### RU=EU

#### High probability

Arbour 2011 Louise Arbour is president of the International Crisis Group 12-27-2011 Foreign Policy “Next Year’s Wars” http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/12/27/next\_years\_wars?page=0,5

Several states in the region are surviving on luck: their infrastructure near collapse, their political systems eaten away by corruption, their public services almost nonexistent. On top of all this, Tajikistan, for example, now faces a growing security threat from both local and external insurgencies, something it has almost zero capacity to contain. Adding to the country's woes, relations with neighboring Uzbekistan are at an all-time low, with their long-running water dispute no closer to resolution and occasionally deadly border incidents threatening to spark deeper violence. As for Uzbekistan itself, Washington increasingly relies on Tashkent for logistics in Afghanistan, but the brutal nature of the regime means it is not only an embarrassing partner but also, ultimately, a very unreliable one. Already there has been at least one attack on the rail line transiting U.S. material through the country. Given how U.S.-Pakistan relations seem to hit a new low every week, Washington may feel it has little choice, but it certainly seems to be "out of the fire and into the frying pan" at best. Then there is volatile Kyrgyzstan. Without prompt, genuine and exhaustive measures to address the damage done by the 2010 ethnic pogroms in the south, the country risks another round of mass violence. The ultranationalist mayor of Osh, Melis Myrzakmatov, who has in the past claimed that Bishkek's writ does not extend to the southern city and now muses out loud about creating a municipal police force independent of the Ministry of Interior, will no doubt continue to fire shots across the bows of the central government in 2012.

#### Russia-EU solves global rule of law

Adamski 2011 (Łukasz Adamski, Vladimir G. Baranovsky, Nikolay I. Bukharin, Sławomir Dębski, Mark L. Entin, Leszek Jesień, Artem V. Malgin, Paweł Świeboda, Ernest Wyciszkiewicz, Andrey V. Zagorsky, Polish-Russian Group on Difficult Matters, November 2011, “RETHINKING EU–RUSSIA RELATIONSHIP,” The Centre for Polish-Russian Dialogue and Understanding, online)

The EU and Russia have a joint stake in ensuring that the future global order will be based on a strong normative foundation. It is only in such circumstances that the process of globalisation can continue to bring benefits to our economies and societies, allowing the challenges it creates can be openly addressed. In order to prepare for that, the EU and Russia should place their own relationship on a solid foundation of the rule of law and a joint regulatory framework, both of which can also play an important role in fighting corruption. Commitments on both sides should lead to creation of a legal basis for the new institutional framework.

The approach based on respect for the rule of law will surely be tested first in the context of the current international financial, economic and fiscal crisis. Both the EU and Russia have their own problems to overcome during the crisis. Their consultations and cooperation could well help the emerging global governance system, also the G20. Keeping the flows of finances, trade and services across the globe stable is in everyone’s vital interest and needs a continued effort to build mutual trust and understanding.

#### Extinction

Rhyne 1958 (Charles S. Rhyne, Law Day Speech for Voice of America delivered on the first Law Day, May 1 abanet.org/publiced/lawday/rhyne58.html) GENDER MODIFIED YO

The tremendous yearning of all peoples for peace can only be answered by the use of law to replace weapons in resolving international disputes. We in our country sincerely believe that [hu]mankind’s best hope for preventing the tragic consequences of nuclear-satellite-missile warfare is to persuade the nations of the entire world to submit all disputes to tribunals of justice for all adjudication under the rule of law. We lawyers of America would like to join lawyers from every nation in the world in fashioning an international code of law so appealing that sentiment will compel its general acceptance. Man’s relation to man is the most neglected field of study, exploration and development in the world community. It is also the most critical. The most important basic fact of our generation is that the rapid advance of knowledge in science and technology has forced increased international relationships in a shrunken and indivisible world. Men must either live together in peace or in modern war we will surely die together. History teaches that the rule of law has enabled mankind to live together peacefully within nations and it is clear that this same rule of law offers our best hope as a mechanism to achieve and maintain peace between nations. The lawyer is the technician in man’s relationship to man. There exists a worldwide challenge to our profession to develop law to replace weapons before the dreadful holocaust of nuclear war overtake our people. It is said that an idea can be more powerful than an atom because strength today resides in man’s mind—not his muscle. We lawyers of the world must take the idea of peace under the rule of law and make it a force superior to weapons and thus outlaw wars of weapons. Law offers the best hope for order in a disordered world. The law of force or the force of law will rule the world. In the field of human conduct the law has never confessed failure. The struggle for a world ruled by law must go on with increased intensity. We must prove that the genius of man in the field of science and technology has not so far outstripped his inventiveness in the sphere of human relations as to make catastrophe inevitable. If man can conquer space he can also solve the need for legal machinery to insure universal and lasting peace. In our country ignorance of the value of law in international relations and what it could do for the people of the world is appalling. A major purpose of “Law Day-U.S.A.” is therefore to demonstrate to our people that the need for law in the world community is the greatest gap in the growing structure of civilization. And we lawyers of America are anxious to work with lawyers and men of good of all nations in filling this gap in that structure. We believe that no greater challenge exists for any profession and that no greater service to mankind can be performed.

#### EU-RU partnerships solve Gulf of Aden piracy

Chizhov 2013 (Ambassador Vladimir Chizhov, Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation to the European Union, January 20, 2013, “Russia-EU: facing the future together,” New Europe, http://www.neurope.eu/blog/russia-eu-facing-future-together)

As two key exporters of regional stability, facing similar transnational threats and challenges, Russia and the EU stand to gain from creating new avenues for cooperation. Joint actions in the field of foreign and security policy as well as crisis management have proven to be invaluable. To appreciate this one needs to look no further than the rapidly decreasing numbers of pirate attacks in the Gulf of Aden, which is jointly patrolled by Russian and EU naval forces. The impending US withdrawal from Afghanistan, in particular, should serve as an impetus for collectively framing a coherent post-2014 regional strategy, drawing, inter alia, on Russian expertise in the area as well as the EU soft-power toolkit. ¶ It is our view that the Russia-EU crisis management partnership needs to be grounded in a firm legal setting by elaborating a relevant agreement in the spirit of equality. Hopefully this important work will be resumed in 2013. We will also remain steadfast in convincing our EU partners that our institutional framework would substantially benefit from installing a permanent Russia-EU strategic decision-making and planning capacity along the lines of the 2010 Meseberg initiative.¶ As two continental centres of gravity Russia and the EU cannot allow their strategic partnership to become derailed by misguided attempts to politicize selective human rights cases or exploit the crucial energy and trade pillar of our relationship for short-term commercial gains. While differences between partners are natural and should be expected, they can be reconciled in a manner consistent with international law and agreements in force, while paying due heed to Russia-EU economic interdependence, cultural proximity and a common civilizational future.

#### Ocean collapse

Middleton 2008 (Roger Middleton, consultant researcher at the Chatham House Africa Programme, October 2008, “Piracy in Somalia Threatening global trade, feeding local wars,” Chatham House, http://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/default/files/public/Research/Africa/1008piracysomalia.pdf)

Large oil tankers pass through the Gulf of Aden and the danger exists that a pirate attack could cause a major oil spill in what is a very sensitive and important ecosystem. During the attack on the Takayama the ship’s fuel tanks were penetrated and oil spilled into the sea. The consequences of a more sustained attack could be much worse. As pirates become bolder and use ever more powerful weaponry a tanker could be set on fire, sunk or forced ashore, any of which could result in an environmental catastrophe that would devastate marine and bird life for years to come. The pirates’ aim is to extort ransom payments and to date that has been their main focus; however, the possibility that they could destroy shipping is very real.

#### Extinction

Craig 2003 (Robin Kundis Craig, Associate Professor at Indiana University School of Law, “Taking Steps Toward Marine Wilderness Protection”, McGeorge Law Review, Winter)

Biodiversity and ecosystem function arguments for conserving marine ecosystems also exist, just as they do for terrestrial ecosystems, but these arguments have thus far rarely been raised in political debates. For example, besides significant tourism values - the most economically valuable ecosystem service coral reefs provide, worldwide - coral reefs protect against storms and dampen other environmental fluctuations, services worth more than ten times the reefs' value for food production. 856 Waste treatment is another significant, non-extractive ecosystem function that intact coral reef ecosystems provide. 857 More generally, "ocean ecosystems play a major role in the global geochemical cycling of all the elements that represent the basic building blocks of living organisms, carbon, nitrogen, oxygen, phosphorus, and sulfur, as well as other less abundant but necessary elements." 858 In a very real and direct sense, therefore, human degradation of marine ecosystems impairs the planet's ability to support life. Maintaining biodiversity is often critical to maintaining the functions of marine ecosystems. Current evidence shows that, in general, an ecosystem's ability to keep functioning in the face of disturbance is strongly dependent on its biodiversity, "indicating that more diverse ecosystems are more stable." 859 Coral reef ecosystems are particularly dependent on their biodiversity. [\*265] Most ecologists agree that the complexity of interactions and degree of interrelatedness among component species is higher on coral reefs than in any other marine environment. This implies that the ecosystem functioning that produces the most highly valued components is also complex and that many otherwise insignificant species have strong effects on sustaining the rest of the reef system. 860 Thus, maintaining and restoring the biodiversity of marine ecosystems is critical to maintaining and restoring the ecosystem services that they provide. Non-use biodiversity values for marine ecosystems have been calculated in the wake of marine disasters, like the Exxon Valdez oil spill in Alaska. 861 Similar calculations could derive preservation values for marine wilderness. However, economic value, or economic value equivalents, should not be "the sole or even primary justification for conservation of ocean ecosystems. Ethical arguments also have considerable force and merit." 862 At the forefront of such arguments should be a recognition of how little we know about the sea - and about the actual effect of human activities on marine ecosystems. The United States has traditionally failed to protect marine ecosystems because it was difficult to detect anthropogenic harm to the oceans, but we now know that such harm is occurring - even though we are not completely sure about causation or about how to fix every problem. Ecosystems like the NWHI coral reef ecosystem should inspire lawmakers and policymakers to admit that most of the time we really do not know what we are doing to the sea and hence should be preserving marine wilderness whenever we can - especially when the United States has within its territory relatively pristine marine ecosystems that may be unique in the world. We may not know much about the sea, but we do know this much: if we kill the ocean we kill ourselves, and we will take most of the biosphere with us. The Black Sea is almostdead, 863 its once-complex and productive ecosystem almost entirely replaced by a monoculture of comb jellies, "starving out fish and dolphins, emptying fishermen's nets, and converting theweb of life into brainless, wraith-like blobs of jelly." 864 More importantly, the Black Sea is not necessarily unique.

### 2AC Consumption K

Our role of the ballot is to evaluate the normative effects of the plan- anything else excludes 9 min of 1AC offense - it’s does not prove the 1ac undesirable- the judge should choose the set of representations that best test plan desirability - knowledge production is linear - sufficient reasonability filters their epistemology args – prefer specific warrants over vague buzzwords - saving a life is a prerequisite to enhancing its value

Perm: Do both
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#### Pragmatic embrace of natural gas key to sustainable energy paradigm shift

Huber 2011 (Jacob Huber, MSc, Environment and Resource Management/Energy Studies at Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Energy Analyst for EDI and Editor of EDI Quarterly, June 2011, “A Role for Natural Gas in the Pragmatic Transition to a Sustainable Energy System,” Energy Delta Institute Quarterly, http://www.energydelta.org/uploads/bestanden/c21f508d-b71c-40f3-a403-d082ec51ce93)

At any point in history, the constraints of most thinking are defined by a ruling paradigm, according to Thomas Kuhn. When its effectiveness begins to diminish, its foundation come into question and thus begins the breakdown process; a paradigm shift yields the establishment of a new paradigm. Such shifts are, however, sufficiently open-ended “to¶ leave all sorts of problems for the redefined group of practitioners¶ to resolve.” This very sort of shift is taking place, changing the way energy issues are viewed and our very assumptions regarding energy generation and consumption and their associated impacts on the environment and society. A focus on the supply side without attention to the end use of energy is being replaced with a greater concentration on the demand side, emphasizing the end uses of energy and services that this use provides. Thus, energy efficiency is seen as playing a¶ large role in the transition to a sustainable energy system based on renewables. Such transitions do not however happen overnight and conventional energy resources and technologies will continue to play a large role in the short- and medium-term.¶ The newest project of EDI, EDIaal, aims to contribute to the dialogue surrounding the transition to a sustainable, low carbon energy system. Integral to this objective is the development of competencies in all transition issues including legal and regulatory aspects, renewables, energy efficiency, CCS, smart grids, and the appropriate context of fossil fuel technologies. This knowledge will then be provided through the development of training programs, seminars, and other events as well as tools for sharing knowledge of the role of natural gas in this transition. Natural gas is the contemporary source of energy most suited to playing a facilitating role in an efficient transition.¶ It is well known that the contemporary energy system is dominated by fossil fuels, the negative aspects of which are motivating the push for a more efficient and sustainable system. These drivers include concerns ranging from climate change and pollution to resource depletion and security of supply. It is clear that the current system, which has been such a force for the development and advancement of humanity, cannot be suddenly abandoned and that a gradual transition toward the ultimate goal of a clean and sustainable energy system must be pursued. A future sustainable energy system is seen as being based on three pillars: energy efficiency, renewables, and clean fossil fuel technology (via carbon capture and storage, or CCS). It is expected that energy efficiency in various forms will account for 58% of carbon reductions in the IEA’s BLUE Map Scenario (Fig. 1). Renewables and CCS will account for 17% and 19% respectively, with the remaining 6% being due to nuclear. Natural gas in its various forms will play an essential role in this transition due to its cleanliness, flexibility, and other favorable characteristics.¶ Current renewable or “sustainable” energy generation technologies, such wind and solar, are inherently intermittent and their product energy carrier (electricity) is essentially impossible to store on a large scale for significant lengths of time with current technology. While the resource represented by renewable technologies is large, these shortcomings present a technical barrier to their significant penetration in the short and medium term. Natural gas will play an important¶ role in that its storability allows it to be dispatched upon command to account for a sudden shortfall of wind-based generation, for example. Development of gas-fired combined cycle power plants that are able¶ to enter the grid in as little as 30 minutes (compared with a number¶ of hours for coal and days for nuclear plants) provide a perfect fit with the variable nature of wind and allow integration of a much larger percentage of intermittent renewable sources. In addition, a large existing infrastructure of pipelines, storage, and power plants (as well as associated knowledge) minimize the capital expenditure required for capacity expansion. Energy efficiency is seen as playing a role in dampening growth in worldwide energy demand in the face of strongly increasing demand¶ in developing economies, and here natural gas has a part to play. Natural gas has a role in the efficiency component of a sustainable energy system, both on the supply-side and in end-use efficiency. Carrier switching, distributed generation, and combined heat and power (CHP) together represent an enormous opportunity to increase system-level efficiency and thus minimize the extent to which capital- intensive renewable generation technologies must be implemented. The flexibility of natural gas allows it to fit into these niches and optimize system-wide performance.¶ Carrier switching involves the choice of the most appropriate energy carrier to supply a given end use, with the objective of minimizing primary energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions. In¶ most contexts, it is more efficient to provide space heating, domestic hot water, and heat for cooking from natural gas than via electrical resistance from a grid-mix of electricity. For every 10 units of primary energy (PE) used to supply domestic hot water (DHW) via electrical resistance 3.8 units of final energy (FE) would ultimately be available to provide hot water after accounting for losses in power plants and transmission and distribution. 1 If provided by a natural gas boiler with an efficiency of 90% ten units of PE would yield nine of FE for water heating. This simple example illustrates the powerful role of carrier switching in energy efficiency. Although the penetration of natural gas in DHW, space heating, and cooking for the Netherlands is already extremely high, considerable potential for this sort of carrier switching exists in Southern Europe, the United States and other parts of the world. In the USA 10 units of PE yield 3.4 of FE delivered through the electricity grid on average, while in the IEA-EU 3.6 units are produced.2 In the IEA BLUE scenario, this sort of “end-use fuel switching” alone is expected to account for 15% of CO2 reductions.¶ Distributed generation represents another domain of natural gas in the scheme of energy efficiency. The flexibility of gas allows it to be used on any scale from large centralized power plants to medium and small plants that can be strategically placed to reinforce the electricity grid. This can have the effect of lowering losses due to shorter transmission distances and less congestion, but also minimizes the requirement of electricity grid expansion and associated capital expenditures. Perhaps more significantly such a system allows for the greater usage of waste heat for industrial processes or district heating/cooling via systems¶ of combined heat and power (CHP). These factors combined further demonstrate the ability of natural gas to contribute to efficiency efforts. The largest opportunity for natural gas in the scheme of energy efficiency is likely represented by CHP. Such systems make use of the waste heat from electrical power generation for industrial process heat or district heating and cooling. Through the advent of adsorption chillers, waste heat can also be used to generate cold water for district or process cooling. According to the IEA around 2/3 of fuel used to produce power on a global scale is wasted and CHP, through better utilization of waste heat and the lowering of transmission losses, has the potential to more than double this efficiency. In general, CHP plants convert 75-80% of the fuel source into useful energy, and those with the most modern technology have achieved efficiencies in excess of 90%. This figure stands in contrast to the ~60% efficiencies achieved by only the most advanced combined-cycle gas turbine (CCGT) power plants, representing the cutting edge in thermal power plant efficiency. CHP plants also deliver on an additional selection of policy objectives including reduced emissions of CO2 and other pollutants, cost savings for energy consumers, and a reduced need for transmission and distribution networks.¶ It must be noted that appropriate system design maximizing utilization of waste heat is necessary both in order to maximize the economic viability of CHP systems and achieve the efficiencies stated. If the system is driven by heat demand with electricity as a “byproduct”¶ to be utilized on-site or injected into the grid system efficiencies can easily reach the previously mentioned levels. If the system is driven by electricity demand complete utilization of waste heat is not assured and thus system efficiencies are lower. An illustrative example can be found in the case of a steam turbine CHP system with a power efficiency¶ of 38%, and “heat” efficiency of up to 42%. 3 Assuming maximal utilization of heat, an overall efficiency of 80% can be achieved. In a system driven by the price of electricity at times of high demand it is conceivable that only a portion (or even none) of the waste heat can be utilized, driving overall efficiencies as low as the 38% electrical efficiency. Thus, such a system could be economically viable but inefficient when compared with contemporary CCGT power plants. This example underscores the importance of proper system design in order to achieve theoretical efficiencies in the real world. Natural gas has its final role to play in a sustainable energy system as a large-scale source of clean and climate-neutral energy in combination with CCS. CCS is currently being developed and scaled and will likely be ready in the medium term to make a significant contribution. In fact, the IEA expects CCS technology to deliver around a fifth of the 50% reduction of CO2 by 2050 in their Energy Technology Perspectives “BLUE Map Scenario.” Fossil fuels have their role to play in the energy system of the future and it likely that natural gas, being the cleanest among them, will only expand its role in power generation for the foreseeable future.¶ Favorable characteristics are also displayed by natural gas in the context of the traditional energy paradigm include its large existing reserves, especially with their recent expansion due to the contribution of unconventional resources. Its scalability is also an advantage in that¶ it can fit into the energy system on any scale from a small boiler for domestic hot water to a 1000MW power station. It is also traded on a large scale in liquid markets facilitated by its readily available delivery by pipeline or, increasingly, liquefied natural gas (LNG) carrier and the associated network of terminals. Production of renewable or “green” gas from such sources as biomass (via gasification), or agricultural waste (via biogas digesters) is also being pursued. Such gases can be injected into the natural gas network (after being upgraded to an equivalent composition) and take advantage of its existing infrastructure.¶ One significant hurdle to the faster growth of renewable generation capacity is represented by their large, up-front costs. Although technologies such as wind and solar do not have fuel costs their¶ capital requirements present an obstacle, particularly with the current economic climate characterized by limits in the availability of credit and liquidity. Investments in conventional generation technologies with a lower capital intensity thus often appear more attractive. Continuing with such investments in the cleanest forms of contemporary generation technologies thus make sense in allowing alternative technologies to become more commercially viable, counter intuitively allowing investments to leverage larger capacities of alternative generation in the long term. The shorter lead-time for construction of natural gas power plants (in comparison to coal and nuclear) represents another favorable characteristic in this context. It is clear that conventional generation technologies and sources of energy will continue to expand and play a large role in the medium term. The question must therefore be asked: Which of the current energy sources are most feasible from an environmental, economic, and technical perspective? From a technical perspective, all of the current major technologies (natural gas, oil, nuclear, and hydropower) are well developed. Large reserves of coal and natural gas exist but those of oil are rapidly being depleted and the majority of suitable hydropower locations have been exploited. The EIA’s 2010 International Energy Outlook estimates a current reserves-to-production ratio (R/P) of 60 years for natural gas (excluding unconventional sources excepting those in the USA) and 129 years for coal. Uranium ore is widely available (R/P of ~60 years) but the future of nuclear power is uncertain, particularly considering that the recent Fukushima disaster in Japan¶ is likely to have a long-lasting adverse impact on the acceptance of nuclear generation. Coal and natural gas are the most widely available and scalable in addition to being relatively cheap and requiring of low capital investment.¶ Coal, in comparison to natural gas, exhibits significantly higher CO2 emissions and negative externalities including pollution (particulate matter, NOx, SOx,, mercury, etc). The EU project “ExternE” estimates externalities resulting from coal electricity generation in the EU (including global warming, public and occupational health as well as material damage, Table 1) at 2 - 15 Euro-cent/kWh, while those for natural gas are 1 - 4 cents/kWh. The IEA estimates that deaths per 10 billion kWh of electricity produced by coal range from 2.8 - 32.7, with those from natural gas falling between the range of 0.3 - 1.6. These include deaths resulting from mining accidents, explosions, pollution, and similar causes. Finally, a simple switch from coal to natural gas represents a reduction in CO2 emissions on the order of 50%.¶ Renewables, despite recent rapid growth and development, still require time to scale from their current levels to a leading role in the provision of energy for humanity. They currently lack the flexibility necessary to optimize energy system efficiency in the near-term and scale to account for significant portion of primary energy in the medium-term. Natural gas is already well developed and integrated into the contemporary energy system but will additionally support the transition to a more efficient system in its new role. This role comes in the form of a flexible, clean, and reliable energy carrier in the supporting a sustainable energy transition based on renewables, energy efficiency, and clean fossil generation technology. Thus, although its function will evolve, natural gas has an increasing role to play in the provision of a sustainable energy supply for the continued advancement of humanity.

#### Alt fails- 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.

#### The alternative is not non- neolib but distorted versions like China’s- the financial crisis doesn’t doom it

Rogoff 2011 (Kenneth Rogoff, Professor of Economics at Harvard University and recipient of the 2011 Deutsche Bank Prize in Financial Economics, was the chief economist at the International Monetary Fund from 2001 Dec. 2, 2011 Is Modern Capitalism Sustainable? http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/is-modern-capitalism-sustainable-)

CAMBRIDGE – I am often asked if the recent global financial crisis marks the beginning of the end of modern capitalism. It is a curious question, because it seems to presume that there is a viable replacement waiting in the wings. The truth of the matter is that, for now at least, the only serious alternatives to today’s dominant Anglo-American paradigm are other forms of capitalism. European capitalism, which combines generous health and social benefits with reasonable working hours, long vacation periods, early retirement, and relatively equal income distributions, would seem to have everything to recommend it – except sustainability. China’s Darwinian capitalism, with its fierce competition among export firms, a weak social-safety net, and widespread government intervention, is widely touted as the inevitable heir to Western capitalism, if only because of China’s huge size and consistent outsize growth rate. Yet China’s economic system is continually evolving. Indeed, it is far from clear how far China’s political, economic, and financial structures will continue to transform themselves, and whether China will eventually morph into capitalism’s new exemplar. In any case, China is still encumbered by the usual social, economic, and financial vulnerabilities of a rapidly growing lower-income country. Perhaps the real point is that, in the broad sweep of history, all current forms of capitalism are ultimately transitional. Modern-day capitalism has had an extraordinary run since the start of the Industrial Revolution two centuries ago, lifting billions of ordinary people out of abject poverty. Marxism and heavy-handed socialism have disastrous records by comparison. But, as industrialization and technological progress spread to Asia (and now to Africa), someday the struggle for subsistence will no longer be a primary imperative, and contemporary capitalism’s numerous flaws may loom larger. First, even the leading capitalist economies have failed to price public goods such as clean air and water effectively. The failure of efforts to conclude a new global climate-change agreement is symptomatic of the paralysis. Second, along with great wealth, capitalism has produced extraordinary levels of inequality. The growing gap is partly a simple byproduct of innovation and entrepreneurship. People do not complain about Steve Jobs’s success; his contributions are obvious. But this is not always the case: great wealth enables groups and individuals to buy political power and influence, which in turn helps to generate even more wealth. Only a few countries – Sweden, for example – have been able to curtail this vicious circle without causing growth to collapse. A third problem is the provision and distribution of medical care, a market that fails to satisfy several of the basic requirements necessary for the price mechanism to produce economic efficiency, beginning with the difficulty that consumers have in assessing the quality of their treatment. The problem will only get worse: health-care costs as a proportion of income are sure to rise as societies get richer and older, possibly exceeding 30% of GDP within a few decades. In health care, perhaps more than in any other market, many countries are struggling with the moral dilemma of how to maintain incentives to produce and consume efficiently without producing unacceptably large disparities in access to care. It is ironic that modern capitalist societies engage in public campaigns to urge individuals to be more attentive to their health, while fostering an economic ecosystem that seduces many consumers into an extremely unhealthy diet. According to the United States Centers for Disease Control, 34% of Americans are obese. Clearly, conventionally measured economic growth – which implies higher consumption – cannot be an end in itself. Fourth, today’s capitalist systems vastly undervalue the welfare of unborn generations. For most of the era since the Industrial Revolution, this has not mattered, as the continuing boon of technological advance has trumped short-sighted policies. By and large, each generation has found itself significantly better off than the last. But, with the world’s population surging above seven billion, and harbingers of resource constraints becoming ever more apparent, there is no guarantee that this trajectory can be maintained. Financial crises are of course a fifth problem, perhaps the one that has provoked the most soul-searching of late. In the world of finance, continual technological innovation has not conspicuously reduced risks, and might well have magnified them. In principle, none of capitalism’s problems is insurmountable, and economists have offered a variety of market-based solutions. A high global price for carbon would induce firms and individuals to internalize the cost of their polluting activities. Tax systems can be designed to provide a greater measure of redistribution of income without necessarily involving crippling distortions, by minimizing non-transparent tax expenditures and keeping marginal rates low. Effective pricing of health care, including the pricing of waiting times, could encourage a better balance between equality and efficiency. Financial systems could be better regulated, with stricter attention to excessive accumulations of debt. Will capitalism be a victim of its own success in producing massive wealth? For now, as fashionable as the topic of capitalism’s demise might be, the possibility seems remote. Nevertheless, as pollution, financial instability, health problems, and inequality continue to grow, and as political systems remain paralyzed, capitalism’s future might not seem so secure in a few decades as it seems now.

#### Sustainable capitalism now

Economist 2012 (The Economist, February 16, 2012, “Blood, Gore and capitalism,” http://www.economist.com/blogs/schumpeter/2012/02/sustainable-capitalism)

THESE are busy days for Al Gore. In late January, the former vice-president turned climate-change warrior took to the high seas, leading a luxury cruise-cum-fact-finding mission to Antarctica for a bunch of billionaires and policy wonks. They were to see for themselves the melting ice shelf and enjoy what remains of the spectacular views. Then, on February 15th, he was in New York to launch a manifesto (pdf) for what he calls “sustainable capitalism”. The manifesto is published by the non-profit arm of Generation Investment Management, a fund-management company Mr Gore launched in 2004 with David Blood, an ex-partner at Goldman Sachs. The company focuses on firms with what it calls sustainable business models. Unlike Mr Gore's seafaring adventures, which generated a lively blogging war between Mr Gore, shipmates such as Richard Branson, and their right-wing critics, the manifesto is unlikely to set anyone's pulse racing. Yet its very dullness is a virtue, for it reflects the practical lessons learnt from several years of trying to make a success of the investment business, where the devil lies very much in the boring detail. The big picture outlined by Messrs Blood and Gore is hardly novel. An obsession with short-term profits rather than sustainable long-term profits led to the apotheosis of unsustainable capitalism—the crash of September 2008—and the subsequent bail-out of the financial system (though in this case, a lack of environmental concern was the least of the unsustainability problems). Like many people, they had expected this crash to be a turning point, after which capitalism would be reorientated towards the long term. In the event, this did not happen. Indeed, says Mr Gore, the “conversation about sustainability has if anything gone backwards”. To help remedy this, the manifesto suggests several changes to the way the capitalist system works. (It does not go into detail about other farther-reaching reforms for which Mr Gore has long advocated, such as putting a price on carbon.) The sexiest of these, assuming securities law turns you on, is a proposal—already made elsewhere by organisations such as the Aspen Institute—for “loyalty shares” that pay out more to investors that have owned them continuously for at least three years. The average holding period for a share is now seven months, down from several years in the 1990s. Rewarding longer ownership would require a lot of new legislation, particularly to apply it to existing firms. Even among those who favour long-termism there is debate about whether longer ownership is necessarily the same as more effective ownership. Still, it is worth discussing. Lovers of accountancy may be taken more by two other proposals. One, which would probably need legislation though could conceivably be introduced without it by regulators such as America’s Securities and Exchange Commission, is to require all companies to publish “integrated reports” that would include details of their environmental, social and governance (ESG) performance alongside their financial returns. Making such reporting mandatory would be a big step, especially given opposition from the significant number of firms that say that the science of ESG reporting is too immature to be integrated with financial reports. A better approach, cited in the manifesto, may be South Africa's new requirement that firms either publish an integrated report or explain why not. That should stimulate lively debate in either case. The Blood and Gore manifesto also wants firms to have to account for assets that might become "stranded" —worth much less—in the event of policy changes such as the imposition of a price on carbon emissions or higher charges for the use of water. This, the pair contend, would reveal many companies to be in much worse shape than they now appear, given plausible scenarios for how policy in these areas might one day develop. This scenario-planning might seem like a lot of extra work about stuff that is only hypothetical, and thus a burdensome extra cost. But Mr Blood points out that many firms already apply a price of carbon internally,¶ for example when evaluating significant investments, as they increasingly think it likely that governments will impose one. So perhaps it isn't that much more work. A key issue is whether all this extra information and rewards for loyalty will result in demands for more sustainable performance from those who own companies. As well as calling for company bosses to be paid in ways that incentivise sustainable long-term performance, the manifesto rightly shines a critical light on the pay of fund managers employed by institutional shareholders such as pension funds. Often, these managers are paid for short-term financial results, even though the liabilities of those investors—all of our pensions, for instance—are mostly very long-term. This prompts the thought that institutional investors that incentivise short-term performance when their liabilities are long-term may be in breach of their fiduciary duty as managers of other people's money. Indeed, maybe this incentive mismatch could provide the basis for a lawsuit. Messrs Blood and Gore say they are intrigued by the possibilities for such litigation to drive change, though they are not inclined to bring it themselves. But they do want to see the definition of what it means to be a fiduciary expanded to include an emphasis on sustainable investing. To their critics, Messrs Blood and Gore simply want to weigh capitalism down with political correctness. Yet they insist that a focus on firms that deliver sustainable results is actually the best long-term investment strategy. That, after all, is why they created Generation. Unlike earlier "green" and "ethical" investment funds, which screened out "bad" companies, effectively sacrificing financial return for purity, Generation set out to outperform the market by finding firms that it expected to do better than average over the long term.

#### Tech solves

Huggins 2012 (Laura E. Huggins, research fellow at the Hoover Institution and director of development at PERC—the Property and Environment Research Center—a think tank in Bozeman, Montana, that focuses on market solutions to environmental problems, 2012 “A Doom Deferred” http://www.hoover.org/publications/hoover-digest/article/105756)

The authors of the Times op-ed also wrote that “the effects of overpopulation play a part in practically every daily report of mass human calamity.” Floods, for example, “inundate more homes as populations expand into floodplains. Such extreme events are stoked by climate change, fueled by increasing carbon emissions from an expanding global population.” These modern-day predictions are in stark contrast to claims in the same vein from the 1970s. In a popular 1970 speech at Swarthmore College, for example, well-known ecologist Kenneth Watt said, “If present trends continue, the world will be about four degrees colder for the global mean temperature in 1990, but 11 degrees colder in the year 2000. This is about twice what it would take to put us into an ice age.” Time has not been gentle with such prophecies. Four decades later, the world hasn’t come to an end. Most measures of human welfare show the Earth’s population is better off today than at any other time in human history. Life expectancy is increasing, per-capita income is rising, and the air we breathe and the water we drink are cleaner. And concerns about climate change have shifted from cooling to warming since the 1970s. Given past trends, we are right to deny doom-and-gloom claims such as this one in Harte and Ehrlich’s article: “Perpetual growth is the creed of a cancer cell, not a sustainable human society.” New ideas and technologies proliferate at a much faster rate than population. New ideas and technologies proliferate at a much faster rate than population. They depend on individuals who are free to pursue their own interests and innovate with few constraints. As Stanford economist Paul Romer put it, “Every generation has perceived the limits to growth that finite resources and undesirable side effects would pose if no new recipes or ideas were discovered. And every generation has underestimated the potential for finding new recipes and ideas. We consistently fail to grasp how many ideas remain to be discovered. Possibilities do not add up; they multiply.”

#### Neolib solves the environment

Zey 1997 (Michael Zey, Professor of Management at Montclair State University, 1997, The Futurist, “The Macroindustrial Era: A New Age of Abundance and Prosperity”, March/April, http://www.zey.com/Featured\_2.htm)

This brings me to one of my major points about the necessity of growth. A recurring criticism of growth - be it industrial, economic, or technological - centers around its negative consequences. A good example of this is the tendency of economic and industrial growth to generate pollution. However, I contend that growth invariably provides solutions to any problems it introduces. The following examples will illustrate my point. Although economic growth can initially lead to such problems as pollution and waste, studies show that, after a country achieves a certain level of prosperity, the pendulum begins to swing back toward cleaner air and water. In fact, once a nation's per capita income rises to about $4,000 (in 1993 dollars), it produces less of some pollutants per capita. The reason for this is quite simple: Such a nation can now afford technologies such as catalytic converters and sewage systems that treat and eliminate a variety of wastes. According to Norio Yamamoto, research director of the Mitsubishi Research Institute, "We consider any kind of environmental damage to result from mismanagement of the economy." He claims that the pollution problems of poorer regions such as eastern Europe can be traced largely to their economic woes. Hence he concludes that, in order to ensure environmental safety, "we need a sound economy on a global basis." Thus, the answer to pollution, the supposed outgrowth of progress, ought to be more economic growth. Such economic growth can be accelerated by any number of actions: the transfer of technology, the sharing of scientific know-how, and economic investment. The World Bank estimates that every dollar invested in developing countries will grow to $100 in 50 years. As their wealth increases, these countries can take all the necessary steps to invest in pollution-free cars, catalytic converters, and other pollution-free technologies, such as the cleanest of all current large-scale energy sources, nuclear power. They can also afford to invest in bioremediation - the utilization of viruses to literally eat such impurities as oil spills and toxic waste. Russia is actively growing and exporting microorganisms that eat radioactive and metallic wastes from such sources as uranium, plutonium, magnesium, and silver.

#### The environment is resilient nuclear war destroys it

Schweickart 2010 (David Schweickart, Professor at Loyola University Chicago, Ph.D. in Mathematics UVA, Ph.D. in Philosophy The Ohio State University, “Is Sustainable Capitalism Possible?,” Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences 41 (2010) 6739–6752)

It is not true either that the various ecological crises we are facing will bring about “the end of the world.” Consider the projections of the Stern Review, the recently released report commissioned by the British Government. If nothing is done, we risk “major disruption to economic and social activity, later in this century and the next, on a scale similar to those associated with the great wars and economic depression of the first half of the 20th century.”¶ This is serious. Some sixty million people died in World War Two. The Stern Review estimates as many as 200 million people could be permanently displaced by rising sea level and drought. But this is not “the end of the world.” Even if the effects are far worse, resulting in billions of deaths—a highly unlikely scenario—there would still be lots of us left. If three-quarters of the present population perished, that would still leave us with 1.6 billion people—the population of the planet in 1900. ¶ I say this not to minimize the potentially horrific impact of relentless environmental destruction, but to caution against exaggeration. We are not talking about thermonuclear war—which could have extinguished us as a species. (It still might.) And we shouldn’t lose sight of the fact that millions of people on the planet right now, caught up in savage civil wars or terrorized by U.S. bombers (which dropped some 100,000 lbs. of explosives on a Baghdad neighborhood during one ten-day period in January 2008—the amount the fascists used to level the Basque town of Guernica during the Spanish Civil War), are faced with conditions more terrible than anyone here is likely to face in his or her lifetime due to environmental degradation.

#### Neolib Solves War

Hillebrand 2010 Evan E. Hillebrand (Professor of Diplomacy at University of Kentucky and a Senior Economist for the Central Intelligence Agency) 2010 “Deglobalization Scenarios: Who Wins? Who Loses?” Global Economy Journal, Volume 10, Issue 2 2010

A long line of writers from Cruce (1623) to Kant (1797) to Angell (1907) to Gartzke (2003) have theorized that economic interdependence can lower the likelihood of war. Cruce thought that free trade enriched a society in general and so made people more peaceable; Kant thought that trade shifted political power away from the more warlike aristocracy, and Angell thought that economic interdependence shifted cost/benefit calculations in a peace-promoting direction. Gartzke contends that trade relations enhance transparency among nations and thus help avoid bargaining miscalculations. There has also been a tremendous amount of empirical research that mostly supports the idea of an inverse relationship between trade and war. Jack Levy said that, “While there are extensive debates over the proper research designs for investigating this question, and while some empirical studies find that trade is associated with international conflict, most studies conclude that trade is associated with peace, both at the dyadic and systemic levels” (Levy, 2003, p. 127). There is another important line of theoretical and empirical work called Power Transition Theory that focuses on the relative power of states and warns that when rising powers approach the power level of their regional or global leader the chances of war increase (Tammen, Lemke, et al, 2000). Jacek Kugler (2006) warns that the rising power of China relative to the United States greatly increases the chances of great power war some time in the next few decades. The IFs model combines the theoretical and empirical work of the peacethrough trade tradition with the work of the power transition scholars in an attempt to forecast the probability of interstate war. Hughes (2004) explains how he, after consulting with scholars in both camps, particularly Edward Mansfield and Douglas Lemke, estimated the starting probabilities for each dyad based on the historical record, and then forecast future probabilities for dyadic militarized interstate disputes (MIDs) and wars based on the calibrated relationships he derived from the empirical literature. The probability of a MID, much less a war, between any random dyad in any given year is very low, if not zero. Paraguay and Tanzania, for example, have never fought and are very unlikely to do so. But there have been thousands of MIDs in the past and hundreds of wars and many of the 16,653 dyads have nonzero probabilities. In 2005 the mean probability of a country being involved in at least one war was estimated to be 0.8%, with 104 countries having a probability of at least 1 war approaching zero. A dozen countries12, however, have initial probabilities over 3%. model predicts four great power wars in the deglobalization scenario vs. 2 in the globalization scenario.16 The globalization scenario projects that the probability for war will gradually decrease through 2035 for every country—but not every dyad--that had a significant (greater than 0.5% chance of war) in 2005 (Table 6). The decline in prospects for war stems from the scenario’s projections of rising levels of democracy, rising incomes, and rising trade interdependence—all of these factors figure in the algorithm that calculates the probabilities. Not all dyadic war probabilities decrease, however, because of the power transition mechanism that is also included in the IFs model. The probability for war between China and the US, for example rises as China’s power13 rises gradually toward the US level but in these calculations the probability of a China/US war never gets very high.14 Deglobalization raises the risks of war substantially. In a world with much lower average incomes, less democracy, and less trade interdependence, the average probability of a country having at least one war in 2035 rises from 0.6% in the globalization scenario to 3.7% in the deglobalization scenario. Among the top-20 war-prone countries, the average probability rises from 3.9% in the globalization scenario to 7.1% in the deglobalization scenario. The model estimates that in the deglobalization scenario there will be about 10 wars in 2035, vs. only 2 in the globalization scenario15. Over the whole period, 2005-2035, the IV. Winners and Losers Deglobalization in the form of reduced trade interdependence, reduced capital flows, and reduced migration has few positive effects, based on this analysis with the International Futures Model. Economic growth is cut in all but a handful of countries, and is cut more in the non-OECD countries than in the OECD countries. Deglobalization has a mixed impact on equality. In many non-OECD countries, the cut in imports from the rest of the world increases the share of manufacturing and in 61 countries raises the share of income going to the poor. But since average productivity goes down in almost all countries, this gain in equality comes at the expense of reduced incomes and increased poverty in almost all countries. The only winners are a small number of countries that were small and poor and not well integrated in the global economy to begin with—and the gains from deglobalization even for them are very small. Politically, deglobalization makes for less stable domestic politics and a greater likelihood of war. The likelihood of state failure through internal war, projected to diminish through 2035 with increasing globalization, rises in the deglobalization scenario particularly among the non-OECD democracies. Similarly, deglobalization makes for more fractious relations among states and the probability for interstate war rises.

### DA

#### This DA is our advantage- Shale is crashing now

#### A2 production low now- Helder = production treadmill

#### There’s tons of gas in the OCS – guarantees long term supply. Plan is key to leasing certainty that solves production

Griles 2003 (Steven Griles, Deputy Secretary of the DOI, “Energy Production on Federal Lands,” February 27, 2003, Hearing before the Energy and Natural Resources Committee of the US Senate, http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CHRG-108shrg86709/html/CHRG-108shrg86709.htm)

Mr. Griles. America's public lands have an abundant ¶ opportunity for exploration and development of renewable and ¶ nonrenewable energy resources. Energy reserves contained on the ¶ Department of the Interior's onshore and offshore Federal lands ¶ are very important to meeting our current and future estimates ¶ of what it is going to take to continue to supply America's ¶ energy demand.¶ Estimates suggest that these lands contain approximately 68 ¶ percent of the undiscovered U.S. oil resources and 74 percent ¶ of the undiscovered natural gas resources. President Bush has ¶ developed a national energy policy that laid out a ¶ comprehensive, long-term energy strategy for America's future. ¶ That strategy recognizes we need to raise domestic production ¶ of energy, both renewable and nonrenewable, to meet our ¶ dependence for energy.¶ For oil and gas, the United States uses about 7 billion ¶ barrels a year, of which about 4 billion are currently imported ¶ and 3 billion are domestically produced. The President proposed ¶ to open a small portion of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge ¶ to environmentally responsible oil and gas exploration.¶ Now there is a new and environmentally friendly technology, ¶ similar to directional drilling, with mobile platforms, self-¶ containing drilling units. These things will allow producers to ¶ access large energy reserves with almost no footprint on the ¶ tundra. Each day, even since I have assumed this job, our ¶ ability to minimize our effect on the environment continues to ¶ improve to where it is almost nonexistent in such areas as even ¶ in Alaska.¶ According to the latest oil and gas assessment, ANWR is the ¶ largest untapped source of domestic production available to us. ¶ The production for ANWR would equal about 60 years of imports ¶ from Iraq.¶ The National Energy Policy also encourages development of ¶ cleaner, more diverse portfolios of domestic renewable energy ¶ sources. The renewable policy in areas cover geothermal, wind, ¶ solar, and biomass. And it urges research on hydrogen as an ¶ alternate energy source.¶ To advance the National Energy Policy, the Bureau of Land ¶ Management and the DOE's National Renewable Energy Lab last ¶ week announced the release of a renewable energy report. It ¶ identifies and evaluates renewable energy resources on public ¶ lands.¶ Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit this for the record.\* ¶ This report, which has just come out, assess the potential for ¶ renewable energy on public lands. It is a very good report that ¶ we hope will allow for the private sector, after working with ¶ the various other agencies, to where can we best use renewable ¶ resource, and how do we take this assessment and put it into ¶ the land use planning that we are currently going, so that ¶ right-of-ways and understanding of what renewable resources can ¶ be done in the West can, in fact, have a better opportunity. The Department completed the first of an energy inventory ¶ this year. Now the EPCA report, which is laying here, also, Mr. ¶ Chairman, is an estimate of the undiscovered, technically ¶ recoverable oil and gas. Part one of that report covers five ¶ oil and gas basins. The second part of the report will be out ¶ later this year.¶ Now this report, it is not--there are people who have ¶ different opinions of it. But the fact is we believe it will be ¶ a good guidance tool, as we look at where the oil and gas ¶ potential is and where we need to do land use planning. And as ¶ we update these land use plannings and do our EISs, that will ¶ help guide further the private sector, the public sector, and ¶ all stakeholders on how we can better do land use planning and ¶ develop oil and gas in a sound fashion.¶ Also, I have laying here in front of me the two EISs that ¶ have been done on the two major coal methane basins in the ¶ United States, San Juan Basis and the Powder River Basin. ¶ Completing these reports, which are in draft, will increase and ¶ offer the opportunity for production of natural gas with coal ¶ bed methane.¶ Now these reports are in draft and, once completed, will ¶ authorize and allow for additional exploration and development. ¶ It has taken 2 years to get these in place. It has taken 2 ¶ years to get some of these in place. This planning process that ¶ Congress has initiated under FLPMA and other statutes allows ¶ for a deliberative, conscious understanding of what the impacts ¶ are. We believe that when these are finalized, that is in fact ¶ what will occur.¶ One of the areas which we believe that the Department of ¶ the Interior and the Bureau of Land Management is and is going ¶ to engage in is coordination with landowners. Mr. Chairman, the ¶ private sector in the oil and gas industry must be good ¶ neighbors with the ranchers in the West. The BLM is going to be ¶ addressing the issues of bonding requirements that will assure ¶ that landowners have their surface rights and their values ¶ protected.¶ BLM is working to make the consultation process with the ¶ landowners, with the States and local governments and other ¶ Federal agencies more efficient and meaningful. But we must ¶ assure that the surface owners are protected and the values of ¶ their ranches are in fact assured. And by being good neighbors, ¶ we can do that.¶ In the BLM land use planning process, we have priorities, ¶ ten current resource management planning areas that contain the ¶ major oil and gas reserves that are reported out in the EPCA ¶ study. Once this process is completed, then we can move forward ¶ with consideration of development of the natural gas.¶ We are also working with the Western Governors' Association ¶ and the Western Utilities Group. The purpose is to identify and ¶ designate right-of-way corridors on public lands. We would like ¶ to do it now as to where right-of-way corridors make sense and ¶ put those in our land use planning processes, so that when the ¶ need is truly identified, utilities, energy companies, and the ¶ public will know where they are Instead of taking two years to ¶ amend a land use plan, hopefully this will expedite and have ¶ future opportunity so that when the need is there, we can go ¶ ahead and make that investment through the private sector. It ¶ should speed up the process of right-of-way permits for both ¶ pipelines and electric transmission.¶ Now let me switch to the offshore, the Outer Continental ¶ Shelf. It is a huge contributor to our Nation's energy and ¶ economic security.¶ The Chairman. Mr. Secretary, everything you have talked ¶ about so far is onshore.¶ Mr. Griles. That is correct.¶ The Chairman. You now will speak to offshore.¶ Mr. Griles. Yes, sir, I will.¶ Now we are keeping on schedule the holding lease sales in ¶ the areas that are available for leasing. In the past year, ¶ scheduled sales in several areas were either delayed, canceled, ¶ or put under moratoria, even though they were in the 5-year ¶ plan. It undermined certainty. It made investing, particularly ¶ in the Gulf, more risky.¶ We have approved a 5-year oil and gas leasing program in ¶ July 2002 that calls for 20 new lease sales in the Gulf of ¶ Mexico and several other areas of the offshore, specifically in ¶ Alaska by 2007. Now our estimates indicate that these areas ¶ contain resources up to 22 billion barrels of oil and 61 ¶ trillion cubic feet of natural gas.¶ We are also acting to raise energy production from these ¶ offshore areas by providing royalty relief on the OCS leases ¶ for new deep wells that are drilled in shallow water. These are ¶ at depths that heretofore were very and are very costly to ¶ produce from and costly to drill to. We need to encourage that ¶ exploration. These deep wells, which are greater than 15,000 ¶ feet in depth, are expected to access between 5 to 20 trillion ¶ cubic feet of natural gas and can be developed quickly due to ¶ existing infrastructure and the shallow water.¶ We have also issued a final rule in July 2002 that allows ¶ companies to apply for a lease extension, giving them more time ¶ to analyze complex geological data that underlies salt domes. ¶ That is, where geologically salt overlays the geologically ¶ clay. And you try to do seismic, and the seismic just gets ¶ distorted. So we have extended the lease terms, so that ¶ hopefully those companies can figure out where and where to ¶ best drill. Vast resources of oil and natural gas lie, we hope, ¶ beneath these sheets of salt in the OCS in the Gulf of Mexico. ¶ But it is very difficult to get clear seismic images.¶ We are also working to create a process of reviewing and ¶ permitting alternative energy sources on the OCS lands. We have ¶ sent legislation to Congress that would give the Minerals ¶ Management Service of the Department of the Interior clear ¶ authority to lease parts of the OCS for renewable energy. The ¶ renewables could be wind, wave, or solar energy, and related ¶ projects that are auxiliary to oil and gas development, such as ¶ offshore staging facilities and emergency medical facilities.¶ We need this authority in order to be able to truly give ¶ the private sector what are the rules to play from and buy, so ¶ they can have certainty about where to go.

#### 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.

#### Plan immediately solve the economy

Mason 2009 (Joseph R. Mason, Hermann Moyse Jr./Louisiana Bankers Association Endowed Chair of Banking, Louisiana State University, E. J. Ourso College of Business, “The Economic Contribution of Increased Offshore Oil Exploration and Production to Regional and National Economies by J oseph R. Mason,” http://www.americanenergyalliance.org/images/aea\_offshore\_updated\_final.pdf)

The estimates suggest that permanently lifting the OCS moratoria would produce broad economic benefits. Those benefits are analyzed on both short- and long-term bases. Short-run effects are represented as expected annual effects during the first years of the investment (pre-production) phase; Long-run effects are represented as expected annual effects during the production phase. A summary of the estimated shortand long-run effects is presented in Table 1. Summarizing the results, increased offshore investment and production would support hundreds of thousands of new careers and provide billions of dollars in new wages and tax revenues. By the present estimates, increased production is likely to contribute an additional 0.5 percent of GDP in immediate new economic activity each year and will ultimately contribute more than 2 percent of GDP each year for thirty or more years of production. That magnitude of economic growth is expected to contribute federal and state and local tax revenue from production equivalent to approximately $350 per person over the age of eighteen per year over a similar time horizon. The total incremental contribution of increased OCS Planning Area production to GDP is more than $8 trillion (in current dollars), and total tax benefits amount to some $2.2 trillion. Total royalty revenues amount to over $400 billion. Importantly, those benefits would be realized without any increase in direct government spending. Rather, increased OCS output would refill national, state, and local government coffers—currently depleted by the real estate and credit crises—without additional government outlays. The effects of such a stimulus are particularly attractive in the face of a severe economic downturn.

#### Econ collapse doesn’t cause war – prefer our studies

Samuel Bazzi (Department of Economics at University of California San Diego) and Christopher Blattman (assistant professor of political science and economics at Yale University) November 2011 “Economic Shocks and Conflict: The (Absence of?) Evidence from Commodity Prices” <http://www.chrisblattman.com/documents/research/2011.EconomicShocksAndConflict.pdf?9d7bd4>

VI. Discussion and conclusions A. Implications for our theories of political instability and conflict The state is not a prize?—Warlord politics and the state prize logic lie at the center of the most influential models of conflict, state development, and political transitions in economics and political science. Yet we see no evidence for this idea in economic shocks, even when looking at the friendliest cases: fragile and unconstrained states dominated by extractive commodity revenues. Indeed, we see the opposite correlation: if anything, higher rents from commodity prices weakly 22 lower the risk and length of conflict. Perhaps shocks are the wrong test. Stocks of resources could matter more than price shocks (especially if shocks are transitory). But combined with emerging evidence that war onset is no more likely even with rapid increases in known oil reserves (Humphreys 2005; Cotet and Tsui 2010) we regard the state prize logic of war with skepticism.17 Our main political economy models may need a new engine. Naturally, an absence of evidence cannot be taken for evidence of absence. Many of our conflict onset and ending results include sizeable positive and negative effects.18 Even so, commodity price shocks are highly influential in income and should provide a rich source of identifiable variation in instability. It is difficult to find a better-measured, more abundant, and plausibly exogenous independent variable than price volatility. Moreover, other time-varying variables, like rainfall and foreign aid, exhibit robust correlations with conflict in spite of suffering similar empirical drawbacks and generally smaller sample sizes (Miguel et al. 2004; Nielsen et al. 2011). Thus we take the absence of evidence seriously. Do resource revenues drive state capacity?—State prize models assume that rising revenues raise the value of the capturing the state, but have ignored or downplayed the effect of revenues on self-defense. We saw that a growing empirical political science literature takes just such a revenue-centered approach, illustrating that resource boom times permit both payoffs and repression, and that stocks of lootable or extractive resources can bring political order and stability. This countervailing effect is most likely with transitory shocks, as current revenues are affected while long term value is not. Our findings are partly consistent with this state capacity effect. For example, conflict intensity is most sensitive to changes in the extractive commodities rather than the annual agricultural crops that affect household incomes more directly. The relationship only holds for conflict intensity, however, and is somewhat fragile. We do not see a large, consistent or robust decline in conflict or coup risk when prices fall. A reasonable interpretation is that the state prize and state capacity effects are either small or tend to cancel one another out. Opportunity cost: Victory by default?—Finally, the inverse relationship between prices and war intensity is consistent with opportunity cost accounts, but not exclusively so. As we noted above, the relationship between intensity and extractive commodity prices is more consistent with the state capacity view. Moreover, we shouldn’t mistake an inverse relation between individual aggression and incomes as evidence for the opportunity cost mechanism. The same correlation is consistent with psychological theories of stress and aggression (Berkowitz 1993) and sociological and political theories of relative deprivation and anomie (Merton 1938; Gurr 1971). Microempirical work will be needed to distinguish between these mechanisms. Other reasons for a null result.—Ultimately, however, the fact that commodity price shocks have no discernible effect on new conflict onsets, but some effect on ongoing conflict, suggests that political stability might be less sensitive to income or temporary shocks than generally believed. One possibility is that successfully mounting an insurgency is no easy task. It comes with considerable risk, costs, and coordination challenges. Another possibility is that the counterfactual is still conflict onset. In poor and fragile nations, income shocks of one type or another are ubiquitous. If a nation is so fragile that a change in prices could lead to war, then other shocks may trigger war even in the absence of a price shock. The same argument has been made in debunking the myth that price shocks led to fiscal collapse and low growth in developing nations in the 1980s.19 B. A general problem of publication bias? More generally, these findings should heighten our concern with publication bias in the conflict literature. Our results run against a number of published results on commodity shocks and conflict, mainly because of select samples, misspecification, and sensitivity to model assumptions, and, most importantly, alternative measures of instability. Across the social and hard sciences, there is a concern that the majority of published research findings are false (e.g. Gerber et al. 2001). Ioannidis (2005) demonstrates that a published finding is less likely to be true when there is a greater number and lesser pre-selection of tested relationships; there is greater flexibility in designs, definitions, outcomes, and models; and when more teams are involved in the chase of statistical significance. The cross-national study of conflict is an extreme case of all these. Most worryingly, almost no paper looks at alternative dependent variables or publishes systematic robustness checks. Hegre and Sambanis (2006) have shown that the majority of published conflict results are fragile, though they focus on timeinvariant regressors and not the time-varying shocks that have grown in popularity. We are also concerned there is a “file drawer problem” (Rosenthal 1979). Consider this decision rule: scholars that discover robust results that fit a theoretical intuition pursue the results; but if results are not robust the scholar (or referees) worry about problems with the data or empirical strategy, and identify additional work to be done. If further analysis produces a robust result, it is published. If not, back to the file drawer. In the aggregate, the consequences are dire: a lower threshold of evidence for initially significant results than ambiguous ones.20

### 2AC Politics- CIR- Econ

#### Credibility doesn’t matter

**Fettweis 2008** (Christopher J. Fettweis, assistant professor of national security affairs at the U.S. Naval War College, Ph.D. University of Maryland's Department of Government and Politics, University of Notre Dame, “Credibility and the War on Terror,” Political Science Quarterly, EBSCO Host)

The second observation on the use of the credibility imperative in policy debate is perhaps related to the first: the imperative often produces astonishing hyperbole, even in otherwise sober analysts. If the United States were to lose credibility, the floodgates would open to a variety of catastrophes, setting off dominoes that would eventually not only threaten vital interests and make war necessary, but perhaps even lead to the end of the Republic itself. The credibility imperative warns that momentum toward disaster can begin with the smallest demonstration of irresolution, thus sustaining the vision of an interdependent system in which there are no inconsequential events. In the words of Dale Copeland, "It is easier to stop a snowball before it begins to roll downhill than to intervene only after it has started to gain momentum."" Therefore, even the smallest of slips can lead to large-scale disaster.

#### Navy solves the impact to economic collapse- Sea power enables us to maintain trade routes and deter conflicts with carrier groups, etc.

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

Hirsch 2/7 (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’s PC is BAD- derails now-inevitable CIR

Cooper 1/28 (Matthew Cooper, editor of national journal daily, January 28, 2013, “Why Obama Could Be the Biggest Obstacle to An Immigration Deal,” http://www.nationaljournal.com/politics/why-obama-could-be-the-biggest-obstacle-to-an-immigration-deal-20130128)

Anyone with a kid or a boss knows that one of the most important things you can do is back off. Hovering over your kid is not the best way to get them to put on their coat, and it’s not the best way to get a raise.

And that is the position President Obama finds himself in as he jets to Las Vegas on Tuesday to tout comprehensive immigration reform. The issue has hopelessly divided Congress over the past few years and the president punted on it in his first term, vowing to return to it after the election. It was in his Inaugural Address and it will be in his State of the Union.¶ But a funny thing happened on the way to the border crossing: Congress has now taken up immigration reform in earnest with all the good-government diligence of a Brookings report and a Washington Post editorial. Bipartisan groups of senators have been earnestly hammering out plans, including the inseparable duo of John McCain, R-Ariz., and Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., as well Democratic leaders Chuck Schumer of New York and Dick Durbin of Illinois.¶ Chastened by the election results, Republicans have returned to the McCain-Ted Kennedy-George W. Bush immigration consensus that thrived around 2006, which is to create a so-called pathway to citizenship for 11 million undocumented workers. McCain himself retreated from his earlier position saying that border security had to come before the creation of a pathway for 11 million undocumented workers to seek citizenship. Now, McCain is back on board with his own plan—and so are lots of other folks.¶ One of the things to look for is whether Obama has the good sense to lead from behind and not claim this plan as his own crusade. That is the surest way to piss off Congress, especially congressional Republicans, just as it is children and bosses. Letting them come up with the plan and showing a willingness to sign off on it would probably be the best bet. If it’s seen as Obama's plan, they’ll reflexively oppose it. If it’s Marco Rubio’s plan, even if it bears little difference from Obama’s, Republicans—who want Hispanics' love even more than a tax cut—will embrace it.¶ In 1986, Ronald Reagan goosed tax reform along without making it his own, and that’s probably the best bet for Obama this time.¶ Of course, having set in motion the presidential machinery of claiming it is one of his top priorities, it’s going to be hard for Obama not to lead the charge, especially when it’s like pushing on an open door. Congress has suddenly become receptive. So why not? But despite the temptation to drop one’s own bill in, say, the Senate Judiciary Committee through Chairman Patrick Leahy, D-Vt., holding back would make the most sense, lest the president galvanize Republicans.¶ Getting to the finish line on immigration won’t be easy despite the new receptivity. There are policy questions: Will the E-Verify system be widely demanded or not? What’s the route to green cards? There are political ones: Can the tea party back off its tough stand on immigration? Can labor and Hispanic groups accept tougher documentation standards? There’s a reason we haven’t had a big immigration bill in more than a generation. Knowing when to have a light touch will require the president to be less assertive than he was in his inaugural address.

#### Compromise now- Obama messes it up

Klein 1/28 (Ezra Klein, “Two numbers show why Republicans support immigration reform,” Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2013/01/28/two-numbers-show-why-republicans-support-immigration-reform/)

So on this issue, Republicans have both strategic and substantive reasons for making a deal. The question for the Obama administration is how to keep them from developing reasons for opposing whatever particular deal the Obama administration proposes. And the answer, in a way, is obvious: The Obama administration shouldn’t propose a deal. In fact, it should stay out of the dealmaking as much as possible.¶ The immigration-reform effort is being spearheaded by a bipartisan group of senators that includes Chuck Schumer (D-N.Y.), John McCain (R-Ariz.), Dick Durbin (D-Ill.), Marco Rubio (R-Fla.), Bob Menendez (D-N.J.), Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.), Michael Bennet (D-Colo.) and Jeff Flake (R-Ariz.). You can read their plan here. That’s no accident. Durbin, Schumer and Menendez are close allies of the White House. The fact that they moved first isn’t a quirk of scheduling. It’s an effort to keep the fever down.¶ Republicans will fight most anything Obama proposes. This is, again, not because they’re sick, but because they run in primaries and represent districts and states where their constituents want them to fight anything overly associated with the Obama administration.¶ This is a frustrating fact of life for the Obama administration — and perhaps even a sick commentary on how our political system works — but it is, nevertheless, a fact: Their involvement polarizes issues. And it’s not unique to them: Presidential involvement in general polarizes issues. By staying out, at least for now, the Obama administration is making it easier for Republicans to stay in.

#### Plan immediately solve the economy

Mason 2009 (Joseph R. Mason, Hermann Moyse Jr./Louisiana Bankers Association Endowed Chair of Banking, Louisiana State University, E. J. Ourso College of Business, “The Economic Contribution of Increased Offshore Oil Exploration and Production to Regional and National Economies by J oseph R. Mason,” http://www.americanenergyalliance.org/images/aea\_offshore\_updated\_final.pdf)

The estimates suggest that permanently lifting the OCS moratoria would produce broad economic benefits. Those benefits are analyzed on both short- and long-term bases. Short-run effects are represented as expected annual effects during the first years of the investment (pre-production) phase; Long-run effects are represented as expected annual effects during the production phase. A summary of the estimated shortand long-run effects is presented in Table 1. Summarizing the results, increased offshore investment and production would support hundreds of thousands of new careers and provide billions of dollars in new wages and tax revenues. By the present estimates, increased production is likely to contribute an additional 0.5 percent of GDP in immediate new economic activity each year and will ultimately contribute more than 2 percent of GDP each year for thirty or more years of production. That magnitude of economic growth is expected to contribute federal and state and local tax revenue from production equivalent to approximately $350 per person over the age of eighteen per year over a similar time horizon. The total incremental contribution of increased OCS Planning Area production to GDP is more than $8 trillion (in current dollars), and total tax benefits amount to some $2.2 trillion. Total royalty revenues amount to over $400 billion. Importantly, those benefits would be realized without any increase in direct government spending. Rather, increased OCS output would refill national, state, and local government coffers—currently depleted by the real estate and credit crises—without additional government outlays. The effects of such a stimulus are particularly attractive in the face of a severe economic downturn.

#### Their internal to debt/deficit selectively ignores counter-evidence – no significant link

Jack Martin, April 2009 Special Projects Director at the Federation for American Immigration Reform Amnesty & the Economy: Myths, Lies & Obfuscation http://www.fairus.org/site/DocServer/amnesty\_economy.pdf

Recognizing that today’s economic conditions and climbing unemployment are a deterrent to any consideration of immigration amnesty legislation, amnesty advocates are trying to persuade the public and Members of Congress that an amnesty for illegal aliens would help the economy. For example, the Immigration Policy Center (IPC) recently issued a report that argues that, “Without comprehensive reform of the immigration system [read amnesty for illegal aliens], our nation cannot experience a full economic recovery.”1 If bold, baseless assertions such as these would win the immigration debate, the debate would be over. This argument spins a fantasyland out of partial and misleading data. Here is how they do it. ECONOMIC RECOVERY REQUIRES AMNESTY FOR ILLEGAL ALIENS? The first assertion of the IPC polemic describes a revenue panacea for the government if an amnesty is enacted. “The 2007 immigration reform bill, which included a legalization program, would have more than paid for itself through increased tax revenue. The CBO and JCT estimated that the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2007, as amended by the Senate through May 24, 2007, would have generated $48 billion in new revenue during 2008-2017, primarily through Social Security payroll taxes. • The additional revenue would have more than offset the estimated $23 billion in new “direct spending” on refundable income tax credits and Medicaid during 2008-2017. • The extra revenue would have partially offset the $43 billion in new “discretionary spending” on immigration enforcement during 2008-2017.” Read that again. The estimate is that a “legalization” program would cost $23 billion in direct spending and $43 billion in discretionary spending for a total cost of $66 billion and would generate $48 billion in new revenue. So the difference — a deficit of $18 billion — “would have more than paid for itself.” Moral: stating that down is up does not make it so. An analysis by the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities of the same CBO projection noted: “The legislation would increase the unified federal budget deficit by only ‘several billion dollars a year’ by 2027…”2 Although that estimate may understate the net fiscal cost, at least it recognized that it would a revenue loser, not a bonus for the federal government. Aside from the wishful thinking about the impact on the federal budget, the IPC ignores the much greater fiscal impact that amnesty would have at the state and local level. The Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR) explained this impact with regard to the earlier CBO estimate of the impact of the 2006 Senate amnesty bill: “An estimate of the fiscal impact at the local level by FAIR identifies a cost of $70 billion per year by 2020, primarily for education and health care. The $70 billion annual price tag does not include a number of other likely cost increases for programs such as assisted housing and other social welfare programs.”3 In addition, because the formal CBO estimate is for the ten-year period after adoption of the legislation, the estimate focuses on the early effects when the newly legalized aliens currently are precluded by law from using federal welfare programs.Therefore, it does not include the delayed impact. The CBO acknowledged this issue in its report. “This [the increase in the budget deficit] would happen because, the net cost of the legislation would grow after 2017, as more of the affected immigrants became eligible for benefits and the per capita cost of benefits rose…”4

#### Econ collapse doesn’t cause war – prefer our studies

Samuel Bazzi (Department of Economics at University of California San Diego) and Christopher Blattman (assistant professor of political science and economics at Yale University) November 2011 “Economic Shocks and Conflict: The (Absence of?) Evidence from Commodity Prices” <http://www.chrisblattman.com/documents/research/2011.EconomicShocksAndConflict.pdf?9d7bd4>

VI. Discussion and conclusions A. Implications for our theories of political instability and conflict The state is not a prize?—Warlord politics and the state prize logic lie at the center of the most influential models of conflict, state development, and political transitions in economics and political science. Yet we see no evidence for this idea in economic shocks, even when looking at the friendliest cases: fragile and unconstrained states dominated by extractive commodity revenues. Indeed, we see the opposite correlation: if anything, higher rents from commodity prices weakly 22 lower the risk and length of conflict. Perhaps shocks are the wrong test. Stocks of resources could matter more than price shocks (especially if shocks are transitory). But combined with emerging evidence that war onset is no more likely even with rapid increases in known oil reserves (Humphreys 2005; Cotet and Tsui 2010) we regard the state prize logic of war with skepticism.17 Our main political economy models may need a new engine. Naturally, an absence of evidence cannot be taken for evidence of absence. Many of our conflict onset and ending results include sizeable positive and negative effects.18 Even so, commodity price shocks are highly influential in income and should provide a rich source of identifiable variation in instability. It is difficult to find a better-measured, more abundant, and plausibly exogenous independent variable than price volatility. Moreover, other time-varying variables, like rainfall and foreign aid, exhibit robust correlations with conflict in spite of suffering similar empirical drawbacks and generally smaller sample sizes (Miguel et al. 2004; Nielsen et al. 2011). Thus we take the absence of evidence seriously. Do resource revenues drive state capacity?—State prize models assume that rising revenues raise the value of the capturing the state, but have ignored or downplayed the effect of revenues on self-defense. We saw that a growing empirical political science literature takes just such a revenue-centered approach, illustrating that resource boom times permit both payoffs and repression, and that stocks of lootable or extractive resources can bring political order and stability. This countervailing effect is most likely with transitory shocks, as current revenues are affected while long term value is not. Our findings are partly consistent with this state capacity effect. For example, conflict intensity is most sensitive to changes in the extractive commodities rather than the annual agricultural crops that affect household incomes more directly. The relationship only holds for conflict intensity, however, and is somewhat fragile. We do not see a large, consistent or robust decline in conflict or coup risk when prices fall. A reasonable interpretation is that the state prize and state capacity effects are either small or tend to cancel one another out. Opportunity cost: Victory by default?—Finally, the inverse relationship between prices and war intensity is consistent with opportunity cost accounts, but not exclusively so. As we noted above, the relationship between intensity and extractive commodity prices is more consistent with the state capacity view. Moreover, we shouldn’t mistake an inverse relation between individual aggression and incomes as evidence for the opportunity cost mechanism. The same correlation is consistent with psychological theories of stress and aggression (Berkowitz 1993) and sociological and political theories of relative deprivation and anomie (Merton 1938; Gurr 1971). Microempirical work will be needed to distinguish between these mechanisms. Other reasons for a null result.—Ultimately, however, the fact that commodity price shocks have no discernible effect on new conflict onsets, but some effect on ongoing conflict, suggests that political stability might be less sensitive to income or temporary shocks than generally believed. One possibility is that successfully mounting an insurgency is no easy task. It comes with considerable risk, costs, and coordination challenges. Another possibility is that the counterfactual is still conflict onset. In poor and fragile nations, income shocks of one type or another are ubiquitous. If a nation is so fragile that a change in prices could lead to war, then other shocks may trigger war even in the absence of a price shock. The same argument has been made in debunking the myth that price shocks led to fiscal collapse and low growth in developing nations in the 1980s.19 B. A general problem of publication bias? More generally, these findings should heighten our concern with publication bias in the conflict literature. Our results run against a number of published results on commodity shocks and conflict, mainly because of select samples, misspecification, and sensitivity to model assumptions, and, most importantly, alternative measures of instability. Across the social and hard sciences, there is a concern that the majority of published research findings are false (e.g. Gerber et al. 2001). Ioannidis (2005) demonstrates that a published finding is less likely to be true when there is a greater number and lesser pre-selection of tested relationships; there is greater flexibility in designs, definitions, outcomes, and models; and when more teams are involved in the chase of statistical significance. The cross-national study of conflict is an extreme case of all these. Most worryingly, almost no paper looks at alternative dependent variables or publishes systematic robustness checks. Hegre and Sambanis (2006) have shown that the majority of published conflict results are fragile, though they focus on timeinvariant regressors and not the time-varying shocks that have grown in popularity. We are also concerned there is a “file drawer problem” (Rosenthal 1979). Consider this decision rule: scholars that discover robust results that fit a theoretical intuition pursue the results; but if results are not robust the scholar (or referees) worry about problems with the data or empirical strategy, and identify additional work to be done. If further analysis produces a robust result, it is published. If not, back to the file drawer. In the aggregate, the consequences are dire: a lower threshold of evidence for initially significant results than ambiguous ones.20

#### Secretary of the Interior does the plan

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

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

#### Shields the link

Dobkin 2008 (Donald Dobkin, former Chairperson of the Immigration Law Section of the Oakland County (Michigan) Bar Association and has lectured and presented seminars on immigration in the U.S., Canada and the U.K., “THE RISE OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE STATE: APRESCRIPTION FOR LAWLESSNESS,” [www.law.ku.edu/publications/journal/pdf/v17n3/dobkin.pdf](http://www.law.ku.edu/publications/journal/pdf/v17n3/dobkin.pdf))

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

#### Fosters bipartisanship

Davenport 2012 (Coral Davenport, Energy and Environment Correspondent for National Journal. “How Obama and Congress Could Find Common Ground on Energy,” December 6, 2012, http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/how-obama-and-congress-could-find-common-ground-on-energy-20121206)

Meanwhile, the partisan impasse may be about to end. Quietly, lawmakers and lobbyists say they can envision a grand bargain on energy and climate change—cutting fossil- fuel use and investing in clean energy in exchange for new offshore drilling or approval of the controversial Keystone XL pipeline. The biggest if, and the heaviest lift, will be getting Congress to enact the policy that economists say would do the most to transform the nation’s energy economy: taxing or pricing fossil carbon pollution. A price on carbon, say economists across the ideological spectrum, will increase the price of fossil fuels and decisively drive the free market toward clean energy. Yet any lawmaker who supports the plan could be accused of supporting an energy tax. Still, a combination of events—including more droughts, floods, and extreme weather like superstorm Sandy—has increased the sense of urgency. The recent explosion in domestic oil and natural-gas production has helped to create jobs and prop up the recovery while bringing together oil companies and the Obama White House in alliances that could pave the way for new agreements on energy policy. And as Washington grapples with the deficit, many in the capital are more open to the carbon tax as a way to raise revenue.

#### Olive branch to GOP

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.

#### Thumpers-

#### Gun control

AP 2/8 (“Keystone of Obama gun control plan gains steam as Dem, GOP senators seek background check pact,” Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/congress/dem-gop-senators-quietly-seek-background-check-deal-that-could-improve-gun-control-prospects/2013/02/08/5362c63a-71cb-11e2-b3f3-b263d708ca37\_story.html)

A cornerstone of President Barack Obama’s drive to check gun violence is gathering bipartisan steam as four senators, including two of the National Rifle Association’s congressional champions, privately seek compromise on requiring far more firearms purchasers to undergo background checks.¶ The talks are being held even as Obama’s call to ban assault weapons and high-capacity ammunition magazines, the two other major pillars of his plan, are hitting rough waters on Capitol Hill. An agreement among the four senators to expand background checks would add significant impetus to that high-profile proposal by getting the endorsement of a group that ranges from one of the Senate’s most liberal Democrats to one of its most conservative Republicans.

#### Sequester

Klein 2/5 (Philip Klein, Senior Editorial Writer, “Obama blinks on the sequester, GOP finally has upper hand,” Washington Examiner, http://washingtonexaminer.com/obama-blinks-on-the-sequester-gop-finally-has-upper-hand/article/2520598)

Ever since the election, Republicans have been frustrated by their lack of leverage against Obama. Taxes would have gone up by $4.5 trillion on Jan. 1 if nothing was done, so Republicans were forced to agree to limit the damage. If there were no increase in the debt limit, any economic chaos that followed would have allowed Obama to blame Republicans and distract attention from the problems posed by the nation’s mounting debt, so they agreed to suspend it — a strategy I had described as Maneuver X.¶ Now Republicans have turned the tables on Obama. If nothing happens by March 1, about $1 trillion worth of spending cuts will go into effect automatically. Ideally, Republicans don’t want the military spending cuts, and they have voted in the House to replace them with other cuts. But they can live with them if nothing happens. Coming off the fourth quarter in which the economy contracted by 0.1 percent and was hurt by defense cuts, Obama doesn’t want to have headlines of defense contractor layoffs eroding his political capital in the short window he has to advance his second term agenda.