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#### Comprehensive immigration reform’s top of the docket and will pass

Moffett 1/21 Dan is an About.com guide on immigration. “Obama's Inauguration Begins Push For Comprehensive Reform Bill,” 2013, <http://immigration.about.com/b/2013/01/21/obama-inauguration-begins-push-for-comprehensive-reform.htm>

Top Democrats and White House aides are saying that President Obama not only talked about comprehensive immigration reform in his inaugural address Monday, but he will start pushing Congress to agree on a bill and pass it within the next 90 days.¶ The president said this about immigrants during his second inaugural address: "Our journey is not complete until we find a better way to welcome the striving, hopeful immigrants who still see America as a land of opportunity; until bright young students and engineers are enlisted in our workforce rather than expelled from our country."¶ White House senior adviser David Plouffe made the rounds of the Sunday talk shows this week and had the same message for everyone: "The stars are finally aligned for immigration reform."¶ Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, during a recent interview with PBS in Nevada, said that comprehensive immigration reform wasn't just important, it was the most important issue on the Senate's schedule.¶ "Immigration is our No. 1 item," Reid said. "It's going to be the first thing on our agenda."

#### Plan causes a political firestorm

Schoen 10 John is a writer for NBC. “BP Spill Clouds Future of U.S. Oil Drilling,” May 28, http://www.nbcdfw.com/news/breaking/BP\_spill\_clouds\_future\_of\_U\_S\_\_oil\_drilling-95099234.html

Just a few months ago, offshore drilling was poised to play a greater role meeting in the nation’s energy needs. But the massive BP oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico has brought an abrupt reversal to that policy and ushered in more restrictions on new exploration, tighter controls of existing wells and higher costs for oil companies. “I continue to believe that domestic oil production is important,” President Barack Obama told reporters at a Thursday news conference. “But I also believe we can't do this stuff if we don't have confidence that we can prevent crises like this from happening again.” Some have likened the spill to the 1979 partial meltdown of a nuclear reactor at Three Mile Island — a turning point in U.S. energy policy that would effectively cap expansion of nuclear power for decades. Just as Three Mile Island didn’t put an end to nuclear power production, the BP disaster won’t put a stop to deep water drilling in the Gulf. For at least the next decade, the need for oil is just too great. But the future of U.S. offshore drilling has suddenly become as murky as the oily Gulf waters fouled by BP's runaway wellhead a mile underwater. Even if the ongoing “topkill” effort to cap the leaking well is successful, the legacy of the disaster — and the final tally of the environmental and financial damage — won’t be known for years. “There is a long term study needed — I’m talking decades — to really fully understand the consequences of this spill,” said John Stegeman, a scientist at the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution. “So that when the next one comes along — and there will be others, whether they’re this big our not — we can enhance our ability to understand and deal with and predict consequences of future spills.” For now, the spill has brought new offshore drilling to a virtual standstill. On Thursday, the Obama administration announced a six-month moratorium on deep water oil and gas drilling and ordered the shutdown of offshore exploratory wells already operating until they meet new safety requirements. Public outrage over BP’s inability to stop the runway well has created a political firestorm. Congress has held a blizzard of hearings on the cause of the accident and the implications for future drilling. Pictures of tarred beaches and oil-fouled pelicans in the Gulf Coast have intensified a decades-long debate weighing the need to expand domestic oil supplies against the risk of environmental damage. Supporters of expanded drilling argue the country can’t afford to stop looking for new domestic oil supplies. "If the delay is for a season to ensure we have the highest levels of protection in place, that's one thing," said Sen. Lisa Murkowski, R-Alaska, the ranking member the Senate’s Energy and Natural Resources Committee, on Thursday. “But if it means that existing permits are allowed to lapse … that's not acceptable to me or Alaska." The political battle lines over U.S. energy policy are complex. Over the past decade, multiple skirmishes have been fought between bipartisan alliances of energy-producing and energy-consuming states. The divisions are further complicated by the often conflicting goals of energy policy related to oil natural gas, coal, wind, solar, etc.

#### PC’s key

Foley 1/15 Elise is a writer @ Huff Post Politics. “Obama Gears Up For Immigration Reform Push In Second Term,” 2013, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/15/obama-immigration-reform\_n\_2463388.html

Obama has repeatedly said he will push hard for immigration reform in his second term, and administration officials have said that other contentious legislative initiatives -- including **gun control and the debt ceiling -- won't be allowed to get in the way.** At least at first glance, he seems to have politics on his side. GOP lawmakers are entering -- or, in some cases, re-entering -- the immigration debate in the wake of disastrous results for their party's presidential nominee with Latino voters, who support reform by large measures. Based on those new political realities, "it would be a suicidal impulse for Republicans in Congress to continue to block [reform]," David Axelrod, a longtime adviser to the president, told The Huffington Post.¶ Now **there's the question of how Obama gets there.** While confrontation might work with Republicans on other issues -- the debt ceiling, for example -- the consensus is that the GOP is serious enough about reform that the president can, and must, play the role of broker and statesman to get a deal.¶ It starts with a lesson from his first term. Republicans have demanded that the border be secured first, before other elements of immigration reform. Yet the administration has been by many measures the strictest ever on immigration enforcement, and devotes massive sums to policing the borders. The White House has met many of the desired metrics for border security, although there is always more to be done, but Republicans are still calling for more before they will consider reform. Enforcing the border, but not sufficiently touting its record of doing so, the White House has learned, won't be enough to win over Republicans.¶ In a briefing with The Huffington Post, a senior administration official said the White House believes it has met enforcement goals and must now move to a comprehensive solution. The administration is highly skeptical of claims from Republicans that immigration reform can or should be done in a piecemeal fashion. Going down that road, the White House worries, could result in passage of the less politically complicated pieces, such as an enforcement mechanism and high-skilled worker visas, while leaving out more contentious items such as a pathway to citizenship for undocumented immigrants.¶ "Enforcement is certainly part of the picture," the official said. "But if you go back and look at the 2006 and 2007 bills, if you go back and look at John McCain's 10-point 'This is what I've got to get done before I'm prepared to talk about immigration,' and then you look at what we're actually doing, it's like 'check, check, check.' We're there. The border is as secure as it's been in a generation or two, so it's really time."¶ One key in the second term, advocates say, will be convincing skeptics such as Republican Sen. John Cornyn of Texas that the Obama administration held up its end of the bargain by proving a commitment to enforcement. **The White House** also **needs to convince GOP lawmakers** that there's support from their constituents for immigration reform, which could be aided by conservative evangelical leaders and members of the business community who are pushing for a bill.¶ Immigrant advocates want more targeted deportations that focus on criminals, while opponents of comprehensive immigration reform say there's too little enforcement and not enough assurances that reform wouldn't be followed by another wave of unauthorized immigration. The Obama administration has made some progress on both fronts, but some advocates worry that the president hasn't done enough to emphasize it. The latest deportation figures were released in the ultimate Friday news dump: mid-afternoon Friday on Dec. 21, a prime travel time four days before Christmas.¶ Last week, the enforcement-is-working argument was bolstered by a report from the nonpartisan Migration Policy Institute, which found that the government is pouring more money into its immigration agencies than the other federal law-enforcement efforts combined. There are some clear metrics to point to on the border in particular, and Doris Meissner, an author of the report and a former commissioner of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, said she hopes putting out more information can add to the immigration debate.¶ "I've been surprised, frankly, that the administration hasn't done more to lay out its record," she said, adding the administration has kept many of its metrics under wraps.¶ There are already lawmakers working on a broad agreement. Eight senators, coined the gang of eight, are working on a bipartisan immigration bill. It's still in its early stages, but nonmembers of the "gang," such as Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.) are also talking about reform.¶ It's still unclear what exact role the president will play, but sources say he does plan to lead on the issue. Rep. Zoe Lofgren (D-Calif.), the top Democrat on the House immigration subcommittee, said the White House seems sensitive to the fact that Republicans and Democrats need to work out the issue in Congress -- no one is expecting a fiscal cliff-style arrangement jammed by leadership -- while keeping the president heavily involved.

#### Path to citizenship solves the deficit

Tucker 10 Cynthia is a columnist for The Atlanta Journal-Constitution. “We need immigrants to help pay the deficit,” Nov 19, http://blogs.ajc.com/cynthia-tucker/2010/11/19/we-need-immigrants-to-help-pay-the-deficit/

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

#### Deficit will collapse hegemony and the economy---trigger global nuclear war

Khalilzad 11 – Zalmay Khalilzad, the United States ambassador to Afghanistan, Iraq, and the United Nations during the presidency of George W. Bush and the director of policy planning at the Defense Department from 1990 to 1992, February 8, 2011, “The Economy and National Security; If we don’t get our economic house in order, we risk a new era of multi-polarity,” online: <http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/259024/economy-and-national-security-zalmay-khalilzad>

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

### 1NC Solvency

#### Removing restrictions for gas-only leases doesn’t spur OCS development – companies aren’t willing to take the risk

MarEx 11 [Maritime Executive, “Gas-Only Drilling in Offshore Moratorium Areas Suggested,” January 19, http://www.maritime-executive.com/article/2005-10-20gas-only-drilling-in-offshore-moratori]

Oil and gas industry groups are criticizing a provision in House offshore drilling legislation that would allow the government to offer "natural gas-only" leases in areas that are currently off-limits to new production.¶ The criticism is included in wider comments by petroleum producers to the Minerals Management Service (MMS), which has begun collecting public comments as it begins preparing an outer continental shelf leasing plan for 2007-2012. MMS asked for comment on the gas-only concept.¶ Gas-only leasing was included in a bill by House Resources Committee Chairman Richard Pombo (R-CA.) that allows states to "opt-out" of offshore leasing bans. States exercising the option could allow gas-only leasing, or oil and gas leasing.¶ Senate legislation by Senator Lamar Alexander (R-TN.)—and supported by chemical companies and other industries that rely on the costly fuel—also accepts the idea.¶ However, the American Petroleum Institute (API), in comments this week to MMS, says gas-only and gas-preference leasing would offer the "false promise" of future supplies. The group says the concept would create uncertainties that could dampen investment, since it is impossible to predict with certainty what types of resources will be in an area.¶ "A company might spend up to $80 million to buy a lease, conduct seismic testing, obtain the necessary permits, and drill a well(s) to determine whether any resources are present in amounts that make the prospect economic," the group says. "A company is unlikely to know if it had met the gas only or gas preference requirement until the capital investment had been made. Companies will be reluctant to spend tens of millions of dollars to explore for and develop a prospect, only to be forced to abandon the resource, stranding substantial investments."

#### sq production solves ---

#### a) companies are only reducing shale plays because it’s so abundant and cheap---but low prices are self-correcting

Knowledge@Wharton 12, the University of Pennsylvania’s business school, “The Once and Future U.S. Shale Gas Revolution,” 8/29/12, http://knowledge.wharton.upenn.edu/article.cfm?articleid=3068

Today, operators are pulling back from more mature shale gas fields, such as the Barnett in Texas and the Haynesville in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas, and deploying to newer fields with the potential of producing gas along with oil -- including the Utica in Ohio and Bone Spring in Texas and New Mexico, says Drew Koecher, KPMG's U.S. energy leader in transactions and restructuring. With low gas prices, many shale gas developers are facing financial challenges. Chesapeake Energy, based in Oklahoma City and the nation's second largest shale gas company after Exxon Mobil, needs to raise cash through asset sales, while managing a U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission investigation into CEO Aubrey McClendon's alleged conflicts of interest, which involve taking loans against his personal stake in the company's wells, according to news reports.

Still, the recent shale gas boom is far from over, and a full realization of the U.S. shale gas revolution is yet to come, say experts. For starters, the U.S. has significantly more resources to recover. "The U.S. has a long way to go before it depletes shale gas," says Brandon Beard, KPMG's managing director for U.S. energy transactions and restructuring. "It will take 10 to 20 years to play through." Moreover, as new demand for gas develops, gas prices will recover and buck up the industry. "The glut of gas is somewhat temporary," states Noam Lior, a Penn mechanical engineering and applied mechanics professor who is also on the graduate faculty of Penn/Wharton's Lauder Institute. "As long as oil prices are holding above $100 a barrel or so, gas will be very competitive." Jonathan Banks, senior climate policy advisor at the Clean Air Task Force in Boston, agrees. "Nothing cures low prices like low prices," he says. Spurred by these low prices, demand from electric utilities, chemical manufacturers, natural gas vehicles and overseas markets will restore health to the shale gas industry, and relatively low natural gas energy prices could help buoy the U.S. economy, experts predict. "It's a game changer," notes A.J. Scamuffa, U.S. chemicals leader at PwC in Philadelphia.

#### b) No impact to decline rates---continual tech improvements

Jason Baihly 11, the Schlumberger product line manager for multistage stimulation, focusing on directing new technology research and market analysis for multistage acidized and hydraulically fractured reservoirs, May 2011, “Study Assesses Shale Decline Rates,” http://www.slb.com/~/media/Files/dcs/industry\_articles/201105\_aogr\_shale\_baihly.ashx

Lessons learned from earlier analyses of shale plays are benefiting the later developments in terms of improved log and core evaluation, leading to more precise well placement in reservoir sweet spots as well as better completion and stimulation design. Improvements have been made in lateral length, stage selection, diverter use and pumping techniques. Real-time microseismic hydraulic fracture mapping has enabled operators to avoid geohazards while maximizing reservoir contact.

While the Barnett Shale has the lowest initial production compared with the other plays, the decline rate for Barnett wells is markedly flatter, leading to the conclusion that fracture conductivity is sustained longer in the Barnett because of the favorable rock properties. However, a large number of open natural fractures in this area characterize the Barnett Shale.

With this wealth of data, any number of comparisons can be made to determine if there are relationships among basins, production years, initial production rates or decline rates. This allows EUR forecasts to be made.

It is perhaps an unfair comparison, but when shale gas wells are compared with tight gas sands wells, and when vertical wells are compared with horizontal wells, in a general sense it is clear that horizontal shale gas wells offer significantly higher EURs-definitely when compared with vertical wells, but also when compared with tight gas sands horizontal wells. The normalized decline curves were similar for both horizontal shale gas and horizontal tight gas sands, if not slightly better for the shales.

For the time frame analyzed, the Cotton Valley sand is a lower limit for normalized production decline behavior for all commercial horizontal shale gas plays analyzed in the study (Table 1). Considering that the study was conducted using only publicly available data, and did not include production improvements from workovers, recompletions or refracs, one can conclude that the study results are likely on the conservative side.

Costs Versus Gas Prices

Bottom-line financial success in the shale plays depends on many things, not the least of which is the capital cost of leasehold acquisitions. Early entrants have a decided advantage, some paying one-tenth of the lease prices of latecomers. Different basins have exhibited decidedly different cost structures (Table 2). which impact the economic parameters. Consequently, differences were factored into the economic analysis by determining discount profitability indexes (DPI) to allow basins to be compared. For this analysis, well construction, royalty and operating costs were compared with the EUR at three discount rates, assuming a constant wellhead gas price of $4.00 an Mcf for the life of the well (Table 3). Profitability is defined for wells whose DPI is greater than 1.0 at a given discount rate.

Accordingly, for wells analyzed in core play areas in 2008 and 2009, only wells in the Barnett and Fayetteville were deemed to be profitable under spot gas prices. That said, it is important to note that many operators have some or all of their gas prices hedged at higher than spot price values. However, it also is clear that modern methods and technology supported by experience and knowledge are improving results significantly in most plays. The results shown in Table 4 reflect the break-even price for wells drilled in each formation based on wells completed in 2008 and 2009.

It is important to note that actual drilling, completing, stimulating and operating costs may vary1 greatly from operator to operator, resulting in a large impact on overall economics. Some operators may have better production in a given core area versus others, further improving the picture. In addition, as noted, nearly all operators have at least some portion of their gas prices hedged at levels that may make all or most of the shale plays analyzed viable.

#### shale’s sustainable for decades, cyclical rise and fall doesn’t mean it’s a bubble

John Hanger 11-26, expert on energy, electric markets, and utility regulation with unique experience in and out of government, Special Counsel at the law firm Eckert Seamans and a Democratic candidate for Governor of PA, former Secretary of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection and Commissioner of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, 11/26/12, “Debunking Latest Attacks On Shale Gas As Bubble/Ponzi Scheme & Systemic Threat To Economy,” <http://johnhanger.blogspot.com/2012/11/debunking-latest-attacks-on-shale-gas.html>

Shale gas production for nearly a dozen years. A massive shale gas boom for now 5 years or since 2008. Record US natural gas production that crashed prices to below $2 for a thousand cubic feet.

Nothing stops the vampire like quality of attacks portraying the shale gas resource as soon to run out, as a bubble ready to pop, or a ponzi scheme. Here is the link to one of the latest:

http://www.desmogblog.com/2012/11/13/shale-sas-bubble-about-to-burst-say-energy-insiders-art-berman-bill-powers. Indeed, Bill Powers is promoting a book to be published in May, 2013 theorizing that the shale gas resource will last just 5 to 7 years more. Mind you such forecasts of impending shale gas supply doom are already about 3 years old, and soon US shale gas production will enter its 13th year.

Powers and Art Berman, who has done more than anyone to assert that the shale gas resource will soon collapse, also state that the economy faces cataclysm, like the financial catastrophe of 2008, when the shale gas resource is soon exhausted. This comparison of the shale gas industry to the US financial system is, however, absurd.

The industry has no too big to fail problem. Indeed, with about 60 different companies holding drilling permits in just Pennsylvania, the gas industry features a lack of concentration and has traits opposite of too big to fail.

Moreover, the gas industry is not the equivalent of a basic, economic infrastructure, unlike the banking system that is. Economic life goes on through gas booms and busts, while a financial collapse brings all commerce crashing down.

By pointing to the 2008 financial collapse and suggesting that shale gas is another round of such disaster, Berman and Powers engage in fear mongering and attention seeking behavior.

Tellingly, the recent pull back in dry gas production in the US, of course, results from the opposite of an emerging gas supply shortage. Instead, a very real gas supply glut crashed the price and caused rigs to redeploy to oil and wet gas.

But as some rigs went to more profitable opportunities, the gas in the ground stayed put, where it will be, when the gas rigs return. And return they will, once gas prices move to $4 to $6 per thousand cubic feet range. And there is conservatively 20 years of shale gas to be produced within that price range.

Moreover, were the US price to go above $6--hardly a high price, when today Europe and Asia pay $10 to $16 for natural gas-- the available shale gas supply certainly totals many decades more.

### 1NC Warming

#### adv makes no sense --- low prices aren’t solved by supply --- see cx

#### Natural gas doesn’t reduce emissions or act as a bridge fuel

Romm 12 (Joseph, editor of Climate Progress and a senior fellow at the Center for American Progress, “Natural gas: A bridge to nowhere”, 1/24, http://grist.org/natural-gas/natural-gas-a-bridge-to-nowhere/)

Building lots of new gas plants doesn’t make much sense since we need to sharply reduce greenhouse-gas emissions in the next few decades if we’re to have any chance to avoid catastrophic global warming. We don’t want new gas plants to displace new renewables, like solar and wind, which are going to be some of the biggest sustainable job-creating industries of the century.

Late last year, some of the leading (center-right) economists in the country — Nicholas Z. Muller, Robert Mendelsohn, and William Nordhaus — concluded in a top economic journal that the total damages from natural gas generation exceed its value-added at a low-ball carbon price of $27 per ton. At a price of $65 per ton of carbon, the total damages from natural gas are more than double its value-added.

For the record, stabilizing atmospheric concentrations of CO2 at 550 parts per million (ppm), which would likely still be catastrophic for humanity, would require a price of $330 per metric ton of carbon in 2030, the International Energy Agency (IEA) noted back in 2008.

The fact that natural gas is a bridge fuel to nowhere was, in fact, first demonstrated by the IEA in its big June 2011 report on gas. That study — which had both coal and oil consumption peaking in 2020 — made abundantly clear that if we want to avoid catastrophic warming, we need to start getting off of all fossil fuels.

Then came a remarkable new study by Tom Wigley of the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR) that concluded:

In summary, our results show that the substitution of gas for coal as an energy source results in increased rather than decreased global warming for many decades.

Here was the key figure:

This research indicates that shifting from coal to natural gas would have limited impacts on climate. If methane leaks from natural gas operations could be kept to 2.5 percent or less, the increase in global temperatures would be reduced by about 0.1 degree C (0.18 degrees F) by 2100. Note: This is a figure of temperature change relative to baseline warming of roughly 3 degrees C (5.4 degrees F) in 2100 (or nearly 7 degrees F warming compared to preindustrial levels).

What NCAR’s new study added is more detailed modeling of all contributors to climate change from fossil-fuel combustion — positive and negative. Reducing coal use reduces sulfate aerosols that have a short-term cooling effect. Methane is a very potent greenhouse gas, so leakage throughout the natural gas production and delivery system adds to near-term warming. And, of course, since natural gas is a hydrocarbon, its combustion does produce CO2, albeit much less than the coal it might replace. When you put all these factors together, here’s what you conclude:

“Relying more on natural gas would reduce emissions of carbon dioxide, but it would do little to help solve the climate problem,” says Wigley, who is also an adjunct professor at the University of Adelaide in Australia. “It would be many decades before it would slow down global warming at all, and even then it would just be making a difference around the edges.”

Natural gas might have been a “bridge” to a low-carbon future 30 years ago when the term was first introduced, but now its primary value would be to reduce the cost of meeting a near-term CO2 target in the U.S. in the context of a rising CO2 price.

A key finding of the NCAR study is:

The most important result, however, in accord with the above authors, is that, unless leakage rates for new methane can be kept below 2 percent, substituting gas for coal is not an effective means for reducing the magnitude of future climate change.

The question of what the total leakage rate is remains hotly contested, but I know of no analysis that finds a rate below 2 percent, including one by the National Energy Technology Laboratory, the Department of Energy’s premier fossil fuel lab.

Bottom line: If we want to have a serious chance at averting catastrophic global warming, then we need to start phasing out all fossil fuels as soon as possible. **Natural gas isn’t a bridge fuel from a climate perspective.** Carbon-free power is the bridge fuel until we can figure out how to go carbon-negative on a large scale in the second half of the century.

### 1NC SCS

#### Consensus of experts on structural constraints to US LNG exports – lower cost producers and market forces

Michael Levi, senior fellow for energy @ CFR, June 2012, “A Strategy for U.S. Natural Gas Exports,” Hamilton Project, http://www.hamiltonproject.org/papers/a\_strategy\_for\_u.s.\_natural\_gas\_exports/

It is far from clear that all or even most of this export volume would be used even if it were approved. A recent MIT study looked at nine scenarios for U.S. and world natural gas markets; none of them led to the emergence of significant U.S. natural gas exports, in large part because other lower cost producers undercut prices offered by the United States in distant markets (MIT 2011). Other forces, discussed in Chapter 2, could also lead global natural gas prices to converge even without U.S. exports, removing opportunities for economically attractive U.S. LNG sales. Indeed, most analysts anticipate that less LNG will be exported than currently pending permits would allow, even if all of those were approved. (They also expect to see more permit applications, since the plans behind many of the pending ones are expected to eventually fizzle.) For example, Citigroup analysts foresee up to 5 billion cubic feet a day of LNG exports by the end of the decade, barring regulatory barriers (Morse et al. 2012). UK gas producer BG has projected up to six billion cubic feet a day by then (Gismatullin 2012), the same volume that Deloitte (2011) analysts have focused their modeling on. Given this consistent view among market analysts on the maximum likely volume of LNG exports from the United States, the main analysis in this paper focuses on the possibility of up to six billion cubic feet of daily exports. This is approximately half the capacity currently awaiting approval and almost ten percent of current U.S. natural gas production. I consider the possibility of significantly greater or lesser exports in Chapter 6; the qualitative conclusions do not change, though the specific costs and benefits of allowing LNG exports do. To provide some context, Figure 2 shows natural gas consumption and LNG trade by region.

## 2NC ev

### 2NC Time/Cost

#### Cost barriers and timeframe take out solvency

Wilson Center 12 (The Woodrow Wilson Center, July 12, 2012, “In Search of Arctic Energy”, http://www.wilsoncenter.org/event/search-arctic-energy)

While the price of oil remains at elevated levels, companies will increase their efforts to drill in increasingly complex Arctic fields, said Robert Johnston of the Eurasia Group. In order to ensure that these resources are extracted in a timely and responsible manner, governments and energy companies with Arctic interests must work together to develop these resources. However, Arctic development will only be available to the very largest players in the industry as the capital outlays required for drilling these wells are prohibitively high. The large scale necessary for Arctic operations makes progress slow, with well development measured in years rather than months. The more difficult wells can take more than a decade to produce oil in large quantities. These logistical challenges give companies very little margin for error in the harsh Arctic environment. Johnston questioned whether the United States and Europe have the appetite to engage in long-term governance of the Arctic.

#### Plan doesn’t solve for 8 years

Spakovsky and Loris 12 Hans A. von Spakovsky is a Senior Legal Fellow in the Center for Legal and Judicial Studies, and Nicolas D. Loris is the Herbert and Joyce Morgan Fellow in the Thomas A. Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies, at The Heritage Foundation, August 13, 2012, “Offshore Drilling: Increase Access, Reduce the Risk, and Stop Hurting American Companies”, http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2012/08/offshore-drilling-increase-access-reduce-the-risk-and-stop-hurting-american-companies

ATP’s lawsuit provides a revealing glimpse into the capital-intensive oil and gas industry where unfair and illegal actions by a government agency—or a Cabinet official like Ken Salazar—can cost companies (and the U.S. economy) enormous sums of money. Drilling a well in water deeper than 500 feet typically costs over $75 million and a deepwater drilling rig can cost in excess of $500,000 per day to operate. It takes an average of eight years to progress from initial discovery to the production stage; the end cost of developing and producing an offshore oil field over its productive life can reach into the billions of dollars.

### Production/Price Equilibrium---2NC

#### Production and price will find a natural equilibrium---makes shale sustainable and solves the impact to the advantage

Market Watch 11 – “Is shale gas production and investment sustainable?,” 12/2/11, http://blogs.marketwatch.com/thetell/2011/12/02/is-shale-gas-production-and-investment-sustainable/

The short answer to whether shale natural gas production and investment is sustainable is “yes,” according to Dimitris Kapsis, chief energy officer at American Utility Management.

Production and investment growth in shale gas will likely last for at least the next decade or two and possibly beyond, he said. Investment will also include “research for safer and more efficient production processes and technology.”

And once the U.S. economic recovery takes hold, demand for natural gas should increase, providing a lift to prices, he said.

Natural gas prices were trading lower Friday, with the January contract NG12F down 1.5% at $3.59 per million British thermal units on the New York Mercantile Exchange.

But Kapsis doesn’t expect pricing to “stay this depressed past 2013.” Prices won’t likely fall much further, either, because that will cause production shutdowns and “cause price spikes instead of sustainable methodic price growth.”

He believes pricing could stabilize around the $7 mark, “which should be acceptable by a healthy economy and fairly profitable for the producers.”

### PGC---2NC

#### The PGC’s estimates align with the consensus of experts---estimates continually expand because tech advances open up new plays

NGSA 13 – Natural Gas Supply Association, Winter 2012-13, “Understanding the Size of US Natural Gas Resources,” http://www.ngsa.org/Assets/understanding%20the%20size%20of%20natural%20gas%20resources%20in%20the%20united%20states.pdf

Experts are aligned on natural gas estimates. The Potential Gas Committee (PGC), the U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA) and the National Petroleum Council (NPC) each periodically issues estimates of U.S. natural gas resources. Done independently, the most up-to-date estimates from each are roughly equivalent.

• The PGC estimated 2,170 trillion cubic feet (Tcf) of natural gas in the U.S. (2011)

• The EIA estimated 2,214 Tcf. (2012)

• The NPC estimated 1,900 to 3,600 Tcf, depending on technology. (2011)

To put these amounts in context, the United States consumes about 24 Tcf per year.

Focus on the Potential Gas Committee. We focus here on estimates made by the Potential Gas Committee, since that organization has published them the longest (since 1964) and most frequently. The PGC’s estimates are based on solid scientific, geologic, statistical and economic principles. Contributors come from the natural gas industry, the field and technical services, and consulting sectors. Their findings are reviewed thoroughly by technical advisors and observers from government, universities, industry and research organizations in North America before publication.

Estimates are always evolving and usually growing. As technology has improved, the ability to detect and extract natural gas has also improved, boosting the PGC’s resource estimates. In fact, if the 1966 estimate of 600 Tcf had remained static, the U.S. would have run out of natural gas about 10 years ago. Instead, estimates doubled by 2002 and in 2011 grew to over 2,100 Tcf.

Growth of U.S. resources due to advances in technology. With advances in technology, gas that was once considered beyond reach can suddenly become economic to produce. This was the case recently with natural gas trapped in shale rock formations in more than 20 states. The PGC knew the gas was there, but did not include it in resource estimates because it was too hard to extract at that time. In the mid- 2000s, energy producers successfully and economically combined hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling, unlocking a vast untapped natural gas resource in shale rock. As a result, the PGC’s 2008 estimate of natural gas resources shot up by a full 33 percent compared to its 2006 estimate.

#### Err neg---their estimates are conservative

NGSA 13 – Natural Gas Supply Association, Winter 2012-13, “Understanding the Size of US Natural Gas Resources,” http://www.ngsa.org/Assets/understanding%20the%20size%20of%20natural%20gas%20resources%20in%20the%20united%20states.pdf

Potential Gas Committee estimates fall on the conservative side. The PGC is cautious in its appraisals. For example, even if natural gas is known to be present, if it is located too deep or in a quantity that does not justify the effort of extraction, the PGC does not count it. In fact, there is at least a 1,000-year supply of natural gas in the United States that is considered“unrecoverable ”with current technology and economic constraints, such as gas locked deep under the ocean in frozen methane hydrates. It is possible that one day improvements in technology will enable the PGC to include some of those natural gas resources in its estimates.

#### PGC estimates count reserves rather than resources---it’s more accurate and suggests much greater capacity

NGSA 13 – Natural Gas Supply Association, Winter 2012-13, “Understanding the Size of US Natural Gas Resources,” http://www.ngsa.org/Assets/understanding%20the%20size%20of%20natural%20gas%20resources%20in%20the%20united%20states.pdf

The PGC estimates resources and EIA estimates reserves. The PGC estimates unconfirmed and undiscovered natural gas resources and then combines those figures with EIA’s proved reserves to determine total recoverable gas in the U.S.

The distinction between resources and reserves. It is tempting to use the terms interchangeably, but they are entirely different ways of measuring natural gas in the United States. While both are important, reserve measurements provide a way to track natural gas that is in hand and where the presence and quantity have been confirmed through testing. Reserves (also called proved reserves) are the equivalent of animals in the zoo: you can count their heads and make good estimates of the offspring they will produce. The U.S. Energy Information Administration publishes measurements of U.S. natural gas reserves and updates them annually.

In contrast, the natural gas resources that the PGC estimates, and which this fact sheet explores in more detail, are like animals in the wild that are estimated through observation, association, deduction and logic. As technology improves, we get better at spotting their traces and our estimates become more and more precise. Although we can’t yet touch resources, we can be assured that they are there.

In a way, reserves are today’s natural gas, while resources represent tomorrow’s untapped potential. Some critics would prefer that estimates be restricted to reserves, ignoring most or all of natural gas resources. Using that methodology is the equivalent of assuming there is only one bee in the hive because only one is in plain sight. It would short-sightedly exclude most of the natural gas in the United States.

### EIA Estimates---2NC

#### If anything, EIA estimates are too conservative

Inman 12 Mason, National Geographic News, Feb 29, "Estimates Clash for How Much Natural Gas in the United States", news.nationalgeographic.com/news/energy/2012/03/120301-natural-gas-reserves-united-states/

However, geologist Terry Engelder of Pennsylvania State University argued that the recent EIA estimate is too conservative, given the data on which the agency based its conclusions.¶ Engelder is often given credit for spurring the shale gas rush in the Marcellus with early estimates that the formation held large amounts of natural gas. In his most recent published estimate, from 2009, he figured the Marcellus could in the long run yield 489 tcf, a number in the same ballpark as the EIA's 2011 estimate.¶ More recently, he has obtained production data from leaseholders for a small number of wells, to see how much they produce, and to update his estimate.¶ Engelder's earlier estimate was based on very limited data available at the time. "That's a pretty challenging thing to do," he said, "to take just 50 wells and try to project what a field might do that might ultimately end up having 100,000 to 300,000 wells."¶ With new data on production from 16 Pennsylvania counties, Engelder has updated his estimate. Though he has yet to publish the results, "half the counties are doing better than predicted, and half of them are not doing quite as well as predicted," he said. "But on average, it is just right where we were with that 2009 estimate."¶ Engelder said the geological analysis by the USGS—which was a crucial input for the EIA's reassessment of the potential for Marcellus shale gas—is problematic.¶ A key problem, Engelder said, was that the USGS assessment broke up the Marcellus into thousands of parcels, and then assumed that only 37 percent of them would yield significant natural gas. Engelder thinks that a lot more of the parcels will be productive.

### Berman Indicts---2NC

#### Berman’s dead wrong---flawed data, ignores new highly productive plays

Hurdle 12-5 – Jon Hurdle, December 5th, 2012, "Are US Shale Gas Resources Overstated? Part 2" energy.aol.com/2012/12/05/are-us-shale-gas-resources-overstated-part-2/

Enthusiasm over the US natural gas production renaissance has been steadily building over the past few years and increasing production of both gas and oil from shale deposits came up numerous times during the 2012 US presidential election cycle. However, not everyone views shale gas as a supply panacea, which is the thrust of a book due out next spring written by Bill Powers with a forward by Arthur Berman.¶ Potential Gas Committee executive director John Curtis rejected Berman's reliance on the committee's "probable" category, which is based on gas in existing fields.¶ "He's dead wrong," Curtis said, arguing that restricting the resource estimate to only "probable" gas ignores the existence of highly productive plays **like the Marcellus and the Haynesville that** were not initially included **in that category because they had not been drilled**.¶ Curtis added that **any deficit between a field's actual production and its resource estimate** may reflect a lack of pipelines or undeveloped markets **for the gas** rather than a resource that undershoots expectations**.**¶ The PGC's latest estimate, published in 2010, is for total US shale resource of 687 tcf, including "probable", "possible" and "speculative" gas. Including all categories of gas, the committee estimated a total resource of 1,900 tcf, not far below the EIA's assessment of 2,203 tcf.¶ Ahead of the next PGC report, due in April 2013, Curtis said there was no indication of a need to cut its current estimate of gas resources, and there had not been in 2010 compared with the previous report two years earlier.¶ The Thorny Issue of Reserve Estimates¶ "From year-end 2008 to year-end 2010 we saw no reason to move away from our position for the quality and quantity of resources, and from 2010 to now we still do not," he said.¶ For his part, Powers cited the EIA's own data in support of his case, noting that the organization sharply cut its estimate of unproved technically recoverable resource to 482 tcf in the latest outlook from 827 tcf a year earlier, largely because of a big decline in its TRR estimate for the Marcellus Shale to 141 tcf from 410 tcf a year earlier.¶ "**The EIA is starting to walk back from its earlier claims**," Powers said, in an interview ahead of the book's scheduled publication in May 2013. He said the EIA's credibility was hurt when it cut its Marcellus estimate after the US Geological Survey calculated in its own 2011 study that the Appalachian shale play contained just 84 tcf.¶ Philip Budzik, a spokesman for the EIA, said the changing estimates reflect the industry's increasing experience in the field. "The numbers have been changing significantly over the last couple of years," he said. "Producers have been experimenting with drilling and completion techniques."¶ Any confirmed cut in US shale gas resources could have far-reaching consequences ranging from reduced energy security to more greenhouse gas emissions and higher energy costs. With increased production and optimistic projections for recoverable resources, natural gas is assuming an increasingly important role in US energy policy.¶ The EIA estimated the TRR for all forms of natural gas including tight gas and coal bed methane is 2,203 tcf, or about a century's supply at the current national consumption rate of some 24 tcf a year. Shale gas represents about a quarter of the EIA's total, or around 22 years' worth; that resource would shrink to just 5.5 years if Powers is right.¶ Dan Whitten, a spokesman for the trade group America's Natural Gas Alliance, rejected Powers's estimates, **saying that shale gas production has risen more than 12-fold over the last decade, and estimates of recoverable resources have risen at a similar rate.** Whitten said Powers's assertions have been refuted by prominent organizations including the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the Potential Gas Committee.¶ "There is no question**, with continued advances in both the technology used to produce natural gas and our understanding of resource potential, that** projections will continue to evolve," Whitten wrote in an email. "While we have not seen Mr. Powers' book, his conclusions run counter to the established science on the abundance of natural gas."

#### Throw out Berman quotes---petro-physicists uniformly reject him, he publishes on The Oil Drum because no one reputable will back him, and he’s contradicted by literally the entire energy industry

Nick Grealy 12, director of the energy consultancy No Hot Air, specialising in public perception and acceptance issues of shale energy worldwide, 2/13/12, “Annoying Post 2,” <http://oilandglory.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/02/12/is_there_really_so_much_shale_gas_in_the_ground>

I've watched The Oil and The Glory move from a centrist sane view of shale to driving into the the ditch of denial lately. Vis The report of European shale earlier this month. It would be nice to have an update on that one: How Exxon, Marathon and San Leon have affirmed their drilling programs and in the last case talked about gas (and oil) flows.

Art Berman and his Galileo complex don't really belong here. Why no mention of his Peak Oil obsessions for example? Berman does the typical Oil Drum shtick of providing reams of information that only a petrophysicist can even recognise, which is meant to impress non experts that he knows what he is talking about.

I'm no petrophysicist, but I know a lot of people who are, and they they have no time for Berman. But of course, he explains that by them being in on the plot.

As BAKINETS points out: Maybe he is right. But if its Berman v Exxon, BP, Shell, Total, Statoil, Marathon, Chevron, Reliance, BHP, Petro China, ENI, Mitsui, Petronas, Sinopec and hundreds of smaller drillers and the service sector and the chemical industry: Then the only logical conclusion is that Galileo has been reincarnated as Berman or that he's wrong.

## Ptx 1NR

#### Top of the agenda and will pass

TNW 1/25 The Next Web. “The Senate will move next week on comprehensive high-skill immigration reform,” 2013, http://thenextweb.com/us/2013/01/25/the-senate-will-move-next-week-on-comprehensive-high-skill-immigration-reform/

Today The Hill obtained a copy of a forthcoming proposed law dubbed the ‘Immigration Innovation Act.’ Critically, it is backed by a bipartisan collection of Senators, giving it a clear shot at clearing the upper chamber of the United States Congress.¶ While likely h, the bill’s two key tenets would dramatically improve the high-skill immigration system of the United States. According to The Hill’s notes, the act would:¶ Completely end the cap on the total, yearly number of H-1B visas that American companies can apply for, providing that they are applying for a foreign graduate with a technical degree of an American university. TNW isn’t sure, but we’re assuming that degrees that fall under the “STEM” rubric are what will be required.¶ Improve the extant H-1B system by adding 40,000 slots each year. Also, the act would grant more H-1B visas based on market demand, provided that the new 115,000 visa ceiling was reached before the end of the year. This system would have a final cap of 300,000.¶ The bill does allow for spouses of H-1B visa holders to live and work inside of the United States. The House will likely have issues with the provision. Given that the House has been home to various immigration conspiracy theories, it would be out of character for it to keep its marbles this time around. This bill is a massive improvement on the laws tossed around during the last Congress.¶ The previous bill included fewer high-skilled visas, did not create the education exception, and perhaps most oddly ended the popular ‘green card lottery.’ That specific provision ended the proposed law’s chance of becoming law.¶ Here is the list of tipped co-sponsors for the Immigration Innovation Act: “Sens. Orrin Hatch (R-Utah), Marco Rubio (R-Fla.), Chris Coons (D-Del.) and Amy Klobuchar (D-Minn.).”¶ If it can quickly pass the Senate, and receives a nod from the President, the House will be under immense pressure to pass it as well, but it could become weighed down with ponderous amendments that could be viewed as poison pills, roughly.¶ In his inaugural address, the President called for an improvement of the country’s high-skill immigration system. He may get it.

#### It’s on the front-burner---there’s bipartisan support

Neifach and Hanagan 1/22 Michael and Sean, Jackson Lewis LLP. “Momentum grows for comprehensive immigration reform,” 2013, http://www.lexology.com/library/detail.aspx?g=4d06085e-7d82-44c3-9c51-1e21c3d44288

Lawmakers return to Washington for the 113th Congress with comprehensive immigration reform once again moving to the front burner. Comments and proposals are being fielded by prominent political figures, including former President George W. Bush http://trailblazersblog.dallasnews.com/2012/12/george-w-bush-debate-immigration-policy-with-a-benevolent-spirit.html/ and Senator Marco Rubio http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887323442804578235844003050604.html. These and similar calls for Congress to finally address the country’s immigration system, widely criticized as “broken” on both sides of the aisle, seem to be resonating with the White House, at least mildly http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/citing-rubios-ideas-on-immigration-reform-white-house-sees-hope-for-bipartisan-deal/2013/01/15/d83f4102-5f48-11e2-9940-6fc488f3fecd\_story.html.¶ The growth of bipartisan support for comprehensive immigration reform may move the Administration and Congress to initiate a new push to enact immigration reform legislation as early as this March. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid recently noted publicly that a bipartisan group of senators, led by Democratic Sens. Chuck Schumer and Dick Durbin and Republican Sens. John McCain and Lindsey Graham, have been crafting an immigration package and that this was to be “first thing” on the Senate’s agenda. While the exact scope and language is still being discussed, all indications are that the Administration is looking to pass comprehensive legislation that addresses multiple elements of immigration reform. Key elements of any comprehensive solution include: mandatory verification of legal status of newly hired workers, additional visa numbers for highly skilled immigrants and creation of a temporary guest-worker program. Reform legislation also is expected to address the approximately 11 million individuals currently residing in the U.S. without legal status.

#### Will pass---Obama has all the leverage

Weigant 1/23 Chris is a Political writer and blogger at ChrisWeigant.com. “Handicapping Obama's Second Term Agenda,” 2013, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/chris-weigant/obama-second-term\_b\_2537802.html

The second big agenda item is immigration reform. President Obama holds virtually all the cards, politically, on this one. All Republicans who can read either demographics or polling numbers know full well that this may be their party's last chance not to go the way of the Whigs. Their support among Latinos is dismal, and even that's putting it politely. Some Republicans think they have come up with a perfect solution on how to defuse the issue, but they are going to be proven sadly mistaken in the end, I believe. The Republican plan will be announced by Senator Marco Rubio at some point, and it will seem to mirror the Democratic plan -- with one key difference. Republicans -- even the ones who know their party has to do something on the immigration problem -- are balking at including a "path to citizenship" for the 11 million undocumented immigrants who are already in America.¶ The Republicans are trying to have their cake and eat it too -- and it's not going to work. "Sure," they say, "we'll give some sort of papers to these folks, let them stay, and even let them work... but there's no need to give them the hope of ever becoming a full citizen." This just isn't going to be good enough, though. There are essentially two things citizens can do which green card holders cannot: serve on juries, and vote. The Republicans are not worried about tainted juries, in case that's not clear enough.¶ Republicans will bend over backwards in an effort to convince Latinos that their proposal will work out just fine for everyone. Latinos, however, aren't stupid. They know that being denied any path to citizenship equals an effort to minimize their voice on the national political stage. Which is why, as I said, Obama holds all the cards in this fight. Because this is the one issue in his agenda which Republicans also have a big vested interest in making happen. Obama and the Democrats will, I believe, hold firm on their insistence on a path to citizenship, and I think a comprehensive immigration bill will likely pass some time this year, perhaps before the summer congressional break. The path to citizenship it includes will be long, expensive and difficult (Republicans will insist on at least that), but it will be there.¶ On gun control, I think Obama will win a partial victory. On immigration, I think he will win an almost-total victory. On global warming, however, he's going to be disappointed. In fact, I doubt -- no matter how much "bully pulpiting" Obama does -- that any bill will even appear out of a committee in either house of Congress. This will be seen as Obama's "overreach" -- a bridge too far for the current political climate. Anyone expecting big legislative action on global warming is very likely going to be massively disappointed, to put it quite bluntly. In fact, Obama will signal this in the next few months, as he approves the Keystone XL pipeline -- much to the dismay of a lot of his supporters.¶ Of course, I could be wrong about any or all of these predictions. I have no special knowledge of how things will work out in Congress in the immediate future. I'm merely making educated guesses about what Obama will be able to achieve in at least the first few years of his second term. **Obama has a lot of political capital right now**, but that could easily change soon. The **House Republicans seem** almost **demoralized** right now, and **Obama has successfully splintered them** and called their bluff on two big issues already -- but they could regroup and decide to block everything the White House wants, and damn the political consequences. Unseen issues will pop up both on the domestic and foreign policy stages, as they always do. But, for now, this is my take on how the next few years are going to play out in Washington. Time will tell whether I've been too optimistic or too pessimistic on any or all of Obama's main agenda items. We'll just have to wait and see.

#### GOP’s getting on board

Chait 1/23 Jonathan is a writer @ New York Magazine. “How Obama Can Have a Great Second Term,” 2013, http://nymag.com/daily/intelligencer/2013/01/how-obama-can-have-a-great-second-term.html

**The strongest prospect for domestic legislation appears to be immigration reform.** The key dynamic here is the **desire by Republican leaders to suture** off the party’s **wound among Latino and Asian voters,** and the figure here is Marco Rubio. In the immediate wake of the election, Rubio called for “step by step” reform rather than a comprehensive overhaul, which I read as code for opposing anything real. But I read Rubio wrong. He has backed off his opposition to comprehensive reform and has advocated policies eerily similar to Obama’s own proposal, while framing it in a way **that has gained advocates on the right**. Fox News, ground zero for a panicked reaction by the conservative base, seems to be climbing onboard, and Republican voters seem to be getting the message.

#### High on the agenda and will pass

Calderon 1/21 Sara is a writer @ Politic365. “Rep Lujan: Immigration Reform Bill in ‘First Quarter’ of 2013,” 2013, http://politic365.com/2013/01/21/rep-lujan-immigration-reform-bill-in-first-quarter-of-2013-2/

New Mexico Congressman Ben Ray Lujan is optimistic that **immigration reform will happen this year**, in 2013. He also told Politic365 that he believes that Republican representatives in the House and Senate will likely join with him and other Latino congressman to push for legislation true to the nine immigration principles released by the Congressional Hispanic Caucus last November.¶ “I really believe that it will happen this year,” Lujan told Politic365. “I remain optimistic that this continues to be a very pressing issue and that there’s support to work on immigration reform in Congress.”¶ The principles outlined by the CHC include mandatory registration by undocumented immigrants with the government, fingerprinting, a federal background check, learning English, and a vague path to permanent residency, and eventually, citizenship. Also outlined are vague “solutions” for agriculture workers, enforcement, employment verification and the payment of taxes.¶ Importantly, the last point reaffirms the importance of the Citizenship Clause of the Constitution.¶ When it comes to a timeline, Congressman Lujan believes the legislation is coming sooner, rather than later.¶ “I would suggest early on this Congress, in the first quarter of the calendar year that our Republican colleagues would show some movement and willingness to move with us to get some legislation moving built on the principles that we’ve put out,” he said.

#### PC is the deciding factor---otherwise CIR will fall by the wayside

Hesson 1/2 Ted is a writer @ ABC News. “Analysis: 6 Things Obama Needs To Do for Immigration Reform,” 2013, http://abcnews.go.com/ABC\_Univision/News/things-president-obama-immigration-reform/story?id=18103115

On Sunday, President Barack Obama said that immigration reform is a "top priority" on his agenda and that he would introduce legislation in his first year.¶ To find out what he needs to do to make reform a reality, we talked to Lynn Tramonte, the deputy director at America's Voice, a group that lobbies for immigration reform, and Muzaffar Chishti, the director of the New York office of the Migration Policy Institute, a think tank. Here's what we came up with.¶ 1. Be a Leader¶ During Obama's first term, bipartisan legislation never got off the ground. The president needs to do a better job leading the charge this time around, according to Chishti. "He has to make it clear that it's a high priority of his," he said. "He has to make it clear that he'll use his bully pulpit and his political muscle to make it happen, and he has to be open to using his veto power." His announcement this weekend is a step in that direction, but he needs to follow through.

#### **PC is vital to transform rhetorical support into actual CIR**

Shifter 12/27 Michael is the President of Inter-American Dialogue. “Will Obama Kick the Can Down the Road?” 2012, http://www.thedialogue.org/page.cfm?pageID=32&pubID=3186

Not surprisingly, Obama has been explicit that reforming the US’s shameful and broken immigration system will be a top priority in his second term. There is every indication that he intends to use some of his precious political capital – especially in the first year – to push for serious change. The biggest lesson of the last election was that the “Latino vote” was decisive. No one doubts that it will be even more so in future elections. During the campaign, many Republicans -- inexplicably -- frightened immigrants with offensive rhetoric. But the day after the election, there was talk, in both parties, of comprehensive immigration reform. ¶ Despite the sudden optimism about immigration reform, there is, of course**, no guarantee that it will happen. It will require a lot of negotiation and deal-making.** Obama will have to invest a lot of his time and political capital -- twisting some arms, even in his own party. **Resistance will not disappear.**

#### PC is vital to an effective bill---key to overcome GOP and Dem opposition

Dallas Morning News 1/2 “Editorial: Actions must match Obama’s immigration pledge,” 2013, http://www.dallasnews.com/opinion/editorials/20130102-editorial-actions-must-match-obamas-immigration-pledge.ece

The president’s words to NBC’s David Gregory are only that — words. What will really matter is whether he puts his **muscle into the task** this year.¶ We suggest that Obama start by looking at the example of former President George W. Bush. Back in 2006 and 2007, the Republican and his administration constantly worked Capitol Hill to pass a comprehensive plan. They failed, largely because Senate Republicans balked. But the opposition didn’t stop the Bush White House from fully engaging Congress, including recalcitrant Republicans.¶ Obama may have a similar problem with his own party. The dirty little secret in the 2006 and 2007 immigration battles was that some Democrats were content to let Senate Republicans kill the effort. Labor-friendly Democrats didn’t want a bill, either.¶ And they may not want one this year. That reluctance is a major reason the president needs to invest in this fight. He must figure out how to bring enough Democrats along, while also reaching out to Republicans.¶ In short, the nation doesn’t need a repeat of the process through which the 2010 health care legislation was passed. Very few Republicans bought into the president’s plan, leaving the Affordable Care Act open to partisan sniping throughout last year’s election. If the nation is going to create a saner immigration system, both parties need to support substantial parts of an answer.¶ The new system must include a guest worker program for future immigrants and a way for illegal immigrants already living here to legalize their status over time. Some House Republicans will object to one or both of those reforms, so Speaker John Boehner must be persuasive about the need for a wholesale change.¶ But the leadership that matters most will come from the White House. The president has staked out the right position. Now he needs to present a bill and fight this year for a comprehensive solution. Nothing but action will count.¶ HE SAID IT …¶ “I’ve said that fixing our broken immigration system is a top priority. I will introduce legislation in the first year [of the second term] to get that done. I think we have talked about it long enough. We know how we can fix it. We can do it in a comprehensive way that the American people support. That’s something we should get done.”

#### Even if they agree about immigration in theory, there will still be fights on the substance of the bill

Dwoskin 1/21 Elizabeth is a writer @ Bloomberg. “A Hard Line on Immigration Reform Lurks in Obama's Inaugural Speech,” 2013, http://www.businessweek.com/articles/2013-01-21/the-hard-line-on-immigration-hidden-in-obamas-inaugural-speech

On the surface, there’s nothing controversial about that. Increasing the number of visas for highly skilled immigrants is one of the few policy goals Obama and the GOP agree on. That reflects a big change in Republican thinking in recent months, as party leaders have softened their anti-immigration rhetoric after nearly three-quarters of Hispanic voters cast ballots for Obama in November.¶ If visas for highly skilled workers were the only issue, Democrats and Republicans could quickly resolve it. **But it’s not.** What Obama didn’t say in his speech is that he will insist on tying the visas to broader changes in immigration laws, which many Republicans strongly object to. Earlier in January, White House officials told reporters that the president won’t agree to raise the visa caps without reforms that include a path to citizenship for many of the estimated 11 million immigrants living illegally in the U.S.¶ These immigrants aren’t the “bright young” future job creators Obama lauded in his speech. Most work dirty jobs for low wages, and many lack high school diplomas. They’re the undocumented workers Republican governors in Arizona, Georgia, Alabama, and other states have driven away with tough anti-immigration laws.¶ It’s not lost on Republicans that Obama’s everything-at-once approach exploits a rift in the GOP, which is struggling to find a policy its factions can accept. For many House Republicans from Southern and border states, words such as “legalization” and “citizenship” are nonstarters. Obama is just dangling visas for the highly skilled as a way of pressuring conservatives to go along with his “real goal,” GOP Representative Lamar Smith of Texas says in an e-mail, “which is mass amnesty for illegal immigrants.”

#### Top of the docket

Mascaro 1/21 Lisa is a writer @ the LA Times. “Axelrod: Immigration reform coming 'early' in Obama's agenda,” 2013, http://www.latimes.com/news/politics/la-pn-axelrod-immigration-reform-coming-early-in-obamas-agenda-20130121,0,2596253.story

WASHINGTON -- While fiscal battles have dominated discussions of President Obama’s second term, a top advisor said Monday that the president will push forward with immigration reform **early on** -- possibly **as soon as the State of the Union speech in three weeks**.¶ Speaking shortly after the inauguration ceremony, senior advisor David Axelrod suggested Obama carries the goodwill of the American public with him as he sets out on his second term. ¶ “I think the country likes this president. I think they support this president. Now he has four years to finish the work he’s begun,” Axelrod told reporters as he walked through the halls at the Capitol. “We’ve got a foundation on which to build and he has a chance to build on it.”¶ Axelrod suggested congressional Republicans should reconsider their opposition to the president’s agenda, as polls show Americans have grown tired of the cycle of brinkmanship.¶ Several top Republicans panned Obama’s inauguration speech on Monday, suggesting Obama did not signal a willingness to reach across the aisle to find common ground on issues. Arizona Sen. John McCain of Arizona, a former Republican presidential nominee, was among those lobbing a note of criticism. ¶ “Really? I’m surprised because Sen. McCain is usually so receptive to what the president has to say,” Axelrod said, in a sarcastic reference to the 2008 combatants’ routine disagreement.¶ The longtime Obama advisor defended the president’s approach. ¶ “I think he did reach out in the sense that he made the point that we always have achieved what we achieved as a country by working together and we have to work together now,” Axelrod said. “You hear in the speech what you want to, I suppose. But I don’t believe that it was a particularly political speech. I think it was a speech about the values and principles that should unite us -- and I hope they do.”¶ Axelrod declined to prioritize the top few issues on the president’s agenda, but suggested immigration is gaining in importance as the budget battles consume the early months ahead.¶ “I expect you’re going to see immigration surface early in the year,” he said. “We have certain immutable deadlines relative to the fiscal discussion, but I do believe he’s going to move quickly on immigration as well -- he’s got a State of the Union in three weeks.”

#### Immigration reform is at the top of the docket

Estes 1/2 Adam is a writer for The Atlantic Wire. “Obama’s Push for Immigration Reform Starts Now,” 2013, http://www.theatlanticwire.com/politics/2013/01/obamas-push-immigration-reform-starts-now/60525/

Everybody knew that Obama was going to tackle immigration reform in his second term. We just didn't know how soon. Well, **the word is out**, and it's good news for anybody eager for lawmakers to tackle an issue that's troubled the country for years. **Obama will take on immigration reform** this month. A fresh report from The Huffington Post's Elise Foley and Sam Stein quotes anonymous administration officials and Democratic aides in explaining that the president is going to move fast on immigration reform, as well as gun control, and advocates couldn't be happier. None of this is a tremendous surprise, though the expedited timeline is sort of curious. Obama's been talking about sweeping immigration since he took office and, at least until 2009, has left many guessing if and when that's going to happen. He made progress last year when he kept 800,000 young people who had been brought to the United States illegally as children from being deported, making a DREAM Act-like policy initiative as the DREAM Act itself floundered in Congress. Immigration remained an issue through the election, and almost as soon as Obama won his second term, whispers of a renewed push for immigration reform started, though the White House vowed to deal with the fiscal cliff first. Obama then reiterated his commitment to tackle immigration soon on his Meet the Press appearance last weekend. With a fiscal cliff deal (sort of) sealed, it would appear it's immigration time, and details about how the president will handle the challenge are trickling out. Stein and Foley say that California congresswoman Zoe Lofgren will lead the Democratic effort in the House and pushes back at the idea that House Speaker John Boehner will be able to stonewall the effort. "In the end, immigration reform is going to depend very much on whether Speaker Boehner wants to do it or not," she said. Democrats will inevitably have to navigate more than Boehner's will, but some say that the challenge of the fiscal cliff has Capitol Hill ready for some easier negotiations. Or as one pro-immigration reform executive told HuffPost, "The chance to legislate through regular order on immigration reform might have leaders in both parties working together and singing 'Kumbaya.'"

#### Obama will prioritize immigration over guns and budget which is what their evidence is about

Wernick 1/25 Allan is a writer for the New York Daily News. “A look at where key Congressional players stand on immigration indicates reform could come soon,” 2013, http://www.nydailynews.com/new-york/citizenship-now/immigration-chances-good-sweeping-immigration-reform-article-1.1245988

As expected, President Obama confirmed his support for immigration reform in his inaugural address. It was one of the few specific issues mentioned by the President in setting the program for his coming four years in office. In the last few weeks, some pundits have argued that the debate over debt and budget issues or gun control will sidetrack the President from his commitment to immigrants. That analysis ignores the expectations of Latino voters and their allies. **Obama and both parties have no choice but to make immigration reform a priority in the coming year**. The doubters are wrong. I am more optimistic than ever that we will see reform this year. To understand why, lets take a look at what some key players on the immigration reform debate have been saying and doing this year:

#### Sequestration will happen---budget deal won’t be finalized for months---proves the DA comes first

Hicks 1/24 Josh is a writer @ The Washington Post. “Party leaders predict temporary sequestration cuts are likely,” 2013, http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/federal-eye/wp/2013/01/24/party-leaders-predict-temporary-sequestration-cuts-are-likely-2/

Leaders from both political parties predicted Wednesday that sequestration would take place at least temporarily while lawmakers try to come up with a **longer-term** plan for reining in the national debt, according to an article by Lori Montgomery and Rosalind S. Helderman in Thursday’s Washington Post.¶ Sen. Richard J. Durbin (D-Ill.) reportedly said, “I think we are committed to some form of sequestration spending cut.” He added that the White House is considering options for blunting the impacts on government services and the federal workforce, according to Thursday’s article.¶ So what does that mean for federal agencies?¶ A Jan. 10 report from the Congressional Research Service said sequestration would entail “largely across-the-board spending reductions.” The operative word there is “largely,” meaning some programs — but not the federal workforce — would be shielded.¶ A host of so-called “mandatory” programs would be exempt from cuts, including Social Security, the Earned Income Tax Credit, the Additional Child Tax Credit, and low-income programs such as Medicaid, the Children’s Health Insurance Program and Supplemental Nutrition Assistance, according to the report.¶ Federal agencies would see across-the-board budget cuts of between 8 percent and 10 percent.¶ The government would have until Sept. 30 to make the required reductions, giving lawmakers time to forge a deal for less-painful cuts. In the meantime, agencies would absorb the impacts slowly, which is what Durbin was referring to when he said “I think we are committed to some form of sequestration spending cut.”¶ The idea is that lawmakers might be willing to let sequestration run its course for awhile to reduce spending **without having to choose where the trimming occurs.**

#### Obama won’t spend PC on gun control---this ev’s comparative with immigration

Turner 12/14 Dan has been an editorial editor or writer with the LA Times since 2004. “Not another gun control diatribe,” 2012, <http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/opinion-la/la-ol-guns-connecticut-20121214,0,404849.story>

The latter argument is a little hard to make with a straight face in the case of Friday's shootings at an elementary school in Newtown, Conn.; I doubt even National Rifle Assn. chief Wayne LaPierre would claim that arming 6-year-olds or their teachers is a good idea. Regardless, the liberal blogosphere will scream for action, politicians will promise to take it, and then **they'll misplace that gun control bill** on the way to cut the ribbon for a new community center in their districts.¶ President Obama is a master at this kind of bait-and-switch tactic, regularly calling for a national conversation on gun violence in the wake of mass killings, or touting his support for a ban on assault rifles, **without doing anything whatsoever** to advance these causes. In a tearful news conference Friday, he promised to take "meaningful action to prevent more tragedies like this, regardless of the politics." And what action would that be? Obama knows that gun control is a political nonstarter. Advocates might be hoping he'll be more courageous now that he has won a second term, but if history is a guide, he will save his political capital for fights he can win, such as immigration reform, and dump issues that fire up conservative opposition, such as climate controls and, yes, gun control. Smart politician. Disappointing leader.

#### Repubs use it as an opportunity to say Obama’s weak --- his own moratorium gets contradicted by an agency that he controls --- makes it look like he can’t keep his house in order ---- also proves plan gets rolled back – only fiat DOI

Posner 2---Professor of Law, Chicago (Eric and Adrian Vermeule, 69 U. Chi. L. Rev. 1721

This argument remains valid even if we accept the assumption that Congress really does not want much authority because then it has to make difficult decisions about to whom it should make transfers, when it would rather accumulate political goodwill by engaging in constituent service. 91 Thus, Congress delegates authority to agencies [\*1747] without monitoring them, in effect holding a "regulatory lottery," in the words of Aranson and his coauthors. 92 The problem with this theory is that interest groups and constituents who pick the wrong ticket in the regulatory lottery will lobby Congress to reverse the agency's decisions, and indeed **even to** retract the delegation. Those who benefit from the agency decisions will lobby Congress to maintain the status quo. 93 **Congress will have to answer the hard question** of whether to interfere with its agency, and so it cannot divest itself of the responsibility for making difficult decisions. Indeed, both the winners and the losers will realize ex ante that the delegation might benefit or harm them, and so they will lobby ex ante about the delegation as **vigorously** as they would about any other kind of legislation.

#### Agencies don’t shield and no risk of a turn---Obama is velcro and will only get blamed---no credit

**Nicholas & Hook 10** Peter and Janet, Staff Writers---LA Times, “Obama the Velcro president”, LA Times, 7-30, http://articles.latimes.com/2010/jul/30/nation/la-na-velcro-presidency-20100730/3

If Ronald Reagan was the classic Teflon president, Barack **Obama is made of Velcro.¶** Through two terms, Reagan eluded much of the responsibility for recession and foreign policy scandal. In less than two years, Obama has become **ensnared in blame**.¶ Hoping to **better insulate Obama**, White House aides have sought to **give other Cabinet officials a higher profile** and additional public exposure. They are also crafting new ways to explain the president's policies to a skeptical public.¶ **But Obama remains the colossus of his administration** — to a point where trouble anywhere in the world is often his to solve.¶ The president is on the hook to repair the Gulf Coast oil spill disaster, stabilize Afghanistan, help fix Greece's ailing economy and do right by Shirley Sherrod, the Agriculture Department official fired as a result of a misleading fragment of videotape¶ What's **not sticking to Obama** is a legislative track record that his recent predecessors might envy. **Political dividends** from passage of a healthcare overhaul or a financial regulatory bill **have been fleeting**.¶ Instead, voters are measuring his presidency by a more immediate yardstick: Is he creating enough jobs? So far the verdict is no, and that has taken a toll on Obama's approval ratings. Only 46% approve of Obama's job performance, compared with 47% who disapprove, according to Gallup's daily tracking poll.¶ "I think the accomplishments are very significant, but I think most people would look at this and say, 'What was the plan for jobs?' " said Sen. Byron L. Dorgan (D-N.D.). "The agenda he's pushed here has been a very important agenda, but it hasn't translated into dinner table conversations."¶ Reagan was able to glide past controversies with his popularity largely intact. He maintained his affable persona as a small-government advocate while seeming above the fray in his own administration.¶ Reagan was untarnished by such calamities as the 1983 terrorist bombing of the Marines stationed in Beirut and scandals involving members of his administration. In the 1986 Iran-Contra affair, most of the blame fell on lieutenants.¶ Obama lately has tried to rip off the Velcro veneer. In a revealing moment during the oil spill crisis, he reminded Americans that his powers aren't "limitless." He told residents in Grand Isle, La., that he is a flesh-and-blood president, not a comic-book superhero able to dive to the bottom of the sea and plug the hole.¶ "I can't suck it up with a straw," he said.¶ But as a candidate in 2008, he set sky-high expectations about what he could achieve and what government could accomplish.¶ Clinching the Democratic nomination two years ago, Obama described the moment as an epic breakthrough when "we began to provide care for the sick and good jobs to the jobless" and "when the rise of the oceans began to slow and our planet began to heal."¶ Those towering goals remain a long way off. And most people would have preferred to see Obama focus more narrowly on the "good jobs" part of the promise.¶ A recent Gallup poll showed that 53% of the population rated unemployment and the economy as the nation's most important problem. By contrast, only 7% cited healthcare — a single-minded focus of the White House for a full year.¶ At every turn, Obama makes the argument that he has improved lives in concrete ways.¶ Without the steps he took, he says, the economy would be in worse shape and more people would be out of work. There's evidence to support that. Two economists, Mark Zandi and Alan Blinder, reported recently that without the stimulus and other measures, gross domestic product would be about 6.5% lower.¶ Yet, Americans aren't apt to cheer when something bad doesn't materialize.¶ Unemployment has been rising — from 7.7% when Obama took office, to 9.5%. Last month, more than 2 million homes in the U.S. were in various stages of foreclosure — up from 1.7 million when Obama was sworn in.¶ "Folks just aren't in a mood to hand out gold stars when unemployment is hovering around 10%," said Paul Begala, a Democratic pundit.¶ **Insulating the president from bad news has proved impossible**. Other White Houses have tried doing so with more success. **Reagan's Cabinet officials often took the blame, shielding the boss**.¶ But **the Obama administration is about one man**. Obama is the White House's chief spokesman, policy pitchman, fundraiser and negotiator. **No Cabinet secretary has emerged as an adequate surrogate**. Treasury Secretary Timothy F. Geithner is seen as a tepid public speaker; Energy Secretary Steven Chu is prone to long, wonky digressions and has rarely gone before the cameras during an oil spill crisis that he is working to end.¶ So, **more falls to Obama, reinforcing the Velcro effect: Everything sticks to him**. He has opined on virtually everything in the hundreds of public statements he has made: nuclear arms treaties, basketball star LeBron James' career plans; Chelsea Clinton's wedding.¶ Few audiences are off-limits. On Wednesday, he taped a spot on ABC's "The View," drawing a rebuke from Democratic Pennsylvania Gov. Edward G. Rendell, who deemed the appearance unworthy of the presidency during tough times.¶ "Stylistically he creates some of those problems," Eddie Mahe, a Republican political strategist, said in an interview. "His favorite pronoun is 'I.' When you position yourself as being all things to all people, the ultimate controller and decision maker with the capacity to fix anything, you set yourself up to be blamed when it doesn't get fixed or things happen."¶ A new White House strategy is to forgo talk of big policy changes that are easy to ridicule. Instead, aides want to market policies as more digestible pieces. So, rather than tout the healthcare package as a whole, advisors will talk about smaller parts that may be more appealing and understandable — such as barring insurers from denying coverage based on preexisting conditions.¶ But at this stage, it may be late in the game to downsize either the president or his agenda.

#### Obama will be blamed for agency action

Wallison 3 Resident Fellow @ A.E.I. “A Power Shift No One Noticed”, AEI Online, 1-1, http://www.aei.org/publications/pubID.15652/pub\_detail.asp

To be sure, the president had appointed the chairman and the other members of the SEC, but that in itself would not make him blameworthy unless one assumed that he was also directly responsible for how the SEC acted before, and after, the scandals erupted. That is the nub of the important but largely unnoticed change that has occurred: the unchallenged assumption on the part of **all parties**--in Congress, in the media, among the public, and even in the White House itself--that the president was **fully accountable for an agency** that has always been viewed as independent.¶ The significance of this change in the grand government scheme of things can **hardly be overstated**. Without legislation or judicial decision, the president has suddenly become **electorally responsible** for the decisions of bodies that were considered to be within the special purview of Congress, susceptible only to congressional policy direction. Of course, this functional revolution did not give the president any new powers with respect to the independent regulatory agencies. But the **die is now cast**. The way the American people look at the president's responsibilities apparently is changing, and that will affect the **attitude of Congress**. If the American people believe that the president should be responsible for the actions of the SEC, it will be **difficult to convince them otherwise**. Significantly, since Harvey Pitt's resignation as SEC chairman in November, the media have routinely referred to the president's choice to head the SEC, investment banker William H. Donaldson, as a member of the Bush "economic team."

Plan forces political energy fights---saps capital --- also proves rollback

Geman 10 (Ben, The Hill, 4/1/10, <http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/90137-drilling-push-shakes-up-climate-fight->)

While most of the drilling proposal can be undertaken using executive power, expanded drilling in the eastern Gulf of Mexico would require congressional approval. That will surely play a role in the fight over energy and climate legislation that Democrats hope to bring to the floor. Republicans called Obama’s plan too narrow, as it closes off or delays leasing or sales in other areas. The energy consulting firm ClearView Energy Partners, in a research note Wednesday, said the limits of the White House plan give architects of the Senate energy and climate bill an opening to woo new support. “One obvious implication of today’s announcement: delaying and canceling OCS [Outer Continental Shelf] sales gives lawmakers the opportunity to ‘sweeten’ a climate bill by restoring or accelerating sales,” ClearView states. But the White House and the architects of Senate legislation — Sens. John Kerry (D-Mass.), Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.) and Joe Lieberman (I-Conn.) **— risk losing support among liberal Democrats and environmentalists as they seek expanded drilling**. For instance, Sen. Frank Lautenberg (D-N.J.) attacked the plan Wednesday. “Drilling off the Virginia coast would endanger many of New Jersey’s beaches and vibrant coastal economies,” Lautenberg said in a prepared statement. Environmental groups that are on board with efforts to craft a compromise climate change and energy bill — such as the Sierra Club and the Natural Resources Defense Council — **also slammed the proposal.**

#### Removing offshore drilling restrictions costs political capital

Mergers and Acquisitions Round Table 8 This section includes quotes from Andrew Spitzer, Founder of the Energy and Power Group at Harris and Williams Co., and Douglas Korn of Irving Place Partners. “Combustible; The volatility of the energy sector has turned the industry upside down. Top players in the space discuss what this means for investors and how dealmakers can capitalize.,” Dec 1, Lexis

But it's also important to remember that oil is a fungible commodity and the price is set on a worldwide basis. Ultimately, we have to focus on domestic production to help with the supply issue, and, internationally, see if we can't encourage the national oil companies to open up more acreage for competition. This is a worldwide problem; not just a US problem.¶ Mergers & Acquisitions: Is it even possible, though, to completely eliminate demand for foreign oil? Is this something that could happen in our lifetime?¶ Spitzer: The economics certainly make it extremely challenging, and frankly, without the political willpower to put in a variety of reforms - whether it's CAFE standards or relieving offshore drilling inhibitors - it's not something that would get done without some form of government intervention.¶ Korn: That being said, the recent turmoil in the market and the government's response have created a very difficult fiscal situation going into 2009. You have the normal cyclical impacts of a downturn in government receipts and that overlays all of the government support to shore up the markets.¶ You have to go back to the question of whether or not there will there be the political will. There are important reasons behind why we have to become less reliant on foreign energy; from a geopolitical point of view, from a carbon emissions point of view. But how now you have to ask, "How do we make that happen in an environment where the government will be under some severe fiscal constraints." That's going to be the real challenge.¶ Spitzer: And regulation is effectively a silent taxation policy. So instituting that in the face of the pocketbook issues that people are dealing with is going to be tough. **Any administration would have to burn a lot of** political capital **to push through an energy policy** that tries to accomplish what either candidate proposed.

#### Natural gas development is extremely unpopular and partisan---alienates everyone

Dicker 9/4 Daniel is a Senior Columnist at The Street. “Why Isn't Natural Gas an Election Issue?” 2012, http://www.thestreet.com/story/11684440/1/why-isnt-natural-gas-an-election-issue.html?cm\_ven=GOOGLEN

Why has this opportunity towards increased reliance on natural gas been so obvious and yet so difficult for politicians of both parties to embrace?¶ It hasn't been solely because 2012 is an election year. Boone Pickens was on CNBC last week marking the fourth anniversary of his "Pickens Plan," the failed congressional effort to invest in truck natural gas engines and fuelling infrastructure to run them on.¶ In fact, if anyone wanted to see political partisanship in action slowing the real economic progress this nation could make, they'd find no better example than the history of the Pickens plan and other natural gas initiatives in Washington.¶ **Both radical wings of each party have made advocating natural gas use** impossible. Democratic environmentalists are concerned about hydraulic fracturing and its possible impact to aquifers. Republicans are reluctant to approve further federal spending of any kind as well as risk a charge of "picking winners" in natural gas -- a charge they have made successfully against Democrats.¶ Of course, both radical wings of both parties are wrong: Overwhelming evidence from every independent research source has concluded that hydraulic fracturing of shale for natural gas has proven to be safe to our water supplies and is getting safer all the time.¶ Republican reticence to support natural gas expansion belies a long history of government incentives for developing new energy sources, from as far back as our development of coal to our much discussed modern tax incentives for crude oil exploration and production.¶ It is a fact that our government has been picking winners in energy for as long as there's been government.¶ The advantages of natural gas conversion and greater use are obvious but bear repeating. Natural gas is a domestic source of energy and promises energy independence here in the U.S. Production, transport and building of infrastructure for natural gas would mean millions of new jobs. Natural gas prices are literally half that of competing oil and gasoline. Finally, carbon emissions for natural gas are about a third that for coal and other fossil fuels.¶ What's not to like?¶ But it seems both radical wings of each party continue to wield enormous influence. Neither candidate has made natural gas a cornerstone of a new and necessary energy policy.

#### The plan’s controversial---makes Obama seem in bed with natural gas

Berman 12 Dan is a writer at Politico. “**When it comes to natural gas, Obama can’t win,”** 5/16, http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0512/76402.html

President Barack Obama talked up natural gas in his State of the Union address, his top aides have held dozens of meetings with natural gas industry leaders and his administration has given the industry what it wanted on two big regulatory issues.¶ What he’s gotten in return: **a giant headache.**¶ Industry backers have hammered away at virtually all of the White House’s rule-making efforts while pouring millions of dollars into campaigns fighting Obama’s reelection.¶ At the same time, environmentalists and even some Republicans have complained that natural gas is too cozy with the White House.¶ The gas industry’s had plenty of access. This year, the White House Office of Management and Budget held at least a dozen meetings on fracking with senior officials from companies like ExxonMobil, Anadarko and BP, as well as Republican congressional staffers, tribal leaders and industry lobby shops.¶ But the White House seems unable to decide how close it wants to be to the industry. Obama and Cabinet officials like Energy Secretary Steven Chu, Interior Secretary Ken Salazar and EPA chief Lisa Jackson consistently praise natural gas. And recent headlines have trumpeted the newfound closeness; Bloomberg, for instance, went with “Obama Warms to Energy Industry by Supporting Natural Gas” while National Journal chose: “White House’s Coziness With Big Oil Irks GOP.”¶ White House energy adviser Heather Zichal insisted Monday that the relationship isn’t that simple.¶ “It’s safe to say the notion that we rolled out the welcome mat or have this hunky-dory relationship where we’re all holding hands and singing ‘Kumbaya’ is not exactly where we’re at today,” Zichal said at an American Petroleum Institute event.¶ “What I can say is that we were in the middle of working on a number of regulations that directly impact the oil and gas industry,” she added. “There was no way for us to finalize a regulation that made sense without us actually engaging with the industry.”¶ The past several weeks have demonstrated the love-hate relationship with industry.¶ On April 13, Obama signed an executive order meant to coordinate the administration’s activities on natural gas and perhaps answer criticism that the administration is trying to end hydraulic fracturing. Industry lobbyists met that afternoon with Zichal.¶ The White House press office even blasted out a release quoting supportive statements from places like the American Petroleum Institute, Business Roundtable and Dow Chemical.¶ But when the EPA and Interior Department each rolled out their much-anticipated rules regarding fracking, they were hammered by the industry and its GOP allies. And when Sen. Jim Inhofe (R-Okla.) started a media blitz using a two-year-old video of a regional EPA administrator saying he wanted to “crucify” law-breaking oil and gas companies, some of the same groups that had praised the executive order called for the person to be fired (he stepped down within five days).¶ Making things worse for the White House, environmentalists who are happy the agencies were tackling fracking in the first place complained that the rules were watered down.¶ “I agree it seems like they’re trying to somehow make the industry happy, but we think that the White House absolutely should be holding the industry to a much higher standard,” said Amy Mall of the Natural Resources Defense Council. “We know the industry can operate with cleaner and safer methods.”

#### Can’t win on energy

Eisler 12 Matthew is a Researcher @ the Chemical Heritage Foundation. “Science, Silver Buckshot, and ‘All of The Above’” April 2, http://scienceprogress.org/2012/04/science-silver-buckshot-and-%E2%80%9Call-of-the-above%E2%80%9D/

Conservatives take President Obama’s rhetoric at face value. Progressives see the president as disingenuous. No doubt White House planners regard delaying the trans-border section of the Keystone XL pipeline and approving the Gulf of Mexico portion as a stroke of savvy realpolitik, but one has to wonder whether Democratic-leaning voters really are as gullible as this scheme implies. And as for the president’s claims that gasoline prices are determined by forces beyond the government’s control (speculation and unrest in the Middle East), it is probably not beyond the capacity of even the mildly educated to understand that the administration has shown little appetite to reregulate Wall Street and has done its part to inflate the fear premium through confrontational policies in the Persian Gulf. Committed both to alternative energy (but not in a rational, comprehensive way) and cheap fossil fuels (but not in ways benefiting American motorists in an election year), President **Obama has accrued** no political capital **from his energy policy from either the left or the right** by the end of his first term.¶ The president long ago lost the legislative capacity for bold action in practically every field, including energy, but because the GOP’s slate of presidential candidates is so extraordinarily weak in 2012, he may not need it to get re-elected. At least, that is the conventional wisdom in Democratic circles. Should President Obama win a second term, Congress is likely to be **even more hostile** than in his first term, as in the Clinton years. And as in the Clinton years, that will probably mean four more years of inaction and increased resort to cant.

#### Winners lose---PC’s not renewable, is zero-sum, and diminishes fast

Ryan 9 Selwyn, Professor Emeritus and former Director, Institute of Social and Economic Research, University of the West Indies, “Obama and political capital,” 1/18 http://www.trinidadexpress.com/index.pl/article\_opinion?id=161426968

Like many, I expect much from Obama, who for the time being, is my political beast of burden with whom every other politician in the world is unfavourably compared. As a political scientist, I however know that given the structure of American and world politics, it would be **difficult for him to deliver half of what he has promised**, let alone all of it. Reality will **force him to make many "u" turns** and detours which may well land him in quick sand. Obama will, however, begin his stint with a **vast accumulation of political capital**, perhaps more than that held by any other modern leader. Seventy-eight per cent of Americans polled believe that his inauguration is one of the most historic the country will witness. Political capital is, however, a lumpy and **fast diminishing asset** in today's world of instant communication, which once misspent, is **rarely ever renewable**. The world is full of political leaders like George Bush and Tony Blair who had visions, promised a lot, and probably meant well, but who **did not know how to husband** the **political capital** with which they were provided as they assumed office. They squandered it as quickly as they emptied the contents of the public vaults. Many will be watching to see how Obama manages his assets and liabilities register. Watching with hope would be the white young lady who waved a placard in Obama's face inscribed with the plaintive words, "I Trust You." Despite the general optimism about Obama's ability to deliver, many groups have already begun to complain about being betrayed. Gays, union leaders, and women have been loud in their complaints about being by-passed or overlooked. Some radical blacks have also complained about being disrespected. Where and when is Joshua going to lead them to the promised land, they ask? When is he going to pull the troops out of Iraq? Civil rights groups also expect Obama to dis-establish Guantanamo as soon as he takes office to signal the formal break with Dick Cheney and Bush. They also want him to discontinue the policy which allows intelligence analysts to spy on American citizens without official authorisation. In fact, Obama startled supporters when he signalled that he might do an about-turn and continue this particular policy. We note that Bush is signalling Obama that keeping America safe from terrorists should be his top priority item and that he, Bush, had no regrets about violating the constitutional rights of Americans if he had to do so to keep them safe. Cheney has also said that he would do it again if he had to. The safety of the republic is after all the highest law. Other groups-sub-prime home owners, workers in the automobile sector, and the poor and unemployed generally all expect Obama to work miracles on their behalf, which of course he cannot do. Given the problems of the economy which has not yet bottomed out, **some promises have to be deferred** beyond the first term. Groups, however, expect that the promise made to them during the campaign must be kept. Part of the problem is that almost every significant social or ethnic group believes that it was instrumental in Obama's victory. White women felt that they took Obama over the line, as did blacks generally, Jews, Hispanics, Asians, rich white men, gays, and young college kids, to mention a few of those whose inputs were readily recognisable. Obama also has a vast constituency in almost every country in the world, all of whom expect him to save the globe and the planet. Clearly, he is the proverbial "Black Knight on a White Horse." One of the "realities" that Obama has to face is that **American politics is not a winner-take-all system**. It is pluralistic vertically and horizontally, and getting **anything done politically**, even when the President and the Congress are controlled by the same party, **requires groups to negotiate, bargain and engage in serious horse trading.** No one takes orders from the President who can only use moral or political suasion and promises of future support for policies or projects. The system was in fact deliberately engineered to prevent overbearing majorities from conspiring to tyrannise minorities. The system is not only institutionally diverse and plural, but socially and geographically so. As James Madison put it in Federalist No 10, one of the foundation documents of republicanism in America, basic institutions check other basic institutions, classes and interests check other classes and interests, and regions do the same. All are grounded in their own power bases which they use to fend off challengers. The coalitions change from issue to issue, and there is no such thing as party discipline which translated, means you do what I the leader say you do. Although Obama is fully aware of the political limitations of the office which he holds, he is fully aware of the vast stock of political capital which he currently has in the bank and he evidently plans to enlarge it by drawing from the stock held by other groups, dead and alive. He is clearly drawing heavily from the caparisoned cloaks of Lincoln and Roosevelt. Obama seems to believe that by playing the all-inclusive, multipartisan, non-ideological card, he can get most of his programmes through the Congress without having to spend capital by using vetoes, threats of veto, or appeals to his 15 million strong constituency in cyberspace (the latent "Obama Party").

#### PC is finite---fights on one issue make pushing others harder

Hayward 12 John is a writer at Human Events. “DON’T BE GLAD THE BUFFETT RULE IS DEAD, BE ANGRY IT EVER EXISTED,” 4/17, http://www.humanevents.com/2012/04/17/dont-be-glad-the-buffett-rule-is-dead-be-angry-it-ever-existed/

Toomey makes the excellent point that Obama’s class-warfare sideshow act is worse than useless, because it’s wasting America’s valuable time, even as the last fiscal sand runs through our hourglass. Politicians speak of “political capital” in selfish terms, as a pile of chips each party hoards on its side of the poker table, but in truth America has only a **finite amount of political capital** in total. When time and energy is wasted on pointless distractions, the capital expended---in the form of the public’s attention, and the debates they hold among themselves---cannot easily be regained. ¶ There is an “opportunity cost” associated with the debates we aren’t having, and the valid ideas we’re not considering, when our time is wasted upon nonsense that is useful only to political re-election campaigns. Health care reform is the paramount example of our time, as countless real, workable market-based reforms were obscured by the flaccid bulk of ObamaCare. The Buffett Rule, like all talk of tax increases in the shadow of outrageous government spending, likewise distracts us from the real issues.