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#### Natural gas is on the cusp of long-term supply and price stability but air emissions restrictions threaten to derail the industry

Anderson 12/21 (Christopher Anderson, Counsel at Spilman, Thomas and Battle LLC, December 21, 2012, “The Natural Gas Industry: 2012 Year in Review and Look Ahead,” JD Supra, http://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/the-natural-gas-industry-2012-year-in-r-17838/)

Looking ahead, it will be interesting to see whether natural gas can hold onto the price gains that it realized in the latter half of 2012, as this will give producers some degree of revenue stability that they require for continued development. Key to this is whether the United States experiences a more normal winter in 2012-2013 in contrast to the unseasonably warm temperatures experienced in 2011-2012. But, 2013 should also see demand-side gambits come into play that have the potential to sustain favorable price stability for natural gas producers. For example, will policymakers authorize large-scale export of liquefied natural gas to European, South American and Asian markets? And, if so, to what extent? Also, with President Obama’s reelection, regulatory pressure on the coal industry is expected to continue. Consequently, 2012’s trend of coal-to-gas switching among power plants is likely to continue as well. Further, 2012 saw the beginnings of a revival in American manufacturing as low domestic energy costs offset low labor costs in Asian countries, thus creating a pivot back to domestic manufacturing in chemicals and durable goods. As this trend gathers momentum, demand for natural gas and NGLs should continue.¶ As resource development continues in 2013, the legal issues related to that development will continue as well. Despite numerous studies demonstrating the safety of hydraulic fracturing, there still remains strident opposition to its use in some regions. Further, while some operators will continue to assess implementation of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s new air regulations that apply to hydraulically fractured wells, the challenge to these regulations by the Independent Petroleum Association of America will continue. Finally, state and federal courts will entertain landowner challenges to traditional notions of property law and will continue to shape the contours of how old law mixes with new technology.

#### Best resource estimates prove we have enough gas for a long time- estimates are high and will keep increasing

Deutch 2011 (John Deutch, professor of Industry and Chemistry at MIT, January/February 2011, “The Good News About Gas Subtitle: The Natural Gas Revolution and Its Consequences,” Foreign Affairs, http://web.mit.edu/chemistry/deutch/policy/2011-TheGoodNewsAboutGas.pdf)

It is not yet clear exactly how large North America’s shale gas reserves¶ are. Canada is beginning to explore its shale gas resources, but as yet¶ there is little activity in Mexico. Estimates of U.S. shale gas reserves, meanwhile, keep increasing. In 2007, the U.S. Energy Information¶ Administration estimated that out of the United States’ approximately¶ 250 trillion cubic feet of proven natural gas reserves, there were 22 trillion cubic feet of proven reserves of all types of unconventional gas.¶ (“Proven” means that geological and engineering data suggest that,¶ with a reasonable degree of certainty, the reserves are recoverable under¶ existing economic and operating conditions.) In 2008, as expanding¶ exploration and production ﬁeld activity provided new data,the estimate¶ jumped to 33 trillion cubic feet. Future estimates of proven unconventional gas reserves in the United States will almost certainly continue to¶ increase. As for the total technically recoverable shale gas reserves in the¶ United States (natural gas that could be recovered in the future using¶ today’s technology without considering economic constraints), estimates¶ fall in the range of 600 to 700 trillion cubic feet, out of a total 2,500 trillion cubic feet of technically recoverable natural gas from all sources.

#### Low-price shale gas is bringing US steel industry back from the brink of collapse

James 2012 (Steve James, March 16, 2012, “Analysis: Steelmakers eye gas to cut costs, drive exports,” Reuters, http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/03/16/us-steel-gas-idUSBRE82F12Y20120316)

America's steel industry, for decades a symbol of industrial decline, is betting on natural gas to make it more competitive against foreign producers.¶ U.S. Steel Corp (X.N) and Nucor Inc (NUE.N), the two largest U.S. steel producers, are changing their traditional manufacturing processes as relatively cheap domestic natural gas supplies become more plentiful.¶ Some experts believe the new techniques will not only allow steelmakers to cut costs and lower selling prices at home, but also give U.S. companies a chance to compete with Japanese, South Korean and European rivals for a slice of the export pie.¶ "Gas is very positive for steel; it really lowers the cost of the product," said Michael Locker of Locker Associates, a consultant for steel companies.¶ U.S. Steel Chief Executive John Surma said in an interview that using natural gas in some stages of production can cut the use of more expensive coking coal by some 10 percent.¶ He estimated that factoring in costs such as labor, energy and transportation, the overall savings would be $6 to $7 per ton of steel. U.S. Steel produces 23 million tons per year.¶ Christopher Plummer, managing director of Metal Strategies, an industry consultant in West Chester, Pennsylvania, said the global average cost of producing a ton of steel is about $600 to $700. Russian steelmakers produce at the bottom of the cost curve, averaging about $500 per ton. Americans are in the middle at about $625 to $675 per ton. The most expensive are the Japanese and Koreans, at $650 to $750 per ton.¶ While a savings of about 1 percent may not sound like much, every little bit counts for companies in an industry that has been struggling with steep rises in raw material costs, such as coking coal, iron ore and scrap metal.¶ "You do an analysis of our costs and they are much higher than five years ago," said Surma, whose company posted a net loss of $226 million for the fourth quarter -- its fifth in the last eight quarters. "The capital cost to increase our ability to inject greater quantities of natural gas into our blast furnaces is minimal, but the potential savings certainly start to add up when you are producing 20 million tons or more of steel every year."¶ A GAME CHANGER¶ With natural gas prices at 10-year lows because new fracking technology has opened up huge deposits in the Northeast United States, most domestic steelmakers are looking to use more of it.¶ "There is a new focus on natgas," said Larry Kavanagh, president of the American Iron and Steel Institute's Steel Market Development Institute. "Until the recent discovery, we believed coal-based technologies would dominate the future. Now the game has changed in the near term."¶ Nucor, for instance, has dropped plans to build a traditional blast furnace in Louisiana and instead is constructing a gas-fired plant to produce direct reduced iron, or DRI, a key ingredient in its steel-making process.¶ The $750 million facility will convert natural gas and iron ore pellets into high-quality DRI used by Nucor's steel mills, along with recycled scrap, to produce 2.5 million tons of steel a year. Like U.S. Steel, Nucor produces about 23 million tons of steel a year. According to Nucor officials, the DRI offers a carbon footprint that is one-third of that for the coke oven/blast furnace, and at less than half the capital cost.¶ Nucor may be better placed than U.S. Steel to reap the benefits of lower-cost gas because it is a so-called mini-mill operator, which melts recycled steel or pig iron in electric arc furnaces. Electricity is expensive, but costs can be cut by substituting natural gas to fire the furnace. U.S. Steel is an integrated manufacturer that largely makes steel the old-fashioned way, by cooking iron ore and coking coal in a blast furnace. Thus, there is a limit on the amount of natural gas it can substitute for coal.¶ Nucor has not said how much it expects to save on the cost of a ton of steel by using more natural gas.¶ Of course, there is no guarantee that natural gas prices will stay low forever; but increases are likely to be more limited than in the past because of the increased production. In the past, prices were volatile and in 2005 were as high as $14 per million British thermal units (BTU), compared with slightly above $2 per million BTU today.¶ But John Anton, director of steel services for the global forecasting company IHS, said he believes there is little risk that steel companies will get burned should gas prices rise again.¶ "DRI cannot stand high gas prices; but with fracking technology, we see low prices around $4 lasting for 30 years and under $8 for the next 80 years."

#### Cheap steel key to naval power and defense

AISI 2008 (American Iron and Steel Institute, July 1, 2008, “U.S. STEEL INDUSTRY CRITICAL TO KEEPING US FREE,” http://legacy.steel.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Home&CONTENTID=24325&TEMPLATE=/CM/ContentDisplay.cfm)

As we reflect on our country’s independence this Fourth of July, we should pause to recognize those who fought for our freedom more than 230 years ago. But we should also recognize those who continue to keep our country free today: the men and women in uniform who offer their noble service in order to preserve America’s national security. ¶ “Members of the United States Navy, Marine Corps, Army, Air Force and Coast Guard, both at home and overseas, risk their lives everyday to ensure that Americans continue to have the freedoms that our country is founded upon. It is their commitment to our country that has made America what it is today – a beacon for freedom and democracy, “Andrew G. Sharkey, III, president and CEO, American Iron and Steel Institute (AISI), said. “Our veterans represent the very best of America and the U.S. steel industry is continuously working to serve the military in their efforts to defend our nation.”¶ Sharkey said domestically-produced steel is important to “improve our military platforms, strengthen the nation’s industrial base and harden our vital homeland security infrastructure.” Congressman Peter J. Visclosky (D-IN), Chairman of the Congressional Steel Caucus, has noted that “to ensure that our national defense needs will be met, it is crucial that we have a robust and vibrant domestic steel industry. It is poor policy to rely on foreign steel for our national security – instead, we need a long-term investment in domestically-produced, high-quality and reliable steel that will serve and strengthen our national security interests.” ¶ Protecting the nation’s vast infrastructure is essential to our homeland security. This became an issue in recent times when it was discovered that substandard steel imported from China was being used by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security to construct the border fence between the United States and Mexico. Members of the Congressional Steel Caucus, including Congressman Visclosky (D-IN), have worked to introduce legislation that will help strengthen the domestic steel industry in order to address issues of substandard steel imports.¶ “AISI and its members greatly appreciate the Congressional Steel Caucus’ support for the steel industry and their vigilance on behalf of America’s national security,” Sharkey said. ¶ In addition, thousands of skilled men and women of the U.S. steel industry work to produce high quality, cost-competitive products that are used by the military in various applications ranging from aircraft carriers and nuclear submarines to Patriot and Stinger missiles, Sharkey said. Land based vehicles, such as the Bradley Fighting Vehicle, Abrams Tank and the family of Light Armored Vehicles, also utilize significant tonnage of steel plate per vehicle. The up-armored Humvee, in use by the U.S. Army, includes steel plating around the cab of the vehicle, offering improved protection against small arms fire and shrapnel. In fact, the steel plating underneath the cab is designed to survive up to eight pounds of explosives beneath the engine to four pounds in the cargo area. These critical applications require consistent, high quality domestic sources of supply.¶ “We as a country need to make sure that our national defense needs will be met, making it critical for the United States to have a robust and vibrant domestic steel industry that will serve to strengthen our national security interests,” Sharkey noted.¶ Historically, American-made steel and specialty metals have been integral components of U.S. military strength and they continue in this role today. The Department of Defense’s (DOD’s) primary use of steel in weapons systems is for shipbuilding, but steel is also an important component in ammunition, aircraft parts, and aircraft engines. DOD’s steel requirements are satisfied by both integrated steel mills and EAF producer mills.¶ “With the desire never to be dependent on foreign nations for the steel used in military applications, it is critical that U.S. trade laws be defended, strengthened and enforced so that American-made steel can continue to play a vital role in our nation’s security,” Sharkey said. “On this Independence Day, let’s pledge to work to uphold that ideal.”

#### Key to upstream stability and downstream innovations that cement naval power

Shaiken 2002 (Harley Shaiken, global economy professor at UC Berkeley, March 22, 2002, Detroit News, online)

But because an advanced industrial economy needs a vibrant steel industry, not just a source of steel products, the U.S. steel industry needs some temporary resuscitation and long-term structural support to survive. More than 30 firms have gone bankrupt since 1998 -- and far more would likely have fallen over the edge without President George W. Bush's recent modest measures. The hard lesson of this debacle might well have been that it's easier to see an industry like steel implode than to rebuild it when it's needed. Why does America need a steel industry? Steel executives want to keep their companies afloat and the steelworkers union wants to preserve members' jobs. But beyond their immediate concerns, an important, long-term public interest is involved. First, steel provides critical linkages throughout manufacturing. A healthy steel industry can spur innovations in downstream industries such as autos. These industries would enjoy earlier access to new processes and products. U.S. steel firms, for example, are spearheading an international consortium on advanced vehicle concepts. It doesn't help that three of the largest U.S. firms involved are in bankruptcy. Second, steel remains an important source of well-paid, middle-class jobs. While more than 70,000 jobs are threatened at bankrupt steel producers, an additional 250,000 jobs at suppliers and firms dependent on steelworker spending are impacted, according to Professor Robert Blecker at American University. A collapsing steel industry cuts a wide swath of destruction through communities. Finally, a domestic industry provides more stable sources of supply, which is pivotal in a national security crisis. Steel is genuinely a strategic industry unless we are thinking about aluminum aircraft carriers and mahogany tanks.

#### Their resilience arguments are malarkey- scalability is vital

Holmes 2012 (James R. Holmes, not the Dark Knight Rises shooter, associate professor of strategy at the US Naval War College, June 26, 2012, “U.S. Navy’s Quantity Problem,” Flashpoints, The Diplomat, http://thediplomat.com/flashpoints-blog/2012/06/26/u-s-navys-quantity-problem/)

As naval technology gallops on, can fleets execute the same missions with fewer assets?¶ Eminent people say so; I have my doubts.¶ Officials like U.S. Defense Secretary Leon Panetta and Undersecretary of the Navy Robert Work point to scientific and technical advances that supposedly render numbers of ships and aircraft less meaningful than in bygone decades. Unmanned reconnaissance aircraft able to detect, classify, and track hostile contacts across wide sea areas and feed targeting information to U.S. Navy task forces represent one such innovation. Sea-service leaders also point out that warships now entering service are far more technologically advanced than the ones they replace.¶ The message, seemingly, is that quantity no longer has much quality of its own.¶ Yet there’s an otherworldly feel to such claims. It’s certainly true that each new generation of ships, warplanes, sensors, and weaponry is far more capable in an absolute sense than the generations that went before. True, but not especially meaningful.¶ One of today’s Arleigh Burke-class Aegis destroyers, for example, would surely outclass an Aegis cruiser from the early 1980s, when that combined radar/fire-control system first went to sea on board USS Ticonderoga.¶ So what?¶ In most respects the Ticonderoga (in which I spent two happy months cruising the Baltic Sea in 1989) vastly outmatched its ancestors from Adm. Chester Nimitz’s Pacific Fleet, or from Adm. George Dewey’s flotilla at Manila Bay. Such comparisons tell us little about our prospects in battle today. We build against present-day competitors, not our Cold War, World War II, or Spanish-American War selves.¶ Combat power is a relative thing, then, not an absolute one. We may be more capable. So are our competitors.¶ The only standard that matters is how well ships, aircraft, and weaponry perform against today’s adversaries in today’s tactical setting – not on battlegrounds of yore. As prospective antagonists mount fiercer, more sophisticated defenses of offshore seas and skies, navies must keep improving just to keep pace with the competition. By that unforgiving standard, it’s far from clear that American men-of-war have vaulted past their predecessors.¶ Furthermore, the fleet’s complexion is changing. In some cases, the Navy is replacing retired vessels not with like vessels of new design but with lesser – and less capable – ship types. Speaking at the 2012 Shangri-La Dialogue last month, Secretary Panetta announced that the Navy will take delivery of forty new warships in the coming years. That sounds impressive. But what kinds of hulls comprise that forty? The single-mission Littoral Combat Ships (LCS), for example, aren’t descendants of the multi-mission Oliver Hazard Perry frigates they replace. The Perrys were built to perform picket duty with the battle fleet, fending off aerial, surface, and subsurface threats. The lightly armed LCS has important diplomatic and maritime-security uses. It is no frigate.¶ This uneven shipbuilding program will dilute the fleet’s aggregate combat power at a time when the threat environment has grown increasingly stressful – witness the proliferation of air-independent diesel submarines, stealthy missile craft, antiship cruise and ballistic missiles, and other hardware useful for disputing U.S. access to “contested zones” around the world. Secretary Work’s boast that the low-end LCS will “kick [the] asses” of foes it encounters may be true. But it misleads. It’s one thing to apply a boot to the posterior of a pirate in a skiff, quite another to enter the lists against the likes of China’s People’s Liberation Army. The LCS is eminently qualified to do the former, but ill-suited to the latter.¶ Sea power is an interactive business in which prospective opponents may attempt to veto U.S. actions, and increasingly possess the wherewithal to make their veto stick. Whether the United States can accomplish the same globe-spanning goals it has pursued for decades with fewer assets is doubtful. A mismatch among policy, strategy, and forces looms.¶ Carl von Clausewitz advises statesmen and commanders to undertake campaigns in “secondary” theaters only if the likely gains are “exceptionally” promising, the enterprise contributes to success in the principal theater, and it does not imperil efforts in the principal theater. Only “decisive superiority” in the main theater justifies secondary efforts. Abiding by this formula requires setting priorities – namely, determining which zones on the map are critical and which are not. The corollary is that a nation should wind down military commitments in nonessential theaters in order to concentrate resources where needed most.¶ But declaring that some regions or missions are more important than others evidently demands that global powers make a hard mental leap. Few and far between are leaders like Adm. Jacky Fisher, the British first sea lord who brought home – and mostly scrapped – the Royal Navy’s detached squadrons of gunboats and light combatants a century ago. Fisher’s decision freed up resources and manpower in the Far East and North America that the navy sorely needed to gird itself for its arms race with Imperial Germany. Staying ahead of the German High Seas Fleet, which threatened the British Isles, constituted the greater priority by far.¶ Fin de siècle Britain pivoted homeward, largely evacuating U.S. and Asian waters and trusting to local powers to guard its interests there. It accepted risk while unloading foreign commitments. By contrast, I could retire comfortably tomorrow if I had a dollar for every time in recent weeks I’ve heard a U.S. official or pundit insist that Secretary of State Hillary Clinton’s metaphor of a “pivot” to Asia had to be discarded because it implied that America was turning its back on regions outside Asia. Hence the switch to the more neutral, less evocative term “rebalance.” But it’s worth rediscovering Clausewitz’s remorseless logic and Fisher’s clear vision and pugnacity. Washington ought to reacquaint itself with setting priorities.¶ History is unkind to sea powers that invent fudge factors – golly-gee technology, tactical mastery, indomitable élan – to explain away numerical shortfalls. The interwar Imperial Japanese Navy had boundless faith in Japanese seafarers’ resolve and tactical virtuosity. Commanders talked themselves into believing that these intangibles would negate superior U.S. Navy numbers. Their navy now litters the bottom of the Pacific – in large part because Rosie the Riveter and her comrades turned out warships and merchantmen like sausages during World War II, overwhelming Japan with insurmountable numbers. Quantity does matter. Let’s not succumb to the sort of thinking that beguiled Tokyo in those fateful years.

#### Naval decline unleashes numerous nuclear conflicts

Eaglen 2011 (Mackenzie Eaglen, research fellow for national security at the Heritage Foundation, and Bryan McGrath, former naval officer and director at Delex Consulting, Studies and Analysis, May 16, 2011, “Thinking About a Day Without Sea Power: Implications for U.S. Defense Policy,” Heritage Foundation, http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/05/thinking-about-a-day-without-sea-power-implications-for-us-defense-policy)

Global Implications. Under a scenario of dramatically reduced naval power, the United States would cease to be active in any international alliances. While it is reasonable to assume that land and air forces would be similarly reduced in this scenario, the lack of credible maritime capability to move their bulk and establish forward bases would render these forces irrelevant, even if the Army and Air Force were retained at today’s levels. In Iraq and Afghanistan today, 90 percent of material arrives by sea, although material bound for Afghanistan must then make a laborious journey by land into theater. China’s claims on the South China Sea, previously disputed by virtually all nations in the region and routinely contested by U.S. and partner naval forces, are accepted as a fait accompli, effectively turning the region into a “Chinese lake.” China establishes expansive oil and gas exploration with new deepwater drilling technology and secures its local sea lanes from intervention. Korea, unified in 2017 after the implosion of the North, signs a mutual defense treaty with China and solidifies their relationship. Japan is increasingly isolated and in 2020–2025 executes long-rumored plans to create an indigenous nuclear weapons capability.[11] By 2025, Japan has 25 mobile nuclear-armed missiles ostensibly targeting China, toward which Japan’s historical animus remains strong. China’s entente with Russia leaves the Eurasian landmass dominated by Russia looking west and China looking east and south. Each cedes a sphere of dominance to the other and remains largely unconcerned with the events in the other’s sphere. Worldwide, trade in foodstuffs collapses. Expanding populations in the Middle East increase pressure on their governments, which are already stressed as the breakdown in world trade disproportionately affects food importers. Piracy increases worldwide, driving food transportation costs even higher. In the Arctic, Russia aggressively asserts its dominance and effectively shoulders out other nations with legitimate claims to seabed resources. No naval power exists to counter Russia’s claims. India, recognizing that its previous role as a balancer to China has lost relevance with the retrenchment of the Americans, agrees to supplement Chinese naval power in the Indian Ocean and Persian Gulf to protect the flow of oil to Southeast Asia. In exchange, China agrees to exercise increased influence on its client state Pakistan. The great typhoon of 2023 strikes Bangladesh, killing 23,000 people initially, and 200,000 more die in the subsequent weeks and months as the international community provides little humanitarian relief. Cholera and malaria are epidemic. Iran dominates the Persian Gulf and is a nuclear power. Its navy aggressively patrols the Gulf while the Revolutionary Guard Navy harasses shipping and oil infrastructure to force Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) countries into Tehran’s orbit. Russia supplies Iran with a steady flow of military technology and nuclear industry expertise. Lacking a regional threat, the Iranians happily control the flow of oil from the Gulf and benefit economically from the “protection” provided to other GCC nations. In Egypt, the decade-long experiment in participatory democracy ends with the ascendance of the Muslim Brotherhood in a violent seizure of power. The United States is identified closely with the previous coalition government, and riots break out at the U.S. embassy. Americans in Egypt are left to their own devices because the U.S. has no forces in the Mediterranean capable of performing a noncombatant evacuation when the government closes major airports. Led by Iran, a coalition of Egypt, Syria, Jordan, and Iraq attacks Israel. Over 300,000 die in six months of fighting that includes a limited nuclear exchange between Iran and Israel. Israel is defeated, and the State of Palestine is declared in its place. Massive “refugee” camps are created to house the internally displaced Israelis, but a humanitarian nightmare ensues from the inability of conquering forces to support them. The NATO alliance is shattered. The security of European nations depends increasingly on the lack of external threats and the nuclear capability of France, Britain, and Germany, which overcame its reticence to military capability in light of America’s retrenchment. Europe depends for its energy security on Russia and Iran, which control the main supply lines and sources of oil and gas to Europe. Major European nations stand down their militaries and instead make limited contributions to a new EU military constabulary force. No European nation maintains the ability to conduct significant out-of-area operations, and Europe as a whole maintains little airlift capacity. Implications for America’s Economy. If the United States slashed its Navy and ended its mission as a guarantor of the free flow of transoceanic goods and trade, globalized world trade would decrease substantially. As early as 1890, noted U.S. naval officer and historian Alfred Thayer Mahan described the world’s oceans as a “great highway…a wide common,” underscoring the long-running importance of the seas to trade.[12] Geographically organized trading blocs develop as the maritime highways suffer from insecurity and rising fuel prices. Asia prospers thanks to internal trade and Middle Eastern oil, Europe muddles along on the largesse of Russia and Iran, and the Western Hemisphere declines to a “new normal” with the exception of energy-independent Brazil. For America, Venezuelan oil grows in importance as other supplies decline. Mexico runs out of oil—as predicted—when it fails to take advantage of Western oil technology and investment. Nigerian output, which for five years had been secured through a partnership of the U.S. Navy and Nigerian maritime forces, is decimated by the bloody civil war of 2021. Canadian exports, which a decade earlier had been strong as a result of the oil shale industry, decline as a result of environmental concerns in Canada and elsewhere about the “fracking” (hydraulic fracturing) process used to free oil from shale. State and non-state actors increase the hazards to seaborne shipping, which are compounded by the necessity of traversing key chokepoints that are easily targeted by those who wish to restrict trade. These chokepoints include the Strait of Hormuz, which Iran could quickly close to trade if it wishes. More than half of the world’s oil is transported by sea. “From 1970 to 2006, the amount of goods transported via the oceans of the world…increased from 2.6 billion tons to 7.4 billion tons, an increase of over 284%.”[13] In 2010, “$40 billion dollars [sic] worth of oil passes through the world’s geographic ‘chokepoints’ on a daily basis…not to mention $3.2 trillion…annually in commerce that moves underwater on transoceanic cables.”[14] These quantities of goods simply cannot be moved by any other means. Thus, a reduction of sea trade reduces overall international trade. U.S. consumers face a greatly diminished selection of goods because domestic production largely disappeared in the decades before the global depression. As countries increasingly focus on regional rather than global trade, costs rise and Americans are forced to accept a much lower standard of living. Some domestic manufacturing improves, but at significant cost. In addition, shippers avoid U.S. ports due to the onerous container inspection regime implemented after investigators discover that the second dirty bomb was smuggled into the U.S. in a shipping container on an innocuous Panamanian-flagged freighter. As a result, American consumers bear higher shipping costs. The market also constrains the variety of goods available to the U.S. consumer and increases their cost. A Congressional Budget Office (CBO) report makes this abundantly clear. A one-week shutdown of the Los Angeles and Long Beach ports would lead to production losses of $65 million to $150 million (in 2006 dollars) per day. A three-year closure would cost $45 billion to $70 billion per year ($125 million to $200 million per day). Perhaps even more shocking, the simulation estimated that employment would shrink by approximately 1 million jobs.[15] These estimates demonstrate the effects of closing only the Los Angeles and Long Beach ports. On a national scale, such a shutdown would be catastrophic. The Government Accountability Office notes that: [O]ver 95 percent of U.S. international trade is transported by water[;] thus, the safety and economic security of the United States depends in large part on the secure use of the world’s seaports and waterways. A successful attack on a major seaport could potentially result in a dramatic slowdown in the international supply chain with impacts in the billions of dollars.[16]

#### Dominance renders great power wars obsolete

Eaglen 2011 (Mackenzie Eaglen, research fellow for national security at the Heritage Foundation, and Bryan McGrath, former naval officer and director at Delex Consulting, Studies and Analysis, May 16, 2011, “Thinking About a Day Without Sea Power: Implications for U.S. Defense Policy,” Heritage Foundation, http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/05/thinking-about-a-day-without-sea-power-implications-for-us-defense-policy)

The U.S. Navy’s global presence has added immeasurably to U.S. economic vitality and to the economies of America’s friends and allies, not to mention those of its enemies. World wars, which destroyed Europe and much of East Asia, have become almost incomprehensible thanks to the “nuclear taboo” and preponderant American sea power. If these conditions are removed, all bets are off. For more than five centuries, the global system of trade and economic development has grown and prospered in the presence of some dominant naval power. Portugal, Spain, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and now the U.S. have each taken a turn as the major provider of naval power to maintain the global system. Each benefited handsomely from the investment: [These navies], in times of peace, secured the global commons and ensured freedom of movement of goods and people across the globe. They supported global trading systems from the age of mercantilism to the industrial revolution and into the modern era of capitalism. They were a gold standard for international exchange. These forces supported national governments that had specific global agendas for liberal trade, the rule of law at sea, and the protection of maritime commerce from illicit activities such as piracy and smuggling.[4] A preponderant naval power occupies a unique position in the global order, a special seat at the table, which when unoccupied creates conditions for instability. Both world wars, several European-wide conflicts, and innumerable regional fights have been fueled by naval arms races, inflamed by the combination of passionate rising powers and feckless declining powers.

#### Sea power key to maintenance of global trade

Eaglen and Sayers 2009 (Mackenzie Eaglen, Senior Policy Analyst, and Eric Sayers, Research Assistant for National Security at The Heritage Foundation, March 24, 2009, “A 21st Century Maritime Posture for an Uncertain Future,” Heritage, http://www.heritage.org/research/commentary/2009/03/a-21st-century-maritime-posture-for-an-uncertain-future)

Beyond the vagaries of history and human behavior, a central element of America's national strength is tied to maritime security and stability.¶ Only a secure global maritime environment will continue to ensure economic viability, and promote global freedom of trade and the movement of people. America's $14 trillion economy depends on maritime trade as its lifeline. Fully 95% of the nation's imports and 90% of total global commerce are carried by sea. In the last half century, whose defining feature has been a dramatic rise in overall global prosperity, global trade has grown 60% faster than the world's combined Gross Domestic Product.¶ With over 100 maritime shipping chokepoints around the world, and much of the world economy now operating around a just-in-time delivery business model that requires the steady flow of cargo, the U.S. cannot afford to leave these shipping lanes unprotected. The same imperatives face developing nations like China and India, who see the ability to project maritime power as a rising national security priority. Chinese President Hu Jiantao has referred to his nation's need to secure the shipment of energy resources through the narrow Strait of Malacca as the "Malacca dilemma."¶ In 2008, the Heritage Foundation conducted a gaming exercise that simulated the effects on world oil supplies, demand, and prices following a series of terrorist attacks in the Persian Gulf and Pacific Asia. The findings demonstrated the vulnerabilities of the global system's capacity to produce and deliver oil supplies in the face of a concerted transnational terrorist threat. This exercise also suggests that major producer and consumer nations ,and key geostrategic allies who can act in concert with one another while protecting their own national interests, can ameliorate the severity of long-term disruptions.¶ The geographical proximity of a majority of the world's population to the seas (75% live within 200 miles of coastlines) has also ensured that coastal zones will become more immediate security concerns. Further, 65% of the world's oil and 35% of global gas reserves are resident in the littorals. The maritime consequences of weak and failed states have already been demonstrated off the coast of Somalia. Likewise, the trafficking of narcotics and proliferation of both conventional weapons and weapons of mass destruction is almost entirely a seaborne enterprise. U.S. Navy leaders are predicting a disorderly future world whose challenges are concentrated along its coasts. These problems will require a multi-faceted maritime solution that includes cooperation with the private sector, between agencies and services, and among nation states.¶ States are increasingly looking to the seas as a means to project power and secure their territorial and energy interests. Naval analyst Bob Work has observed the "United States may be on the leading edge of a broader, longer-term global naval competition, with either China or Russia, or perhaps both."¶ Emerging naval powers like China are beginning to challenge our Shipbuilding capabilities, with indigenous industrial bases that can produce high-quality maritime assets, in quantity. Indeed, China is in the middle of a peacetime naval buildup that is unprecedented in modern history. The People's Liberation Army's (PLA) foreign procurement and indigenous develop of anti-ship cruise missiles adds to the risks faced by America's major surface combatants.¶ Though Russia has a long way to go, its intent to again project power globally is leading to a national rearmament drive, beginning with the deployment of a more capable navy. Both Russia and China are also building, and in Russia's case, exporting, modern submarines. They are not alone. U.S. Navy leaders project a startling 280% growth in the number of submarines in operation around the world over the next 2 decades alone, with most of that growth occurring outside the United States or Europe. At the same time, today's Navy has fewer sailors than it has at any period since 1941, and is the smallest fleet since 1960.¶ An American Navy that cold be hedged from vital shipping lanes in times of crisis, or from key maritime theaters of operation, would sharply undercut America's global influence. Yet that is exactly the challenge poses by these and other trends.¶ The global proliferation of nuclear technology and ballistic missiles also presents challenges. The Chief of Naval Operations recently cautioned that every 3 years since the early 1990s, a nation becomes capable of launching ballistic missiles. Continuing the Navy's evolution into a key component of America's global Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) mission will be one of its primary responsibilities in the decades ahead.

#### Solves conflict- best studies

Hegre et al 2009 (H’vard Hegre, Professor of Political Science @University of Oslo, , John R. Oneal, Professor of Political Science @ The University of Alabama, Bruce Russett, Professor of Political Science @ Yale University) August 25, 2009 “Trade Does Promote Peace: New Simultaneous Estimates of the Reciprocal Effects of Trade and Conflict” http://www.yale-university.com/leitner/resources/docs/HORJune09.pdf)

Liberals expect economically important trade to reduce conflict because interstate violence adversely affects commerce, prospectively or contemporaneously. Keshk, Reuveny, & Pollins (2004) and Kim & Rousseau (2005) report on the basis of simultaneous analyses of these reciprocal relations that conflict impedes trade but trade does not deter conflict. Using refined measures of geographic proximity and size—the key elements in the gravity model of international interactions—reestablishes support for the liberal peace, however. Without careful specification, trade becomes a proxy for these fundamental exogenous factors, which are also important influences on dyadic conflict. KPR‘s and KR‘s results are spurious. Large, proximate states fight more and trade more. Our re-analyses show that, as liberals would expect, commerce reduces the risk of interstate conflict when proximity and size are properly modeled in both the conflict and trade equations. We provided new simultaneous estimates of liberal theory using Oneal & Russett‘s (2005) data and conflict equation and a trade model derived from Long (2008). These tests confirm the pacific benefit of trade. Trade reduces the likelihood of a fatal militarized dispute, 1950–2000 in our most comprehensive analysis, as it does in the years 1984-97 when additional measures of traders‘ expectations of domestic and interstate conflict are incorporated (Long, 2008) and in the period 1885-2000. This strong support for liberal theory is consistent with Kim‘s (1998) early simultaneous estimates, Oneal, Russett & Berbaum‘s (2003) Granger-style causality tests, and recent research by Robst, Polachek & Chang (2007). Reuveny & Kang (1998) and Reuveny (2001) report mixed results. It is particularly encouraging that, when simultaneously estimated, the coefficient of trade in the conflict equation is larger in absolute value than the corresponding value in a simple probit analysis. Thus, the dozens of published articles that have addressed the endogeneity of trade by controlling for the years of peace—as virtually all have done since 1999—have not overstated the benefit of interdependence. Admittedly, our instrumental variables are not optimal. In some cases, for example, in violation of the identification rule, the creation or end of a PTA may be a casus belli. More importantly, neither of our instruments explains a large amount of variance. Thus, future research should be directed to identifying better instruments. Our confidence in the commercial peace does not depend entirely on the empirical evidence, however; it also rests on the logic of liberal theory. Our new simultaneous estimates—as well as our re-analyses of KPR and KR—indicate that fatal disputes reduce trade. Even with extensive controls for on-going domestic conflict, militarized disputes with third parties, and expert estimates of the risks of such violence, interstate conflict has an adverse contemporaneous effect on bilateral trade. This is hardly surprising (Anderton & Carter, 2001; Reuveny, 2001; Li & Sacko, 2002; Oneal, Russett & Berbaum, 2003; Glick & Taylor, 2005; Kastner, 2007; Long, 2008; Findlay & O‘Rourke, 2007; cf. Barbieri & Levy, 1999; Blomberg & Hess, 2006; and Ward & Hoff, 2007). If conflict did not impede trade, economic agents would be indifferent to risk and the maximization of profit. Because conflict is costly, trade should reduce interstate violence. Otherwise, national leaders would be insensitive to economic loss and the preferences of powerful domestic actors. Whether paid prospectively or contemporaneously, the economic cost of conflict should reduce the likelihood of military conflict, ceteris paribus, if national leaders are rational.

#### Protectionism lowers the threshold for all conflict – makes escalation more likely – causes a laundry list of impacts

Patrick 2009 (Stewart Patrick, senior fellow and director of the Program on International Institutions and Global Governance at the Council on Foreign Relations, March 2009 “Protecting Free Trade” The National Interest http://nationalinterest.org/article/protecting-free-trade-3060)

President Obama and his foreign counterparts should reflect on the lessons of the 1930s-and the insights of Cordell Hull. The longest-serving secretary of state in American history (1933-1944), Hull helped guide the United States through the Depression and World War II. He also understood a fundamental truth: "When goods move, soldiers don't." In the 1930s, global recession had catastrophic political consequences-in part because policymakers took exactly the wrong approach. Starting with America's own Smoot Hawley Tariff of 1930, the world's major trading nations tried to insulate themselves by adopting inward looking protectionist and discriminatory policies. The result was a vicious, self-defeating cycle of tit-for-tat retaliation. As states took refuge in prohibitive tariffs, import quotas, export subsidies and competitive devaluations, international commerce devolved into a desperate competition for dwindling markets. Between 1929 and 1933, the value of world trade plummeted from $50 billion to $15 billion. Global economic activity went into a death spiral, exacerbating the depth and length of the Great Depression. The economic consequences of protectionism were bad enough. The political consequences were worse. As Hull recognized, global economic fragmentation lowered standards of living, drove unemployment higher and increased poverty-accentuating social upheaval and leaving destitute populations "easy prey to dictators and desperadoes." The rise of Nazism in Germany, fascism in Italy and militarism in Japan is impossible to divorce from the economic turmoil, which allowed demagogic leaders to mobilize support among alienated masses nursing nationalist grievances. Open economic warfare poisoned the diplomatic climate and exacerbated great power rivalries, raising, in Hull's view, "constant temptation to use force, or threat of force, to obtain what could have been got through normal processes of trade." Assistant Secretary William Clayton agreed: "Nations which act as enemies in the marketplace cannot long be friends at the council table." This is what makes growing protectionism and discrimination among the world's major trading powers today so alarming. In 2008 world trade declined for the first time since 1982. And despite their pledges, seventeen G-20 members have adopted significant trade restrictions. "Buy American" provisions in the U.S. stimulus package have been matched by similar measures elsewhere, with the EU ambassador to Washington declaring that "Nobody will take this lying down." Brussels has resumed export subsidies to EU dairy farmers and restricted imports from the United States and China. Meanwhile, India is threatening new tariffs on steel imports and cars; Russia has enacted some thirty new tariffs and export subsidies. In a sign of the global mood, WTO antidumping cases are up 40 percent since last year. Even less blatant forms of economic nationalism, such as banks restricting lending to "safer" domestic companies, risk shutting down global capital flows and exacerbating the current crisis. If unchecked, such economic nationalism could raise diplomatic tensions among the world's major powers. At particular risk are U.S. relations with China, Washington's most important bilateral interlocutor in the twenty-first century. China has called the "Buy American" provisions "poison"-not exactly how the Obama administration wants to start off the relationship. U.S. Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner's ill-timed comments about China's currency "manipulation" and his promise of an "aggressive" U.S. response were not especially helpful either, nor is Congress' preoccupation with "unfair" Chinese trade and currency practices. For its part, Beijing has responded to the global slump by rolling back some of the liberalizing reforms introduced over the past thirty years. Such practices, including state subsidies, collide with the spirit and sometimes the law of open trade. The Obama administration must find common ground with Beijing on a coordinated response, or risk retaliatory protectionism that could severely damage both economies and escalate into political confrontation. A trade war is the last thing the United States needs, given that China holds $1 trillion of our debt and will be critical to solving flashpoints ranging from Iran to North Korea. In the 1930s, authoritarian great-power governments responded to the global downturn by adopting more nationalistic and aggressive policies. Today, the economic crisis may well fuel rising nationalism and regional assertiveness in emerging countries. Russia is a case in point. Although some predict that the economic crisis will temper Moscow's international ambitions, evidence for such geopolitical modesty is slim to date. Neither the collapse of its stock market nor the decline in oil prices has kept Russia from flexing its muscles from Ukraine to Kyrgyzstan. While some expect the economic crisis to challenge Putin's grip on power, there is no guarantee that Washington will find any successor regime less nationalistic and aggressive. Beyond generating great power antagonism, misguided protectionism could also exacerbate political upheaval in the developing world. As Director of National Intelligence Dennis Blair recently testified, the downturn has already aggravated political instability in a quarter of the world's nations. In many emerging countries, including important players like South Africa, Ukraine and Mexico, political stability rests on a precarious balance. Protectionist policies could well push developing economies and emerging market exporters over the edge. In Pakistan, a protracted economic crisis could precipitate the collapse of the regime and fragmentation of the state. No surprise, then, that President Obama is the first U.S. president to receive a daily economic intelligence briefing, distilling the security implications of the global crisis.

### Adv 2

#### US shale supplies obviate the need for gas imports and solves European dependence on Russian supplies

Jaffe 2012 (Amy Jaffe, Wallace S. Wilson Fellow in Energy Studies at the James A. Baker III Institute for Public Policy at Rice University, and Meghan L. O'Sullivan, the Jeane Kirkpatrick Professor of the Practice of International Affairs at the John F. Kennedy School at Harvard University, July 2012, “The Geopolitics of Natural Gas,” Baker Institute, http://bakerinstitute.org/publications/EF-pub-HKSGeopoliticsOfNaturalGas-073012.pdf)

Knowledge of the shale gas resource is not new. Geologists have known about the existence of¶ shale formations for years but accessing those resources was long held to be an issue of technology and cost. In the past decade, innovations have yielded substantial cost reductions,¶ making shale gas production a commercial reality. In fact, shale gas production in the United¶ States has increased from virtually nothing in 2000 to more than 10 billion cubic feet per day¶ (bcfd) in 2010. Rising North America shale gas supplies have significantly reduced US requirements for imported LNG and contributed to lower US domestic natural gas prices. The natural gas supply picture in North America will have a ripple effect around the globe that will¶ expand over time, not only through displacement of supplies in global trade but also by fostering a growing interest in shale resource potential in other parts of the world.¶ The importance of the commercialization of shale cannot be understated from a geopolitical,¶ environmental, or market development perspective. Given the assumption that known shale gas resources will be developed according to their commercial viability in North America and¶ elsewhere, the reference scenario projects shale gas production could more than quadruple over the next two decades, accounting for over 50 percent of total US natural gas production by the early 2030s. Still, the countries of the former Soviet Union will collectively be the largest¶ supplier of natural gas (conventional and unconventional) by 2040, with North America a close second. The reference case anticipates the strongest supply of shale gas will be in North America, where the recoverable shale resource comprises more than a quarter of the world’s 4,024 trillion cubic feet (Tct) and is rivaled in size only by the shale plays in Asia and Oceania.¶ These supply trends will have a significant impact on gas trade flows. Not only will the United¶ States be able to avoid growth in LNG imports for the next three decades, but the reference case projects that North America will export 720 million cubic feet per day of LNG by 2030. Australia will rival Qatar as the world’s largest LNG exporter by 2030. Qatar and Australia will remain the largest LNG exporters through 2040, collectively accounting for about 40 percent of global LNG exports.¶ LNG supplies whose development was anchored to the belief that the United States would be a¶ premium market will continue to be diverted. In the reference case, the US market remains the lowest priced major market region in the world throughout the model time horizon. Many US terminals once expected to be actively utilized will remain relatively empty. During the period from 2013 to 2015, US terminals see some growth as new volumes from Australian LNG development push African LNG cargoes to the US market—a trend exacerbated by growth in LNG supply from West Africa in the 2014-2015 period.¶ The reference case projects that consumers in Europe will receive a double benefit from the rise in global gas supply. Not only will Europe increasingly find alternatives to Russian pipeline supplies, but these alternative supplies will exert pressure on the status quo of indexing gas sales to a premium marker determined by the price of petroleum products. In fact, Russia has already had to accept lower prices for its natural gas and is now allowing a portion of its sales in Europe to be indexed to spot natural gas markets, or regional market hubs, rather than oil prices. This change in pricing terms signals a major paradigm shift.¶ Yet as Europe moves to gas-on-gas pricing, global marker prices in the reference scenario fail to converge through 2040. Europe’s price premium will hover at more than $1 above Henry Hub prices, even as Europe develops its own shale resource and diversifies sources of supply.¶ Shale gas eventually makes up 20 percent of European market. European shale gas production¶ begins in earnest in 2020s, and approaches 20 percent of the total market by 2040. LNG import growth is the second fastest growing source of European supply. The availability of shale gas under the reference case means that Caspian flows will not make economic sense as a competing supply to Europe. The Nabucco pipeline project, for example, is not constructed until lower-cost Iraqi gas is able to flow into the line.

#### That solves Russian aggression and prevents Russia from obstructing US-EU partnerships

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

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

#### Russian aggression causes regional nuke wars that draw in great powers

Blank 2009 (Stephen Blank, Research Professor of National Security Affairs at the Strategic Studies Institute of the U.S. Army War College, March 2009, “Russia And Arms Control: Are There Opportunities For The Obama Administration?,” online)

Proliferators or nuclear states like China and Russia can then deter regional or intercontinental attacks either by denial or by threat of retaliation. 168 Given a multipolar world structure with little ideological rivalry among major powers, it is unlikely that they will go to war with each other. Rather, like Russia, they will strive for exclusive hegemony in their own “sphere of influence” and use nuclear instruments towards that end. However, wars may well break out between major powers and weaker “peripheral” states or between peripheral and semiperipheral states given their lack of domestic legitimacy, the absence of the means of crisis prevention, the visible absence of crisis management mechanisms, and their strategic calculation that asymmetric wars might give them the victory or respite they need. 169 Simultaneously, The states of periphery and semiperiphery have far more opportunities for political maneuvering. Since war remains a political option, these states may find it convenient to exercise their military power as a means for achieving political objectives. Thus international crises may increase in number. This has two important implications for the use of WMD. First, they may be used deliberately to offer a decisive victory (or in Russia’s case, to achieve “intra-war escalation control”—author 170 ) to the striker, or for defensive purposes when imbalances 7 in military capabilities are significant; and second, crises increase the possibilities of inadvertent or accidental wars involving WMD. 171 Obviously nuclear proliferators or states that are expanding their nuclear arsenals like Russia can exercise a great influence upon world politics if they chose to defy the prevailing consensus and use their weapons not as defensive weapons, as has been commonly thought, but as offensive weapons to threaten other states and deter nuclear powers. Their decision to go either for cooperative security and strengthened international military-political norms of action, or for individual national “egotism” will critically affect world politics. For, as Roberts observes, But if they drift away from those efforts [to bring about more cooperative security], the consequences could be profound. At the very least, the effective functioning of inherited mechanisms of world order, such as the special responsibility of the “great powers” in the management of the interstate system, especially problems of armed aggression, under the aegis of collective security, could be significantly impaired. Armed with the ability to defeat an intervention, or impose substantial costs in blood or money on an intervening force or the populaces of the nations marshaling that force, the newly empowered tier could bring an end to collective security operations, undermine the credibility of alliance commitments by the great powers, [undermine guarantees of extended deterrence by them to threatened nations and states] extend alliances of their own, and perhaps make wars of aggression on their neighbors or their own people.

#### US-EU partnerships solve several extinction risks

Stivachtis 2010 (Dr. Yannis A. Stivachtis, Director, International Studies Program, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, State University, 2010, “The Imperative for Transatlantic Cooperation,” google)

There is no doubt that US-European relations are in a period of transition, and that the stresses and strains of globalization are increasing both the number and the seriousness of the challenges that confront transatlantic relations. The events of 9/11 and the Iraq War have added significantly to these stresses and strains. At the same time, international terrorism, the nuclearization of North Korea and especially Iran, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD), the transformation of Russia into a stable and cooperative member of the international community, the growing power of China, the political and economic transformation and integration of the Caucasian and Central Asian states, the integration and stabilization of the Balkan countries, the promotion of peace and stability in the Middle East, poverty, climate change, AIDS and other emergent problems and situations require further cooperation among countries at the regional, global and institutional levels. Therefore, cooperation between the U.S. and Europe is more imperative than ever to deal effectively with these problems. It is fair to say that the challenges of crafting a new relationship between the U.S. and the EU as well as between the U.S. and NATO are more regional than global, but the implications of success or failure will be global. The transatlantic relationship is still in crisis, despite efforts to improve it since the Iraq War. This is not to say that differences between the two sides of the Atlantic did not exist before the war. Actually, post-1945 relations between Europe and the U.S. were fraught with disagreements and never free of crisis since the Suez crisis of 1956. Moreover, despite trans-Atlantic proclamations of solidarity in the aftermath of 9/11, the U.S. and Europe parted ways on issues from global warming and biotechnology to peacekeeping and national missile defense. Questions such as, the future role of NATO and its relationship to the common European Security and Defense policy (ESDP), or what constitutes terrorism and what the rights of captured suspected terrorists are, have been added to the list of US-European disagreements. There are two reasons for concern regarding the transatlantic rift. First, if European leaders conclude that Europe must become counterweight to the U.S., rather than a partner, it will be difficult to engage in the kind of open search for a common ground that an elective partnership requires. Second, there is a risk that public opinion in both the U.S. and Europe will make it difficult even for leaders who want to forge a new relationship to make the necessary accommodations. If both sides would actively work to heal the breach, a new opportunity could be created. A vibrant transatlantic partnership remains a real possibility, but only if both sides make the necessary political commitment. There are strong reasons to believe that the security challenges facing the U.S. and Europe are more shared than divergent. The most dramatic case is terrorism. Closely related is the common interest in halting the spread of weapons of mass destruction and the nuclearization of Iran and North Korea. This commonality of threats is clearly perceived by publics on both sides of the Atlantic.

#### Abundant shale solves- de-securitizes and boosts EU-Russia relations

Sharples 2012 (Jack. D. Sharples, Central and East European Studies Graduate Student at the University of Glasgow, “Russia-EU gas relations: the Russian perspective,” British Association for Slavonic and East European Studies Conference Paper, http://www.academia.edu/1534968/Russia-EU\_Gas\_Relations\_The\_Russian\_Perspective)

From the Russian perspective the period 2001-2008 represented a ‘golden era’ for Russian gas exports to the EU, with prices and demand rising, and Russia’s international status and economic growth following suit. However, despite the quicker than expected recovery of international energy markets, the period of 2008-2012 may be interpreted as the beginning of a transition period in the Russia-EU energy relationship. The development of the EU into a more liquid, competitive gas market will continue. Gazprom must adapt to these changing conditions through a combination of competitive pricing, more flexible contracts (regarding contract duration and offtake volumes) and asset-swaps of minority shareholdings in partnership with downstream European energy companies, in order to retain market share and export volumes. Russia’s domestic gas market is expected to become more profitable and competitive, dueto the gradual increase in state regulated prices and the liberalisation of gas sales. As independent Russian gas producers and Russian oil companies supply an increasing share of the Russian market, the need for Gazprom to use export revenues to subsidise domestic saleswill be reduced. In the long term, post-2020 period, it is possible that increased Russian gas exports to theAsia-Pacific region in line with projections in Russia’s Energy Strategy to 2030 (MinEnergo,2009, pg. ) could further reduce Russia’s dependence on the EU as an export market.Finally, 2012 should see both the completion of the second line of Nord Stream and thelaunch of the construction of the South Stream gas pipeline. If both projects are completed as planned, Ukraine’s share of the transit of Russian gas to the EU will be reduced from around80 percent in mid-2011 to below 50 percent. Even if these projects do not reduce the propensity for Russo-Ukrainian disputes, they will reduce the impact of such disputes on deliveries of Russian gas to the EU. Therefore, there is the distinct possibility that Russia’s gas exports to the EU will undergo a ‘de-securitisation’ over the next decade as Russia and the EU reduce their ‘negative interdependence’. If this is the case, there remains the hope that Russia and the EU will be able to overcome the difficulties of the past decade and renew their mutually-beneficial energy relationship.

#### EU dependence on Russian gas has been the key sticking point to broader EU-Russia cooperation- plan solves

Vatansever 2010 (Adnan Vatansever, Ph.D., School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University, former senior associate in the Energy and Climate Program at the Carnegie Endowment, June 17, 2010, “EU-Russia Energy Relations: A Pause or Fast Forward?,” Carnegie Endowment, http://carnegieendowment.org/2010/06/17/eu-russia-energy-relations-pause-or-fast-forward/21mf)

While the two sides are sorting out a clearer road map about a partnership in modernizing Russia, a key question is what type of role energy will play in fostering this partnership. During the past few years, energy—amidst Europe’s mounting concerns about security of supply—largely played the role of a “pause” button in deepening Russian-European relations. Will it now serve as a “fast forward” button for deepening the partnership? The answer lies in addressing mutual energy security concerns as well as in expanding opportunities for joint energy sector projects involving Russian and European (along with other foreign) companies.¶ Signs of Optimism¶ An optimist would find some positive signs in three areas at least. First, energy efficiency has suddenly emerged as a big priority for the Russian government. Key legislation was recently put in place and governmental commissions have been launched to actively pursue the ambitious targets set by President Medvedev. Furthermore, energy efficiency is hardly a controversial area, and both Russia and its Western partners see mutual benefits in cooperation. For Europe in particular, a more energy efficient Russia means potentially more hydrocarbons available for its own market. For Russia, improving energy efficiency is a key for enhancing the competitiveness of its economy, and the drive itself for greater efficiency could spur innovation-based industries.¶ Second, it is probably fair to say that the Russian leadership already faces increasingly compelling reasons to broaden the participation of foreign companies in developing its hydrocarbons. Its largest Soviet-era gas fields are in decline and the core of its oil production, West Siberia, has started to generate fewer volumes while development costs are rising. The focus is gradually shifting towards new fields, but the cost for developing them will be staggering and the need for foreign technology and capital is getting considerably larger. Furthermore, Russia is already a high-cost hydrocarbon producer—indicating that economic risks of investment are relatively higher due to price uncertainties. As the global recession has further augmented such uncertainties, Russia could only benefit if foreign partners share such economic risks through expanding their involvement in Russia’s oil and gas sectors. As an additional benefit, if European and multinational companies acquire a more solid stake in Russian oil and gas, this could also alleviate European energy security concerns.¶ Finally, the gas market, which was at the center of European–Russian tensions in the past few years, looks very different now. Europe may well find itself in a relatively stronger negotiating position against is principal external gas supplier—Gazprom. Market fundamentals have suddenly shifted as a major decline in Europe’s gas demand has coincided with a substantial growth in gas traded on spot markets. As a sign of readjusting itself to this condition, Gazprom has agreed to index some of its gas deliveries to spot market prices—a major step back from its traditionally firm commitment to long-term contracts. What probably further weakens Gazprom’s hand over the next few years is that it is largely captive to the European market. A decade of negotiations with potential Asian buyers of pipeline gas is still far from reaching a conclusion. Likewise, Gazprom entered the liquefied natural gas (LNG) business only recently and its ability to compete in this segment of the gas market will remain modest at most for some time.

#### EU-Russia coop solves human trafficking, crime and terrorism

Renata 2011 (Mantel Renata, Kazakh-American Free University, “The EU and world powers: EU – Russia relations,” The Kazakh-American Free University Academic Journal №2 – 2011, http://www.kafu-academic-journal.info/journal/2/43/)

The EU and Russia cooperation is based on a number of challenges at international level and common neighborhood, common interests and shared values. The most important issues are climate change, drug and human trafficking, organized crime, counter - terrorism, non - proliferation, etc.¶ When in recent decade journalists and political observers characterized relations between Russia and the European Union as being in crisis, Moscow and Brussels objected with energy. As evidence they suggested to analyze the results of biannual summits. Each summit produced a document signifying or mentioning the striving to make a step forward. During the period leading up to the signing of the Partnership and Cooperation Agreement in 1994, and its ratification in 1997, both sides took the position that Russia would gradually continue its "Europeanization" according to the Brussels recipe, but without the eventual prospect of EU membership. A lot has changed since then. The EU has doubled in size and run into management problems. Russia has ceased to depend on external financing and is no longer open to models of governance offered from beyond its borders, and integration is connoted as an exchange of interests among equals.¶ Now Russia is the EU’s third biggest trade partner, with Russian supplies of oil and gas making up a large percentage of Russia’s exports to Europe. According to the results of the St. Petersburg Summit in May 2003, the EU and Russia agreed to reinforce their ongoing co-operation by creating, in the long term, 4 specific policy areas. These “common spaces”, cover economic issues and the environment; Freedom, Security and Justice; External Security; and Research and Education, including cultural aspects.¶ Over the past 15 years, the EU and Russia have developed a dense network of political institutions and diplomatic contacts. The Partnership and Cooperation Agreement created the legal foundation of EU-Russia relations. In the framework of the Four Common Spaces, Brussels and Moscow have conducted a large number of dialogues and working groups in the fields of economic, security and cultural relations since 2005. Economic interdependence has grown stronger as well, with the EU becoming Russia’s most important foreign trade partner, and Russia becoming the EU’s largest energy supplier.

#### Crime causes nuclear war

Dobriansky 2001 (Paula Dobriansky, Under Secretary for Global Affairs at the State Department, “The Explosive Growth of Globalized Crime,” http://www.iwar.org.uk/ecoespionage/resources/transnational-crime/gj01.htm)

Certain types of international crime -- terrorism, human trafficking, drug trafficking, and contraband smuggling -- involve serious violence and physical harm. Other forms -- fraud, extortion, money laundering, bribery, economic espionage, intellectual property theft, and counterfeiting -- don't require guns to cause major damage. Moreover, the spread of information technology has created new categories of cybercrime.¶ For the United States, international crime poses threats on three broad, interrelated fronts. First, the impact is felt directly on the streets of American communities. Hundreds of thousands of individuals enter the U.S. illegally each year, and smuggling of drugs, firearms, stolen cars, child pornography, and other contraband occurs on a wide scale across our borders.¶ Second, the expansion of American business worldwide has opened new opportunities for foreign-based criminals. When an American enterprise abroad is victimized, the consequences may include the loss of profits, productivity, and jobs for Americans at home.¶ Third, international criminals engage in a variety of activities that pose a grave threat to the national security of the United States and the stability and values of the entire world community. Examples include the acquisition of weapons of mass destruction, trade in banned or dangerous substances, and trafficking in women and children. Corruption and the enormous flow of unregulated, crime-generated profits are serious threats to the stability of democratic institutions and free market economies around the world.

#### Trafficking spreads AIDS

Kloer 2009 (Amanda Kloer, program associate of the American Bar Association's AIDS Coordination Project, December 1, 2009, “The Intersection of Human Trafficking and AIDS” http://humantrafficking.change.org/blog/view/the\_intersection\_of\_human\_trafficking\_and\_aids)

With World AIDS Day today, it's important to understand that the HIV/AIDS epidemic is by no means isolated from other social issues. It intersects with a number of other human rights concerns, including children's rights, international violence against women, and human trafficking. Trafficking victims, particularly in commercial sex, are more vulnerable to becoming infected with HIV. And sex trafficking as an institution spreads AIDS. Here's a quick guide to how human trafficking and AIDS are intersecting epidemics. Sex Trafficking Victims are More Vulnerable to HIV/AIDS All people in commercial sex are more vulnerable to HIV infection, but human trafficking victims are especially so. Since trafficking victims cannot make free choices or control their situation, they cannot insist on safer sex practices, like using a condom. Even if condoms are available in the brothel where a trafficking victim is held, she may not have the power to insist upon, or even suggest, their usage. Trafficking victims are also more frequently raped and exposed to violent and high-risk sexual behavior. Violent sex can cause ripping and tearing of tissue, making HIV transmission more likely. Since many trafficking victims are young girls in their early teens, their age may make their bodies even more vulnerable to infection. Once a trafficking victim contracts HIV, it is highly unlikely she will be tested, diagnosed, and treated for the disease, thus allowing the AIDS to develop. Sex Trafficking Spreads HIV/AIDS Sex trafficking also contributes to proliferating the global AIDS epidemic. Since trafficking victims are rarely tested and treated for HIV infections, they may continue to be forced to have unprotected sex with hundreds or thousands of men before exhibiting any symptoms. The cross-border transportation which sometimes accompanies sex trafficking operations spreads the disease, as one infected victims can infect the men who buy her in several different regions or countries. Those men may go on and infect other partners, both in and out of the commercial sex industry. Some cultural myths about AIDS, like the idea that sex with a virgin will cure an HIV infection, cause infected men to seek out unprotected sex with young trafficked women. All of these conditions allow HIV to flourish and spread. AIDS and Trafficking Prevention Efforts Have Clashed Perhaps one of the trickiest parts of the intersection between HIV and human trafficking is the history of clashing between trafficking prevention and HIV prevention groups. HIV prevention groups have focused on getting condoms into brothels, even if it means befriending brothel owners, to help prevent transmission. Trafficking prevention groups, on the other hand, have focused on removing enslaved women from the brothels, even if it means pissing off the brothel owners and condom distributors. It's not surprising well-intentioned groups with these different philosophies have butted heads, but that conflict has done little to help trafficked women from becoming infected with HIV. Both trafficking prevention and HIV prevention groups should understand that they are working for related goals. When the AIDS epidemic destroys a village or family, it makes people more vulnerable to sex trafficking, which in turn makes people more vulnerable to AIDS. These dual epidemics fuel and support each other, lining the pockets of criminals and destroying the lives of vulnerable people all over the world. Only when we truly understand this intersection can we put our differences aside and begin to address these issues the way they exist in the world: together.

#### Extinction

Koblentz 2010 (Gregory D. Koblentz, Deputy Director of the Biodefense Program @ GMU, Assistant Professor in Public and International Affairs, March, "Biosecurity Reconsidered: Calibrating Biological Threats and Responses." International Security, Vol. 34, No. 4, p. 96-132)

Pandemics are disease outbreaks that occur over a wide geographic area, such as a region, continent, or the entire world, and infect an unusually high proportion of the population. Two pandemic diseases are widely cited as having the potential to pose direct threats to the stability and security of states: HIV/AIDS and influenza. HIV/AIDS. Since it was first identified in 1981, HIV is estimated to have killed more than 25 million people worldwide. According to the Joint UN Program on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS), the percentage of the global population with HIV has stabilized since 2000, but the overall number of people living with HIV (33 million in 2007) has steadily increased. Sub-Saharan Africa continues to bear a disproportionate share of the global burden of HIV with 35 percent of new HIV infections, 75 percent of AIDS deaths, and 67 percent of all people living with HIV. 116 Scholars have identified four ways that HIV/AIDS can affect security. 117 First, the disproportionately high prevalence of HIV/AIDS in the armed forces of some nations, particularly in Southern Africa, may compromise the ability of those states to defend themselves from internal or external threats. Militaries with high rates of HIV infection may suffer losses in combat readiness and effectiveness as infected troops are transferred out of combat roles, units lose cohesion because of high turnover rates, middle management is "hollowed out" by the early death or disability of officers, and defense budgets are strained because of rising medical costs and the need to recruit and train replacements for sick soldiers. The second threat is that HIV/AIDS will undermine the international peace-keeping system. Nations with militaries with high rates of HIV/AIDS will be unable to provide troops for international peacekeeping missions; nations with healthy militaries may be unwilling to commit troops to peacekeeping operations in nations with a high prevalence rate of HIV/AIDS; and war-torn nations may be unwilling to accept peacekeepers for fear they will spread the disease in their country. The third threat is that a "second wave" of HIV/AIDS could strike large, strategically important countries such as China, India, and Russia. These states, which possess nuclear weapons and are important players in critical regions, also suffer from internal security challenges that could be aggravated by a severe AIDS epidemic and its attendant socioeconomic disruptions.The fourth threat is that the high prevalence of HIV in less developed countries will cause political instability that could degenerate into internal conflict or spread into neighboring countries. Unlike most diseases, which affect primarily the poor, young, and old, HIV/AIDS strikes young adults and members of the middle and upper classes. By sickening and killing members of society when they should be their most productive, HIV/AIDS has inflicted the "single greatest reversal in human development" in modern history. 118

#### AND- Locking Gazprom out of the market forces economic modernization- eviscerates the Kremlin’s slush fund

Aslund 2012 (Anders Åslund, senior fellow at the Peterson Institute for International Economics, September 27, 2012, “Gazprom crisis casts shadow over Putin,” Financial Times, http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/55c1aeb0-07c6-11e2-9df2-00144feabdc0.html#axzz2E3nig37e)

For years, many analysts have said that Russia will reform only when the oil price falls because Gazprom seems to be the Kremlin’s main slush fund, which is now being drastically reduced. The Kremlin will have little choice but to forsake its mega-projects. It has already abandoned the mastodon Arctic Shtokman field. The next steps should be to back out of South Stream, the superfluous and exceedingly expensive pipeline project, as well as the planned gigantic sky-rise headquarters in St Petersburg. But that will hardly suffice. This dysfunctional former Soviet gas ministry will have to be cut up into real companies, which need to be privatised.¶ Gazprom’s demise looks likely. With its demise, Russia’s revenues would dwindle. Mr Putin‘s model of state capitalism would suffer a devastating blow from Gazprom’s fall. If not even Gazprom is viable, which Russian state company is? Such an insight could give market economic reforms new impetus. After all, Russia just privatised $5.2bn of shares in Sberbank, the state savings bank.

#### Modernization solves nuclear war

Nye 2011 (Joseph Nye, Professor at Harvard University, February 28, 2011, “Russia and Reform,” Expert Article 698, http://www.tse.fi/FI/yksikot/erillislaitokset/pei/Documents/Julkaisut/PEIpublication%204\_2012.pdf)

Russia is no longer hampered by communist ideology and a cumbersome central planning system, and the likelihood of ethnic fragmentation, though still a threat, is less than in the past. Whereas ethnic Russians were only 50 percent of the former Soviet Union, they are now 81 percent of the Russian Federation. The political institutions for an effective market economy are largely missing, and corruption is rampant. Russia’s robber baron capitalism lacks the kind of effective regulation that creates trust in market relationships. The public health system is in disarray, mortality rates have increased, and birthrates are declining. The average Russian male dies at fifty- nine, an extraordinarily low number for an advanced economy. Midrange estimates by UN demographers suggest that Russia’s population may decline from 145 million today to 121 million by midcentury.¶ Many Russian futures are possible. At one extreme are those who project decline and see Russia as a “one-crop economy” with corrupt institutions and insurmountable demographic and health problems. Others argue that with reform and modernization, Russia will be able to surmount these problems and that the leadership is headed in this direction. President Medvedev has issued a sweeping call “for Russia to modernize its economy, wean itself from a humiliating dependence on natural resources and do away with Soviet-style attitudes that he said were hindering its effort to remain a world power.” But as Katynka Barisch of the Centre for European Reform argues, Russian leaders’ concept of modernization is too state led, and problematic because public institutions function so badly. “An innovative economy needs open markets, venture capital, free thinking entrepreneurs, fast bankruptcy courts and solid protection of intellectual property.” Instead there is “wide-spread monopolies, ubiquitous corruption, stifling state-interferences, weak and contradictory laws.” Dysfunctional government and pervasive corruption make modernization difficult. A Russian economist says flatly that “there is no consensus in favor of modernization.”¶ Whatever the outcome, because of its residual nuclear strength, its great human capital, its skills in cyber-technology, its location in both Europe and Asia, Russia will have the resources to cause major problems or to make major contributions to a globalized world. In that sense, Obama was right. We all have an interest in Russian reform.

#### No economy turns- Privatization allows Russia to be re-integrated into the global gas market without enabling political manipulation

Riley 2012 (Alan Riley, Professor, City Law School, City University, London, September 17, 2012, “Resetting Gazprom in the Golden Age of Gas,” European Energy Review, http://www.europeanenergyreview.eu/site/pagina.php?id=3853#artikel\_3853)

The overriding issue for Gazprom is to ensure that gas delivered to market can compete profitably in spot markets where indexation will have less and less sway. This focus on keeping costs low and efficiency suggests that the Russian Federation and Gazprom are also going to have to grasp the most painful part of any reset: liberalisation of the Russian gas market. This does not have to be a full European style liberalization but it does require creating pressures to push prices down and encourage throughput. One option for a Russian approach to liberalization would be to adopt the Thatcher government technique of introducing golden shares which allow the state to call and control companies that have been privatized. ¶ It would be possible to design a Russian gas market where there was a privately owned gas pipeline network, Moscow owned a minority of the shares but maintained a golden share to ensure supply security and state interests were protected. Meanwhile a series of baby Gazproms would provide supply in competition with Novatek and others. Some of the baby Gazproms would be privatized and some sold to foreign investors. Those holding key supply facilities would also be subject to golden shares. This Russian approach to liberalization would allow more competition, more foreign investment and increase cost pressure while giving the state the means to maintain a significant degree of control. ¶ Such a Gazprom reset would provide for a much more successful innovative Russian gas market. The baby Gazproms could grow into major international players and the privatized Russian gas network company would find it much easier to acquire network assets across the continent without regulatory or political fears. ¶ The argument against such a reset is the traditional one that the Kremlin would never accept any form of breakup of the existing Gazprom. That however overlooks the scale of the threats that Gazprom faces. The compelling question for the Kremlin is: what is the alternative? Gazprom can continue to defend its old business model. However, that would be fighting a rearguard action. There is no future for the company in defending every last stronghold of its current market until market forces dislodge it stronghold by stronghold. The danger for Gazprom is that it ends up the supplier of last resort for Europe.¶ If the Russian Federation does not recognize the range of threats faced by Gazprom and take effective action to protect its European market and profitability, Russian gas will be utterly marginalized. Gazprom will lose profitability, revenue and influence. Does President Putin in his third term really want to preside over the decline of Gazprom?

#### Russia’s economy is structurally doomed without reform

Shuman 2011 (Michael Shuman, B.A. in Asian history and political science from the University of Pennsylvania and a master of international affairs from Columbia, September 30, 2011, “State capitalism vs the free market: Which performs better?,” TIME Magazine, http://business.time.com/2011/09/30/state-capitalism-vs-the-free-market-which-performs-better/

But most of all, anyone who believes in state capitalism should take a visit to Russia, which I did recently for a recent story in TIME magazine. Once considered a premier state capitalist, Russia’s economy is now being strangled by the state. Under Prime Minister (and formerly President) Vladimir Putin, the state reasserted its authority, regaining its dominance over key sectors of the economy, especially the crucial oil and gas industry. Putin also redistributed oil money by increasing government spending and the size of the civil service. That sparked a pre-crisis consumer boom, but today the story is much different. State enterprises, favored by overbearing bureaucrats, are crowding out the private sector. World Bank surveys show Russia is becoming a harder and harder place to do business. Endemic corruption has soured the investment climate. Private capital is fleeing the country. Because of those problems, growth has never recovered to its pre-crisis levels, and most economic forecasts don’t expect it will anytime soon. Even senior policymakers within the Kremlin are doubting the future of Russia’s state capitalist model. One of them is Arkady Dvorkovich, a reform-minded economic adviser to President Dmitri Medvedev. Those who admire state capitalism “don’t know what they’re saying,” he told me in a very forthright interview. “This way of doing things has exhausted all its potential, so we need to change policies.”¶ Ironically, what Russia and the other state capitalists need is a strong dose of market reform – deregulation to free up entrepreneurship; better rule of law to attract investment; greater emphasis on commercial viability to prevent wasteful investment. So even though it is true that free capitalism has fallen on hard times, a better system has not yet emerged. State capitalism is not the solution.

### Solvency

#### EPA restrictions cut shale revolution in half

ARI 2012 (Advanced Resources International, report for the American Petroleum Institute, February 2012, “ESTIMATE OF IMPACTS OF EPA PROPOSALS TO REDUCE AIR EMISSIONS FROM HYDRAULIC FRACTURING OPERATIONS,” http://www.api.org/~/media/Files/Policy/Hydraulic\_Fracturing/NSPS-OG-ARI-Impacts-of-EPA-Air-Rules-Final-Report.ashx)

Depending on the REC-Set Use Rate scenario assumed, the following impacts from base case levels are projected in the first 4 years after the requirements go into effect (through 2015):¶ • Overall well drilling for unconventional resources producing natural gas over 2012 - 2015 would be reduced by 31% to 52%, amounting to reductions in drilling ranging from 12,700 to 21,400 wells.¶ • 5.8 to 7.0 quadrillion Btu (Quads) of otherwise economic unconventional natural gas would not be developed and produced by 2015, a 9% to 11% reduction.¶ • 1.0 to 1.8 billion barrels of otherwise economic unconventional liquids would not be developed and produced by 2015, a 21% to 37% reduction.¶ • Federal royalties of $7.0 to $8.5 billion that would otherwise be collected would not be paid in the first 4 years after the requirements go into effect.¶ • State revenues from severance taxes amounting to $1.9 to $2.3 billion would be delayed beyond the first 4 years after the requirements go into effect.¶ Under either scenario of REC equipment availability, a significant slowdown in unconventional resource development would occur, resulting in less reserve additions, less production, lower royalties to the Federal government and private landowners, and lower severance tax payments to state governments. The delays in drilling results in delays in production, which result in the delays in the economic benefits associated with that production. This analysis did not attempt to estimate lost jobs associated with reduced drilling, oil and gas supply services, and indirect employment.

#### Final rule functionally prohibits fracking- requires emissions capture when it is technically impossible

Farrell 10/15 (Amy Farrell, Vice President of Regulatory Affairs America’s Natural Gas Alliance, and V. Bruce Thompson, President American Exploration and Production Council, October 15, 2012, “RE: America’s Natural Gas Alliance Request for Reconsideration -- Oil and Natural Gas Sector: New Source Performance Standards and National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants Reviews; 77 Fed.Reg. 49490 (Aug. 16, 2012),” American Exploration and Production Council, America’s Natural Gas Alliance, http://www.axpc.us/download/issues\_and\_info/environment/environment\_15oct2012.pdf)

ANGA and AXPC appreciate the Agency’s efforts to develop this rulemaking, and in particular the outreach and dialogue on the many important issues that are embedded in the Final Rule. We believe that the Final Rule reflects important changes on many of the issues of importance to the natural gas industry; however, we also believe that there are several issues where the Final Rule remains problematic and where the Final Rule contains specific provisions or language that ANGA and AXPC did not have an adequate opportunity to address during the public comment period. To that end we list and discuss these issues below, and request that the Agency reconsider each of them pursuant to Section 307(d)(7)(B).¶ Gas Well Completions¶ 1. While ANGA and AXPC appreciate EPA’s efforts to encourage early action by exempting recompleted wells that comply with the reduced emission completion (REC) requirement from becoming an affected facility, the Final Rule, as drafted, requires that owner/operators of exempt recompleted wells comply with all of the notification, recordkeeping, and reporting requirements of §60.5375 that are associated with recompleted wells that are not exempt. We agree with EPA’s policy decision to encourage early action to meet REC requirements, but the regulatory language as drafted does not encourage early action, as exempt recompletions are essentially treated the same as regulated recompletions. We request that EPA reconsider the requirements that it set forth in Section 60.5365(h)(1) of the Final Rule and develop a scheme that actually encourages early action to meet REC requirements. For example, EPA could adopt language stating that recompletions are exempt if they meet the operational or work practice standard requirements of section 60.5375(a).¶ 2. As described to EPA in previous submissions regarding this rulemaking, there are periods during normal completions operations when fluids are not able to be sent to the separator in order to be flared or captured without the use of a flaring pit. In the proposed rule, there was a provision that allowed owners/operators to use various methods, including venting, during the initial phase of the flowback operations. The Final Rule does not include any such provision, and because it was not anticipated that EPA would eliminate this provision in the Final Rule, ANGA and AXPC did not have the opportunity to provide information to EPA regarding the adverse impacts resulting from the elimination of the provision in the Final Rule during the comment period. We request that EPA reconsider the elimination of the proposed Section 60.5375(a)(2) and adopt provisions clarifying that, during periods when capture or flaring is not feasible, EPA does not intend to require fluids to be routed to a separator and subsequently captured or flared as lon

#### Imposes costs that tank production and causes confusion

Harris and London 2012 (Colin Harris, partner at Bryan Cave & Affiliates, 20 years experience with energy and natural resources industry in environmental, public lands and related matters; Ivan London, associate at Bryan Cave & Affiliate, practice focuses environmental law and energy and natural resource law, May 1, 2012, “OIL AND NATURAL GAS PRODUCTION SUBJECT TO NEW AIR RULES,” http://www.bryancave.com/files/Publication/1f3ae3c1-8031-4275-b48d-5baea9f92098/Presentation/PublicationAttachment/60d24296-7d1e-4402-ae58-5bea20bd4943/Oil%20%20Gas%20CAA%20Client%20Alert\_v2A.pdf)

The final rules did accommodate some of the concerns expressed by the oil and natural gas sector about the proposed rules.¶  EPA postponed the deadline for the hydraulic fracturing green completion requirements due to the unavailability of equipment and personnel.¶  EPA agreed that certain wells in low-pressure reservoirs would not be subject to the green completion requirement.¶  Unlike the proposal, EPA did not mandate the use of particular equipment for green completions. Operators have more flexibility to adopt methods to capture liquids and natural gas.¶  EPA did not finalize a proposal to use third-party verification to assure compliance with the new rules.¶  EPA provided some relief on the proposed VOC performance standards for compressors and pneumatic controllers.¶ The applicability provisions and compliance dates for the NSPS are as follows:¶  The new oil and natural gas performance standards apply to facilities that commenced construction or were modified beginning on or after August 23, 2011, which was the date the proposed rules were published in the Federal Register.¶  These facilities must be in compliance within 60 days after the final rules are published in the Federal Register.¶  Some of the specific requirements have a phase-in period for compliance.¶  All future new or modified facilities must comply with the regulations at the time of¶ commencement of construction or modification.¶ The new rules applicable to natural gas production are complex and burdensome. As with most Clean Air Act programs, the rules are very technical, fraught with detailed distinctions and nuances, and contain off-ramps that should be used with extreme caution. Numerous upstream and midstream activities, from drilling to storage to compression to processing, are affected by the requirements. The new requirements reflect a “one-size-fits-all” approach to regulating air emissions. There is little flexibility based on particular aspects of producing regions or reservoirs.¶ While operators may feel secure that many states already regulate much of the same equipment that is subject to the new rules, an overriding factor is that the rules have nationwide applicability.¶ Operators need to be aware that the new regulations may impose essentially the same requirements as applicable state rules in certain areas, inconsistent requirements in other areas, and may impose new requirements not yet imposed in a particular state. Some states may already have permitting programs in place that address well completions and tanks, while other states may change their permitting programs based on the new rules. Moreover, the new rules will likely become a focus of renewed federal inspection and enforcement, and EPA may not have the same experience or practical flexibility as state regulators on air issues pertaining to upstream and midstream operations.¶ The new rules will factor into strategic planning. They may impact expansion and drilling plans as operators consider whether the added burden and expense can justify capital expenditures, and whether equipment is available to meet compliance requirements.

The rules may impact the timing of planned construction. The regulation of emissions from well completions may impact permitting under other regulatory programs, such New Source Review (NSR) preconstruction permitting. It is unclear whether potential emissions of VOC associated with flowback must now be considered in calculating potential to emit for purposes of NSR applicability. Other permitting may be affected, such as state construction permit programs, under which the new NSPS and HAP requirements will be incorporated into Title V operating permits. In addition, states must wrestle with how to incorporate the new rules into their State Implementation Plans, and operators should monitor those developments to determine whether the states will impose more stringent requirements.¶ While the rules are intimidating for many reasons, the hydraulic fracturing requirements will undoubtedly garner the most attention. As an initial matter, well completions are part of well construction. Applying performance standards to a construction activity is a departure from EPA’s historic interpretation and application of NSPS. This remains controversial. In addition, there is concern that, while VOC emissions associated with oil and natural gas development in certain areas present legitimate issues worthy of reasonable and scientifically defensible regulatory scrutiny, the rules do not adequately consider the wide variability in oil and natural gas production operations and emissions.¶

#### Create uncertainty and lead to more restrictions

Mack 2012 (Joel Mack, partner in Latham & Watkins, Davon Collins, Sara Orr and Ben Lawless, associates at Latham & Watkins, May 11, 2012, “A 1st for Fracking: EPA’s Air Emissions Regulations,” www.lw.com/thoughtLeadership/a-first-for-fracking)

Notably, although the rule does not regulate methane directly, there are indications that methane — a potent greenhouse gas — may have been the true target of the new regulations. This might explain why the EPA declined to grant any exemptions from green completion requirements for wells withdemonstrated low or de minimis VOC emissions.The EPA claimed that, given VOC variability among gas wells, such an exemption would be “inappropriate” due to implementation concerns.[34] In addition, the EPA has noted in its supporting comments for the rule that it intends “to continue to evaluate the appropriateness of regulating methane with an eye toward taking additional steps if appropriate.”[35] Thus, the rule is likely a harbinger of further greenhouse gas regulation of the upstream and midstream oil and gas industries. Additionally, the rule may reflect the EPA’s increasing scrutiny of hydraulic fracturing as the EPA assesses the scope of its statutory authority to regulate hydraulic fracturing under the Safe Drinking Water Act’s Underground Injection Control program.[36] Therefore, as the oil and gas industry begins to comply with this rule and the greenhouse gas reporting rule issued by the EPA in November 2010, companies should closely evaluate their greenhouse gas emissions and hydraulic fracturing operations for likely regulatory targets and be prepared to engage infuture rulemaking processes.

#### Regulatory certainty key to shale revolution

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

Natural gas stands to play a positive role in the global energy mix, making it easier to shift away from more polluting, higher carbon-intensity fuels and increasing the near-term options to improve energy security and handle the challenge of climate change. The ample geologic endowment of shale gas in North America and potentially elsewhere around the globe means that natural gas prices will likely remain affordable and that the high level of supply insecurity currently facing world oil supplies could be eased by a shift to greater use of natural gas without fear of increasing the power of large natural gas resource holders such as Russia, Iran, and Venezuela. To tap this benefit, it will be essential for the United States to promote a stable investment climate with regulatory certainty. In particular, the United States will need adopt policies that ensure shale gas exploitation can proceed steadily and predictably with sound environmental oversight. The United States should focus squarely on setting the policies needed to ensure that shale gas can play a significant role in the U.S. and global energy mix, thereby contributing to greater diversification of global energy supplies and to the long-term national interests of the United States.

#### Federalization of fracking regulations spurs NIMBYism

Harris and London 2012 (Colin Harris, partner at Bryan Cave & Affiliates, 20 years experience with energy and natural resources industry in environmental, public lands and related matters; Ivan London, associate at Bryan Cave & Affiliate, practice focuses environmental law and energy and natural resource law, May 1, 2012, “OIL AND NATURAL GAS PRODUCTION SUBJECT TO NEW AIR RULES,” http://www.bryancave.com/files/Publication/1f3ae3c1-8031-4275-b48d-5baea9f92098/Presentation/PublicationAttachment/60d24296-7d1e-4402-ae58-5bea20bd4943/Oil%20%20Gas%20CAA%20Client%20Alert\_v2A.pdf)

EPA’s decision to federalize the regulation of potential air emissions from fracturing, despite arguments that it lacks the legal authority to do so and has not made the case for across-the-board controls, and even though many states have already imposed reasonable requirements with the support of industry, may fuel the anti-fracturing frenzy that, until now, has focused on water quality. Considerable misinformation has clouded the discussion about fracturing and drinking water aquifers. Much of the backlash against fracturing does not recognize even basic, elementary facts, such as the extensive regulatory framework that is already in place to protect water, the technology, which drills at depths thousands of feet below drinking water supplies, and the lack of any incidents where credible science shows that hydraulic fracturing itself caused contamination to a drinking water supply. The oil and natural gas industry should be prepared to address misconceptions about hydraulically fractured well completions and air quality, and must be in a position to recognize public concerns while vigorously defending against claims that are unfounded in science and law and that lack any context about the relationship between fracturing and air quality.

### \*\*\*2AC\*\*\*

### Case- Russia

#### Russia econ doomed now

Guriev and Tsyvinsky 1/18 (Sergei Guriev, Morgan Stanley Professor of Economics and a Rector at the New Economic School in Moscow, and Oleg Tsyvinsky, professor at Yale University and the New Economic School, “2013 to be a make-or-break year for Russia's economy,” Russia Beyond the Headlines, http://rbth.ru/opinion/2013/01/18/2013\_to\_be\_a\_make-or-break\_year\_for\_russias\_economy\_22013.html)

2013 looks set to be a decisive year in terms of President Vladimir Putin's pre-election promises on economic policy. Chief among these was his promise that Russia would have one of the top 20 business climates in the world by 2018. Plenty of time, as it seems. However, unless 2013 is utilized properly, Russia will struggle to meet this objective.¶ Why does it matter so much? First, the target is measurable and the ranking is determined by a body independent of the Russian government. Second, the promise cannot be fulfilled without improving the performance of the country's institutions. Third, improving the business climate will spur economic growth.¶ One year ago — January 30, 2012, to be precise — Vladimir Putin published an article entitled "We need a new economy." The priorities it outlined were subsequently formalized under the decree "On long-term national economic policy," which was signed on May 7, immediately after his inauguration.¶ The decree instructed the government to "take steps to achieve, in particular, the following objectives: improve Russia's position in the World Bank's 'Doing Business' index, from 120th in 2011, to 50th in 2015 and 20th in 2018."¶ The clock is ticking. The 2013 Doing Business rating, published in the fall of 2012, put Russia in 112th place. According to November's Directive No. 2096-r, the gap between the 50th and 112th spot is to be overcome in just two jumps — i.e., in 2014, Russia needs to be no lower than 81st.¶ The Doing Business rating in 2014 will be published in the fall of 2013, and data is compiled from the start of the year. Therefore, it is not too early to discuss the prospects of achieving the leap to 81st in the 2014 index. The legal framework for 2013 is in place, but, unfortunately, no laws were passed last year to improve the business climate.¶ The State Duma was busy with other important matters: regulating the Internet and NGOs, increasing fines for attending rallies and slander, and its response to the Magnitsky Act. As a result, Directive 2096-r is likely to remain in the filing cabinet.¶ 2012 was not completely devoid of action, however. The government and the Agency for Strategic Initiatives drafted a set of roadmaps to improve the business climate in various areas of the economy. These roadmaps are to be implemented in the form of new laws and regulations, with the aim of raising Russia's position in the 2015 rating, at least.¶ Another seemingly key promise in the May 7 decree is the exact time frame set for the privatization of state property. Putin instructed the government to draw up, by November 1, 2012, a privatization plan to provide for "the government's complete withdrawal by 2016 from the capital of companies in the 'non-raw materials sector' that are not natural monopolies or related to the defense industry."¶ Specifically, this means the full privatization of all banking assets (Sberbank, VTB, Russian Agricultural Bank) and the full privatization of transport assets in competitive sectors, including Aeroflot and Sovcomflot.¶ The implementation of this ambitious program will improve the managerial performance of the privatized companies and raise the level of economic competition. The only question is whether the program will actually be implemented, since previous privatization programs have been systematically discarded. Unlike the push to move up the Doing Business index, in this case, even the preparatory work remains untouched.¶ If 2013 does not see the publication of a 2014-2016 asset privatization program, then all hope of implementing Putin's decree on schedule will be lost.¶ What is the likelihood that Vladimir Putin's campaign promises to improve the business climate and privatize assets will be kept? We believe that it is perfectly feasible, but, for it to happen, 2013 must be a year of deeds, not words.

#### Russia’s economy is resilient

Garrels 2008 (Annie Garrels, foreign correspondent for National Public Radio in the United States, “RUSSIAN ECONOMY STRONG DESPITE COMMODITY FALLOUT”, 9/20/08, [http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=94647099](http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=94647099" \t "_blank))

For the past six years, Russia's economy has boomed in large part because of soaring prices for oil and metals. Russia is strong in these areas ó too strong, though, for a balanced economy. Russian shares have bled almost 50 percent of their value since May, but many analysts say Russia still remains a resilient economy. And after the Georgia invasion and weeks of harsh, anti-western rhetoric, both Russian President Dmitri Medvedev and Prime Minister Vladimir Putin have tried to reassure foreign investors. When those commodities prices dropped, Russia's stock market was hit hard. "The question is if they fall significantly further," says James Fenkner with Red Star Assets in Moscow. Fenkner is one of the more cautious voices in Moscow, and other analysts like Roland Nash of Renaissance Capital look at other indicators, like direct foreign investment. "The level of foreign investment is twice the per capita of Brazil, four times that of China, and six times that of India this year," Nash says. "The market arguments for Russia are still very good and there is still a lot of money coming in." Too Dependent On Commodities The Russia government recognizes it is too dependent on commodities, and while their prices were high, it amassed huge reserves as a cushion. The country now has a balanced budget and financial analysts predict its economy will continue to grow at about six percent. Vladmir Tikhomirov, senior economist at Uralsib Financial Corporation, says this is enough to avoid a crisis, but it is not what the Kremlin hoped for. "It's not enough to make fundamental changes to the economic structures," Tikhomirov says. "Russia must have to be a more competitive and efficient economy." Moscow may now be the most expensive, glamorous city in the world, but the rest of the country lags behind. Tikhomirov says the Russia needs to improve basic infrastructure like roads as well as small and mid-size businesses.

#### Diversification solves the impact

Cohen and Ericson 2009 (Ariel Cohen, Ph.D., Senior Research Fellow, The Kathryn and Shelby Cullom Davis Institute for International Studies; and Richard Ericson, Ph.D., Chair of the Department of Economics at the East Carolina University and former Director of the Harriman Institute at Columbia University, November 2, 2009, The Heritage Foundation, “Russia's Economic Crisis and U.S.-Russia Relations: Troubled Times Ahead,” http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2009/11/russias-economic-crisis-and-us-russia-relations-troubled-times-ahead)

An economic model based on natural resources would tend to perpetuate authoritarianism, nationalism, and corruption, and it would require Russia to follow a neo-imperial policy throughout the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) to support Russian domination of the pipeline system. In a way, the petrostate model and the associated militarized foreign policy require Russia to label the U.S. as an enemy. A more open and diversified economy would be more compatible with democratization and the rule of law.

### Case- Regs Bad

#### No green completion complies with the restriction

Farrell 10/15 (Amy Farrell, Vice President of Regulatory Affairs America’s Natural Gas Alliance, and V. Bruce Thompson, President American Exploration and Production Council, October 15, 2012, “RE: America’s Natural Gas Alliance Request for Reconsideration -- Oil and Natural Gas Sector: New Source Performance Standards and National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants Reviews; 77 Fed.Reg. 49490 (Aug. 16, 2012),” American Exploration and Production Council, America’s Natural Gas Alliance, http://www.axpc.us/download/issues\_and\_info/environment/environment\_15oct2012.pdf)

The compliance requirements for enclosed combustion devices were derived from the NESHAP Subpart HH control requirements for major sources of HAP emissions and area sources that are located near an urban area. The wellpad facilities where the majority of the storage vessel affected facilities will be located are unmanned and are often very remote, do not have power, and are minor sources of VOC and HAP emissions. As a result, several of the compliance requirements applicable to enclosed combustion devices in the Final Rule cannot be logistically or economically achieved by these units, and there are alternative compliance requirements that would be feasible, achievable, and adequately demonstrate compliance:¶ • As the rule has recognized in other sections, exploration and development in some remote locations introduces several challenges to effective capture of continuous monitoring parameter data. Some remote locations do not have electricity to power logging systems, remote data acquisition systems, or the phone lines or bandwidth available to transmit data every hour.¶ • Due to the inherent variability of flow to the control device, hourly monitoring may not be indicative of the periodic flow events, and an alarm system may be more appropriate in order to ensure compliance with an operating limit.¶ • The flow monitors that are capable of measuring the widely variable flow rates are very expensive, and given the difficulty and cost of accurate flow measurement, as well as the direct relationship between inlet pressure and flow capacity, ANGA and AXPC believe that measurement of inlet pressure should serve as a surrogate monitoring parameter for the flow rate.¶ • Control devices (such as the ABUTEC medium temperature flare) -- which do not require a continuous pilot light and utilize an electronic ignition system to ignite vapors once a set point is reached (typically around 4 oz) and the solenoid valve opens to release the vapors -- -- are increasingly being used in the field. These devices eliminate the need for a continuous pilot light. Testing has proven that these devices are compliant with all of the requirements of the rule except that they do not require a continuous pilot light and thus require special monitoring provisions.

#### Reporting is impossible

Farrell and Thompson 10/15 (Amy Farrell, Vice President of Regulatory Affairs America’s Natural Gas Alliance, and V. Bruce Thompson, President American Exploration and Production Council, October 15, 2012, “RE: America’s Natural Gas Alliance Request for Reconsideration -- Oil and Natural Gas Sector: New Source Performance Standards and National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants Reviews; 77 Fed.Reg. 49490 (Aug. 16, 2012),” American Exploration and Production Council, America’s Natural Gas Alliance, http://www.axpc.us/download/issues\_and\_info/environment/environment\_15oct2012.pdf)

The Agency changed the reporting deadline in Section 60.5420(b) of the Final Rule to “30 days after the end of the initial compliance period.” In the proposed rule EPA had proposed a reporting deadline of one year after the initial startup date for the affected facility or one year after the date of publication of the final rule in the Federal Register, whichever is later. The reporting deadline as changed in the Final Rule is not feasible, given the amount and detail of data required to complete the report. Manual and automated data collection and reporting systems can have significant lead times, making a 30 day turnaround of accurate data very difficult (if not impossible) in many cases. Turnaround time was not an issue with respect to the deadline in the proposed rule, as the report would simply have included the data and information that had been collected and assembled in time for submission of the report, and the period covered by the report would have simply been the time period that was covered by the data. Because ANGA and AXPC did not have an opportunity to identify these logistical problems with respect to the new provisions set forth in the Final Rule, we request that EPA reconsider the reporting deadlines set forth in Section 60.5420(b) in light of these concerns.

### 2AC CP- Courts

####  “The” refers to one in a group

American Heritage 2009 (American Heritage Dictionary 2009, http://www.thefreedictionary.com/the)

a. Used before singular or plural nouns and noun phrases that denote particular, specified persons or things: the baby; the dress I wore.

b. Used before a noun, and generally stressed, to emphasize one of a group or type as the most outstanding or prominent: considered Lake Shore Drive to be the neighborhood to live in these days.

c. Used to indicate uniqueness: the Prince of Wales; the moon.

#### “Federal government” doesn’t mean three branches

Chicago 2007 (University of Chicago Manual of Style, “Capitalization, Titles”, http://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/CMS\_FAQ/CapitalizationTitles/CapitalizationTitles30.html)

Q. When I refer to the government of the United States in text, should it be U.S. Federal Government or U.S. federal government? A. The government of the United States is not a single official entity. Nor is it when it is referred to as the federal government or the U.S. government or the U.S. federal government. It’s just a government, which, like those in all countries, has some official bodies that act and operate in the name of government: the Congress, the Senate, the Department of State, etc.

#### CP is a reduction- nullification counts

Berger 2001 (Justice Berger, opinion in the case of Industrial Rentals, Inc. Isaac Budovitch and Florence Budovitch, Appelants Below, Appellants, v. New Castle Board of Adjustment and New Castle Country Department of Land Use, Appellees Below, Number 233, Supeme Court of Deleware, Lexis)

We disagree. Statutes must be read as a whole and all the words must be given effect.3 The word “restriction” means “a limitation (esp. in a deed) placed on the use or enjoyment of property.” 4  If a deed restriction has been satisfied, and no longer limits the use or enjoyment of the property, then it no longer is a deed restriction-even though the paper on which it was written remains. Thus, the phrase “projects containing deed restrictions requiring phasing․,” in Section 11.130(A)(7) means presently existing deed restrictions. As of June 1988, the Acierno/Marta Declaration contained no remaining deed restrictions requiring phasing to coincide with improvements to the transportation system. As a result, the Acierno/Marta projects should not have been included in the scope of the Budovitches' TIS.

#### Links to politics

Harrison 2005 (Lindsay Harrison, Lecturer in Law at the University of Miami School of Law, November 8, 2005, "Does the Court Act As ‘Political Cover’ for the Other Branches?," [http://legaldebate.blogspot.com/2005/11/does-court-act-as-political-cover-for.html](http://legaldebate.blogspot.com/2005/11/does-court-act-as-political-cover-for.html%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank))

Does the Court Act as "Political Cover" for the Other Branches? While the Supreme Court may have historically been able to act as political cover for the President and/or Congress, that is not true in a world post-Bush v. Gore. The Court is seen today as a politicized body, and especially now that we are in the era of the Roberts Court, with a Chief Justice hand picked by the President and approved by the Congress, it is highly unlikely that Court action will not, at least to some extent, be blamed on and/or credited to the President and Congress. The Court can still get away with a lot more than the elected branches since people don't understand the technicalities of legal doctrine like they understand the actions of the elected branches; this is, in part, because the media does such a poor job of covering legal news. Nevertheless, it is preposterous to argue that the Court is entirely insulated from politics, and equally preposterous to argue that Bush and the Congress would not receive at least a large portion of the blame for a Court ruling that, for whatever reason, received the attention of the public.

#### Especially EPA regulation decisions

Volcovici 2012 (Valerie Volcovici, August 21, 2012, “Court strikes down EPA rule on coal pollution,” Reuters, http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/08/21/us-usa-epa-ruling-idUSBRE87K0NQ20120821)

A U.S. appeals court on Tuesday overturned a key Obama administration rule to reduce harmful emissions from coal-burning power plants, sparking a rally in coal company shares and relief among utility firms.¶ The U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit said in a 2-1 decision that the Environmental Protection Agency had exceeded its mandate with the rule, which was to limit sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxide emissions from power plants in 28 mostly Eastern states and Texas.¶ In the latest setback for the EPA, the court sent the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule back for revision, telling the agency to administer its existing Clean Air Interstate Rule - the Bush-era regulation that it was updating - in the interim. The EPA said it was reviewing the ruling.¶ The decision was cheered by some Republicans, who have made the EPA and President Barack Obama's environmental policies a major campaign theme ahead of November elections.¶ The agency is endangering a fragile economic recovery by saddling U.S. industries with costly new rules, Republicans say.¶ "The Obama-EPA continues to demonstrate that it will stop at nothing in its determination to kill coal," said Republican Senator James Inhofe, one of the Senate's most vocal EPA opponents. "With so much economic pain in store, it is fortunate that EPA was sent back to the drawing board."¶ Power groups, which had argued that they could not meet the timeframe or bear the financial burden of installing costly new equipment, welcomed the court's decision. The EPA had estimated it would cost $800 million annually from 2014.¶ "The court was clear in finding that EPA had overstepped its legal authority in developing the rule," said Scott Segal, director of the Electric Reliability Coordinating Council.¶ Coal company stocks, which have suffered this year as cheap natural gas undercut demand for coal from power companies, soared. Peabody Energy was 3.7 percent higher and Arch Coal rose 1.1 percent.¶ U.S. natural gas futures briefly fell more than 3 percent after the ruling's announcement as traders bet it would mean less demand for the cleaner fuel over the coming months. By midday, prices had recovered those losses.¶ But some analysts saw little material impact from the ruling, with dozens of coal-fired plants already slated for closure due to other EPA regulations.¶ "It gives the EPA a little bit more of a black eye," said Andrew Weissman, senior energy adviser at law firm Haynes and Boone, which advises power and gas sector clients.¶ "But in the bigger picture, it may not be important in terms of the practical consequences."¶ POLLUTION CONTROLS¶ The EPA's rule was designed to reduce sulfur dioxide emissions by 73 percent and nitrogen oxide by 54 percent at coal-fired power plants from 2005 levels, improving health for over 240 million people, according to the agency. The reasoning is that unhealthy emissions from those plants, pollutants that cause acid rain and smog, cross state lines.¶ Two of the three judges ruling on the case said the EPA had exceeded its "jurisdictional limits" in interpreting the Clean Air Act and imposed "massive emission reduction requirements" on upwind states.¶ "By doing so, EPA departed from its consistent prior approach to implementing the good neighbor provision and violated the (Clean Air Act)," Judge Brett Kavanaugh said in the court's opinion.¶ The rule, known as CSAPR, also established a cap-and-trade system that enabled power producers to comply with the emission limits by buying, trading and selling pollution permits.¶ Environmental market traders said they were "surprised and disappointed" by the ruling.¶ Power generators, such as Southern Co, had argued that the January 1 implementation date was too soon to design and install the needed pollution control equipment.¶ Texas, along with the National Mining Association and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, also challenged the EPA, arguing the rule would cause undue financial burden on power producers and force companies to shut some older plants.¶ "Vindicating the state's objections to EPA's aggressive and lawless approach, today's decision is an important victory for federalism and a rebuke to a federal bureaucracy run amok," said Greg Abbott, attorney general in Texas, where the power industry had warned that the rule could result in peak-season blackouts.¶ Democratic Senator Tom Carper, who authored bills to curb mercury, SOX and NOx emissions in previous years, said he would try to push for new legislation if an appeal failed.

#### EPA circumvents the CP

Hamilton 2012 (Ken Hamilton, Wyoming Farm Bureau Federation Executive Vice President, April 2012, “EPA regulatory over reach is slapped down – again! -,” Wyoming Farm Bureau Federation, http://www.wyfb.org/news-center/farm-bureau-views/273-epa-regulatory-over-reach-is-slapped-down-again-april-2012)

By now some of you may have heard about the U.S. Supreme Court's March 21 ruling in Sackett v. Environmental Protection Agency in which the Court came down with a unanimous decision against the EPA. ¶ For those who haven't followed this case, it revolves around about two-thirds of an acre of land purchased by Mike Sackett and his wife Chantell near the shore of Priest Lake in Idaho in 2005. The land, which sat among other parcels of developed land, was determined by EPA to be a wetland after the Sacketts had already obtained a county permit and had hauled gravel onto the property.¶ EPA told the Sacketts they were filling a wetland in violation of the Clean Water Act and that they were to restore the property to its natural state or face fines up to $37,500 per day. The Sacketts wanted to appeal the EPA's wetlands determination, but the Agency told them they had no right to a “timely and meaningful” hearing in court to challenge the Agency's decision. And that is what the argument was all about.¶ An online article on cnn.com points out comments from Justice Alito during the hearing pointed to the concern that a homeowner could face a fine of such magnitude and still be denied any possibility of a judicial review. Justice Alito said in a concurring opinion that the bureaucracy the Sacketts endured was “unthinkable.” He also said that “The combination of the uncertain reach of the Clean Water Act and the draconian penalties imposed for the sort of violations alleged in this case still leaves most property owners with little practical alternative but to dance to the EPA's tune.”¶ This comment should not only send a message to EPA, but should also encourage Congress to step in. Instead of trying to remove the term “navigable” from the Clean Water Act, as is being contemplated, Congress should instead rein in potential future interpretation of federal authority abuses by the Agency or the Army Corp of Engineers. Congress should do this by amending the law to limit the reach of these mega agencies so the federal authority is clear; not open for interpretation by the agencies. We know from past law suits against EPA that they will not limit their own authority and even when the Courts limit their authority they dance around the meaning of the words in the decision in an effort to circumvent the decisions. A unanimous decision from the Supreme Court should give the legislative branch the courage to do what it needs to do.

### 2AC Immigration

#### Immigration reform wont’ pass – labor unions and historics.

Nathan Bogart, 1-23-2013, Inform U.S. Citizens, “Republicans Not The Only Ones Who Need to Deliver on Immigration Reform,” http://informuscitizens.com/republicans-not-the-only-ones-needing-to-deliver-on-immigration-reform/

Surprisingly, some may argue more pressure is on the Democratic party to bring about reform in President Obama’s second term. Promising immigration reform is nothing new to President Obama or the Democrats. During his 2008 campaign, then candidate Obama promised immigration reform in his first year. When that did not happen, the DREAM Act was placed for a vote before Congress in 2010. While it passed the House of Representatives, the measure failed miserably in the Senate, not only from strong opposition by Republican senators, but also from a lack of support amongst Democrats. With the Obama administration deporting record numbers of immigrants throughout his first term, many began to wonder if the president and his Democratic allies were merely using immigration as a political wedge issue in a similar fashion to the GOP and abortion, simply using the issue to fire up the base, but in reality, having little motivation to actually pass significant legislation. While many Democrats paid lip service to immigration reform, they feared taking any action perhaps due to fear of losing the support of historically anti-immigration labor unions.

#### Thumpers-

#### NLRB

Harper 1/25 (Jennifer Harper, “A 'stinging rebuke' to President Obama,” Washington Times, http://www.washingtontimes.com/blog/watercooler/2013/jan/25/stinging-rebuke-president-obama/)

The decision by a federal appeals court declaring President Obama's recess appointments to the National Labor Relations Board unconstitutional is going to hurt.¶ "This decision represents a stinging rebuke to the unprecedented and unconstitutional actions of President Obama," says Jay Sekulow, chief counsel of the American Ccenter for Law and Justice, which represented House Speaker John Boehner in an amicus brief urging the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit to declare the action unconstitutional.

#### Gun control

Philly 1/25 (“Inquirer Editorial: Must fight for cleaner air,” Philadelphia Inquirer, http://www.philly.com/philly/opinion/inquirer/20130125\_Inquirer\_Editorial\_\_Must\_fight\_for\_cleaner\_air.html)

The administration has been unclear about what it will do, but presidential scholars say if Obama is to get anything through Congress before he's dismissed as a lame duck, he's got about six months to do it.¶ The gun-control and immigration reforms he has asked for will no doubt spend much his political capital. Although Congress seems open to some legislation on those issues, Republican leaders beholden to the coal and oil industries that fund their political campaigns are unwilling to reduce the nation's carbon footprint.

#### EITHERtheGOP pushes the plan

Olson 11/8 (Mark Drajem and Bradley Olson, “Natural Gas That Backed Romney May Gain From Obama Win,” Business Week, http://www.businessweek.com/news/2012-11-07/natural-gas-that-backed-romney-may-gain-from-obama-win)

“Facts are stubborn things and they often defy people’s ideology,” John Hanger, a special counsel at Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellott, LLC in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, and the former top environmental regulator in that state, said in an interview. Obama’s “policies on the demand side are most favorable.”¶ The re-election of Obama and continuation of Republican control of the House of Representatives opens the possibility for legislation to boost demand for gas, including incentives for natural-gas vehicles, Hanger said. Republicans lawmakers may also try to limit actions the administration could take to regulate hydraulic fracturing or curb production on federal lands.

#### OR plan is the bargaining chip that gets GOP on board for the DA

Brown 11/14 (Tristan R. Brown, lawyer working in academia, teaches graduate-level courses on the law and policy, economics, and global issues surrounding the biorenewables sector, November 14, 2012, “Don't Expect The EPA To Finish Off Shale Gas, Either,” Seeking Alpha, http://seekingalpha.com/article/1008611-don-t-expect-the-epa-to-finish-off-shale-gas-either)

Finally, it should be noted that the EPA is not an independent agency. Its regulations must ultimately receive the implicit authorization of the president before they are implemented. President Obama has at least two (and possibly four) years of governing with a divided Congress. Therefore, he'll need at least some Republican support if he is to pass any legislation during this time. If the price of those Republican votes is to scrap proposed EPA regulation of fracking, then expect to see some political horse-trading. While the Democratic majority in the Senate prevents the GOP from passing any legislation that explicitly bars EPA regulations, it still has the ability to require their use as bargaining chips in any legislative negotiations.

#### Fracking restrictions are draining Obama’s PC now

PIN 11/23 (Power Industry News, “Fracking industry keeps eye on Obama; EPA report could doom its future,” Utility Products, http://www.utilityproducts.com/news/2012/11/23/fracking-industry-keeps-eye-on-obama-nl-epa-report-could-doom-its-future.html)

Ms. Harbert and others remain optimistic that the White House will recognize that, and they are heartened by what they heard from the president during his campaign. While Republicans and some industry analysts at times have doubted his sincerity, Mr. Obama voiced strong support for expanded oil and gas drilling throughout his race against Republican challenger Mitt Romney.¶ Politically, it has become increasingly difficult to oppose such expansion, especially in light of research that shows drilling will be vital to the effort to free the U.S. from reliance on Middle Eastern oil.¶ The International Energy Agency last week predicted that the U.S. will become the world's largest oil producer by the next decade, overtaking Saudi Arabia and putting the nation on course to be energy self-sufficient by 2030. The shift is driven by increases in oil extraction and the production of natural gas, which since 2007 has gone up from 20.2 trillion cubic feet per year to more than 24 trillion cubic feet and likely will go even higher.¶ The new energy reality, unimaginable even five years ago and driven primarily by fracking, puts pressure on the Obama administration to fully embrace the extraction method and avoid taking steps that could hamper it, analysts say.

#### Executive action normal means avoids the link

Bryce 2011 (Robert Bryce, a senior fellow at the Manhattan Institute, April 29, 2011, “Obama on Energy: Inconsistent, Incoherent,” http://www.energytribune.com/7583/obama-on-energy-inconsistent-incoherent)

Instead, we can expect increasing use of energy governance by executive fiat. That is, via the political expedience of the ideological energy industry ‘attack dogs’ at the EPA and Bureau of Land Management. Though it means eschewing greater government revenue from the energy industry, it has already proven a more expedient way of imposing regulations that effectively price new oil and gas development out of the market.¶ But whether the administration chooses open anti-carbon warfare on the floor of the House, or the ‘covert ops’ path inherent via his regulatory bodies, employing either would appear to refute a clear and cross-party electoral mandate. A mandate urging support for greater investment in oil and gas; and not one for putting increasingly burdensome impediments in the path of the oil and gas industries.

#### 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

#### Aff solves the economy

Mullaney 2012 (Tim Mullaney, May 15, 2012, “U.S. energy independence is no longer just a pipe dream,” USA Today, http://goo.gl/dycSM)

Much of Wall Street and Washington is seized by the hope that the U.S.'s energy future will be as bright as Williamsport's. As Americans heave a sigh of relief at gasoline prices falling back from near $4 a gallon, big new discoveries of domestic oil and natural gas hold the promise of more substantial benefits for the U.S. economy for decades to come — even the possibility of energy independence. Every president since Richard Nixon has called for the U.S. to wean itself from needing oil from unstable or unsavory countries. The nation's new-found energy riches are likely to bring that ambition closer to reality in the next two decades, according to many forecasters. It's no pipe dream. The U.S. is already the world's fastest-growing oil and natural gas producer. Counting the output from Canada and Mexico, North America is "the new Middle East," Citigroup analysts declare in a recent report. The U.S. Energy Information Agency says U.S. oil imports will drop 20% by 2025. Oil giant BP projects the U.S. will get 94% of its energy domestically by 2030, up from 77% now, as oil imports fall by half. Energy billionaire T. Boone Pickens, a major investor in oil and natural-gas companies, said the U.S. can at least end oil imports from Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries, about half its total, through new drilling and by shifting diesel-swilling trucks to natural gas. Any other oil needs should be from politically stable allies such as Canada, Pickens said. Most enticing, a team of analysts and economists at Citigroup argues that the U.S., or at least North America, can achieve energy independence by 2020, as more domestic production and doubling down on conservation produce a virtuous cycle. The U.S. can make itself a net exporter of crude oil, refined products and natural gas — says Citigroup energy strategist Seth Kleinman. "The notion of the U.S. getting to zero net imports of oil is obviously a sexy notion, but it's not necessary for it to mean the world will change," he says. "We are seeing a dramatic collapse in U.S. net imports of oil as we speak, to the tune of almost 1 million barrels a day each year over the last four years." If anything like that happens, an improbable-sounding litany of good things can result. In practical terms, more energy independence could mean 3.6 million new jobs, enough to cut unemployment by two percentage points, Citigroup argues. It could help manufacturers and chemical businesses that use lots of energy or make products from natural gas. It might give the U.S. a structural advantage on trade partners in energy costs, helping to offset the edge that cheaper labor gives nations such as China, Kleinman says. Already, U.S. natural gas prices are a seventh of what they are in Beijing, Pickens says. "The potential is clearly there for a genuine revitalization and reindustrialization of the economy," Kleinman says. "In industries where energy is a major element of costs, the U.S. is moving into a uniquely advantaged position."

### IFR CP

#### IFRs have never been integrated into a power plant and benefits rest on flawed assumptions

Jim Green, B.Med.Sci. (Hons.), PhD, honors degree in public health and was awarded a PhD in science and technology studies for his analysis of the Lucas Heights research reactor debates, studies and speaks extensively on nuclear power, national nuclear campaigner, “Integral Fast Reactors,” Friends of Earth Australia, November 26, 2011, http://www.foe.org.au/anti-nuclear/issues/nfc/power/ifrs, accessed 7-7-2012.

Complete IFR systems don't exist. Blees cites five reactors with some IFR characteristics. Brook gives this summary of the state of development of IFR components: "IFRs are sodium-cooled fast spectrum nuclear power stations with on-site pyroprocessing to recycle spent fuel. Fast spectrum power reactors exist ... Indeed, even sodium-cooled fast reactors (a type of Advanced Liquid Metal Reactor, ALMR), the type an IFR facility would likely use, already exist (others include lead- or gas-cooled). Metallic alloy fuels (uranium-plutonium-zirconium), operating within a reactor, existed, in the Experimental Breeder Reactor II at the Argonne National Laboratory. Just because they are not currently used in any operating nuclear power plant doesn't mean they don't (haven't) existed). The only thing that doesn't currently exist is the full systems design of the integrated plant." In short: \* Fast neutron reactors (breeders) exist but experience is limited and they have had a troubled history (accidents, and their WMD proliferation potential). \* The pyroprocessing and transmutation technologies intended to operate as part of IFR systems are some considerable distance from being mature. See the references below for further discussion. \* South Korea is investigating IFRs but plans to spend the next 18-19 YEARS just to ASSESS their viability. For a properly functioning IFR system, the individual components would need to work and the components would need to be integrated, with potential technical and social obstacles. For example, there's no point having the capacity to irradiate significant quantities of fissile material from outside sources if states and/or nuclear utilities won't surrender fissile material or if IFR operators don't want to irradiate outside sources of fissile material. And its no good overcoming those potential social obstacles if the technology doesn't meet its proponents' expectations. The possibilities are endless, e.g.: \* Pyroprocessing is scrapped in favour of conventional reprocessing. \* IFRs are rolled out in the absence of rigorous international safeguards. \* The potential non-proliferation benefits of IFR are not realised because they are not used to irradiate outside sources of fissile material to any degree. \* IFR proponents envisage each IFR reactor having on-site pyroprocessing (thus minimising transportation of nuclear materials and the attendant risks of accidents, terrorism etc) but one can readily imagine centralised processing facilities being preferred on economic grounds. The MOX plant and the THORP reprocessing plant at Sellafield (UK) provide two recent examples of nuclear plants which have been conspicuous failures despite considerable historical experience with the basic technology, despite the UK's lengthy and extensive experience with many facets of nuclear technology, and despite the UK's relative economic strength and relative technological/industrial strength.

#### IFRs fail – logistics, cost, security issues, theoretically flawed

Amory Lovins, American consultant, experimental physicist and 1993 MacArthur Fellow, has been active at the nexus of energy, resources, environment, development, and security in more than 50 countries for 35 years, including 14 years based in England. He is widely considered among the world’s leading authorities on energy, Cofounder, Chairman and Chief Scientist, After two years at Harvard, Mr. Lovins transferred to Oxford, and two years later became a don at 21, receiving in consequence an Oxford MA by Special Resolution (1971) and, later, 11 honorary doctorates of various U.S. and U.K. universities. He has been Regents’ Lecturer at the U. of California both in Energy and Resources and in Economics; Grauer Lecturer at UBC; Luce Visiting Professor at Dartmouth; Distinguished Visiting Professor at the University of Colorado; Oikos Visiting Professor of Business, U. of St. Gallen; an engineering visiting professor at Peking U.; and 2007 MAP/Ming Professor at Stanford’s School of Engineering., has briefed 21 heads of state, given expert testimony in eight countries and 20+ states, delivered thousands of lectures, and written 31 books and more than 450 papers, In 1980–81 he served on the U.S. Department of Energy’s senior advisory board, and in 1999–2001 and 2006–08, on Defense Science Board task forces on military energy strategy. In 1984 he was elected a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science “for his book Soft Energy Paths and many other noteworthy contributions to energy policy,” in 1988, of the World Academy of Arts and Sciences, and in 2001, of the World Business Academy, ““New” nuclear reactors, same old story,” Rocky Mountain Institute, March 21, 2009, http://www.rmi.org/Knowledge-Center/Library/2009-07\_NuclearSameOldStory, accessed 7-7-2012.

As this becomes evident, other kinds of reactors are being proposed instead novel designs claimed to solve LWRs' problems of economics, proliferation, and waste. Even climate-protection pioneer Jim Hansen says these "Generation IV" reactors merit rapid R&D. But on closer examination, the two kinds most often promoted Integral Fast Reactors (IFRs) and thorium reactors reveal no economic, environmental, or security rationale, and the thesis is unsound for any nuclear reactor. Integrated Fast Reactors (IFRs) The IFR a pool-type, liquid-sodium cooled fast-neutron reactor plus an ambitious new nuclear fuel cycle was abandoned in 1994, and General Electric's S-PRISM design in 2003, due to both proliferation concerns and dismal economics. Federal funding for fast breeder reactors halted in 1983, but in the past few years, enthusiasts got renewed Bush Administration support by portraying the IFR as a solution to proliferation and nuclear waste. It's neither. Fast reactors were first offered as a way to make more plutonium to augment and ultimately replace scarce uranium. Now that uranium and enrichment are known to get cheaper while reprocessing, cleanup, and nonproliferation get costlier destroying the economic rationale IFRs have been reframed as a way to destroy the plutonium (and similar transuranic elements) in long-lived radioactive waste. Two or three redesigned IFRs could in principle fission the plutonium produced by each four LWRs without making more net plutonium. However, most LWRs will have retired before even one commercial-size IFR could be built; LWRs won't be replaced with more LWRs because they're grossly uncompetitive; and IFRs with their fuel cycle would cost even more and probably be less reliable. It's feasible today to "burn" plutonium in LWRs, but this isn't done much because it's very costly, makes each kg of spent fuel 7x hotter, enhances risks, and makes certain transuranic isotopes that complicate operation. IFRs could do the same thing with similar or greater problems, offering no advantage over LWRs in proliferation resistance, cost, or environment. IFRs' reprocessing plant, lately reframed a "recycling center," would be built at or near the reactors, coupling them so neither works without the other. Its novel technology, replacing solvents and aqueous chemistry with high-temperature pyrometallurgy and electro refining, would incur different but major challenges, greater technical risks and repair problems, and speculative but probably worse economics. (Argonne National Laboratory, the world's experts on it, contracted to pyroprocess spent fuel from the EBRII a small IFR-like test reactor shut down in 1994 by 2035, at a cost DOE estimated in 2006 at approximately 50× today's cost of fresh LWR fuel.)

#### Global warming is inevitable

Spaeth 2012 (Ryu Spaeth, December 5, 2012, “Why it's probably too late to roll back global warming,” The Week, http://theweek.com/article/index/237392/why-its-probably-too-late-to-roll-back-global-warming)

Two degrees Celsius. According to scientists, that's the rise in global temperature, measured against pre-industrial times, that could spark some of the most catastrophic effects of global warming. Preventing the two-degree bump has been the goal of every international treaty designed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, including a new one currently being hammered out at a United Nations summit in Doha, Qatar. But a new study published by the journal Nature Climate Change shows that it's incredibly unlikely that global warming can be limited to two degrees. According to the study, the world in 2011 "pumped nearly 38.2 billion tons of carbon dioxide into the air from the burning of fossil fuels such as coal and oil," says Seth Borenstein at The Associated Press:¶ The total amounts to more than 2.4 million pounds (1.1 million kilograms) of carbon dioxide released into the air every second.¶ Because emissions of the key greenhouse gas have been rising steadily and most carbon stays in the air for a century, it is not just unlikely but "rather optimistic" to think that the world can limit future temperature increases to 2 degrees Celsius (3.6 degrees Fahrenheit), said the study's lead author, Glen Peters at the Center for International Climate and Environmental Research in Oslo, Norway.¶ What happens when the two-degree threshold is crossed? Most notably, that's when the polar ice caps will begin to melt, leading to a dangerous rise in sea levels. Furthermore, the world's hottest regions will be unable to grow food, setting the stage for mass hunger and global food inflation. The rise in temperature would also likely exacerbate or cause extreme weather events, such as hurricanes and droughts.¶ There is a very small chance that the world could pull back from the brink. The U.N. could still limit warming to two degrees if it adopts a "radical plan," says Peters' group. According to a PricewaterhouseCoopers study, such a plan would entail cutting carbon emissions "by 5.1 percent every year from now to 2050, essentially slamming the breaks on growth starting right now," says Coral Davenport at The National Journal, "and keeping the freeze on for 37 years." However, the U.N. has set a deadline of ratifying a new treaty by 2015, and implementing it by 2020, which means the world is already eight years behind that pace. There are still major disagreements between the U.S. and China over whether the developed world, which industrialized first, should bear the bulk of the cost of reducing carbon emissions. And there is, of course, a large contingent of Americans who don't even believe climate change exists, putting any treaty's ratification at risk. Climate change is so politically toxic in America that Congress has prioritized the fiscal cliff over — no exaggeration — untold suffering and the end of the world as we know it.¶ In other words, it isn't happening. And if that's not bad enough, keep in mind that the two-degree mark is just the beginning, says Davenport:¶ Michael Oppenheimer, a professor of geosciences and international affairs at Princeton University and a member of the Nobel Prize-winning U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, says that a 2-degree rise is not itself that point, but rather the beginning of irreversible changes. "It starts to speed you toward a tipping point," he said. "It's driving toward a cliff at night with the headlights off. We don't know when we'll hit that cliff, but after 2 degrees, we're going faster, we have less control. After 3, 4, 5 degrees, you spiral out of control, you have even more irreversible change."¶ Indeed, at the current emissions rate, the world is expected to broach the four-degree mark by 2100 — at which point, we can expect even worse environmental catastrophes.

#### US emissions low now and not key

Traub 12/7 (James Traub, contributing writer for The New York Times Magazine, December 7, 2012, “The Climate Scofflaw,” http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/12/07/the\_climate\_scofflaw)

Actually, that's not true -- the last part, anyway. According to the International Energy Agency, U.S. emissions have dropped 7.7 percent since 2006 -- "the largest reduction of all countries or regions." Yes, you read that correctly. The United States, which has indeed refused to sign the Kyoto Accords establishing binding targets for emissions, has reduced its carbon footprint faster than the greener-than-thou European countries which have done so. The reasons for this have something to do with climate change itself (warm winters mean less heating oil -- something to do with market forces -- the shift from coal to natural gas in power plants) and something to do with policy at the state and regional level. And in the coming years, as both new gas-mileage standards and new power-plant regulations championed by the Obama administration kick in, policy will drive the numbers further downwards; U.S. emissions are expected to fall 23 percent between 2002 and 2020. Apparently Obama's record on climate change is not quite as calamitous as reputation would have it.¶ The West has largely succeeded in bending downwards the curve of carbon emissions. But the developing world has not. Last year, China's emissions rose 9.3 percent; India's, 8.7 percent. China is now the world's No. 1 source of carbon emissions, followed by the United States, the European Union, and India. The emerging powers have every reason to want to emulate the energy-intensive economic success of the West; even those, like China, who have taken steps to increase energy efficiency, are not prepared to do anything to harm economic growth. The real failure of U.S. policy has been, first, that it is still much too timid, and second, that it has not acted in such a way as to persuade developing nations to take the truly difficult decisions which would put the world on a sustainable path.

#### Only gas solves fast enough

Ward 2011 (Richard Ward, director of energy initiatives at the Aspen Science Center and senior energy advisor to the UN Foundation’s Energy Future Coalition, Spring 2011, “Ally Renewables with Natural Gas,” Earth Island Journal, EBSCO)

The scientific consensus is stark: Earth systems are dangerously close to tipping points which, once crossed, could ignite negative feedback loops and catastrophic climate change beyond human capacity to remedy. Because burning hydrocarbons is the cause, many environmentalists advocate a complete ban on carbon fuel sources in favor of renewables. This is compelling until we consider the numbers. The US uses about 100 quadrillion BTUs of energy a year and emits 6 billion tons of the world’s 30 billion tons of CO2. We use nearly 40 quads of oil for transportation and about 40 quads of energy for electric power. By contrast, our production from wind and solar is only 0.5 quads. To replace the 67 quads of oil, coal, and natural gas with wind and solar would take decades. In this time, the emissions from coal and oil would drive the planet over the brink. Even if we were to able ramp up solar and wind power by 20 times our current capacity over the next 20 years, the total contribution would only be 10 percent of the energy we need. We do not have time to be purists. The renewables revolution must occur. But we must make significant cuts in the carbon emissions today — and natural gas offers the fastest way to do that. Each year, coal emits 2 billion tons of CO2 for electric power generation in the United States. Because natural gas is 50 to 70 percent more carbon efficient than coal for the same energy output, switching our coal generation to natural gas will radically reduce the nation’s emissions by up to 500 million tons of CO2 per year in the near-term (1-2 years) and by more than a billion tons per year in the medium-term (10 years). There are no other options that provide these volumes of reductions this fast. Rapidly transitioning our energy infrastructure away from coal and oil toward renewables backed up by clean burning natural gas makes good sense. Renewables emit no greenhouse gases, and when the sun is not shining and the wind is not blowing, burning natural gas creates far less health and environmental damage than coal and oil. As we expand our renewables portfolio, the natural gas electricity generation could be ratcheted back. The reason that natural gas generation can be ramped up so quickly in the US is that the infrastructure for electrical generation is sitting idle most of the time. For most of the year, the natural gas-fed electric power plants are used less than 40 percent of the time. The Congressional Research Office estimates that by simply dispatching gas ahead of coal, the US could reduce 400 million tons of CO2 per year with existing infrastructure. Just because transitioning from coal to renewables and natural gas is smart doesn’t mean it will be easy. The coal lobby will not go away quietly. They sponsor climate skep- tics, support efforts to shut down natural gas development, and flood the air space with disingenuous information. Fear is their best tool. The latest example is that leaking pipes will make a shift to natural gas more dangerous and emit more methane than staying with coal. Environmentalists must not be fooled. It is good that the EPA has raised leaking flanges and compressors as a concern, not to discredit natural gas, but to improve regulations to ensure that the gas stays in the pipes until it is burned. Coal-fired power plants remain among the top emmitters of fine particle pollution, mercury, SO2 and NOx in the country. According to the Clean Air Task Force, this pollution caused over 13,000 premature deaths in 2010, almost 10,000 hospitalizations, and more than 20,000 heart attacks. Shifting to renewables and natural gas is the patriotic thing to do because significantly more Americans die every year from coal emissions than have died in the World Trade Center at- tack and the eight years of Iraq and Afghan wars combined (nearly 11,000 fatalities).

### 2AC Climate DA

#### Status quo offsets the link- new non-fracking climate regs coming

Bloomberg 11/8 (“Re-Election Greenlights Host of EPA Rules, Solidifies Regulation of Greenhouse Gases,”

President Obama's re-election gives the green light to a host of air pollution and other pending environmental rules and will ensure that one of the president's few tools for curbing U.S. greenhouse gas emissions--Environmental Protection Agency regulations--will live on.¶ The president's Nov. 6 win essentially clears the way for EPA's initial efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from new coal- and other fossil fuel-fired power plants under the Clean Air Act's new source performance standards, which are expected to be finalized in 2013.¶ Also likely to move forward are air pollution rules to strengthen national ambient air quality standards for particulate matter and regulations cutting air toxics emitted by boilers, both awaiting final action. Those are likely to be followed by a revision of the ozone rule in 2014 and action on yet-to-be-proposed Tier 3 requirements governing sulfur content in gasoline.¶ Curbing greenhouse gas emissions from power plants, cars, and light trucks has been a top environmental initiative for Obama, and with his re-election secure he is likely to continue to rely on EPA's existing regulatory authority to address climate change (see related story).

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

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

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

#### Plan cements climate cred

Casten 2009 (Sean Casten, president of Recycled Energy Development, December 16, 2009, “Natural gas as a near-term CO2 mitigation strategy,” Grist, http://goo.gl/b8z08)

Discussions of CO2 reduction tend to start from a presumption of near-term economic disruption coupled to long-term investment in green technology. The presumption isn’t right. The U.S. could reduce its total CO2 footprint by 14-20 percent tomorrow with no disruption in our access to energy services, without investing in any new infrastructure. The Waxman-Markey proposal to reduce CO2 emissions by 17 percent over 10 years is constrained only by its ambition. This near-term opportunity would be realized by ramping up our nation’s generation of electricity from gas and ramping down our generation from coal, taking advantage only of existing assets. Its scale and potential for immediate impact deserves consideration; even partial action towards this goal would have dramatic political and environmental consequences, establishing U.S. leadership and credibility in global climate negotiations.

### \*\*\*1AR\*\*\*

### Steel

#### Cheap shale gas key to steel industry

Miller 2012 (John W. Miller, March 28, 2012, “Steel Finds Sweet Spot in the Shale,” Wall Street Journal, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304177104577305611784871178.html)

The rising fortunes of a massive U.S. Steel Corp. X -1.01% plant here has much to do with what sits below: massive deposits of cheap natural gas. Shiny coils roll off the line destined for energy companies drilling in the Marcellus Shale natural-gas formations that rest below much of southwestern Pennsylvania. Production for so-called tubular goods used for pipes, tubes and joints in gas drilling has doubled in two years, says Scott Bucksio, the general manager of the plant in the sprawling Mon Valley Works, as drillers have raced to extract ever-larger amounts of gas from the shale deposits. As significant, or more so for energy-intensive steelmakers, is that newly plentiful natural gas "is also keeping costs down" said Mr. Bucksio of U.S. Steel.¶ With prices of natural gas down more than 35% to $2.21 per million British thermal units from a year ago due to abundant supply, the company has begun replacing coal with natural gas to power its blast furnaces.¶ Industrywide, a ton of steel costs around $600 to produce. Using natural gas instead of coal to run the furnaces cuts the costs by $8 to $10 per ton. Based on those figures, U.S. Steel could save $133 million this year alone, according to a recent report by UBS AG, which also said the Pittsburgh-based company could save another $80 million in 2012 energy costs for nonblast furnace operations.¶ The gas boom is coming just in time for U.S. Steel, the country's largest and the world's eighth-largest steelmaker, with 37,400 workers world-wide.¶ After posting losses in the last three years, the company's stock price, which traded at a low of $20.19 last year, closed at $29.54 Monday and is up 13% in the past three weeks. The company expects a significant improvement in financial results for the first quarter, due in large part to the dual benefits of the natural-gas boom.¶ U.S. Steel shipped about 1.8 million tons of tubular goods used in drilling and transporting natural gas and oil in 2011, a 17% increase from year-earlier levels. Prices for those higher-premium products increased 7.9% to $1,612 per ton from $1,494, boosting the company's profit outlook.¶ "Shale resource development has the potential to make significant, positive contributions to U.S. Steel," Chief Executive John Surma said in a recent speech.¶ And for other industries: Low natural-gas prices, if they can be sustained, represent a competitive advantage across the U.S. manufacturing base. The price of natural gas is $11.35 per million BTUs in northwest Europe and $15.9 in Japan, according to researcher Platts, compared with U.S. levels of $2.27.

### Solvency- States

#### Federal government should stay out of the way- States solve better

Willie 2011 (Matt Willie, JD at Brigham Young Law, “Hydraulic Fracturing and ‘Spotty’ Regulation: Why the Federal Government Should Let States Control Unconventional Onshore Drilling,” Brigham Young University Law Review, Lexis)

Recent years have witnessed a shift of focus in the oil and gas industry. Conventional sources of energy are drying up. 1 Global demand is on the rise. 2 And offshore drilling, though potentially extremely lucrative, has proven to be a risky endeavor. 3 As many experts see it, solutions for developers must now come in the form of unconventional onshore extraction techniques, which allow operators to tap reserves previously thought uneconomical or even impossible to produce. 4 While developers have traditionally focused on cheap, vertical wells and shallow pools of oil and gas, future economic success will likely require expensive directional drilling and unconventional sources of energy. 5 [\*1744] The Barnett Shale play in Texas offers an illustrative example. One of the largest natural gas discoveries in the world, the field sits directly below the city of Fort Worth, Texas, where gas extraction is only possible at a price of $ 2-3 million per well. 6 Even then, drilling would not be economical without the use of hydraulic fracturing 7 (often referred to as "fracking" or "hydrofracking"), a technique used to break up source rock by injecting large amounts of water and other substances into a well at such high pressures that the rock cracks, or fractures. 8 The injected fluid usually contains a propping agent (normally sand or artificial ceramic beads), which "props open" the fracture and allows oil and gas to flow to the wellhead. 9 Hydrofracking in the Barnett Shale is often combined with horizontal drilling, a technique that extends a well's reach and allows operators to produce gas in urban areas where population concerns complicate the drilling process. 10 These methods are also employed in rural regions. In the Williston Basin of western North Dakota and eastern Montana, for example, fracking and horizontal drilling enable developers to target tight shale plays where oil could not be efficiently produced only a decade or two ago. 11 In fact, such well-stimulation techniques have become so efficient and so lucrative for oil producers in the U.S. that most of the country's oil and gas billionaires have made their fortunes investing in onshore, not offshore, drilling. 12 At the same time, few onshore operations pose more concerns than hydraulic fracturing. The debate regarding its potential negative environmental effects has morphed into an outright firestorm in recent years, with drilling advocates staunchly defending the practice 13 but facing fierce opposition from environmental groups and even politicians. 14 New York Attorney General Eric Schneiderman, for example, has promised to sue to keep hydrofracking out of his state until more information is available regarding its environmental effects. 15 [\*1746] Although hydraulic fracturing has been widely employed by the energy industry for more than sixty years, the last decade has witnessed an intense push for more government regulation, especially from the federal level. 16 This Comment will discuss the various legal issues implicated by this enormously lucrative practice, as well as evaluate the desirability of additional federal controls. Ultimately, this Comment argues that regulatory decisions in this realm are best left to the states. While environmental concerns over hydrofracking should not be ignored, in many cases they have been overstated. More importantly, the characteristics of reserves (and therefore specific hydraulic fracturing techniques) vary from state to state, making the success of any regulatory system highly dependent on regulators' knowledge of local and regional industry realities. Each of the nation's major oil-and gas-producing states have effectively grappled with both the environmental and legal challenges posed by the practice since its inception more than half a century ago, and they have done so in a way that has not only generally protected public health but also encouraged economic growth and preserved state common law theories regarding oil and gas development and tort liability. At this late stage, adding an extra layer of federal control will not only fail to diminish fracking's environmental effects but will also create unnecessary inefficiencies that could cripple operators' ability to meet domestic energy demand.

### Russia

#### No lashout

Blackwill 2009 (Robert Blackwill 2009; former associate dean of the Kennedy School of Government and Deputy Assistant to the President and Deputy National Security Advisor for Strategic Planning; RAND, "The Geopolitical Consequences of the World Economic Recession—A Caution", http://www.rand.org/pubs/occasional\_papers/2009/RAND\_OP275.pdf)

Now on to Russia. Again, fi ve years from today. Did the global recession and Russia’s present serious economic problems substantially modify Russian foreign policy? No. (President Obama is beginning his early July visit to Moscow as this paper goes to press; nothing fundamental will result from that visit). Did it produce a serious weakening of Vladimir Putin’s power and authority in Russia? No, as recent polls in Russia make clear. Did it reduce Russian worries and capacities to oppose NATO enlargement and defense measures eastward? No. Did it aff ect Russia’s willingness to accept much tougher sanctions against Iran? No. Russian Foreign Minister Lavrov has said there is no evidence that Iran intends to make a nuclear weapon.25 In sum, Russian foreign policy is today on a steady, consistent path that can be characterized as follows: to resurrect Russia’s standing as a great power; to reestablish Russian primary infl uence over the space of the former Soviet Union; to resist Western efforts to encroach on the space of the former Soviet Union; to revive Russia’s military might and power projection; to extend the reach of Russian diplomacy in Europe, Asia, and beyond; and to oppose American global primacy. For Moscow, these foreign policy first principles are here to stay, as they have existed in Russia for centuries. 26 None of these enduring objectives of Russian foreign policy are likely to be changed in any serious way by the economic crisis.

### EPA DA

#### \*\*\*Resilience overwhelms climate disputes

Kupchan 2012 (Charles A. Kupchan, professor of International Affairs at Georgetown University and Whitney Shepardson Senior Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, March 30, 2012, “A Still-Strong Alliance,” Hoover Institution at Stanford, http://www.hoover.org/publications/policy-review/article/111956)

The atlantic alliance has demonstrated remarkable resilience over the past two decades. Most alliances do not outlast the dissolution of the threat that brought them into being. nato, however, not only survived the collapse of the Soviet Union but went on to welcome a host of new members from Central Europe and to undertake military missions in Bosnia, Kosovo, Afghanistan, and Libya. As the Cold War came to a close, few observers could have predicted that nato, twenty years later, would be in the midst of a major mission in Afghanistan while simultaneously carrying out a successful air campaign to topple the Libyan government.¶ nato’s surprising longevity and activism notwithstanding, the Atlantic alliance has certainly suffered its fair share of setbacks. The Iraq war of 2003 severely strained transatlantic relations and underscored the differences in approach and policy that had come into stark relief after President George W. Bush took office. The election of Barack Obama then seemed to guide the United States and Europe back into alignment — but only temporarily. Soon enough, Europeans began to worry that Obama was a “post-Atlanticist” president who would focus his attention elsewhere — on Asia, in particular. So, too, were Europeans disappointed when Obama backed away from some of his campaign pledges, unable to close Guantanamo or implement a credible U.S. program to curb global warming. For its part, Washington begrudged the eu’s sluggish response to its financial crisis and its inability to muster more coherence and capability on matters of defense.¶ The Western alliance has, however, admirably weathered these ups and downs, and proved wrong its many naysayers. Only a decade ago, many analysts were convinced that the transatlantic coupling was on the rocks. Robert Kagan predicted in these pages that a Hobbesian America obsessed with power and coercion was destined to separate from a Kantian Europe wedded to taming the world through law and institutions. In The End of the American Era, I foresaw a European Union whose deepening integration would gradually give it the wherewithal to chart its own course, fostering an independence that would come at the expense of Atlantic solidarity. Others, such as Ivo Daalder, the current U.S. ambassador to nato, fretted in Survival about the “effective end of Atlanticism” and a strategic drift that could result “in separation and, ultimately, divorce.”¶ How and why has the Western alliance been able to defy such predictions of demise? This essay examines what the skeptics got right and what they got wrong, with particular reference to Kagan’s essay, “Power and Weakness.” Kagan and many other observers of the Atlantic alliance identified key fissures in the transatlantic relationship, but also significantly underestimated its staying power. Common values and interests, which have increased in salience due to the ongoing diffusion of power from the West to the rising rest, have kept centrifugal forces at bay. The transatlantic bond has also proved durable by default; Europe and America remain each other’s best partners because there are for now no viable alternatives.

### IFR CP

#### Commercial breeder reactors have failed in multiple countries. Shutdowns have prevented any of them from being used at full capacity.

Thomas B. Cochran Ph.D. Senior Scientist, Nuclear Program, NRDC, et al. Harold A. Feiveson, Walt Patterson, Gennadi Pshakin, M.V. Ramana, Mycle Schneider, Tatsujiro Suzuki, Frank von Hippel “Fast Breeder Reactor Programs: History and Status” February 2010 <http://fissilematerials.org/library/rr08.pdf> A research report of the International Panel on Fissile Materials

The history of the world’s only commercial-sized breeder reactor, France’s ¶ Superphénix, is dominated by lengthy shutdowns for repairs (see chapter 2). ¶ Superphénix went critical and was connected to the grid in January 1986 but was ¶ shut down more than half of the time until operations ceased in December 1996. ¶ Its lifetime capacity factor — the ratio of the number of kilowatt-hours that it ¶ generated to the number it could have generated had it operated continually at full ¶ capacity — was less than 7 percent. The histories of Japan’s Monju and the U.K.’s ¶ Dounreay and Prototype Fast Reactors and the U.S. Enrico Fermi 1 demonstration ¶ breeder reactor power plants were similarly characterized by prolonged shutdowns ¶ (see chapters 4, 6 and 7). Russia’s BN-600 has experienced a respectable capacity ¶ factor but only because of the willingness of its operators to continue to operate ¶ it despite multiple sodium fires.

#### Several countries have abandoned commercialization of fast breeders because they have been unreliable.

Thomas B. Cochran Ph.D. Senior Scientist, Nuclear Program, NRDC, et al. Harold A. Feiveson, Walt Patterson, Gennadi Pshakin, M.V. Ramana, Mycle Schneider, Tatsujiro Suzuki, Frank von Hippel “Fast Breeder Reactor Programs: History and Status” February 2010 <http://fissilematerials.org/library/rr08.pdf> A research report of the International Panel on Fissile Materials

¶ Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States have abandoned their ¶ breeder reactor development programs. Despite the arguments by France’s nuclear ¶ conglomerate Areva, that fast-neutron reactors will ultimately fission all the¶ plutonium building up in France’s light-water reactor spent fuel,¶ 18¶ France’s only ¶ operating fast-neutron reactor, Phénix, was disconnected from the grid in March ¶ 2009 and scheduled for permanent shutdown by the end of that year.¶ 19¶ The ¶ Superphénix, the world’s first commercial-sized breeder reactor, was abandoned in ¶ 1998 and is being decommissioned. There is no follow-on breeder reactor planned ¶ in France for at least a decade.

#### Methane is no big deal- coal is worse

Cathles 2011 (Lawrence M. Cathles III, professor of earth and atmospheric sciences at Cornell, Larry Brown, professor of earth and atmospheric sciences at Cornell, Milton Taam, Electric Software, Inc., and Andrew Hunter, department of chemical and biological engineering at Cornell, October 2011, “A commentary on ‘The greenhouse-gas footprint of natural gas in shale formations’ by R.W. Howarth, R. Santoro, and Anthony Ingraffea,” Climatic Change, online)

The second aspect of the Howarth et al. paper that we question is the effect of methane leakage from gas drilling on greenhouse gases and the future climate. Howarth et al. compute the GHG impacts using the most unfavorable time period (20 years vs 100 years) and basis (heat vs electricity) for comparing gas with coal. Considering that coal is used almost exclusively for generating electricity, gas must replace electricity generation by coal and the fuels should be compared on this basis. When considering the impact of swapping methane for CO2 it is important to take into account the very short lifetime of methane in the atmosphere compared to the very long lifetime of the CO2. The 100 year GWP for methane does this, the 20 year GWP does not. Focusing on electricity generation and using a 100 year GWP we show, using the same methods as Howarth et al., that gas has less than half and perhaps a third the greenhouse impact as coal. Since gas also possesses other important emission advantages such as no particulates, SO2, NO2, or ash, it is clearly the “cleaner” option in comparison to coal. Howarth et al. arrive at their conclusion that gas could have twice the greenhouse impact as coal only by using fugitive gas emissions 3.6 times larger than is reasonable (e.g. 2.2%), selecting a 20 year Global Warming Potential period for methane (which confers an impact 3.2 times bigger than a 100 year GWP), and failing to consider that a modern gas plant can generate electricity nearly twice as efficiently (and therefore with half the GHG input) as old coal plants.

### A2 Outweighs Nuke War

#### Causes warming

Robock 09 – Professor of climatology @ Rutgers University [Alan Robock (Associate director of Rutger’s Center for Environmental Prediction. 30 year researcher in the area of climate change. Holds a doctorate in meteorology from MIT. Published over 150 peer-reviewed papers on climate change), “Nuclear winter” The Encyclopedia of Earth, January 6, 2009, Pg. http://www.eoearth.org/article/Nuclear\_winter]

Nuclear winter is a term that describes the climatic effects of nuclear war. In the 1980's, work conducted jointly by Western and Soviet scientists showed that for a full-scale nuclear war between the United States and the Soviet Union the climatic consequences, and indirect effects of the collapse of society, would be so severe that the ensuing nuclear winter would produce famine for billions of people far from the target zones. There are several wrong impressions that people have about nuclear winter. One is that there was a flaw in the theory and that the large climatic effects were disproven. Another is that the problem, even if it existed, has been solved by the end of the nuclear arms race. But these are both wrong. Furthermore, new nuclear states threaten global climate change even with arsenals that are much less than 1% of the current global arsenal. What's New Based on new work published in 2007 and 2008 by some of the pioneers of nuclear winter research who worked on the original studies, we now can say several things about this topic. New Science: A minor nuclear war (such as between India and Pakistan or in the Middle East), with each country using 50 Hiroshima-sized atom bombs as airbursts on urban areas, could produce climate change unprecedented in recorded human history. This is only 0.03% of the explosive power of the current global arsenal. This same scenario would produce global ozone depletion , because the heating of the stratosphere would enhance the chemical reactions that destroy ozone. A nuclear war between the United States and Russia today could produce nuclear winter, with temperatures plunging below freezing in the summer in major agricultural regions, threatening the food supply for most of the planet. The climatic effects of the smoke from burning cities and industrial areas would last for several years, much longer than we previously thought. New climate model simulations, that have the capability of including the entire atmosphere and oceans, show that the smoke would be lofted by solar heating to the upper stratosphere, where it would remain for years. New Policy Implications: The only way to eliminate the possibility of this climatic catastrophe is to eliminate the nuclear weapons. If they exist, they can be used. The spread of nuclear weapons to new emerging states threatens not only the people of those countries, but the entire planet. Rapid reduction of the American and Russian nuclear arsenals will set an example for the rest of the world that nuclear weapons cannot be used and are not needed. How Does Nuclear Winter Work? A nuclear explosion is like bringing a piece of the Sun to the Earth's surface for a fraction of a second. Like a giant match, it causes cities and industrial areas to burn. Megacities have developed in India and Pakistan and other developing countries, providing tremendous amounts of fuel for potential fires. The direct effects of the nuclear weapons, blast, radioactivity, fires, and extensive pollution, would kill millions of people, but only those near the targets. However, the fires would have another effect. The massive amounts of dark smoke from the fires would be lofted into the upper troposphere, 10-15 kilometers (6-9 miles) above the Earth's surface, and then absorption of sunlight would further heat the smoke, lifting it into the stratosphere, a layer where the smoke would persist for years, with no rain to wash it out. The climatic effects of smoke from fires started by nuclear war depend on the amount of smoke. Our new calculations show that for 50 nuclear weapons dropped on two countries, on the targets that would produce the maximum amount of smoke, about 5 megatons (Tg) of black smoke would be produced, accounting for the amount emitted from the fires and the amount immediately washed out in rain. As the smoke is lofted into the stratosphere, it would be transported around the world by the prevailing winds. We also did calculations for two scenarios of war between the two superpowers who still maintain large nuclear arsenals, the United States and Russia. In one scenario, 50 Tg of black smoke would be produced and in another, 150 Tg of black smoke would be produced. How many nuclear weapons would be required to produce this much smoke? It depends on the targets, but there are enough weapons in the current arsenals to produce either amount. In fact, there are only so many targets. Once they are all hit by weapons, additional weapons would not produce much more smoke at all. Even after the current nuclear weapons reduction treaty between these superpowers is played out in 2012, with each having about 2,000 weapons, 150 Tg of smoke could still be produced. Here are movies of the smoke transport from three different scenarios: These new results were made possible by the use of a state-of-the-art general circulation model of the climate. For the first time a complete calculation of not only atmospheric but also oceanic circulation was conducted, including the entire atmosphere from the surface up through the troposphere, stratosphere, and mesosphere, to an elevation of 80 kilometers (50 miles). Previous calculations had not been run for the 10 year simulations here, and had not allowed the smoke to be lofted into the upper stratosphere, where it would persist for many years. We calculated the climate response to the three scenarios illustrated above. Compared to the global warming observed for the past century, all three scenarios show massive cooling. Compared to the climate change for the Northern Hemisphere for the past 1,000 years, the famous hockey stick diagram, the climate change from any of these scenarios is unprecedented. Compared to climate change for the past millenium, even the 5 Tg case ( a war between India and Pakistan) would plunge the planet into temperatures colder than the Little Ice Age (approximately1600-1850 ). This would be essentially instantly , and agriculture would be severely threatened . Larger amounts of smoke would produce larger climate changes, and for the 150 Tg case produce a true nuclear winter, making agriculture impossible for years. In both cases, new climate model simulations show that the effects would last for more than a decade. Analogs Support the Theory Nuclear winter is a theory based on computer model calculations. Normally, scientists test theories by doing experiments, but we never want to do this experiment in the real world. Thus we look for analogs that can inform us of parts of the theory. And there are many such analogs that convince us that the theory is correct: Cities burning. Unfortunately, we have several examples of cities burning, firestorms created by the intense release of energy, and smoke being pumped into the upper atmosphere. These include San Francisco as a result of the earthquake in 1906, and cities bombed in World War II, including Tokyo, Dresden, Hamburg, Darmstadt, Hiroshima, and Nagasaki. The seasonal cycle. In the winter, the climate is cooler, because the days are shorter and sunlight is less intense. Again, this helps us quantify the effects of reduction of solar radiation. The diurnal cycle. At night the Sun sets and it gets cold at the surface. If the Sun did not rise tomorrow, we already have an intuitive feel for how much cooling would take place and how fast it would cool. Volcanic eruptions. Explosive volcanic eruptions, such as those of Tambora in 1815, Krakatau in 1883 and Pinatubo in 1991, provide several lessons. The resulting sulfate aerosol cloud in the stratosphere is transported around the world by winds, thus supporting the results from the animations above. The surface temperature plummets after each large eruption, in proportion to the thickness of the stratospheric cloud. In fact 1816, following Tambora, is known as the "Year Without a Summer," with global cooling and famine. Following the Pinatubo eruption, global precipitation, river flow, and soil moisture all reduced, since cooling the planet by blocking sunlight has a strong effect on reducing evaporation and weakening the hydrologic cycle. This is also what the nuclear winter simulations show. Forest fires. Smoke from large forest fires sometimes is injected into the lower stratosphere. And the smoke is transported around the world, also producing cooling under the smoke. Dust storms on Mars. Occasionally, dust storms start in one region of Mars, but the dust is heated by the Sun, lofted into the upper atmosphere, and transported around the planet to completely enshroud it in a dust blanket. This process takes a couple weeks, just like our computer simulations for the nuclear winter smoke. Extinction of the dinosaurs. 65,000,000 years ago an asteroid or comet smashed into the Earth in southern Mexico. The resulting dust cloud, mixed with smoke from fires, blocked out the Sun, killing the dinosaurs, and starting the age of mammals. This Cretaceous-Tertiary (K-T) extinction may have been exacerbated by massive volcanism in India at the same time. This teaches us that large amounts of aerosols in Earth's atmosphere have caused massive climate change and extinction of species . The difference with nuclear winter is that the K-T extinction could not have been prevented. Policy Implications The work on nuclear winter in the 1980's, and the realization that both direct and indirect effects of nuclear war would be a global catastrophe, led to the end of arms race and the end of the Cold War. In response to the comment "In the 1980s, you warned about the unprecedented dangers of nuclear weapons and took very daring steps to reverse the arms race," in an interview in 2000, Mikhail Gorbachev said "Models made by Russian and American scientists showed that a nuclear war would result in a nuclear winter that would be extremely destructive to all life on Earth; the knowledge of that was a great stimulus to us, to people of honor and morality, to act in that situation."[1] Since the 1980's, the number of nuclear weapons in the world has decreased to 1/3 of the peak number of more than 70,000. The consequences of regional-scale nuclear conflicts are unexpectedly large, with the potential to become global catastrophes. The combination of nuclear proliferation, political instability, and urban demographics may constitute one of the greatest dangers to the stability of society since the dawn of humans. The current and projected American and Russian nuclear arsenals can still produce nuclear winter. Only nuclear disarmament will prevent the possibility of a nuclear environmental catastrophe.