening Region To New Military Activity’, 4/16, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/04/16/arctic-climate-change-military-activity\_n\_1427565.html)

To the world's military leaders, the debate over climate change is long over. They are preparing for a new kind of Cold War in the Arctic, anticipating that rising temperatures there will open up a treasure trove of resources, long-dreamed-of sea lanes and a slew of potential conflicts. By Arctic standards, the region is already buzzing with military activity, and experts believe that will increase significantly in the years ahead. Last month, Norway wrapped up one of the largest Arctic maneuvers ever — Exercise Cold Response — with 16,300 troops from 14 countries training on the ice for everything from high intensity warfare to terror threats. Attesting to the harsh conditions, five Norwegian troops were killed when their C-130 Hercules aircraft crashed near the summit of Kebnekaise, Sweden's highest mountain. The U.S., Canada and Denmark held major exercises two months ago, and in an unprecedented move, the military chiefs of the eight main Arctic powers — Canada, the U.S., Russia, Iceland, Denmark, Sweden, Norway and Finland — gathered at a Canadian military base last week to specifically discuss regional security issues. None of this means a shooting war is likely at the North Pole any time soon. But as the number of workers and ships increases in the High North to exploit oil and gas reserves, so will the need for policing, border patrols and — if push comes to shove — military muscle to enforce rival claims. The U.S. Geological Survey estimates that 13 percent of the world's undiscovered oil and 30 percent of its untapped natural gas is in the Arctic. Shipping lanes could be regularly open across the Arctic by 2030 as rising temperatures continue to melt the sea ice, according to a National Research Council analysis commissioned by the U.S. Navy last year. What countries should do about climate change remains a heated political debate. But that has not stopped north-looking militaries from moving ahead with strategies that assume current trends will continue. Russia, Canada and the United States have the biggest stakes in the Arctic. With its military budget stretched thin by Iraq, Afghanistan and more pressing issues elsewhere, the United States has been something of a reluctant northern power, though its nuclear-powered submarine fleet, which can navigate for months underwater and below the ice cap, remains second to none. Russia — one-third of which lies within the Arctic Circle — has been the most aggressive in establishing itself as the emerging region's superpower. Rob Huebert, an associate political science professor at the University of Calgary in Canada, said Russia has recovered enough from its economic troubles of the 1990s to significantly rebuild its Arctic military capabilities, which were a key to the overall Cold War strategy of the Soviet Union, and has increased its bomber patrols and submarine activity. He said that has in turn led other Arctic countries — Norway, Denmark and Canada — to resume regional military exercises that they had abandoned or cut back on after the Soviet collapse. Even non-Arctic nations such as France have expressed interest in deploying their militaries to the Arctic. "We have an entire ocean region that had previously been closed to the world now opening up," Huebert said. "There are numerous factors now coming together that are mutually reinforcing themselves, causing a buildup of military capabilities in the region. This is only going to increase as time goes on." Noting that the Arctic is warming twice as fast as the rest of the globe, the U.S. Navy in 2009 announced a beefed-up Arctic Roadmap by its own task force on climate change that called for a three-stage strategy to increase readiness, build cooperative relations with Arctic nations and identify areas of potential conflict. "We want to maintain our edge up there," said Cmdr. Ian Johnson, the captain of the USS Connecticut, which is one of the U.S. Navy's most Arctic-capable nuclear submarines and was deployed to the North Pole last year. "Our interest in the Arctic has never really waned. It remains very important." But the U.S. remains ill-equipped for large-scale Arctic missions, according to a simulation conducted by the U.S. Naval War College. A summary released last month found the Navy is "inadequately prepared to conduct sustained maritime operations in the Arctic" because it lacks ships able to operate in or near Arctic ice, support facilities and adequate communications. "The findings indicate the Navy is entering a new realm in the Arctic," said Walter Berbrick, a War College professor who participated in the simulation. "Instead of other nations relying on the U.S. Navy for capabilities and resources, sustained operations in the Arctic region will require the Navy to rely on other nations for capabilities and resources." He added that although the U.S. nuclear submarine fleet is a major asset, the Navy has severe gaps elsewhere — it doesn't have any icebreakers, for example. The only one in operation belongs to the Coast Guard. The U.S. is currently mulling whether to add more icebreakers.

#### Coast Guard key to contain

Holmes 3/15 (James Holmes, professor of strategy at the Naval War College, March 15, 2013, “America Needs a Coast Guard That Can Fight,” Foreign Policy, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/03/15/america\_needs\_a\_coast\_guard\_that\_can\_fight)

The Navy and Marine Corps, then, will simply have too few ships, aircraft, and armaments to dedicate to regions of secondary importance. Suitably bulked up, and crewed by mariners who see themselves as warriors as well as the nation's 9-1-1 force, the Coast Guard would represent the go-to guarantor of security off the United States' northern ramparts. Heavy Navy and Marine forces would provide a backstop should serious conflict erupt. But Coast Guard commanders would have to hold their own against rival forces until reinforcements arrived.¶ So how's that going to work? Polar ventures may require the Coast Guard to square off against a serious military competitor, not just against lawbreakers and the elements. But pummeling enemy fleets, projecting power onto foreign shores, warding off ballistic missiles -- business as usual for the Navy/Marine Corps team -- are pursuits remote from the Coast Guard's everyday duties. It may even behoove the service to restore antisubmarine and surface-warfare capabilities dismantled at the Cold War's end. The Coast Guard fleet need not be a U.S. Navy in miniature, built to rule the waves. But the long arm of U.S. strategy needs battle capacity -- not just the light gunnery that now festoons American cutters.

### Shale

#### Berman is the man

DeMelle 2012 (Brendan DeMelle, Executive Director, DeSmogBlog.com, August 1, 2012, “A 'War on Shale Gas'?,” Huffington Post, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/brendan-demelle/a-war-on-shale-gas\_b\_1728979.html)

One of the first people to raise questions about shale gas’s potential was Arthur Berman, a former Amoco geologist who, at the time, was a long-time contributing editor for an industry magazine called World Oil.¶ But when Berman raised important questions about the ways the shale gas industry calculated their reserves, his column was cancelled by the magazine -- amidst pressure from shale gas companies like Petrohawk. Mr. Berman resigned in protest, and within a few days, his editor, Perry Fischer, was fired. ¶ The industry denied that it was responsible -- “It is doubtful that his termination was a direct result of comments made by Petrohawk,” the company’s Investor Relations Vice President Joan Dunlap told a Houston Chronicle reporter at the time -- but those involved had something different to say.¶ “Let me be clear: The decision to pull Art's column was due to pressure from these two companies,” Fischer later wrote.¶ Despite this, Arthur Berman was undeterred. He has gone on to become a persistent thorn in the industry’s side, and the issues he’s raised have been picked up by countless publications ranging from the staid Financial Times, trade publications like Platts and mass media outlets like CNN. ¶ As Mr. Berman has become more prominent, he has again found himself a target for mudslinging by the industry. This was on display in the wake of a New York Times report last year that cited Mr. Berman’s analysis.¶ “And also, to say that he, a handful of unnamed critics of the industry, and a goat cheese farmer from Fort Worth, and a third-tier geologist who considers himself a reservoir engineer, that somehow they know more about the shale gas revolution in America than companies that have combined market caps of almost $2 trillion and have spent hundreds of billions of dollars to develop these new resources, I mean, it's ludicrous.”¶ That's how Aubrey McClendon, CEO of Chesapeake Energy, described the New York Times' coverage on Mad Money on June 28, 2011, apparently referring to reporter Ian Urbina and the speakers in emails he published, shale gas skeptic and federal reserve board advisory member Deborah Rogers, and Art Berman, the so-called “third-tier geologist.”¶ Jim Cramer, the show’s host, also questioned Berman's and the Times’ credibility, saying: “If we're being duped by the nat gas industry, as this article suggests, then how come Exxon Mobil spent 31 billion to buy nat gas giant XTO? Were they fooled, too?”¶ It’s worth noting that Art Berman’s analysis is looking highly prescient these days. Official government estimates for shale gas have been slashed significantly. And the most basic element of his thesis -- that caution is in order because it’s too early to know for sure how much and how long fracked wells will produce -- has even been echoed by an unexpected source: former CEO of ExxonMobil Lee Raymond.¶ “It’s going to be a little while before people are really confident that there is going to be a sufficient amount of gas for 30 years to support the construction of an LNG plant,” Mr. Raymond told Bloomberg News during a February interview. “I’m frankly not sure that we have enough experience with shale gas to make the kind of judgment you’d have to make.”

### 2AC Oceans

#### Plan specifies “conventional gas” production- that excludes methane hydrates

Energy Insider 2007 (Energy Insider, “The Rise of Unconventional Gas”, 2007, http://www.enerdynamics.com/documents/Insider91807\_000.pdf)

What is Unconventional Gas? Natural gas is formed over thousands of years by the combination of pressure and heat on organic material trapped in rock. After natural gas is formed, the earth’s pressure often pushes the gas upward through small holes and cracks in rock until it reaches a layer of impermeable rock where the gas becomes trapped. It sits there in a “pool” until it is released from the ground by a drill bit providing a path to the surface. This is what we call conventional gas, the resource upon which our gas industry was built. But not all gas is found in these formations. In fact, there are a number of forms of unconventional gas that were created in formations without the permeability necessary to allow migration. These include: • Tight Sands Gas – formed in sandstone or carbonate (called tight gas sands) with low permeability which prevents the gas from flowing naturally. • Coalbed Methane (CBM) – formed in coal deposits and adsorbed4 by coal particles. • Shale Gas – formed in fine-grained shale rock (called gas shales) with low permeability in which gas has been adsorbed by clay particles or is held within minute pores and microfractures. • Methane Hydrates – a crystalline combination of natural gas and water, formed at low temperature and high pressure in places such as under the oceans and permafrost.

#### Regs check the impact

BOEM 2011 (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, “Proposed Outer Continental Shelf Oil & Gas Leasing Program 2012-2017”, November, <http://www.boem.gov/uploadedFiles/Proposed_OCS_Oil_Gas_Lease_Program_2012-2017.pdf>)

Offshore Drilling Safety, Spill Preparedness and the Lessons of Deepwater Horizon The Deepwater Horizon blowout and oil spill exposed the overconfidence in the safety of offshore drilling that had developed over time. Because there had not been a major blowout or drilling accident in U.S. waters in decades, both government and industry underestimated the well control issues posed by offshore drilling, particularly in deep and ultra-deepwater. This Proposed Program is informed by both our better understanding of the risks posed by offshore drilling and the substantial measures that have been implemented since the Deepwater Horizon event to address and reduce those risks. Immediately after Deepwater Horizon, the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement (BOEMRE) – with its functions now divided between BOEM and the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement (BSEE) – imposed heightened standards for offshore drilling operations, which included new requirements for well design and integrity and the testing and maintenance of blowout preventers (BOPs). The BOEMRE also introduced, for the first time in U.S. waters, new performance-based standards that require operators to develop Safety and Environmental Management Systems programs that, among other things, systematically and thoroughly evaluate the hazards involved with offshore facilities and operations and implement measures to address those hazards. These new and heightened standards are designed to help prevent a loss of well control or a spill from happening. While these measures have made offshore drilling safer, the risk of an accident cannot be eliminated and government and industry must be prepared in the event of a loss of well control or a spill. After Deepwater Horizon, BOEMRE issued new guidance to operators that revised the methodology for calculating the worst case discharge potential of individual wells to provide more accurate estimates of true worst case scenarios. Operators must submit Oil Spill Response Plans that demonstrate sufficient response capacity to address these revised worst case discharge estimates, as well as other enhancements based on experience with the response to Deepwater Horizon. Most significantly, unlike prior to Deepwater Horizon, operators using subsea BOPs or drilling from a floating facility must demonstrate in advance that they have access to and can deploy an effective subsea containment system in the event of a loss of well control. This includes systems, such as a capping stack, to shut in the well and, if necessary, to capture and contain flow from a well. Industry has developed these systems, and they are available for every covered well in the Gulf of Mexico that has been permitted since Deepwater Horizon. xi The government’s oversight of offshore oil and gas operations has also undergone broad and substantial reforms. Prior to Deepwater Horizon, the Minerals Management Service (MMS) had jurisdiction over offshore activities, was severely under-resourced, and saddled with multiple, sometimes conflicting missions that included responsibility for leasing and environmental reviews, safety oversight, and the collection of revenue from offshore operations. Soon after the Deepwater Horizon explosion, the Secretary of the Interior abolished MMS. In its place, the Secretary established BOEMRE and announced that the DOI’s management of OCS resources and oversight of offshore energy activity would be reorganized into three new agencies – BOEM, BSEE, and the Office of Natural Resources Revenue (ONRR). That reorganization is now complete, and three strong, independent agencies with clear and distinct missions have been established to manage and oversee safe and environmentally responsible offshore activity that helps to meet the Nation’s energy needs and provides a fair return to the public. The BOEM is charged with managing the nation’s offshore resources in a balanced way that promotes prompt and environmentally responsible development. The BSEE is a safety authority responsible for enforcing safety and environmental protection standards. Finally, ONRR is responsible for collecting the public’s share of revenue from resource development on public lands and waters. These new agencies will provide more effective and appropriately balanced management and oversight of the nation’s offshore oil and gas resources.

### 2AC CP- Idle Leases

#### Doesn’t solve the shipbuilding internal link--- they’ve already investigated these areas if they’ve already bought the lease---

#### The aff is necessary- “Use it or lose it” is nonsense

Millican 2012 (Robin Millican, Director of Federal Affairs at the Institute for Energy Research, October 26, 2012, “Rep. Markey’s Many Myths: Report Much Ado About Nothing ,” http://www.instituteforenergyresearch.org/2012/10/26/rep-markeys-many-myths-democrats-report-much-ado-about-nothing/)

MARKEY’s MYTH: We don’t need to open more areas for exploration, because companies already have enough leases.¶ FACT: Just because a lease is bought, doesn’t mean it will yield oil and gas.¶ Companies often purchase leases for millions of dollars without knowing what their full resource potential will be. It is usually only after seismic mapping and exploratory drilling that the company is able to determine whether a commercial amount of oil and gas may be present. Even in these circumstances, past data shows that companies have drilled more wells that have no oil or gas than wells that do.¶ As such, odds favor purchasing larger quantities of leases that hopefully result in one discovery with a big payoff. The graph below illustrates this:¶ FACT: The government leases less than 2.2 percent of federal offshore areas [1] and less than 6 percent of federal onshore lands for oil and natural gas production.[2]¶ FACT: Many of the most energy-rich lands the federal government owns are off-limits to domestic energy production.¶ 85% of the Outer Continental Shelf, which is estimated to hold 86 billion barrels of oil, was placed off-limits under the Department of Interior’s offshore drilling plan for 2012-2017.[3]¶ Offshore Alaska has about 24 billion barrels of oil in unleased federal waters.[4]¶ Under a 2011 Department of Interior directive, 75 percent of Western oil shale under federal lands was closed off to commercial energy development. There is an estimated 1.4 trillion barrels of Western oil shale, almost 70 percent of which is under federal lands.[5]¶ MARKEY’s MYTH: We need a “Use it or Lose It” policy to spur companies to produce, and we should penalize companies for sitting idle on leases.¶ FACT: A “Use it or Lose It” policy already exists (see below). And if the companies do not produce within the lease term, they must relinquish the lease and do not recover the millions—or billions—they spent to acquire the lease. ¶ The Mineral Leasing Act (for onshore production): Section 17(e) stipulates that an oil company must have a producing well within 10 years or surrender the leases. Source: 30 U.S.C. 226(e)¶ The Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act: (for offshore production): Stipulates that an oil company must produce energy between 5 to 10 years (in the government’s discretion) or surrender the lease. Source: 43 U.S.C. 1337(b)¶ FACT: The Obama administration has already increased penalties on producers for “idle” offshore leases. ¶ Under new Department of Interior policies, rental rates escalate over time, the minimum required bid in offshore lease auctions was nearly tripled, and lease times for drilling in shallower water were shortened.[6]¶ MARKEY’s MYTH: Half of deepwater leases in the Gulf of Mexico have been idle for 5 years or more.¶ FACT: The term “idle” erroneously suggests that nothing is being done with the leases.¶ In cases where an exploration has been submitted but not yet approved by the federal government, those leases are still listed as “idle.” The same goes for leases that are undergoing seismic testing or awaiting the arrival of drilling equipment.¶ FACT: It takes a year on average to obtain approval for an exploration plan.¶ As of May 2012, the average wait time between the time an exploration plan for offshore drilling is submitted and the time it is approved is 367 days (160 days on average for an application to be “deemed submitted” and 207 on average for a plan to be approved).[7]¶ FACT: Each offshore lease takes years and millions or billions of dollars to fully develop.¶ Companies must undertake a lengthy and costly process involving geological mapping, testing, and drilling exploratory wells before production can begin.[8] This process can also be significantly delayed by environmental litigation.¶ MARKEY’s MYTH: Idle leases covering more than 20 million acres in the Gulf of Mexico are estimated to hold as much at 18 billion barrels of oil—therefore, each lease should be produced on.¶ FACT: Each lease doesn’t contain a uniform amount of oil and gas.¶ According to the National Ocean Industries Association, Interior seems to be arguing that each and every lease block holds the same potential for oil and natural gas production. In reality, oil and gas reservoirs are not consistently, evenly distributed under every square mile of the Gulf—or any area—and they do not conform to man-made partitions. As such, companies do not drill wells in every lease block that is offered. NOIA reinforces this point, saying, “commanding oil and gas companies to drill a well in every lease block would not necessarily lead to greater production overall; it would only create a lot of unnecessary dry wells.”[9]

#### CP fails, either:

#### Reducing restrictions key to develop idle leases

Milito 2011 (Erik Milito, writer for Energy Tomorrow, March 16, 2011, “The ‘Use It or Lose It’ Deception,” http://energytomorrow.org/blog/the-use-it-or-lose-it-deception#/type/all)

When it comes to crafting a sensible energy policy, once again politics carry the day. This notion of "use it or lose it" is a stale, invalid argument and a political distraction to rising gasoline prices combined with the fact that we're not doing enough in the Gulf to use our own resources and put Americans back to work. Let's get back on track with some facts:¶ The administration itself is preventing the industry from developing these leases because it is not issuing permits to drill or conduct seismic studies of these leases. They want the industry to develop the leases it already possesses, but they won't grant the permits to do so.¶ Companies pay millions of dollars to acquire these leases (each lease costs at least $250,000 and some have gone for more than $100,000,000), further fees for renting the leases and the leases have a finite term. If a company does not produce oil or gas from a lease then they are required to return it to the government. In other words "use it or lose it" is already the law.¶ These are very successful and sophisticated companies that are engaged in this business and it makes no logical sense for companies to pay millions of dollars to purchase leases, sit on them for 10 years, and then give them back to the government. They make money by supplying the American economy with the energy it needs to grow, not from sitting on assets. The level of capital expenditures by the industry to develop these leases demonstrates their commitment to find oil and gas. For example, the industry spent more than $37 billion (with a B) in capital expenditures to develop deep water Gulf leases issued between 1996 and 2000. In addition they paid more than $4 billion (with a B) in bonus bids to obtain those leases in the first place. With that level of investment, it is hard to argue that the industry is not working hard to develop the leases it owns.

#### OR there just isn’t any gas there

Milito 2011 (Erik Milito, writer for Energy Tomorrow, March 16, 2011, “The ‘Use It or Lose It’ Deception,” http://energytomorrow.org/blog/the-use-it-or-lose-it-deception#/type/all)

Finally, these arguments simply ignore the basics of the oil and natural gas industry. Companies purchase leases for the right to explore for the resources. You don't know if a lease actually contains oil or natural gas until you move forward and drill an exploratory well. Companies purchase a large portfolio of leases to give them the greatest opportunity to find oil and natural gas. They work hard to survey and study all of their leases with the hope that they can narrow the list down to a subset that have the best likelihood of actually containing oil or natural gas. However, it is not uncommon for a company to spend $100 million to drill a well and find no oil or natural gas. In fact, companies drill more wells that have no oil or natural gas than wells that actually do.

#### Links to politics

Geman 2011 (Andrew Restuccia and Ben Geman, March 24, 2011, “OVERNIGHT ENERGY: Battle over 'use it or lose it' heats up,” The Hill, http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/151801-overnight-energy)

State of Play: Republicans and the oil industry ramped up their campaign Thursday to undercut Democratic proposals that pressure oil companies to tap their unused leases. The attacks come amid a White House-ordered federal review of the matter.¶ Democratic bills dubbed "use it or lose it" are emerging as a major counterpoint to Republican calls for wider oil-and-gas drilling. Democrats argue companies should tap their unused leases before drilling in new territory, and President Obama this month demanded a quick Interior Department review of unused leases.¶ But Republicans sought to discredit "use it or lose it" proposals Thursday.¶ “We won’t reduce our dependence on foreign oil if politicians in Washington remain dependent on hollow talking points like ‘use it or lose it,'" House Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) said in a statement. “Americans are looking for real solutions and a sustained commitment to expanding American energy production that will lower gas prices and create more jobs, which is what our American Energy Initiative is all about.”

### CP

#### Diversification is key

ICAF 2012 (Industrial College of the Armed Forces, Spring 2012, Industry Study, Final Report on the Shipbuilding Industry, http://www.ndu.edu/es/programs/academic/industry/reports/2012/pdf/es-is-report-shipbuilding-2012.pdf)

It is in the best interest of naval shipyards to diversify into the commercial market to weather the fluctuations in government procurement. By expanding the use of shipbuilding capability preservation agreements, naval shipyards can compete for commercial work, increasing overall efficiency and deepening relationships with the supply base. As a result, the cost of commercial ship construction will decrease. “Once the low-end market is stable, it is the natural tendency of businesses to look up-market for their expansion. Over time, the low- overhead processes developed for the low-end market are shared with high-end manufacturers creating a vibrant industrial base capable of meeting the need of a full spectrum of customers.”26 As a specific example, NASSCO built product carriers for U.S. Shipping Partners L.P. and American Petroleum Tankers while simultaneously building the Lewis and Clark class T-AKE, dry cargo/ammunition ship. The Shipbuilding Capability Preservation Agreement (SCPA) is designed to help shipyards like NASSCO obtain work from both private and public sectors. NASSCO demonstrates versatility in building ships for commercial and government customers, providing cash flow continuity. By seeking commercial customers during periods of low Navy demand, NASSCO has been able to prevent workload and cash flow fluctuations.

### 2AC Politics Link Uniqueness

#### Moniz nomination thumps

Drajem 3/21 (Mark Drajem, “Obama Energy Pick’s Gas Study Faulted Over Industry Ties,” Bloomberg, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-03-21/obama-energy-nominee-s-mit-gas-study-faulted-over-industry-ties.html)

President Barack Obama’s nominee for energy secretary is drawing criticism for leading a study that minimized risks of natural gas while failing to disclose that some of its researchers had financial ties to the industry.¶ The nominee, Ernest Moniz, is head of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology’s Energy Institute, which issued a report in 2011 that said the environmental risks of increased drilling and production “are challenging but manageable.”¶ A report co-author had already agreed to take a position with Talisman Energy Inc (TLM). when the report was released. Another researcher was on the board of Cheniere Energy Inc. (LNG), which is building an export facility for liquefied natural gas.¶ “The public should have been informed that MIT’s natural gas study was written by representatives of the oil and gas industry,” said Kevin Connor, director of the Public Accountability Initiative, a research group in Buffalo, New York, that is critical of the use of hydraulic fracturing for gas and compiled the details of the industry ties. “Aren’t there academics there not on the payroll of gas companies?”¶ It’s unlikely this disclosure will harm Moniz’s chances of confirmation. Obama has also supported development of natural gas through fracking, and the Energy Department doesn’t regulate the practice. That is left to the Environmental Protection Agency and Interior Department.¶ White House¶ “The president has made clear that natural gas has a central role to play in our nation’s energy future,” Clark Stevens, a White House spokesman, said in an e-mail. “Dr. Moniz’s work at MIT demonstrates his ability to work collaboratively with a wide spectrum of stakeholders on a broad range of energy issues.”¶ The Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee scheduled a hearing on Moniz’s nomination for April 9.¶ The accountability group’s report “Industry Partner or Industry Puppet?” released this week also criticized Moniz for not disclosing in the report that he was on the board of a company that provided consulting to gas utilities.¶ The Buffalo group has previously targeted what it calls biased academic studies.¶ It released an investigation last year on the University of Texas Energy Institute and its report on fracking. The school withdrew the study and imposed ethics guidelines on researchers after it was shown that the primary author didn’t disclose that he sat on the board of a gas driller.¶ Bridge Fuel¶ While groups such as the Environmental Defense Fund have backed Moniz, some environmental groups have criticized his nomination because he supports natural gas as a so-called bridge fuel from carbon-intensive coal to cleaner energy such as solar. Some local activists say tapping that gas by fracking, in which water, sand and chemicals are shot underground, causes air and water contamination.¶ Moniz has said there are risks, and industry disclosure and government regulation can contain them. “Research and regulation, both state and federal, are needed to minimize the environmental consequences,” the MIT researchers said in their report.¶ MIT’s Energy Institute discloses that it is sponsored by companies such as BP Plc (BP/), Saudi Aramco and Duke Energy Corp (DUK)., as well as foundations. When it published its Future of Natural Gas report in 2011, it disclosed the groups and companies that funded that study, including the Clean Skies Foundation, which backs natural gas and has close ties to Chesapeake Energy Corp (CHK).

#### Costs capital

Raju 2013 (Manu Raju, January 18, 2013, “Senate vs. President Obama over Cabinet,” Politico, http://www.politico.com/story/2013/01/lessons-learned-obama-takes-fights-to-congress-85936.html)

President Barack Obama is headed into battle with the Senate over his choices for top administration jobs — and it’s not just about Chuck Hagel, his controversial nominee for defense secretary.¶ Jack Lew, the White House chief of staff and front-runner to become Obama’s treasury secretary, has a contentious relationship with some Senate Republicans who are scoffing at reports that he’s poised to get the nomination for one of the most important posts in government. Whoever Obama chooses to run the Environmental Protection Agency or the Energy Department is certain to run into a buzz saw of opposition from Republicans angry at the administration’s environmental policies.¶ Several looming judicial nominations, including for the crucial D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals, are already giving the GOP fits. And senior Republicans are seeking to delay the nomination of John Brennan to head the CIA until their questions are answered over the Benghazi attacks and accusations that the administration leaked classified information to boost the president’s political standing.¶ The opening act of the new Congress was supposed to be about an emboldened president putting all his political muscle into reforming the country’s immigration system, gun policies and budget. But instead, Obama appears likely to be dragged into a grinding personnel fight where he’ll have to expend significant political capital to fill out his Cabinet.¶ With an expanded Democratic majority in the Senate, Obama could very well see all of his nominees confirmed. But the GOP will extract a price — Republicans are poised to hold up nominees to make their political points on issues ranging from the debt to EPA regulations to the Second Amendment.¶ “When the president chooses to pick a fight or to go through a bruising nomination, that’s got a real downside for the president,” Sen. Mike Johanns (R-Neb.) warned Tuesday. “What happens is everything backs up, and there’s enough of that problem already today.”¶ Alabama Sen. Jeff Sessions, the top Republican on the Budget Committee, said nomination fights cause only more wrangling. “I think it can make already shaky relationships even more difficult, which is not a good thing,” he said. “You would think he might want to be gracious in his victory and seek more bipartisan support.”

#### EST thumps

Broder 3/15 (John M. Broder, “Obama Seeks to Use Oil and Gas Money to Develop Alternative Fuel Cars,” New York Times, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/16/us/politics/obamas-2-billion-plan-to-replace-fossil-fuels-in-cars.html)

Mr. Obama has given up on moving comprehensive climate change legislation through Congress and has ruled out a carbon tax as a way to finance the development of alternative energy sources, so he is pursuing smaller projects that do not require new sources of revenue. The Energy Security Trust, as he calls his proposal to shift oil and gas royalties to alternative energy research, is one of those projects.¶ The money will support research on a range of cleaner means of powering vehicles, the White House said, including electricity, biofuels, fuel cells and produced natural gas.¶ The president’s proposal to add $200 million a year to the research budget of the Energy Department’s office of renewable energy would represent about a 10 percent increase in the office’s overall spending, or 25 percent of its spending on transportation research, according to the Union of Concerned Scientists.¶ But David Friedman, the group’s deputy director for clean vehicles, said the plan could have the unintended effect of increasing pressure on the administration to open new public lands and waters to stepped-up drilling to ensure the revenues for the program.¶ He noted that Senator Lisa Murkowski, Republican of Alaska, had proposed a similar mechanism for financing alternative energy research, but had explicitly tied it to new drilling, including in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

### 2AC Immigration Top Shelf

#### Threat assessments are overblown

Rid 3/13 (Thomas Rid, Reader in War Studies at King’s College London. He also is a non-resident fellow at the Center for Transatlantic Relations, “The Great Cyberscare,” Foreign Policy, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/03/13/the\_great\_cyberscare)

The White House likes a bit of threat. In his State of the Union address, Barack Obama wanted to nudge Congress yet again into passing meaningful legislation. The president emphasized that America's enemies are "seeking the ability to sabotage our power grid, our financial institutions, and our air traffic control systems." After two failed attempts to pass a cybersecurity act in the past two years, he added swiftly: "We cannot look back years from now and wonder why we did nothing in the face of real threats to our security and our economy." Fair enough. A bit of threat to prompt needed action is one thing. Fear-mongering is something else: counterproductive. Yet too many a participant in the cybersecurity debate reckons that puffery pays off.¶ The Pentagon, no doubt, is the master of razzmatazz. Leon Panetta set the tone by warning again and again of an impending "cyber Pearl Harbor." Just before he left the Pentagon, the Defense Science Board delivered a remarkable report, Resilient Military Systems and the Advanced Cyber Threat. The paper seemed obsessed with making yet more drastic historical comparisons: "The cyber threat is serious," the task force wrote, "with potential consequences similar to the nuclear threat of the Cold War." The manifestations of an all-out nuclear war would be different from cyberattack, the Pentagon scientists helpfully acknowledged. But then they added, gravely, that "in the end, the existential impact on the United States is the same."¶ A reminder is in order: The world has yet to witness a single casualty, let alone fatality, as a result of a computer attack. Such statements are a plain insult to survivors of Hiroshima. Some sections of the Pentagon document offer such eye-wateringly shoddy analysis that they would not have passed as an MA dissertation in a self-respecting political science department. But in the current debate it seemed to make sense. After all a bit of fear helps to claim -- or keep -- scarce resources when austerity and cutting seems out-of-control. The report recommended allocating the stout sum of $2.5 billion for its top two priorities alone, protecting nuclear weapons against cyberattacks and determining the mix of weapons necessary to punish all-out cyber-aggressors. Then there are private computer security companies. Such firms, naturally, are keen to pocket some of the government's money earmarked for cybersecurity. And hype is the means to that end. Mandiant's much-noted report linking a coordinated and coherent campaign of espionage attacks dubbed Advanced Persistent Threat 1, or "APT1," to a unit of the Chinese military is a case in point: The firm offered far more details on attributing attacks to the Chinese than the intelligence community has ever done, and the company should be commended for making the report public. But instead of using cocky and over-confident language, Mandiant's analysts should have used Words of Estimative Probability, as professional intelligence analysts would have done.

#### The DA completely misunderstands presidential influence- political capital is a meaningless concept and not key to immigration reform

Hirsch 2013 (Michael Hirsch, chief correspondent for the National Journal, “There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital,” http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207)

Meanwhile, the Republican members of the Senate’s so-called Gang of Eight are pushing hard for a new spirit of compromise on immigration reform, a sharp change after an election year in which the GOP standard-bearer declared he would make life so miserable for the 11 million illegal immigrants in the U.S. that they would “self-deport.” But this turnaround has very little to do with Obama’s personal influence—his political mandate, as it were. It has almost entirely to do with just two numbers: 71 and 27. That’s 71 percent for Obama, 27 percent for Mitt Romney, the breakdown of the Hispanic vote in the 2012 presidential election. Obama drove home his advantage by giving a speech on immigration reform on Jan. 29 at a Hispanic-dominated high school in Nevada, a swing state he won by a surprising 8 percentage points in November. But the movement on immigration has mainly come out of the Republican Party’s recent introspection, and the realization by its more thoughtful members, such as Sen. Marco Rubio of Florida and Gov. Bobby Jindal of Louisiana, that without such a shift the party may be facing demographic death in a country where the 2010 census showed, for the first time, that white births have fallen into the minority. It’s got nothing to do with Obama’s political capital or, indeed, Obama at all.¶ The point is not that “political capital” is a meaningless term. Often it is a synonym for “mandate” or “momentum” in the aftermath of a decisive election—and just about every politician ever elected has tried to claim more of a mandate than he actually has. Certainly, Obama can say that because he was elected and Romney wasn’t, he has a better claim on the country’s mood and direction. Many pundits still defend political capital as a useful metaphor at least. “It’s an unquantifiable but meaningful concept,” says Norman Ornstein of the American Enterprise Institute. “You can’t really look at a president and say he’s got 37 ounces of political capital. But the fact is, it’s a concept that matters, if you have popularity and some momentum on your side.”¶ The real problem is that the idea of political capital—or mandates, or momentum—is so poorly defined that presidents and pundits often get it wrong. “Presidents usually over-estimate it,” says George Edwards, a presidential scholar at Texas A&M University. “The best kind of political capital—some sense of an electoral mandate to do something—is very rare. It almost never happens. In 1964, maybe. And to some degree in 1980.” For that reason, political capital is a concept that misleads far more than it enlightens. It is distortionary. It conveys the idea that we know more than we really do about the ever-elusive concept of political power, and it discounts the way unforeseen events can suddenly change everything. Instead, it suggests, erroneously, that a political figure has a concrete amount of political capital to invest, just as someone might have real investment capital—that a particular leader can bank his gains, and the size of his account determines what he can do at any given moment in history.¶ Naturally, any president has practical and electoral limits. Does he have a majority in both chambers of Congress and a cohesive coalition behind him? Obama has neither at present. And unless a surge in the economy—at the moment, still stuck—or some other great victory gives him more momentum, it is inevitable that the closer Obama gets to the 2014 election, the less he will be able to get done. Going into the midterms, Republicans will increasingly avoid any concessions that make him (and the Democrats) stronger.¶ But the abrupt emergence of the immigration and gun-control issues illustrates how suddenly shifts in mood can occur and how political interests can align in new ways just as suddenly. Indeed, the pseudo-concept of political capital masks a larger truth about Washington that is kindergarten simple: You just don’t know what you can do until you try. Or as Ornstein himself once wrote years ago, “Winning wins.” In theory, and in practice, depending on Obama’s handling of any particular issue, even in a polarized time, he could still deliver on a lot of his second-term goals, depending on his skill and the breaks. Unforeseen catalysts can appear, like Newtown. Epiphanies can dawn, such as when many Republican Party leaders suddenly woke up in panic to the huge disparity in the Hispanic vote.¶ Some political scientists who study the elusive calculus of how to pass legislation and run successful presidencies say that political capital is, at best, an empty concept, and that almost nothing in the academic literature successfully quantifies or even defines it. “It can refer to a very abstract thing, like a president’s popularity, but there’s no mechanism there. That makes it kind of useless,” says Richard Bensel, a government professor at Cornell University. Even Ornstein concedes that the calculus is far more complex than the term suggests. Winning on one issue often changes the calculation for the next issue; there is never any known amount of capital. “The idea here is, if an issue comes up where the conventional wisdom is that president is not going to get what he wants, and he gets it, then each time that happens, it changes the calculus of the other actors” Ornstein says. “If they think he’s going to win, they may change positions to get on the winning side. It’s a bandwagon effect.”

#### Obama push would kill any chance of CIR

Alex Altman 3/20 2013 “Four Hurdles That Could Block Immigration Reform” (Washington correspondent for TIME) <http://swampland.time.com/2013/03/20/four-hurdles-that-could-block-immigration-reform/>

Little discussed but also looming is the possibility that Democrats drag their feet on reform. Liberals will balk if the path to citizenship is too long or too onerous, or if enforcement provisions are too rigid. Many conservatives also suspect that Democratic power brokers, despite their daily hammering of Republicans to get moving on immigration reform, would privately prefer to keep the issue as a cudgel than actually pass a law. Barack Obama “wants to make a bill come out of the Senate that is so far out there that it would never pass, so that he can blame us for not being compassionate and use the issue to take back the House in 2014,” says a House Republican. Even some liberals see this as a plausible scenario. “There’s always a lingering doubt in my mind,” admits one House Democrat. Obama knows that putting his fingerprints on the deal is an easy way to kill it; when a draft of his proposal leaked in the press, he called Republican negotiators individually to apologize. But if negotiations in Congress bog down, he may not be so hands off.

#### Gun control first and thumps

Klein 3/22 (Ezra Klein, “Wonkbook: A gun control deal is in trouble,” Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2013/03/22/wonkbook-a-gun-control-deal-is-in-trouble/)

1) Top story: Gun control is in trouble. Can it survive?¶ Senate: We’ll deal with gun control…right after this break. “Gun control will be the first order of business in the Senate when lawmakers return in April from their two-week holiday break. Senate Majority Leader Harry M. Reid (D-Nev.) formally moved a package of gun-related bills onto the legislative calendar Thursday night, setting up the most serious debate on gun control in Congress in more than a decade.” Paul Kane in The Washington Post.¶ @samsteinhp: never expected assault weapons ban to pass, but when talking to folks on hill, this is the bleakest they’ve sounded on gun policy reform¶ What’s holding up gun control? “The core of a gun deal isn’t the assault weapons ban. That will get a vote on the Senate floor, but it won’t pass, and it’s long been clear that it won’t pass. A ban on assault weapons also isn’t, as a policy matter, the most important piece of a gun-control package. That designation goes to universal background checks…But there’s one sticking point: Record-keeping. Schumer wants a record kept of the background check. Coburn won’t agree to anything of the kind.” Ezra Klein in The Washington Post.

#### Plan is an olive branch

McLendon 2010 (Russell McLendon, mother nature network, May 27, 2010, “Offshore drilling: Low bills vs. big spills”, http://www.mnn.com/earth-matters/translating-uncle-sam/stories/offshore-drilling-low-bills-vs-big-spills)

That pressure reached a critical mass in March, when President Obama announced plans to end a three-decade ban onnew offshore drilling in U.S. waters. The move was widely seen as an olive branch to offshore-drilling advocates in Congress, offering a compromise that might win support for a climate-change bill. It paved the way for new drilling in the Gulf of Mexico as well as the first-ever oil rigs off the East Coast, and while it drew the ire of environmentalists, there was only scattered public criticism. Within a few weeks, though, the tides suddenly turned. An explosion aboard the Deepwater Horizon oil rig in the Gulf of Mexico killed 11 workers on April 20, and two days later — the 40th anniversary of Earth Day — the rig sank to the sea floor, starting what is now being called the worst oil spill in American history.

#### No link – doesn’t require congressional approval

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

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

### EU DA

#### US gas key to prevent Russian obstruction of EU initiatives

Medlock 2011 (Kenneth B. Medlock III, Ph.D., Amy Myers Jaffe, Peter R. Hartley, Ph.D., July 2011, “Shale Gas and US National Security,” James A. Baker Institute, online)

The dramatic lessening of Europe’s dependence on Russian gas will likely have considerable geopolitical implications in thwarting Russia’s ability to exercise an “energy” weapon or to unduly influence political outcomes on the Continent. European buyers will have ample alternatives to Russian supplies, thereby reducing Moscow’s political leverage. This outcome would also contribute positively to the balance of power between Russia and the EU, putting Europe in a stronger position to influence Russian foreign policy near Europe’s borders. To wit, Europe’s high dependence on Russian pipeline natural gas supplies made it difficult for certain European leaders to engage in diplomacy objecting to Russia’s invasion of Georgia in 200826 and weakened their support of the shaky election of pro-Western Ukrainian president Viktor Yushchenko, who was negatively targeted by Moscow for his anti-Russian stances. A more diverse energy supply for Europe enhances U.S. interests by buttressing Europe’s abilities to resist Russian interference in European affairs and help border states in the Balkans and Eastern Europe assert greater foreign policy independence from Moscow. U.S. coalitions with European nations are an important element to U.S. national security, including efforts to combat international terrorism and prevent humanitarian crises. An energy-independent Europe will be better positioned to join with the United States in global peacekeeping and other international initiatives that might not have the full support of Russia.

#### US-EU partnership is high resilient and actively maintained

Wilson Boyer and Lamond 2012 (Douglas B. Wilson, former assistant secretary of defense for Public Affairs from 2009 – 2012; Spencer P. Boyer, a visiting senior fellow at the Center for Transatlantic Relations at Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, former deputy asssistant secretary of state for European and Eurasian affairs from 2009 – 2011; James Lamond, Research Director at the National Security Network, October 9, 2012, “So what is Romney’s foreign policy?,” Reuters, http://blogs.reuters.com/great-debate/2012/10/09/so-what-is-romneys-foreign-policy/)

When the president took office, there was enormous tension in transatlantic relations. Many of our European partners felt they had been treated with disrespect and mistrust. From former Bush Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld’s dismissive comments about “Old Europe vs. New Europe” to Romney’s October 2007 interview with Britain’s Daily Telegraph (“The question is whether [the U.S. is] going to become a stronger nation leading the world or whether we’re going to follow the path of Europe and become a second-tier military and a second-tier nation”), our allies had good reason to question the nature of our partnership.¶ Obama has remarkably shifted the tone of this critical relationship. He has made it clear that there is no alliance more fundamental to U.S. security interests, and that we will deal directly with our differences when they arise.¶ The president has also repeatedly stressed that the United States has an unbreakable bond with Europe, steeped in common purpose and shared values. That bond, reinforced rather than disparaged, has made our 21st century partnership relevant beyond the geographic boundaries that defined NATO in the 20th century. The reality is that the United States and Europe have rarely, if ever, been more in sync in terms of our overall strategic goals and the methods by which we seek to achieve them.¶ Tens of thousands of European troops have been fighting alongside our own in Afghanistan, helping us build and sustain the largest overseas deployment in NATO’s history. Together, we have made enormous progress in disrupting, dismantling and defeating al Qaeda, and have set a responsible timeline for transitioning security responsibility from coalition to Afghan forces.¶ In Libya, Obama worked through the NATO alliance and successfully used unique American assets to create a coalition that shared the burden effectively in responding to Muammar Gaddafi’s brutality.¶ We have coordinated with our partners in Europe to confront the nuclear challenge in Iran, producing the most crippling global economic sanctions ever against any nation.¶ On missile defense, Washington has worked with our NATO allies to put in place a more cost-effective system to defend against the threat posed by Iran’s ballistic missiles, integrating both land- and sea-based assets and more sophisticated technology than what had originally been planned.

#### Can’t solve anything

Krastev 2013 (Ivan Krastev, chairman of the Centre for Liberal Strategies in Sofia, permanent fellow at the Institute for Human Sciences in Vienna and a founding board member of the European Council on Foreign Relations, January 17, 2013, “Can Obama Rely on Europe?,” DW, http://www.dw.de/can-obama-rely-on-europe/a-16527310)

Is the European Union willing and capable to preserve the current liberal European order at the moment when Russia has turned her back on the West, Turkey has lost hope of joining the EU and the European periphery lies in shambles?¶ And would the EU be America's reliable partner outside Europe at a moment when Washington lacks the resources and the appetite to be the global policeman while the world is in constant turmoil?¶ These are probably the two critical questions that will define President Barack Obama's European agenda during his second term.¶ Inward-looking nation¶ The financial crisis has made America feel the limits of her global power. The "D"- word for decline is a four letter-word for any US president. Still, Barack Obama better than his predecessors and his critics realizes the extent to which America's role in the world will be constrained by the size of its huge public debt and by the country's frustrating experience in dealing with post-war engagements in Iraq and Afghanistan.¶ The crisis has forced Americans to take a closer look at their own country and what they saw was not inspiring. The lead protagonist of the popular TV drama The Newsroom captures this new mood of bitterness and frustration when he reveals that, while America used to talk about itself as the greatest nation in the world, in reality:¶ "We're seventh in literacy, 27th in math, 22nd in science, 49th in life expectancy, 178th in infant mortality, third in median household income, fourth in labor force, and fourth in exports. We lead the world in only 3 categories: number of incarcerated citizens per capita, number of adults who believe angels are real, and defense spending where we spend more than the next 26 countries combine."¶ So, not surprisingly the president's efforts will be focused to reform America and not to transform the world.¶ Solid partner needed¶ But in order to buy time for his American rebuilding project Obama needs to know how effective the EU can be as a regional power and how ambitious the EU will be as a global power.¶ It is now pretty obvious that the US does not have any resources to continue its commitment in places like the Balkans or Ukraine; Obama's reset with Russia is history and Washington is eager to "outsource" all Europe related problems to Brussels.¶ But can Obama rely on the EU to get Moscow right? Can Obama outsource the problems of wider Europe to a Union that undergoes the most dangerous crisis in its existence?¶ Many in Washington are skeptical but the President does not have much of a choice.¶ Looming British EU exit¶ When it comes to the world outside of Europe, Obama's fears are even greater. If the euro crisis and a possible break-up of the European Union was a major concern for the White House in 2012, at the start of his second term it is Britain and not Greece that preoccupies the President's mind.¶ It is not difficult to guess that an EU without Britain will become even more provincial and inward looking. So, the decline of British influence in the EU can only mean more problems for Washington. That begs the logical question: Is the US influential enough to keep the UK in the EU?¶ When it comes to big ideas in US-EU bilateral relations one quickly notices that they are mostly absent.¶ No grand strategy¶ The perspective of a transatlantic free-trade area is the only big idea that has remained in the portfolio. It appeals not only to the business community but also to all those who believe in the re-invention of the West. But while attractive in principle, it would be a nightmare if it ever came down to the renegotiation of the regulation regimes.¶ So what should Europeans and the EU expect from Barack Obama's second term? Not much, I am afraid.¶ President Obama does not have a grand strategy for the EU. What he has instead are fears and hopes. And it will be the balance between fears and hopes that will determine his policies during his second term.

### Uranium Prices

#### No nuclear renaissance – the two newly approved reactors are exceptions and won’t change anything

Biello 2012 (David, Staff Writer, “Nuclear Reactor Approved in U.S. for First Time Since 1978”, Scientific American, 2-9-12,

http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=first-new-nuclear-reactor-in-us-since-1978-approved&print=true)

But no nuclear renaissance appears to be imminent, despite the go-ahead to build and operate two new reactors in Georgia. Years of shifting and smoothing Georgia red clay paid off today, as the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) voted to allow construction of two new nuclear reactors (pdf) at the Plant Vogtle nuclear power station near Augusta. Atlanta–based utility giant Southern Co. will soon have permission to complete construction and operate two AP1000 type nuclear reactors designed by Westinghouse. But what were initially lauded as the first reactors of a nuclear renaissance when proposed are more likely to be the exceptions that prove the rule of no new nuclear construction in the U.S. Only this twin set of reactors in Georgia, another pair in South Carolina and the completion of an old reactor in Tennessee are likely to be built in the U.S. for at least the next decade. "We won't build large numbers of new nuclear plants in the U.S. in the near term," says Marvin Fertel, president of the Nuclear Energy Institute, a lobbying group for the nuclear industry. The problem is twofold: electricity demand in the U.S. is not growing and natural gas, which can be burned to generate electricity, is cheap. As a result, utilities are building more natural gas–burning turbines rather than more expensive nuclear power plants. "Today, you ought to build gas," Fertel admits. But "you don't want to build only gas." That may become even truer as old coal-fired power plants are forced to retire by new pollution rules and/or natural gas prices rebound. Given the long lead times required to gain permits and actually build a nuclear power plant, however, five new reactors may be as many as the U.S. will see erected during this decade. "If they are built, I suspect all of them are post-2020," says Fertel of other reactor applications awaiting NRC review. In fact, the only reason utilities in Georgia and South Carolina are building the new reactors is because the governments in those states have allowed them to pre-charge customers for their cost. Southern Co. is already charging customers $3.73 per month for the reactors' construction, expected to cost roughly $14 billion, and may receive a more than $8-billion loan guarantee from the federal government. In the absence of a national government policy that puts a premium on electricity generation that results in fewer emissions of greenhouse gases, there is little incentive to build nuclear power plants in the U.S. "If we get back to the carbon discussion, that will have an effect on new plants that are built," argues Bill Johnson, CEO of Progress Energy, one of the utilities filing for a construction license but with no plans to actually build a nuclear power plant in the near future. "Nuclear can't compete today. Other than the Watts Bar unit No. 2 in Tennessee, which will simply be the completion of a reactor that started construction in the 1970s, the four new plants will all employ a novel design—the AP1000. They will be the first to employ so-called passive safety features, or technology that kicks in with or without human intervention. In the case of the AP1000 that means cooling water sits above the reactor core and, in the event of a meltdown like the ones at Fukushima Daiichi, will flow via gravity into the core to cool it with the automatic opening of a heat-sensitive valve. Furthermore, although the thick steel vessel containing the nuclear reactor is encased in a shell of 1.2-meter-thick concrete, that shell is itself surrounded by a building that is open to the sky. Should the concrete containment vessel begin to heat up during a meltdown, natural convection would pull cooling air inside. The NRC initially rejected that open-air building for a lack of structural strength. The U.S. regulator argued that it would not withstand a severe shock such as an earthquake or airplane impact because it was initially planned to be built from prefabricated concrete and steel modules to save money. The NRC approved a modified design (pdf) in December that employs more steel reinforcement, among other changes. Nevertheless, NRC Chairman Gregory Jaczko voted against approving the license for the two reactors at Vogtle today unless they incorporated a "binding obligation that these plants will have implemented the lessons learned from the Fukushima accident before they operate." The commission also required more inspection and testing of the explosive-opened valves that would allow venting in case of an accident. Already, the Shaw Group facility in Lake Charles, La., a nuclear equipment supplier, has begun churning out gear for the new nuclear power plants. A "mini skyscraper," in the words of Westinghouse CEO Aris Candris, has been built at Vogtle to allow for final assembly of the modules that will reach the site by truck or rail. "Both sites are as ready as you can be," he adds. "Rebar is sitting outside the hole ready to go." A global revival of interest in nuclear power technology remains underway, despite the April 2011 meltdowns at Fukushima Daiichi in Japan. China is already building four AP1000s and more than 20 other reactors currently—and many other countries are considering new plant construction, from the Czech Republic to India. But in the U.S., even just to maintain the current fleet of 104 reactors, which provide 20 percent of the nation's electricity supply, would require building as many replacement reactors by 2030. In fact, nuclear power production may shrink in the U.S. before it grows. Aging reactors, even with life extensions of another two decades, will begin to drop off the grid in coming years. "Twenty years is the blink of an eye for 100 gigawatts. The time is now to begin to deploy new nuclear," says David Christian, CEO of Virginia-based utility Dominion Generation, although his company has no plans to do so before the end of the decade. "We're in danger of missing that window."

#### Uranium prices are dropping now amid Japan/Germany delays in nuclear development

Bloomberg 3-12-13 http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-03-12/uranium-rally-falters-on-japanese-nuclear-delays-energy-markets.html

Uranium’s rally from a three-year low is stalling amid signs Japan, once the world’s third-biggest nuclear power producer, will keep all but a handful of its reactors offline this year.

The atomic fuel has slipped 6.8 percent to $42.40 a pound since the Liberal Democratic Party won Dec. 16 elections, erasing most of the 12 percent gain in the six weeks before the vote. While the LDP pledged to review the previous administration’s zero-nuclear policy, regulators probably won’t allow any more plants to start in 2013, a survey of power companies by Kyodo News showed. Uranium will average less than $48 a pound in the six months ending June, the lowest for this time of year since 2010, according to Credit Suisse Group AG. A delay in the resumption of nuclear plants would be a blow for uranium producers from Australia to Namibia, while boosting natural gas exporters such as Qatar, which helped plug Japan’s power deficit after the March 2011 meltdown at Tokyo Electric Power Co.’s Fukushima Dai-Ichi plant. The disaster sent uranium tumbling as countries from Germany to China said they would phase out atomic power or slow project approvals. All but two of Japan’s 50 reactors are still shut and must meet stricter safety standards before they can restart.

“There is much uncertainty around the entire nuclear program in Japan,” Jonathan Hinze, a senior vice president at Roswell, Georgia-based Ux Consulting who forecasts prices won’t exceed $50 before the end of the year, said in an e-mailed response to questions. “Due to Japanese reactor outages as well as smaller reductions in demand from Germany and elsewhere, there continues to be an ample supply of uranium for near-term delivery. We do not expect a rapid price run-up is likely.”

#### Kazakhstan development model flawed – poorly developed organizations, lack of decentralization, and limited resources with distribution problems

Earle, et al. ‘04 [L., Bahodir Fozilhujaev, Chinara Tashbaeva and Kulnara Djamankulova, “Community Development in Kazkhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Uzbekistan: Lessons Learnt from Recent Experience,” Occasoinal Papers Series No: 40, http://www.intrac.org/data/files/resources/50/OPS-40-Community-Development.pdf]

In general, civil society organisations are poorly developed, particularly in rural areas. Kazakhstan is a vast country, with the majority of the population clustered around industrialised centres, which means that within-country networking is patchy and rural populations are often isolated. Many NGOs are based in urban areas and very few have either a mission or capacity to support community based organisations of any type. National development policies are clearly centred on the economic drive provided by the extensive exploitation of oil and gas and other extractive industries, but with little attention to issues related to resource distribution. Reform in governance has not included any decentralisation and thus there is little empowerment at the local level and few policies have a chance of implementation without the political endorsement of the President’s administration. As such, community development initiatives tend to be donor or government driven and lack of decentralisation to date restricts opportunities for partnership between community based organisations, NGOs and local authorities. The lowest level of government – the Akimat (similar to a mayoral office) – is still often the only point of call for communities needing improved infrastructure and resolution of other problems. These bodies tend to be fairly bureaucratic in outlook, are headed by executives who are appointed by the President, and have extremely limited funds to respond to this type of demand. Despite their lack of resources, these bodies are still considered important institutions by communities as they are responsible for the distribution of certain social benefits and can wield influence amongst local business leaders and on individuals further up the hierarchy. Some local level government bodies are becoming more interested in working with civil society organisations, although this is often because of the external funding that these organisations can attract or because of central government directives.

#### No risk of great power conflict in Central Asia: incentives to de-escalate and stable balance of power

Zhao Huasheng, director of the Center for Russia and Central Asia Studies at Fudan University, February 2005, CEF Quarterly, http://www.silkroadstudies.org/new/docs/CEF/CEF\_Quarterly\_Winter\_2005.doc.pdf, p. 31

China, Russia, and the United States will not go to open confrontation for several reasons. Generally speaking, the relations of the three powers in Central Asia depend on their general relations. In other words, if their general relations sour, their relations in Central Asia will go tense or intensify. Otherwise, if their general relations are good, their relations in Central Asia will not be hostile and openly confrontational. Conversely, in spite of the tripartite configuration among the three powers, especially the confrontation between Russia and the United States, like two tigers gazing at each other in their military bases in Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan, none of the three powers wants to undermine bilateral relations on the parochial issue of Central Asia. The coexistence of the three powers in Central Asia restrains their open confrontation as well. None of the three powers intends to ally with one against the other. Or, none is pleased to see a united front formed by two against one. At the same time, none wants to see Central Asia to be monopolized by one power. Therefore, the game played by three powers is good for the balance of power and not for open confrontation in any forms.

#### Economic interests and foreign influence.

Olga Oliker (Senior International Policy Analyst RAND) and Thomas S. Szayna. (Associate Director, Strategy, Doctrine, and Resource Program at the RAND Arroyo Center). "Faultllines of Conflict in Central Asia and the South Caucasus." Rand. 2005. http://www.rand.org/pubs/monograph\_reports/2005/RAND\_MR1598.pdf

All that said, there are other factors that make interstate war somewhat less likely. The economic incentives, particularly for the development of Caspian energy resources, appear to balance out the possible spoils that war might bring. While cooperation among regional leaders remains limited, there is a growing recognition that it is necessary, and it is possible that increased foreign involvement may spur more cooperation.64 Moreover, the presence of regional, Russian, and now Western security forces in the region has played a stabilizing role in the past, particularly in Tajikistan, and may do so again in the future.