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### 1AC Advantage 1

#### Contention 1: Leadership

#### Offshore drilling key to US Arctic leadership

Cohen and Altman 11 Ariel Cohen, Ph.D. is a Senior Research Fellow for Russian and Eurasian Studies and International Energy Policy at the Heritage Foundation, Anton Altman is a research volunteer at The Heritage Foundation, August 16, 2011, “Russia’s Arctic Claims: Neither LOST nor Forgotten”, http://blog.heritage.org/2011/08/16/russias-arctic-claims-neither-lost-nor-forgotten/

Moscow has an unquestionable head start on the rest of the world, and it is not shy about investing in its ambitions. At least six new icebreakers and Sabetta, a new year-round port on the arctic shores—costing $33 billion—are on the agenda, but Prime Minister Putin has said the Kremlin is “open for a dialogue with our foreign partners and with all our neighbors in the Arctic region, but of course we will defend our own geopolitical interests firmly and consistently.” Or as they said in Soviet times, “What is mine is mine, and what is yours is negotiable.”¶ The Arctic is of vital geopolitical importance not just to Russia, but to the entire world. It has enormous quantities of hydrocarbon energy and other natural resources, and as the Arctic is no longer completely icebound, in summertime it may become an important transportation route vital to U.S. national security.¶ Despite this, at present the U.S. has made virtually no effort to strengthen its position in the frozen final frontier. The chief concern is America’s lack of icebreakers—even Canada and Finland have more than the United States. Icebreakers are vital to exploring the Arctic and enforcing one’s sovereignty there. As of 2010, Russia had 29 icebreakers in total and was building more. The United States had two (including one that is obsolete), with no plans to expand. The Heritage Foundation has exposed this problem extensively:¶ The United States has significant geopolitical and geo-economic interests in the High North, but the lack of policy attention and insufficient funding have placed the U.S. on track to abdicate its national interests in this critical region.¶ The United States must strengthen its position in the Arctic and make its interests clear to friend and foe alike. Washington should reach out to the Arctic Council members to block Russia’s expansion plans at the U.N. Meanwhile, the U.S. should fund and build its icebreaking squadron and deploy it in Alaska.¶ Russia’s Arctic aspirations are a serious geopolitical challenge for U.S. and allied interests. America’s security and economic prosperity in the 21st century will depend on U.S. ability to access polar waters and the Arctic Ocean bed.

#### Arctic drilling is critical to retain global U.S. primacy

Hobson ’12 - Energy and Environmental Correspondent for the National Journal

White House candidates for polar summit, Iceland president tells Alaskans, Margaret Kriz Hobson, August 27, 2012, Warrant Cites Rubenstein – Co-Founder of Carlyle Group & Energy, Politics & Economics Expert, [www.eenews.net](http://www.eenews.net); and, http://www.arcticimperative.com/?page\_id=2078

Grimsson noted that despite the increased international interest in oil and gas development in the American Arctic, the United States has been less involved in Arctic policy issues than any other Arctic nation, particularly much less so than Russia.¶ He also said that when he visited China, Singapore and South Korea, the heads of state buttonholed him to support their request to become permanent observers to the Arctic Council, a high-level intergovernmental forum that addresses issues faced by Arctic governments and indigenous people in the region.¶ Grimsson said China, which has no coastal lands located on the Arctic, recently launched a new heavy-duty icebreaker designed to travel through the polar waters. By contrast, the U.S. Coast Guard has only one older operating research icebreaker, the Healy, and no new ice ships under construction.¶ “There’s something profound in the political system of the United States that prevents Washington from becoming as active as China is now in the Arctic,” Grimsson said. “I’m not talking about Russia. It would take you a long time to catch up with Russia. But you can hopefully in the next few years match China in the interest in the Arctic.”¶ Meanwhile, investor David Rubenstein told the conference that Washington isn’t likely to consider underwriting new ice breakers or prioritizing Alaska issues unless the nation suddenly faces a crisis in the Arctic.¶ The co-founder of the Carlyle Group, Rubenstein compared today’s lack of federal investment in the Arctic infrastructure and Coast Guard activities to the 1950s when the government ignored space exploration until Russia launched the Sputnik, the first earth satellite.¶ In the aftermath, the Kennedy administration inspired the nation by channeling federal funds into the space race and beating Russia to land a man on the moon.¶ “What’s going to have to happen is that somebody from outside the United States, perhaps Russia, will have to take such a compelling lead in the Arctic that our national security and our economic viability is clearly threatened in ways that people in Washington see it,” Rubenstein said.¶ “I think you need to have a boogeyman,” he suggested. “[Russian President Vladimir] Putin might be the best one in some respects. He said that the Arctic is his strategic reserve for the 21st century. And people in Washington need to remember what he said. Because if it’s his strategic reserve, then it’s not our strategic reserve.”¶ Iceland President Grimsson said that as the world increasingly looks to the Arctic for resource extraction and international shipping, America must take a larger role in Arctic policy issues or risk losing its primacy on the world political scene.¶ “Quite seriously,” he said, “I cannot see how the United States of America is going to conduct a comprehensive, responsible foreign policy in the coming decades without being the leader of the Arctic.”

**Hegemony prevents extinction**

**Barnett 11** (Thomas P.M., Former Senior Strategic Researcher and Professor in the Warfare Analysis & Research Department, Center for Naval Warfare Studies, U.S. Naval War College American military geostrategist and Chief Analyst at Wikistrat., worked as the Assistant for Strategic Futures in the Office of Force Transformation in the Department of Defense, “The New Rules: Leadership Fatigue Puts U.S., and Globalization, at Crossroads,” March 7 <http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/8099/the-new-rules-leadership-fatigue-puts-u-s-and-globalization-at-crossroads>)

Events in Libya are a further reminder for Americans that we **stand at a crossroads in our continuing evolution as the world's sole full-service superpower**. Unfortunately, we are increasingly seeking change without cost, and shirking from risk because we are tired of the responsibility. We don't know who we are anymore, and our president is a big part of that problem. Instead of leading us, he explains to us. Barack Obama would have us believe that he is practicing strategic patience. But many experts and ordinary citizens alike have concluded that he is actually beset by strategic incoherence -- in effect, a man overmatched by the job. It is worth first examining the larger picture: We live in a time of arguably **the greatest structural change in the global order yet endured**, with this historical moment's most amazing feature being its relative and absolute **lack of mass violence**. That is something to consider when Americans contemplate military intervention in Libya, because if we do take the step to prevent larger-scale killing by engaging in some killing of our own, we will not be adding to some fantastically imagined global death count stemming from the ongoing "megalomania" and "evil" of American "empire." We'll be engaging in the same sort of system-administering activity that has marked our stunningly successful stewardship of global order since World War II. Let me be more blunt: As the **guardian of globalization**, the U.S. military has been the **greatest force for peace the world has ever known**. Had America been removed from the global dynamics that governed the 20th century, the **mass murder never would have ended**. Indeed, it's entirely conceivable **there would now be no identifiable human civilization left, once nuclear weapons entered the killing equation.**  But the world did not keep sliding down that **path of perpetual war**. Instead, America stepped up and changed everything by **ushering in our now-perpetual great-power peace**. We introduced the **international liberal trade order known as globalization** and played loyal Leviathan over its spread. What resulted was the collapse of empires, **an explosion of democracy**, the **persistent spread of human rights**, the liberation of women, **the doubling of life expectancy**, a roughly **10-fold increase in adjusted global GDP** and a **profound and persistent reduction in** battle deaths from **state-based conflicts.** That is what American "hubris" actually delivered. Please remember that the next time some TV pundit sells you the image of "unbridled" American military power as the cause of global disorder instead of its cure. With self-deprecation bordering on self-loathing, we now imagine a post-American world that is anything but. Just watch who scatters and who steps up as the Facebook revolutions erupt across the Arab world. While we might imagine ourselves the status quo power, we remain the world's most vigorously revisionist force. As for the sheer "evil" that is our military-industrial complex, again, let's examine what the world looked like before that establishment reared its ugly head. The last great period of global structural change was the first half of the 20th century, a period that saw a death toll of about 100 million across two world wars. That comes to an average of 2 million deaths a year in a world of approximately 2 billion souls. Today, with far more comprehensive worldwide reporting, researchers report an average of less than 100,000 battle deaths annually in a world fast approaching 7 billion people. Though admittedly crude, these calculations suggest a 90 percent absolute drop and a 99 percent relative drop in deaths due to war. We are clearly headed for a world order characterized by multipolarity, something the American-birthed system was designed to both encourage and accommodate. But given how things turned out the last time we collectively faced such a fluid structure, we would do well to keep U.S. power, in all of its forms, deeply embedded in the geometry to come. To continue the historical survey, after salvaging Western Europe from its half-century of civil war, the U.S. emerged as the progenitor of a new, far more just form of globalization -- one based on actual free trade rather than colonialism. America then successfully replicated globalization further in East Asia over the second half of the 20th century, setting the stage for the Pacific Century now unfolding.

#### That’s necessary to prevent Arctic warfare

Borgerson 10 SCOTT G. BORGERSON is International Affairs Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations and a former Lieutenant Commander in the U.S. Coast Guard, April 2008, “Arctic Meltdown: The Economic and Security Implications of Global Warming”, http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/20032581.pdf?acceptTC=true

Washington cannot afford to stand idly by. The Arctic region is not currently governed by any comprehensive multilateral norms and regulations because it was never expected to become a navigable water¬way or a site for large-scale commercial development. Decisions made by Arctic powers in the coming years will therefore profoundly shape the future of the region for decades. Without U.S. leadership to help develop diplomatic solutions to competing claims and potential conflicts, the region could erupt in an armed mad dash for its resources.

#### Risk of Arctic conflict high---most recent evidence

Tassinari 12 Fabrizio Tassinari is a non-resident Senior Fellow at the German Marshall Fund and the Head of Foreign Policy and EU Studies at the Danish Institute for International Studies, September 7, 2012, “Avoiding a Scramble for the High North”, http://blog.gmfus.org/2012/09/07/avoiding-a-scramble-for-the-high-north/

The geopolitics of the Arctic are stuck in a paradox: The more regional players restate the importance of international cooperation, the more some pundits and policymakers seem to conclude that the Arctic risks descending into competition and even conflict.¶ The world is awakening to the growing strategic importance of the High North. As the Arctic ice melts due to global warming, it opens up new opportunities, from shorter shipping lanes to newly accessible oil and gas reserves; respectively, about 13 percent and 30 percent of the world’s undiscovered resources are in the Arctic, according to the U.S. Geological Survey. These discoveries are usually followed by declarations of the littoral nations to the effect that any potential disagreements over them will be resolved peacefully. However, beneath expressions of goodwill, the Arctic debate is often characterized by a sense of urgency, and even forms of alarmism.¶ In recent years, instances of growing securitization of the Arctic have abounded. Back in 2008, a paper by Javier Solana, then the EU’s foreign policy’s chief, and the European Commission warned about “potential conflict over resources in Polar regions” as they become exploitable due to melting ice. In 2010, NATO’s supreme allied commander in Europe, Adm. James Stavridis, argued that “for now, the disputes in the North have been dealt with peacefully, but climate change could alter the equilibrium.” Then there are actions that speak louder than prepared speeches — from the famous August 2007 expedition that planted a Russian flag on the North Pole’s seabed to the annual summer military exercises carried out by Canada to assert its sovereignty in the North. Although the Russian stunt was most likely aimed at nationalist domestic audiences, some observers view these exercises as the expressions of competing national interests. As the scholar Scott Borgerson ominously put it: “The Arctic powers are fast approaching diplomatic gridlock, and that could eventually lead to the sort of armed brinkmanship that plagues other territories.”¶ The geopolitical constellation in and around the region provides a ready justification for such an assessment. While no-one really imagines the United States, Canada, Norway, and Denmark fighting over the Arctic, some of their politicians have occasionally framed rhetoric in more peppered terms than one might expect. Russia, the fifth Arctic littoral nation, typically treads a fine line between declarations of cooperation and an innate instinct for great-power competition. Add to that the EU, which is seeking to carve its own role, and Asia’s giants, above all China, for which the opening of the Northeast passage may reduce sailing distance with Europe by some 40 percent, and it is not hard to conjure up the prospect of an Arctic race building up.

#### Goes nuclear

Wallace and Staples 10 Michael Wallace is Professor Emeritus at the University of British Columbia; Steven Staples is President of the Rideau Institute in Ottawa, March 2010, “Ridding the Arctic of Nuclear Weapons A Task Long Overdue”, http://www.arcticsecurity.org/docs/arctic-nuclear-report-web.pdf

The fact is, the Arctic is becoming a zone of increased military competition. Russian President Medvedev has announced the creation of a special military force to defend Arctic claims. Last year Russian General Vladimir Shamanov declared that Russian troops would step up training for Arctic combat, and that Russia’s submarine fleet would increase its “operational radius.” Recently, two Russian attack submarines were spotted off the U.S. east coast for the first time in 15 years. In January 2009, on the eve of Obama’s inauguration, President Bush issued a National Security Presidential Directive on Arctic Regional Policy. It affirmed as a priority the preservation of U.S. military vessel and aircraft mobility and transit throughout the Arctic, including the Northwest Passage, and foresaw greater capabilities to protect U.S. borders in the Arctic. The Bush administration’s disastrous eight years in office, particularly its decision to withdraw from the ABM treaty and deploy missile defence interceptors and a radar station in Eastern Europe, have greatly contributed to the instability we are seeing today, even though the Obama administration has scaled back the planned deployments. The Arctic has figured in this renewed interest in Cold War weapons systems, particularly the upgrading of the Thule Ballistic Missile Early Warning System radar in Northern Greenland for ballistic missile defence. The Canadian government, as well, has put forward new military capabilities to protect Canadian sovereignty claims in the Arctic, including proposed ice-capable ships, a northern military training base and a deep-water port. Earlier this year Denmark released an all-party defence position paper that suggests the country should create a dedicated Arctic military contingent that draws on army, navy and air force assets with shipbased helicopters able to drop troops anywhere. Danish fighter planes would be tasked to patrol Greenlandic airspace. Last year Norway chose to buy 48 Lockheed Martin F-35 fighter jets, partly because of their suitability for Arctic patrols. In March, that country held a major Arctic military practice involving 7,000 soldiers from 13 countries in which a fictional country called Northland seized offshore oil rigs. The manoeuvres prompted a protest from Russia – which objected again in June after Sweden held its largest northern military exercise since the end of the Second World War. About 12,000 troops, 50 aircraft and several warships were involved. Jayantha Dhanapala, President of Pugwash and former UN under-secretary for disarmament affairs, summarized the situation bluntly: “From those in the international peace and security sector, deep concerns are being expressed over the fact that two nuclear weapon states – the United States and the Russian Federation, which together own 95 per cent of the nuclear weapons in the world – converge on the Arctic and have competing claims. These claims, together with those of other allied NATO countries – Canada, Denmark, Iceland, and Norway – could, if unresolved, lead to conflict escalating into the threat or use of nuclear weapons.” Many will no doubt argue that this is excessively alarmist, but no circumstance in which nuclear powers find themselves in military confrontation can be taken lightly. The current geo-political threat level is nebulous and low – for now, according to Rob Huebert of the University of Calgary, “[the] issue is the uncertainty as Arctic states and non-Arctic states begin to recognize the geo-political/economic significance of the Arctic because of climate change.”

#### The Arctic will be the next area of great power conflict---oil production results in investments that prevent escalation

Talmadge 12 (Eric – AP, Huffington Post, “Arctic Climate Change Opening Region To New Military Activity’, 4/16, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/04/16/arctic-climate-change-military-activity\_n\_1427565.html)

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

### 1AC Advantage 2

#### Contention 2: Environment

#### Failure to open US Arctic drives drilling to Russia---destroys the environment

Sullivan 12 – Commissioner of Alaska's Department of Natural Resources & Fmr. St. Atty. General

It's time to develop our Arctic resources, Dan Sullivan, Special to CNN, Fri July 20, 2012

http://www.cnn.com/2012/07/20/opinion/sullivan-arctic-drilling/index.html

(CNN) -- The United States is on the verge of an energy renaissance. We need to recognize and seize the opportunity.¶ This renaissance involves domestic production of natural resources ranging from clean renewables to hydrocarbons.¶ In particular, domestic hydrocarbon production -- both oil and gas -- is increasing dramatically, with some experts predicting that the United States could become the largest hydrocarbon producer in the word -- outstripping Saudi Arabia and Russia -- by 2020.¶ Increased domestic production of hydrocarbons is driven by two trends. First, new technology is unlocking unconventional resources such as shale-derived oil and gas. And second, investors and policy makers are recognizing that the U.S. still has an enormous resource base of conventional oil and gas, particularly in Alaska.¶ Federal agencies estimate that Alaska's North Slope and federal waters off Alaska's northern coast contain approximately 40 billion barrels of technically recoverable oil and more than 200 trillion cubic feet of conventional gas.¶ According to the U.S. Geological Survey, this region contains more oil than any comparable region located in the Arctic, including northern Russia.¶ However, the United States is lagging behind its Arctic neighbors in developing these resources. This is unfortunate, because we have some of the highest environmental standards in the world and we should be setting the bar for Arctic development.¶ Developing our Arctic resources will promote our nation's interests in many ways: securing a politically stable, long-term supply of domestic energy; boosting U.S. economic growth and jobs; reducing the federal trade deficit; and strengthening our global leadership on energy issues. Leading academic researchers and economists in Alaska have estimated that oil production from Alaska's outer continental shelf will bring federal revenues of approximately $167 billion over 50 years, and create 55,000 jobs throughout the country.¶ Developing U.S. resources in the Arctic has the added benefit of enhancing global environmental protection.¶ One of the arguments used by Arctic drilling opponents is that "we aren't ready," but it is obvious that no matter what preparations are made, they will argue that it isn't enough.¶ Shell, for example, has spent billions to prepare for drilling in the Arctic this summer, incorporating the lessons learned from the Deepwater Horizon spill in the Gulf of Mexico, state-of-the-art equipment and extensive scientific research. Recently, the Obama administration has publically expressed its confidence in the company's drilling plans.¶ The U.S. has created some of the highest standards in the world for environmental protection. When we delay or disallow responsible resource development, the end result is not to protect the environment, but to drive hydrocarbon investment and production to countries with much lower environmental standards and enforcement capacity.¶ Last year, it was reported that between 5 million and 20 million tons of oil leak in Russia per year. This is equivalent to a Deepwater Horizon blowout about every two months. Russia had an estimated 18,000 oil pipeline ruptures in 2010 -- the figure for the U.S. that year was 341.¶ If we do not pursue responsible development in the Arctic, countries such as Russia -- perhaps even China, which is interested in securing access to Arctic hydrocarbon resources -- will dominate energy production from the Arctic. Such a scenario does not bode well for the global environment.¶ By embracing the opportunities in the Arctic, the United States will show the world that it can be a strong leader in responsible energy development.

#### Russian drilling triggers Arctic environmental collapse

Heath 12 Julia Heath is a writer for Foreign Policy in Focus, February 15, 2012, “Preventing a Blowout in the Arctic”, http://www.fpif.org/articles/preventing\_a\_blowout\_in\_the\_arctic

The Russian Record¶ Russia has had a terrible environmental record and a history of oil spills. The area around Usinsk, just south of the Arctic Circle, is home to what the Huffington Post calls “the world’s worst ecological oil catastrophe,” where leaks in a decommissioned oil well wreaked havoc in 2011.¶ It wasn't the first such incident. In 1994, the town suffered the third largest oil spill in history. A pipeline in Usinsk had been leaking for eight months when the dike containing the leakage collapsed, spreading 102,000 tons of oil across the tundra, into the Kolva and Rechora rivers, and eventually into the Barents Sea. The leak, eight times larger than the Exxon Valdez spill, was the result of old, corroded, poorly maintained, and over-pumped pipelines. The company responsible, Komineft, had five major accidents in the area between 1986 and 1994. In 1994, Russia was losing an estimated 20 percent of the oil it extracted, but refused to revamp inefficient and environmentally detrimental Soviet pipelines for fear that the break in production would lessen the Russian hold on former Soviet republics and interfere with loan repayment. More recently, Greenpeace, the World Wildlife Fund, and the Institute of the Environment and Genetics of Microorganisms have estimated that Russia continues to spill 5 million tons of oil every year, or as the Huffington Post put it, “one Deepwater Horizon-scale leak about every two months.” ¶ Vladimir Chuprov, head of the Arctic campaign for Greenpeace Russia, said that Greenpeace International is absolutely against all offshore drilling in the Arctic. Even the U.S. Minerals Management Service estimates a one in five chance of a major spill occurring over the life of just one lease block on Alaska’s outer continental shelf (OCS). Greenpeace International wants to accord the Arctic a world park status similar to Antarctica. At the very least, they demand that the international community provide strict standards to eradicate the risk of oil spills and require mandatory guarantees that any spills will be mitigated at a cost no less than what was spent on the Deepwater Horizon spill.¶ Like Greenpeace International, the NRDC also advocates mandatory international standards on how to develop the Arctic. According to Lisa Speer of the NRDC, the United States doesn’t “have enough information to be able to determine whether or not oil and gas activities can be conducted safely (in the Arctic). And we don’t have the ability to contain and clean up oil in ice, and therefore we think we should wait for drilling in the Arctic until we do have the ability to deal with that.”¶ At a forum on Arctic drilling in January 2012, Andrew Hartsig of the Ocean Conservancy recommended that the United States wait until it has a better hold on the technological requirements of Arctic drilling. However, the U.S. Bureau of Ocean Energy (BOEM) representative Shoshana Lew replied that the federal five-year leasing plan for blocks on Alaska’s OCS would not be deferred until exploration was complete.¶ Putin abolished the Russian Environmental Agency in order to more easily access Arctic extraction that would otherwise require environmental assessments. This is particularly disconcerting because the Arctic region, according to the UN Environment Programme, “is characterized by some of the largest continuous intact ecosystems on the planet,” and therefore environmentally detrimental projects in the region should require careful consideration and planning.¶ The United States has been slow to invest in developing its own Arctic energy reserves for fear of ecological devastation. However, it has not done enough to slow development in nearby Russia. Russian offshore drilling is a crucial issue for Americans because polar currents could make an Arctic oil spill into a transnational event. A Russian Arctic oil spill would rapidly become a cultural, ecological, and economic disaster for the United States as well.

#### Spills over to global biodiversity

Gill 9 (Michael Gill, Chair of the Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Program, “ABSTRACT: BIODIVERSITY AND ECOSYSTEM SERVICES”, March, UNESCO, http://www.unesco.org/csi/LINKS/monaco-abstracts/Gill\_abstract\_MonacoUNESCOarctic.pdf)

Arctic ecosystems and the biodiversity they support are experiencing growing pressure from climate change and resource development while established research and monitoring programs remain largely uncoordinated, lacking the ability to effectively monitor, understand and report on biodiversity trends at the circumpolar scale. The maintenance of healthy Arctic ecosystems is a global imperative as the Arctic plays a critical role in the Earth’s physical, chemical and biological balance. A coordinated and comprehensive effort for monitoring Arctic ecosystems is needed to facilitate effective and timely conservation and adaptation actions. The Arctic’s size and complexity represents a significant challenge towards detecting and attributing important biodiversity trends. This demands a scaled, pan-Arctic, ecosystem-based approach that not only identifies trends in biodiversity, but also identifies underlying causes. It is critical that this information be made available to generate effective strategies for adapting to changes now taking place in the Arctic - a process that ultimately depends on rigorous, integrated, and efficient monitoring programmes that have the power to detect change within a ‘management’ time frame. Biodiversity is a popular way of describing the diversity of life on earth: it includes all life forms and the ecosystems of which they are a part. World Food Day — the anniversary of FAO's founding on 16 October 1945 — celebrates, in particular, that part of biodiversity that nurtures people and contributes to long-term food security for all. Biodiversity forms the foundation for sustainable development. It is the basis for the environmental health of our planet and the source of economic and ecological security for future generations. In the developing world, biodiversity provides the assurance of food, countless raw materials such as fibre for clothing, materials for shelter, fertilizer, fuel and medicines, as well as a source of work energy in the form of animal traction. The rural poor depend upon biological resources for an estimated 90 percent of their needs. In the industrialized world access to diverse biological resources is necessary to support a vast array of industrial products. In the continuing drive to develop efficient and sustainable agriculture for many different conditions, these resources provide raw material for plant and animal breeding as well as the new biotechnologies. In addition, biodiversity maintains the ecological balance necessary for planetary and human survival.

#### Extinction

Science Daily 11 ("Biodiversity Key to Earth's Life-Support Functions in a Changing World," Cites Albert-Ludwigs-Universitat Freiburg, August 11, [www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2011/08/110811084513.htm](http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2011/08/110811084513.htm))

The biological diversity of organisms on Earth is not just something we enjoy when taking a walk through a blossoming meadow in spring; it is also the basis for countless products and services provided by nature, including food, building materials, and medicines as well as the self-purifying qualities of water and protection against erosion. These so-called ecosystem services are what makes Earth inhabitable for humans. They are based on ecological processes, such as photosynthesis, the production of biomass, or nutrient cycles. Since biodiversity is on the decline, both on a global and a local scale, researchers are asking the question as to what role the diversity of organisms plays in maintaining these ecological processes and thus in providing the ecosystem's vital products and services. In an international research group led by Prof. Dr. Michel Loreau from Canada, ecologists from ten different universities and research institutes, including Prof. Dr. Michael Scherer-Lorenzen from the University of Freiburg, compiled findings from numerous biodiversity experiments and reanalyzed them. These experiments simulated the loss of plant species and attempted to determine the consequences for the functioning of ecosystems, most of them coming to the conclusion that a higher level of biodiversity is accompanied by an increase in ecosystem processes. However, the findings were always only valid for a certain combination of environmental conditions present at the locations at which the experiments were conducted and for a limited range of ecosystem processes. In a study published in the current issue of the journal Nature, the research group investigated the extent to which the positive effects of diversity still apply under changing environmental conditions and when a multitude of processes are taken into account. They found that 84 percent of the 147 plant species included in the experiments promoted ecological processes in at least one case. The more years, locations, ecosystem processes, and scenarios of global change -- such as global warming or land use intensity -- the experiments took into account, the more plant species were necessary to guarantee the functioning of the ecosystems. Moreover, other species were always necessary to keep the ecosystem processes running under the different combinations of influencing factors. These findings indicate that much more biodiversity is necessary to keep ecosystems functioning in a world that is changing ever faster. The protection of diversity is thus a crucial factor in maintaining Earth's life-support functions.

### 1AC Advantage 3

#### CONTENTION 3: ECONOMY

#### The economy’s on the brink---2013’s key

Tverberg 1-8, ’12 - Editor @ the Oil Drum

Why 2013 Will End in a Severe Recession, Gail Tverberg, Tue, 08 January 2013

http://oilprice.com/Finance/the-Economy/Why-2013-will-End-in-a-Severe-Recession.html

We have been hearing a lot about escaping the fiscal cliff, but our problem isn’t solved. The fixes to date have been partial and temporary. There are many painful decisions ahead. Based on what I can see, the most likely outcome is that the US economy will enter a severe recession by the end of 2013.¶ My expectation is that credit markets are likely see increased defaults, as workers find their wages squeezed by higher Social Security taxes, and as government programs are cut back. Credit is likely to decrease in availability and become higher-priced. It is quite possible that credit problems will adversely affect the international trade system. Stock markets will tend to perform poorly. The Federal Reserve will try to intervene in credit markets, but if the US government is one of the defaulters (at least temporarily), it may not be able to completely fix the situation.¶ Less credit will tend to hold down prices of goods and services. Fewer people will be working, though, so even at reduced prices, many people will find discretionary items such as larger homes, new cars, and restaurant meals to be unaffordable. Thus, once the recession is in force, car sales are likely to drop, and prices of resale homes will again decline.¶ Oil prices may temporarily drop. This price decrease, together with a drop in credit availability, is likely to lead to a reduction in drilling in high-priced locations, such as US oil shale (tight oil) plays.¶ Other energy sources are also likely to be affected. Demand for electricity is likely to drop. Renewable energy investment is likely to decline because of less electricity demand and less credit availability. By 2014 and 2015, less government funding may also play a role.¶ This recession is likely be very long term. In fact, based on my view of the reasons for the recession, it may never be possible to exit from it completely.¶ I base the foregoing views on several observations:¶ 1. High oil prices are a major cause of the United States Federal Government’s current financial problems. The financial difficulties occur because high oil prices tend to lead to unemployment, and high unemployment tends to lead to higher government expenditures and lower government revenue. This is especially true for oil importers.¶ 2. The United States and world’s oil problems have not been solved. While there are new sources of oil, they tend to be sources of expensive oil, so they don’t solve the problem of high-priced oil. Furthermore, if our real economic problem is high-priced oil, and we have no way of permanently reducing oil prices, high oil prices can be expected to cause a long-term drag on economic growth.

**US is key to the global economy**

**Caploe 9** David, CEO of the Singapore-incorporated American Centre for Applied Liberal Arts and Humanities in Asia., “Focus still on America to lead global recovery”, April 7, The Strait Times, lexis

IN THE aftermath of the G-20 summit, most observers seem to have missed perhaps the most crucial statement of the entire event, made by United States President Barack Obama at his pre-conference meeting with British Prime Minister Gordon Brown: 'The world has become accustomed to the US being a voracious consumer market, the engine that drives a lot of economic growth worldwide,' he said. 'If there is going to be renewed growth, it just can't be the US as the engine.' While superficially sensible, this view is deeply problematic. To begin with, it ignores the fact that the global economy has in fact been 'America-centred' for more than 60 years. Countries - China, Japan, Canada, Brazil, Korea, Mexico and so on - either sell to the US or they sell to countries that sell to the US. This system has generally been advantageous for all concerned. America gained certain historically unprecedented benefits, but the system also enabled participating countries - first in Western Europe and Japan, and later, many in the Third World - to achieve undreamt-of prosperity. At the same time, this deep inter-connection between the US and the rest of the world also explains how the collapse of a relatively small sector of the US economy - 'sub-prime' housing, logarithmically exponentialised by Wall Street's ingenious chicanery - has cascaded into the worst global economic crisis since the Great Depression. To put it simply, Mr Obama doesn't seem to understand that **there is no other engine for the world economy** - and hasn't been for the last six decades. If the US does not drive global economic growth, growth is not going to happen. Thus, US policies to deal with the current crisis are critical not just domestically, but also to the entire world. Consequently, it is a matter of global concern that the Obama administration seems to be following Japan's 'model' from the 1990s: allowing major banks to avoid declaring massive losses openly and transparently, and so perpetuating 'zombie' banks - technically alive but in reality dead. As analysts like Nobel laureates Joseph Stiglitz and Paul Krugman have pointed out, the administration's unwillingness to confront US banks is the main reason why they are continuing their increasingly inexplicable credit freeze, thus ravaging the American and global economies. Team Obama seems reluctant to acknowledge the extent to which its policies at home are failing not just there but around the world as well. Which raises the question: If the US can't or won't or doesn't want to be the global economic engine, which country will? The obvious answer is China. But that is unrealistic for three reasons. First, China's economic health is more tied to America's than practically any other country in the world. Indeed, the reason China has so many dollars to invest everywhere - whether in US Treasury bonds or in Africa - is precisely that it has structured its own economy to complement America's. The only way China can serve as the engine of the global economy is if the US starts pulling it first. Second, the US-centred system began at a time when its domestic demand far outstripped that of the rest of the world. The fundamental source of its economic power is its ability to act as the global consumer of last resort. China, however, is a poor country, with low per capita income, even though it will soon pass Japan as the world's second largest economy. There are real possibilities for growth in China's domestic demand. But given its structure as an export-oriented economy, it is doubtful if even a successful Chinese stimulus plan can pull the rest of the world along unless and until China can start selling again to the US on a massive scale. Finally, the key 'system' issue for China - or for the European Union - in thinking about becoming the engine of the world economy - is monetary: What are the implications of having your domestic currency become the global reserve currency? This is an extremely complex issue that the US has struggled with, not always successfully, from 1959 to the present. Without going into detail, it can safely be said that though having the US dollar as the world's medium of exchange has given the US some tremendous advantages, it has also created huge problems, both for America and the global economic system. The Chinese leadership is certainly familiar with this history. It will try to avoid the yuan becoming an international medium of exchange until it feels much more confident in its ability to handle the manifold currency problems that the US has grappled with for decades. Given all this, the US will remain the engine of global economic recovery for the foreseeable future, even though other countries must certainly help. This crisis began in the US - and it is going to have to be solved there too.

#### Global economic crisis causes nuclear war

Cesare Merlini 11, nonresident senior fellow at the Center on the United States and Europe and chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Italian Institute for International Affairs, May 2011, “A Post-Secular World?”, Survival, Vol. 53, No. 2

Two neatly opposed scenarios for the future of the world order illustrate the range of possibilities, albeit at the risk of oversimplification. The first scenario entails the premature crumbling of the post-Westphalian system. One or more of the acute tensions apparent today evolves into an open and traditional conflict between states, perhaps even involving the use of nuclear weapons. The crisis might be triggered by a collapse of the global economic and financial system, the vulnerability of which we have just experienced, and the prospect of a second Great Depression, with consequences for peace and democracy similar to those of the first. Whatever the trigger, the unlimited exercise of national sovereignty, exclusive self-interest and rejection of outside interference would self-interest and rejection of outside interference would likely be amplified, emptying, perhaps entirely, the half-full glass of multilateralism, including the UN and the European Union. Many of the more likely conflicts, such as between Israel and Iran or India and Pakistan, have potential religious dimensions. Short of war, tensions such as those related to immigration might become unbearable. Familiar issues of creed and identity could be exacerbated. One way or another, the secular rational approach would be sidestepped by a return to theocratic absolutes, competing or converging with secular absolutes such as unbridled nationalism.

**We have strong statistical support---their defense doesn’t account for global crises**

**Royal 10** Jedediah, Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction at the U.S. Department of Defense, “Economic Integration, Economic Signaling and the Problem of Economic Crises,” in Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal and Political Perspectives, ed. Goldsmith and Brauer, p. 213-215

Less intuitive is how **periods of economic decline** may **increase the likelihood of external conflict**. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defence behaviour of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances Modelski and Thompson's (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous shocks such as economic crises could usher in a redistribution of relative power (see also Gilpin, 1981) that leads to **uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation** (Fearon, 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflict as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power (Werner, 1999). Separately, Pollins (1996) **also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers**, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remain unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland's (1996, 2000) theory of trade expectations suggests that ‘future expectation of trade’ is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behaviour of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However**, if the expectations of future trade decline, particularly for difficult to replace items such as energy resources, the likelihood for conflict increases**, as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states.4 Third, **others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict**, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write, **The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing.** Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favour. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self-reinforce each other. (Blomberg & Hess, 2002, p. 89)Economic decline has also been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism (Blomberg, Hess, & Weerapana, 2004), which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. ‘Diversionary theory’ suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have increased incentives to fabricate external military conflicts to create a ‘rally around the flag’ effect. Wang (1996), DeRouen (1995), and Blomberg, Hess, and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997), Miller (1999), and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states, due to the fact that democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States, and thus weak Presidential popularity, are statistically linked to an increase in the use of force. In summary, **recent economic scholarship positively correlates economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflict at systemic, dyadic and national levels**.5 This implied connection between integration, crises and armed conflict has not featured prominently in the economic-security debate and deserves more attention. This observation is not contradictory to other perspectives that link economic interdependence with a decrease in the likelihood of external conflict, such as those mentioned in the first paragraph of this chapter. Those studies tend to focus on dyadic interdependence instead of global interdependence and do not specifically consider the occurrence of and conditions created by economic crises. As such, the view presented here should be considered ancillary to those views.

#### Plan generates massive economic benefits---job growth, deficit reduction and ripple effect in the short-term

Mills 12 Mark, member of the advisory council of the McCormick School of Engineering and Applied Science at Northwestern University and serves on the board of directors of the Marshall Institute, 7/9, “Could the United States Become the World’s Energy-Export Powerhouse?”, <http://www.manhattan-institute.org/pdf/press_release_pgi_01.pdf>

Unleashing 20 billion barrels of cumulative oil from Alaska’s ANWR and some currently off-limits regions of the outer continental shelf would bring over $1 trillion of net benefits to the U.S. economy. 36¶ In general, both history and recent analyses show that for every billion barrels of oil produced (or oil-equivalent in natural gas, and similar range for coal), there are about $75 billion in broad economic benefits. 37¶ A number of recent studies have explored the implications of the new hydrocarbon trajectory, should it continue unimpeded:¶ o Citi’s analysis concludes that the oil and gas extraction sector could add as many as 3.6 million net new jobs by 2020 (for North America, both direct and indirect) and shrink the deficit by 60 percent. 38¶ o Wood Mackenzie 39 finds in its scenario report for the American Petroleum Institute a cumulative $800 billion in increased revenues to governments (federal, state, local) and another 1.5 million U.S. jobs, direct and indirect, over the coming two decades.¶ o IHS Global Insight, 40 in its analysis for America’s Natural Gas Alliance, estimates that the shale gas industry alone will add more than 1 million jobs across the U.S. economy over the coming two decades and provide over $900 billion in cumulative additional federal, state, and local government tax revenues ($465 federal, $460 state and local).¶ While there are differences in assumptions and boundaries among these and similar analyses, the order-of magnitude benefits are similar and similarly impressive: millions of jobs and hundreds of billions in revenues to government coffers.¶ None of the above accounts for the economic contributions thus far from coal, nor does it countenance expanding coal production, North America’s third great hydrocarbon resource. Some 600,000 jobs are associated with the coal industry, a fuel that already contributes some $60 billion annually to the U.S. economy, not the least of which is the increasingly vital role of low-cost electricity in an information centric economy. 41¶ The U.S. uses about three BBOE of coal per year, while the world consumes about 20 BBOE of coal annually. Expanding coal exports by an amount comparable with the increase in the oil and gas sectors would add several hundred thousand more jobs and several hundred billion more dollars in cumulative tax receipts. 42¶ While expanding hydrocarbon production will require significant investment, it will be supplied by the private sector, generating benefits to the public sector, to private citizens, and to businesses. These kinds of benefits, which accrue without cost to taxpayers, come at a particularly important time, considering the current state of persistent unemployment and underemployment, the losses in net worth for many citizens, and the budget deficits in most states and the federal government.¶ Economic benefits from expanding hydrocarbon production will be felt widely given the structural and geographic diversity of hydrocarbon resources and the associated industries. In contrast to other parts of the world, benefits here won’t flow to a handful of oligarchs but will involve thousands of businesses and ripple broadly throughout the economy. ¶ Expanding hydrocarbon production may be the single most important opportunity for near-term economic growth in North America and a beneficial resetting of energy geopolitics.

#### Job growth’s key to an economic recovery

Patton 12 Mike, Forbes Contributor, "The Key to Economic Growth: Reduce the Unemployment Rate!", 8/27, www.forbes.com/sites/mikepatton/2012/08/27/the-key-to-economic-growth-reduce-the-unemployment-rate/

We’ve all heard how the U.S. economy has been slow to recover. In the final analysis, there is one issue which resides at the epicenter of economic growth. That is our unemployment dilemma. How important is the unemployment rate to our economic recovery? Let me put it in these terms. Employment is to economic growth what oxygen is to the human existence. You can’t have one without the other. In this article, I will present evidence to bolster the point that until the unemployment rate is brought down to a more reasonable level, our economic recovery will falter.¶ Just The Facts¶ The chart below illustrates how unemployment and GDP move in opposition to each other. Using data from January 1948 until the present, one can easily see the inverse relationship between the two. Upon more careful scrutiny, you will notice that most of the time GDP falls as unemployment rises and vice versa. When you calculate the correlation of these two data sets, you find it is -0.38%. As a refresher, correlation measures how closely two (or more) series of data move relative to each other. The scale is from negative one (-1) to positive one (+1). If the correlation was positive one, then it would be said that the two items moved exactly together. If negative one, then they move in the exact opposite direction. In layman terms, correlation measures how each “zigs” and/or “zags” in relation to each other. With unemployment and GDP having a correlation of -0.38%, there is a strong negative relationship. Therefore, we must get the American worker back into the labor force.¶ More Evidence¶ If you need additional evidence, consider this. When you include all calendar quarters from January 1948 through the end of the second quarter 2012, the average unemployment rate during quarters when GDP was negative (i.e.; the economy contracted), was 7.4%. The average rate during the entire period was 5.8%. When you exclude all quarters with negative GDP, the average unemployment rate was 5.6%. Therefore, it is easy to conclude that until we can get unemployment down to say less than 6.0%, GDP will likely remain sluggish.

#### Deficit reduction’s key to prevent economic collapse

Mauldin 11 John, President of Business Marketing Group and President of Millennium Wave Advisors, LLC (MWA) which is an investment advisory firm registered with multiple states,

Business Insider, "We Need To Cut The Deficit Right Now -- And Doing It Is Going To Clobber The Economy", May 7, articles.businessinsider.com/2011-05-07/news/29964201\_1\_endgame-spain-enemies-list/4

Then there is the crisis scenario. Let’s assume we do not deal with the deficit in any meaningful way. Eventually the debt will rise to epic, Greek proportions. The bond vigilantes arise from the dead and start to push up interest rates. Interest as a percentage of government spending rises, crowding out other government expenses or increasing the debt still further.¶ Then we have a crisis. We are FORCED by the bond market to get the deficits under control, but now we are doing so in a crisis. Health care will have to be slashed by far more than it would in a more controlled scenario. Tax increases will be brutal. You think Social Security is untouchable? Not in this crisis world. Means testing and spending freezes will be the rule of the day. Military cuts will seem draconian. Our allies who depend on us for a defense shield will not be happy. Education? On the chopping block. The economy will not be Muddle Through, but Depression 2.0. Unemployment will go north of 15%.¶ What’s my basis for this? History. This movie has played over and over again in various countries in modern history. While we may be the world’s superpower, we are not immune from the laws of economic reality.¶ In such a scenario, I expect QE 3-4-5-6. Could the Fed literally monetize the debt and then “poof” it? When our backa are against the wall, don’t assume that what has been seen as normal will be the reigning paradigm.¶ Let me jump out on a real limb. I was having dinner last Monday with Christian Menegatti, the #2 economist at friend Nouriel Roubini’s economic analysis shop. We were comparing notes (imagine that), and he said their opinion is that the US has until 2015 before the bond market really calls the deficit hand. Knowing that Nouriel is seen as the ultimate bear, it makes me nervous to put out my own even more bearish analysis.¶ I think the crucial point will be reached in late 2013. If the bond market sees a serious move to control the deficit, I think they let us “skate.” Then we Muddle Through. But if not, I think we begin to see some real push-back on rates then.¶ Why so early? Because bond investors are going to be watching the slow-motion train wreck that is happening in Europe and especially Japan. It is one thing for Greece to default (which they will in one form or another, with lots of rumors flying this morning), yet another for Japan to do so. Japan is big and makes a difference. Japan could start to go as early as the middle of 2013. As I have said, Japan is a bug in search of a windshield. Whenever this happens, 2013 or a year or so later, it is going to spook the bond market. The normal indulgence that a superpower and reserve-currency country would be accorded will become much more strained. It will seemingly happen overnight. Think Lehman Brothers on steroids.¶ I think the chances we will deal with this potential crisis are about 75%. Not doing so is such a horrific outcome that I think politicians will do the right thing. See, I am an optimist. (What was it Winston Churchill said? “You can always depend on the Americans to do the right thing, after they have exhausted all the other possibilities.”)¶ And let me note that I have had some rather at-length, high-level (but very off-the-record) discussions with politicians on the right in recent weeks. More and more of them are really getting it. But as one said to me, “John, I can’t run on that platform.” And that is the reason that I give it a 25% chance that we’ll wait until a crisis hits us. If the “good guys” (my view, not yours, gentle reader – I know many of you are of the more liberal persuasion) need a real push to act correctly, we are not in good shape.¶ I totally recognize it will not be easy to fix it. It will probably mean tax increases, which will not be good for the economy. And spending cuts that will be painful. I get all the consequences. I have written about them. But the goal is to get rid of the cancer of the deficit. It could truly destroy our economic body. Sometimes, if you have cancer, you take very ugly chemicals into your body, which have very serious side effects. The prospect does not make me happy at all, but we have made bad choices as a country for decades, and now we have to pay the price.

#### Independently, removing oil restrictions ensures long-term growth and revitalizes the shipbuilding and chemical industries

Mason 11 Joseph, Senior Fellow, The Wharton School, Louisiana State University Endowed Chair of Banking and nationally-renowned economist, “House Natural Resources Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources Hearing; Fisheries, Wildlife, Oceans and Insular Affairs Legislative Hearing on H.R. 306, H.R. 588, S. 266 and H.R. 285”, 4/6, Lexis

Apart from national energy concerns, however, economic considerations also favor increased development of OCS energy resources. Specifically, the boost provided to local onshore economies by offshore production would be particularly welcome in the present economic climate. Similar to fiscal alternatives presently under consideration, OCS development would provide a long-run economic stimulus to the U.S. economy because the incremental output, employment, and wages provided by OCS development would be spread over many years. Unlike those policies, however, this stimulus would not require government expenditures to support that long-term growth. A. The Present State of Offshore U.S. Oil and Gas Production Despite its importance, U.S. oil and natural gas production in offshore areas is currently limited to only a few regions. At the present time, oil and gas is only actively produced off the coast of six U.S. states: Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas, California, and Alaska. The Energy Information Administration (EIA) reports that Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas are the only coastal states that provide access to all or almost all of their offshore energy resources. Only two additional states--Alaska and California--are producing any offshore energy supplies. All California OCS Planning Areas and most Alaska OCS Planning Areas, however, were not open to any new facilities until the recent end of the Congressional and Presidential moratoria. The remaining 16 coastal states are not open to new production and are not presently extracting any offshore energy resources. Even without those remaining sixteen states, plus California and Alaska, the OCS is already the most important source of U.S. energy supplies. According to the MMS, "the Federal OCS is a major supplier of oil and natural gas for the domestic market, contributing more energy (oil and natural gas) for U.S. consumption than any single U.S. state or country in the world." That is, OCS production presently meets more U.S. energy demand than any other single source, including Saudi Arabia. B. Offshore Oil Production Stimulates Onshore Economies Offshore oil and gas production has a significant effect on local onshore economies as well as the national economy. There are broadly three "phases" of development that contribute to state economic growth: (1) the initial exploration and development of offshore facilities; (2) the extraction of oil and gas reserves; and (3) refining crude oil into finished petroleum products. Industries supporting those phases are most evident in the sections of the Gulf of Mexico that are currently open to offshore drilling. For example, the U.S. shipbuilding industry - based largely in the Gulf region - benefits significantly from initial offshore oil exploration efforts. Exploration and development also requires specialized exploration and drilling vessels, floating drilling rigs, and miles and miles of steel pipe, as well as highly educated and specialized labor to staff the efforts. The onshore support does not end with production. A recent report prepared for the U.S. Department of Energy indicates that the Louisiana economy is "highly dependent on a wide variety of industries that depend on offshore oil and gas production" and that offshore production supports onshore production in the chemicals, platform fabrication, drilling services, transportation, and gas processing. Fleets of helicopters and U.S.-built vessels also supply offshore facilities with a wide range of industrial and consumer goods, from industrial spare parts to groceries. As explained in Section IV.G, however, the distance between offshore facilities and onshore communities can affect the relative intensity of the local economic effects. The economic effects in the refining phase are even more diffuse than the effects for the two preceding phases. Although significant capacity is located in California, Illinois, New Jersey, Louisiana, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Washington, additional U.S. refining capacity is spread widely around the country. As a result, refinery jobs, wages, and tax revenues are even more likely to "spill over" into other areas of the country, including non-coastal states like Illinois, as those are home to many refining and chemical industries that ride the economic coattails of oil exploration and extraction. II. OFFSHORE OIL AND GAS RESERVE ESTIMATES AND THE SOURCES OF THEIR ECONOMIC BENEFITS As described in my 2009 white paper, "The Economic Contribution of Increased Offshore Oil Exploration and Production to Regional and National Economies," available at www.americanenergyalliance.org/images/aea\_offshore\_updated\_final.pdf, significant oil and gas reserves lie under the U.S. Outer Continental Shelf (OCS). According to the Energy Information Administration (EIA), the OCS (including Alaskan OCS Planning Areas) contains approximately 86 billion barrels of recoverable oil and approximately 420 trillion cubic feet of recoverable natural gas. As noted by the White House, however, the OCS estimates are conservative. Of the total OCS reserves, a significant portion was unavailable to exploration until recently. Specifically, Presidential and Congressional mandates banned production from OCS Planning Areas covering approximately 18 billion barrels of recoverable oil and 77.61 trillion cubic feet of recoverable natural gas. These bans covered approximately 31 percent of the total recoverable OCS oil reserves and 25 percent of the total recoverable OCS natural gas reserves. Economic benefits of utilizing OCS reserves accrue from three primary sources: (1) exploration/platform investments; (2) production; and (3) refining. Sources (1) and (3) produce initial effects--that is, new industry expenditures--today; in contrast, source (2) produce economic effects only once production begins. The analysis therefore considers "initial" economic effects as those that flow from exploration or investments in new refining capacity and long-term economic effects as those that flow from production and ongoing refining. A. Exploration and Offshore Facility Development In contrast to other industries, the high fixed investment costs associated with offshore oil and gas production produce large initial investments that reverberate throughout the economy. Once oil or gas reserves are located, billions of additional dollars must be spent before the well produces even $1 of revenue. For example, oil exploration costs can amount to between $200,000 and $759,000 per day per site. Additional production in the U.S. will also require a costly expansion refining capacity as well. Taken together, the fixed expenditures that precede actual offshore oil and gas production can amount to billions of dollars. For example, Chevron's "Tahiti" project in the Gulf of Mexico is representative of the large investments that firms must make before production is achieved. In 2002, Chevron explored the Tahiti lease--which lies 100 miles off the U.S. coast at a depth of 4,000 feet--and found "an estimated 400 million to 500 million barrels of recoverable resources." Chevron estimates that it will take seven years to build the necessary infrastructure required to begin production at Tahiti. The firm estimates that its total development costs will amount to "$4.7 billion--before realizing $1 of return on our investment." As a typical U.S. offshore project, the Tahiti project provides a wealth of information regarding the up-front investment costs, length of investment, and lifespan of future OCS fields. As noted above, the Tahiti field is estimated to hold between 400 million and 500 million barrels of oil and oil equivalents (primarily natural gas) and is expected to require an initial fixed investment of $4.7 billion. Using the mid-point reserve estimate of 450 million barrels of oil equivalent, up-front development costs amount to approximately $10.44 per barrel of oil reserves or $1.86 per 1,000 cubic feet of natural gas reserves. These costs will be spread over 7 years, resulting in average up-front development expenditures equal to $1.49 per barrel of oil and $0.27 per 1,000 cubic feet of natural gas. Chevron also estimates that the Tahiti project will produce for "up to 30 years". Although investment and production times vary widely, the analysis that follows uses the Tahiti project numbers - an average initial investment period of seven years followed by an average production period of 30 years - as indicative of the "typical" offshore project. I will thus assume an average initial investment period of seven years followed by an average production period of 30 years. The speed of OCS development also factors into the analysis. Because most areas of the U.S. OCS have been closed to new exploration and production for almost forty years, it is unclear how quickly firms would move to develop new offshore fields. Given its large potential reserves, however, the OCS is sure to attract significant investment. Without the benefit of government data, a rough estimate suggests that annual total investment in OCS fields would be $9.09 billion per year. Those annual expenditures are expected to last, on average, the full seven years of the development phase. Additional investment in states that already support significant production - Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas - are limited. Some of the greatest benefits accrue to areas that are home to enormous - but unavailable - total reserves: California and Florida. B. Production The likely value of state recoverable oil and gas reserves are estimated using the likely lifetime revenue that could be generated by the project. In that case, average wholesale energy prices provide the information necessary to translate reserves into revenues. Taking the simple average of the EIA's latest inflation-adjusted energy price forecasts through 2030 as provided by its Annual Energy Outlook 2009, the average inflation-adjusted price of oil will be $110.64 per barrel and the average inflation-adjusted price of natural gas will be $6.83 per thousand cubic feet. At these prices, the estimated OCS reserves are worth about $13 trillion. The value of each state's available reserves are calculated as the sum of (1) its share of available OCS Planning Area oil reserves times $110.64 per barrel and (2) its share of available OCS Planning Area natural gas reserves times $6.83 per thousand cubic feet. The same method applies to the valuation of total state OCS reserves. By those estimation methods, states such as California, facing a budget crisis in the current recession, have an estimated $1.65 trillion in resources available in nearby OCS planning areas. Florida, while not facing as dire a fiscal crisis, has about $0.55 trillion in resources available in nearby OCS planning areas. Hence, a permanent relaxation of all federal OCS production moratoria would unlock more than $3.4 trillion in new production among all the coastal states. C. Investments in Incremental Refining Capacity Since U.S. refineries are presently operating near maximum capacity increased offshore oil and gas production would also spur investment in new refineries. The U.S. refining industry is presently operating at 97.9 percent of capacity and can no longer depend on excess foreign refining to meet production shortfalls arising from seasonality or repairs. In response, many large refiners are already considering refinery expansions: ConocoPhillips announced that it planned to spend $6.5 billion to $7 billion on capacity expansion at its U.S. facilities; Chevron has also considered a major refinery expansion; and while Shell is completing a $7 billion expansion and its Port Arthur, Texas refinery they are considering further expansion elsewhere. Additional refinery investments are likely to occur in the few U.S. states that already host significant U.S. refineries. This result is largely due to environmental restrictions that severely limit the placement of new refining capacity. Current capacity is primarily concentrated in California, Louisiana, and Texas. The U.S. presently has an operating refining capacity of approximately 6.287 billion barrels of crude oil per year. Conservative estimates of OCS production would add approximately 3.773 billion barrels per year, or about sixty percent of current U.S. operating refinery capacity. Because some OCS refining production would most likely substitute for foreign production, however, the analysis conservatively assumes that only one-quarter of this new OCS production necessitates additional U.S. refinery capacity. That is, I estimate that U.S. refinery demand would increase by 943.25 million barrels per year, or 15 percent of current installed capacity. Even this modest capacity increase would require substantial new investments. In response to existing capacity constraints, Shell is already increasing the capacity of its Port Arthur, Texas refinery. This expansion will take approximately two and one-half years to complete and cost $7 billion. The facility will add 325,000 barrels per day (or 118.6 million barrels per year) in new capacity, at a cost of approximately $59.02 per barrel of new annual capacity. As noted above, since tough environmental regulations effectively limit new refinery capacity to a few states, refinery investments are likely to be limited to only a few states with large existing capacity. These states can be reasonably assumed to be the same states the already have large installed refinery capacity. Hence, incremental refinery capacity will be added predominantly in states already home to large refining capacity--those with a present capacity of more than 200 million barrels per year. There are seven such states: California, Illinois, Louisiana, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Washington. Expected increases in offshore oil production will induce approximately $22 billion in refining capacity investments each year for two and one half years. California, Texas, and Louisiana will receive the bulk of this investment, but investments of more than $1 billion annually can be expected in Illinois, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Washington. III. INCREASED INVESTMENTS IN OFFSHORE OIL AND GAS PRODUCTION WILL CAUSE SUBSTANTIAL INCREASES IN WAGES, EMPLOYMENT, AND TAXES, AND PROFOUND EFFECTS ON COMMUNITIES THROUGHOUT THE NATION Onshore state and local economies benefit from the development of OCS reserves by providing goods and services to offshore oil and gas extraction sites. Onshore communities provide all manner of goods and services required by offshore oil and gas extraction. A variety of industries are involved in this effort: shipbuilders provide exploration vessels, permanent and movable platforms, and resupply vessels; steelworkers fashion the drilling machinery and specialized pipes required for offshore resource extraction; accountants and bankers provide financial services; and other onshore employees provide groceries, transportation, refining, and other duties. These onshore jobs, in turn, support other jobs and other industries (such as retail and hospitality establishments). The statistical approach known as an "input-output" analysis measures the economic effects associated with a particular project or economic development plan. This approach, which was pioneered by Nobel Prize winner Wassily Leontif, has been refined by the U.S. Department of Commerce. The most recent version of the Commerce Department's analysis is known as the Regional Input-Output Modelling System, or "RIMS II." The RIMS II model provides a variety of multipliers that measure how an economic development project--such as offshore drilling--would "trickle down" through the economy providing new jobs, wages, and government revenues. This analysis can be broken down into two parts: (1) a "direct" analysis measuring the benefits that arise from industries that directly supply offshore oil and gas exploration and (2) the "final" analysis that measures the direct and indirect benefits associated with offshore exploration. The RIMS II model is the standard method governmental authorities use to evaluate the benefits associated with an economic development project. According to the Commerce Department, the RIMS II model has been used to evaluate the economic effects of many projects, including: opening or closing military bases, tourist expenditures, new energy facilities, opening or closing manufacturing plants, shopping malls, sports stadiums, and new airport or port facilities. A. Opening OCS Planning Areas would Unleash More than $11 trillion in Economic Activity The broadest measure of the incremental effect of increased OCS oil and natural gas extraction is the effect on total economic output. Until OCS production begins, onshore communities will realize only the benefits associated with offshore investment. These benefits take two forms: (1) the development of the offshore facilities themselves and (2) the expansion of onshore refining capacity. These two effects, taken together, provide a rough approximation of the additional output that would be created by allowing greater access to offshore reserves. Of course, the investment expenditures and resulting output estimated above is only made to facilitate oil and gas extraction. Once extraction begins, additional economic activity continues for the lifetime of the oil and natural gas reserves. Using the total U.S. multipliers (2.2860 for refining and 2.3938 for extraction), the total increase in U.S. output from initial investment is estimated to be a total of about $0.5 trillion, or approximately $73 billion per year for the first seven years the OCS is open. For comparative purposes, a $73 billion stimulus amounts to approximately 0.5 percent of total U.S. output (GDP) per year. Increased OCS oil and gas extraction would yield approximately $5.75 trillion in new coastal state output over the lifetime of the fields. Approximating the total increase in output associated with increasing offshore resource production throughout the U.S. (including states in the interior), yields approximately $2.45 trillion in additional output. The total increase in output in the United States is estimated to total approximately $8.2 trillion or about $273 billion per year, which amounts to just over two percent of GDP. Because the OCS areas are currently unavailable, the entire amount--$8.2 trillion--is completely new output created by a simple change in policy allowing resource extraction in additional OCS Planning Areas. B. Opening OCS Planning Areas could Create Millions of New Jobs An economic expansion tied to increased OCS resource production would also create millions of new jobs both in the extraction industry and in other sectors that serve as suppliers or their employees. The annual increase in coastal state employment from initial investments in previously unavailable OCS planning areas and additional refining capacity is estimated to be 185,320 full-time jobs per year. Again, this number does not consider the spill-over effects of investment in productive capacity and refining to other U.S. states. The total increase in U.S. employment from the investment phase is approximately 271,570 full-time jobs per year. Applying the BEA multipliers to the estimated production value results in approximately 870,000 coastal state jobs in addition to the jobs created during the initial investment phase. Again, the total increase in U.S. employment in all states (including those in the interior) resulting from increased OCS production is 340,000 greater, for a total of approximately 1,190,000 jobs be sustained for the entire OCS production period. Increased investment and production in previously unavailable OCS oil and gas extraction and the ancillary industries that support the offshore industry would produce thousands of new jobs in stable and valuable industries. Among the 271,572 jobs created in the investment phase and sustained during the first seven years of the investment cycle. The majority of new positions (162,541 jobs, or 60 percent) would be created in high-skills fields, such as health care, real estate, professional services, manufacturing, administration, finance, education, the arts, information, and management. Although the largest total increase in employment in the production phase would occur (quite naturally) in the mining industry, significant numbers of jobs would be created in other industries. Again, many of these new jobs would be created in high-skills fields, representing approximately 49 percent of all new jobs and approximately 61 percent of all new non-mining jobs. C. Opening OCS Planning Areas can Release Trillions of Dollars of Wages to Workers Hit by Recession Those jobs pay wages. OCS development is estimated to yield approximately $10.7 billion in new wages in coastal states each year. OCS production would yield approximately $1.406 trillion in additional wage income to workers in coastal states over the lifetime of the fields (or $46 billion per year over 30 years). Across the U.S., the investment phase would generate approximately $15.7 billion in additional annual wages per year for the first seven years and $70 billion per year for the next thirty years, or approximately $2.1 trillion in additional wage income. BLS data suggest that all four broad industry classifications related to oil and gas extraction pay higher wages and similar jobs in other industries. Jobs in: (1) Oil and Gas Extraction, (2) Pipeline Transportation of Crude Oil, (3) Petroleum and Coal Products Manufacturing, and (4) Support Activities for Mining, typically pay higher wages than the average American job. Taking this broader measure, the average job created by increased offshore oil and gas production pays approximately 28 percent more than the average U.S. job. D. Opening OCS Planning Areas can Contribute Trillions of Dollars in Taxes and other Public Revenues to Local, State, and Federal Governments Greater output, more jobs, and higher wages translate into higher tax collections and increases in other sources of public revenues. The MMS Report to Congress suggests that public revenues derived from OCS extraction are significant--the U.S. federal government has collected more than $156 billion in lease and levy payments for OCS oil and natural gas production. Note that this amount counts only lease and royalty payments and thus does not include any sales and income taxes paid by firms or workers supported by OCS production. Conservative estimates suggest that seven years of initial annual exploration and refining investments would produce approximately $4.8 billion annually in coastal state and local tax revenue and $11.1 billion in U.S. federal tax income. Over thirty years of production, I estimate that the extraction phase of OCS development would yield approximately $561 billion ($18.7 billion per year) in coastal state and local tax revenue and approximately $1.64 trillion ($54.7 billion per year) in new U.S. federal tax income.

#### Strong chemical industry prevents extinction

Baum 99 – Baum, Founder of Chemical and Engineering News Washington, 12-6-99 (Rudy, “MILLENNIUM SPECIAL REPORT,” C&EN Washington, Volume 77, Number 49, http://pubs.acs.org/cen/hotarticles/cenear/991206/7749spintro2.html)

Computers and the Internet are clearly one of the driving forces shaping all aspects of society at the turn of the millennium. But despite the stock market's insistence that "tech stocks" equal "computer stocks," we here at C&EN believe that chemistry in all its permutations remains a vital component of high technology. Which brings me to this "Millennium Special Report: Chemistry In The Service Of Humanity." The pace of change in today's world is truly incomprehensible. Science is advancing on all fronts, particularly chemistry and biology working together as they never have before to understand life in general and human beings in particular at a breathtaking pace. Technology ranging from computers and the Internet to medical devices to genetic engineering to nanotechnology is transforming our world and our existence in it. It is, in fact, a fool's mission to predict where science and technology will take us in the coming decade, let alone the coming century. We can say with finality only this: We don't know. We do know, however, that we face enormous challenges, we 6 billion humans who now inhabit Earth. In its 1998 revision of world population estimates and projections, the United Nations anticipates a world population in 2050 of 7.3 billion to 10.7 billion, with a "medium-fertility projection," considered the most likely, indicating a world population of 8.9 billion people in 2050. According to the UN, fertility now stands at 2.7 births per woman, down from 5 births per woman in the early 1950s. And fertility rates are declining in all regions of the world. That's good news. But people are living a lot longer. That is certainly good news for the individuals who are living longer, but it also poses challenges for health care and social services the world over. The 1998 UN report estimates for the first time the number of octogenarians, nonagenarians, and centenarians living today and projected for 2050. The numbers are startling. In 1998, 66 million people were aged 80 or older, about one of every 100 persons. That number is expected to increase sixfold by 2050 to reach 370 million people, or one in every 24 persons. By 2050, more than 2.2 million people will be 100 years old or older! Here is the fundamental challenge we face: The world's growing and aging population must be fed and clothed and housed and transported in ways that do not perpetuate the environmental devastation wrought by the first waves of industrialization of the 19th and 20th centuries. As we increase our output of goods and services, as we increase our consumption of energy, as we meet the imperative of raising the standard of living for the poorest among us, we must learn to carry out our economic activities sustainably. There are optimists out there, C&EN readers among them, who believe that the history of civilization is a long string of technological triumphs of humans over the limits of nature. In this view, the idea of a "carrying capacity" for Earth—a limit to the number of humans Earth's resources can support—is a fiction because technological advances will continuously obviate previously perceived limits. This view has historical merit. Dire predictions made in the 1960s about the exhaustion of resources ranging from petroleum to chromium to fresh water by the end of the 1980s or 1990s have proven utterly wrong. While I do not count myself as one of the technological pessimists who see technology as a mixed blessing at best and an unmitigated evil at worst, I do not count myself among the technological optimists either. There are environmental challenges of transcendent complexity that I fear may overcome us and our Earth before technological progress can come to our rescue. Global climate change, the accelerating destruction of terrestrial and oceanic habitats, the catastrophic loss of species across the plant and animal kingdoms—these are problems that are not obviously amenable to straightforward technological solutions. But I know this, too: Science and technology have brought us to where we are, and only science and technology, coupled with innovative social and economic thinking, can take us to where we need to be in the coming millennium. Chemists, chemistry, and the chemical industry—what we at C&EN call the chemical enterprise—will play central roles in addressing these challenges. The first section of this Special Report is a series called "Millennial Musings" in which a wide variety of representatives from the chemical enterprise share their thoughts about the future of our science and industry. The five essays that follow explore the contributions the chemical enterprise is making right now to ensure that we will successfully meet the challenges of the 21st century. The essays do not attempt to predict the future. Taken as a whole, they do not pretend to be a comprehensive examination of the efforts of our science and our industry to tackle the challenges I've outlined above. Rather, they paint, in broad brush strokes, a portrait of scientists, engineers, and business managers struggling to make a vital contribution to humanity's future. The first essay, by Senior Editor Marc S. Reisch, is a case study of the chemical industry's ongoing transformation to sustainable production. Although it is not well known to the general public, the chemical industry is at the forefront of corporate efforts to reduce waste from production streams to zero. Industry giants DuPont and Dow Chemical are taking major strides worldwide to manufacture chemicals while minimizing the environmental "footprint" of their facilities. This is an ethic that starts at the top of corporate structure. Indeed, Reisch quotes Dow President and Chief Executive Officer William S. Stavropolous: "We must integrate elements that historically have been seen as at odds with one another: the triple bottom line of sustainability—economic and social and environmental needs." DuPont Chairman and CEO Charles (Chad) O. Holliday envisions a future in which "biological processes use renewable resources as feedstocks, use solar energy to drive growth, absorb carbon dioxide from the atmosphere, use low-temperature and low-pressure processes, and produce waste that is less toxic." But sustainability is more than just a philosophy at these two chemical companies. Reisch describes ongoing Dow and DuPont initiatives that are making sustainability a reality at Dow facilities in Michigan and Germany and at DuPont's massive plant site near Richmond, Va. Another manifestation of the chemical industry's evolution is its embrace of life sciences. Genetic engineering is a revolutionary technology. In the 1970s, research advances fundamentally shifted our perception of DNA. While it had always been clear that deoxyribonucleic acid was a chemical, it was not a chemical that could be manipulated like other chemicals—clipped precisely, altered, stitched back together again into a functioning molecule. Recombinant DNA techniques began the transformation of DNA into just such a chemical, and the reverberations of that change are likely to be felt well into the next century. Genetic engineering has entered the fabric of modern science and technology. It is one of the basic tools chemists and biologists use to understand life at the molecular level. It provides new avenues to pharmaceuticals and new approaches to treat disease. It expands enormously agronomists' ability to introduce traits into crops, a capability seized on by numerous chemical companies. There is no doubt that this powerful new tool will play a major role in feeding the world's population in the coming century, but its adoption has hit some bumps in the road. In the second essay, Editor-at-Large Michael Heylin examines how the promise of agricultural biotechnology has gotten tangled up in real public fear of genetic manipulation and corporate control over food. The third essay, by Senior Editor Mairin B. Brennan, looks at chemists embarking on what is perhaps the greatest intellectual quest in the history of science—humans' attempt to understand the detailed chemistry of the human brain, and with it, human consciousness. While this quest is, at one level, basic research at its most pure, it also has enormous practical significance. Brennan focuses on one such practical aspect: the effort to understand neurodegenerative diseases like Alzheimer's disease and Parkinson's disease that predominantly plague older humans and are likely to become increasingly difficult public health problems among an aging population. Science and technology are always two-edged swords. They bestow the power to create and the power to destroy. In addition to its enormous potential for health and agriculture, genetic engineering conceivably could be used to create horrific biological warfare agents. In the fourth essay of this Millennium Special Report, Senior Correspondent Lois R. Ember examines the challenge of developing methods to counter the threat of such biological weapons. "Science and technology will eventually produce sensors able to detect the presence or release of biological agents, or devices that aid in forecasting, remediating, and ameliorating bioattacks," Ember writes. Finally, Contributing Editor Wil Lepkowski discusses the most mundane, the most marvelous, and the most essential molecule on Earth, H2O. Providing clean water to Earth's population is already difficult—and tragically, not always accomplished. Lepkowski looks in depth at the situation in Bangladesh—where a well-meaning UN program to deliver clean water from wells has poisoned millions with arsenic. Chemists are working to develop better ways to detect arsenic in drinking water at meaningful concentrations and ways to remove it that will work in a poor, developing country. And he explores the evolving water management philosophy, and the science that underpins it, that will be needed to provide adequate water for all its vital uses. In the past two centuries, our science has transformed the world. Chemistry is a wondrous tool that has allowed us to understand the structure of matter and gives us the ability to manipulate that structure to suit our own purposes. It allows us to dissect the molecules of life to see what makes them, and us, tick. It is providing a glimpse into workings of what may be the most complex structure in the universe, the human brain, and with it hints about what constitutes consciousness. In the coming decades, we will use chemistry to delve ever deeper into these mysteries and provide for humanity's basic and not-so-basic needs.

#### Commercial shipbuilding’s key to naval power

NLUS 12 Navy League of the United States, “America’s Maritime Industry The foundation of American seapower”, 2012, <http://www.navyleague.org/files/americas-maritime-industry.pdf>, Date Verification – http://gsship.org/industry-links/

Defense Industrial Base: Shipbuilding The American Maritime Industry also contributes to our national defense by sustaining the shipbuilding and repair sector of our national defense industrial base upon which our standing as a seapower is based. History has proven that without a strong maritime infrastructure—shipyards, suppliers, and seafarers—no country can hope to build and support a Navy of sufficient size and capability to protect its interests on a global basis. Both our commercial and naval fleets rely on U.S. shipyards and their numerous industrial vendors for building and repairs. The U.S. commercial shipbuilding and repair industry also impacts our national economy by adding billions of dollars to U.S. economic output annually. In 2004, there were 89 shipyards in the major shipbuilding and repair base of the United States, defined by the Maritime Administration as including those shipyards capable of building, repairing, or providing topside repairs for ships 122 meters (400 feet) in length and over. This includes six large shipyards that build large ships for the U.S. Navy. Based on U.S. Coast Guard vessel registration data for 2008, in that year U.S. shipyards delivered 13 large deep-draft vessels including naval ships, merchant ships, and drilling rigs; 58 offshore service vessels; 142 tugs and towboats, 51 passenger vessels greater than 50 feet in length; 9 commercial fishing vessels; 240 other self- propelled vessels; 23 mega-yachts; 10 oceangoing barges; and 224 tank barges under 5,000 GT. 11 Since the mid 1990’s, the industry has been experiencing a period of modernization and renewal that is largely market-driven, backed by long-term customer commitments. Over the six-year period from 2000-05, a total of $2.336 billion was invested in the industry, while in 2006, capital investments in the U.S. shipbuilding and repair industry amounted to $270 million.12 The state of the industrial base that services this nation’s Sea Services is of great concern to the U.S. Navy. Even a modest increase in oceangoing commercial shipbuilding would give a substantial boost to our shipyards and marine vendors. Shipyard facilities at the larger shipyards in the United States are capable of constructing merchant ships as well as warships, but often cannot match the output of shipyards in Europe and Asia. On the other hand, U.S. yards construct and equip the best warships, aircraft carriers and submarines in the world. They are unmatched in capability, but must maintain that lead. 13

#### Naval power solves nuclear war

Conway et al 7 James – General, US Marine Corps, Commandant of the Marine Corps, Gary Roughead – Admiral, U.S. navy, Chief of Naval Operations, Thad Allen – Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Commandant of the Coast Guard, A Cooperative Strategy for 21st Century Seapower, p. http://www.navy.mil/maritime/MaritimeStrategy.pdf

No other disruption is as potentially disastrous to global stability as war among major powers. Maintenance and extension of this Nation’s comparative seapower advantage is a key component of deterring major power war. While war with another great power strikes many as improbable, the near-certainty of its ruinous effects demands that it be actively deterred using all elements of national power. The expeditionary character of maritime forces—our lethality, global reach, speed, endurance, ability to overcome barriers to access, and operational agility—provide the joint commander with a range of deterrent options. We will pursue an approach to deterrence that includes a credible and scalable ability to retaliate against aggressors conventionally, unconventionally, and with nuclear forces. Win our Nation’s wars. In times of war, our ability to impose local sea control, overcome challenges to access, force entry, and project and sustain power ashore, makes our maritime forces an indispensable element of the joint or combined force. This expeditionary advantage must be maintained because it provides joint and combined force commanders with freedom of maneuver. Reinforced by a robust sealift capability that can concentrate and sustain forces, sea control and power projection enable extended campaigns ashore.

#### Now is key---industry collapse causes South China Sea conflict

Crospey 12 Dr. Seth – Senior Fellow at Hudson Institute, Former Assistant to the Secretary of Defense and Deputy Undersecretary of the Navy, ““The U.S. Navy Shipbuilding Plan: Assumptions and Associated Risks to National Security”, Statement before the Committee on Armed Services Subcommittee on Oversight & Investigations U.S. House of Representatives, 4/18, http://www.hudson.org/files/publications/SethCropsey--USNavyShipbuildingPlan--Testimony041812.pdf

If the Navy’s assumption is mistaken that current political leadership will agree to large future increases in shipbuilding we will be headed toward a kind of naval holiday. The equally optimistic expectation that average ship costs can be maintained at $2 billion dollars per vessel prolongs the holiday. This will not be a pleasant holiday. China’s economy has its problems but it continues to perform. Janes Defence Forecasts says that China will double its defense budget between now and 2015.iii Russia plans a $160 billion dollar naval expansion in the Pacific which is to include 36 new submarines and 40 surface ships.iv If a couple postpones needed repairs on their home for a decade and then decides to fix all that has broken they will be very lucky to finish the job in a year. They will also be fortunate because other more prudent owners will have sustained the home repair industry. Our shipbuilding industry does not have the benefit of other purchasers who can sustain it if Navy budgets prove unequal to the task. For the industrial base that supports U.S. shipbuilding a budget-induced naval holiday would be a disaster that could take decades—if ever—from which to recover. Knowledge of shipbuilding remains part of American manufacturing. But accelerating cost, an ageing workforce, reduced orders for warships, and an uncertain future risk the nation’s ability to turn out sufficient numbers of vessels at affordable prices and profitably enough to keep shipbuilding companies alive. The destabilization of the American shipbuilding industrial base is one reason that the cost of warships is outpacing the rate of inflation. The Navy’s reduced procurement of ships over the past twenty years has caused the industry to contract, lay off workers, and in general to become less reliable. This has driven up the cost of labor and the cost of construction materials. The fewer ships the Navy buys, the less lucrative the industry is for skilled workers. As the cost of labor rises shipbuilders are increasingly pressed to attract and train qualified personnel. The negative trends reinforce each other. As younger workers are dissuaded from seeking employment or remaining in the industry by the prospects of sporadic employment those who remain—the existing workers—age. The cycle is self-defeating. Paying older workers increases overhead costs and makes it increasingly expensive to invest in the training and education of a younger workforce. The destabilization of the industrial base also causes costs to rise since many of the materials and products that go into building Navy ships are not useful for other purposes. Since the Navy is buying far fewer ships now than it did in the 1980s, many shipyards rely on a single source for necessary materials. With a virtual monopoly on these products, the suppliers have in large part the ability to name their price. The inefficient manner in which the shipyards acquire these materials drives up labor and overhead costs. The solution lies in stabilizing the American shipbuilding industry. This means that the Navy must either increase its orders of ships and/or improve its business practices, for example disciplining the changes it requires of shipbuilders once orders have been placed and vessels are under construction. Buying and stockpiling spare parts for ships that are already in service and whose need for regular maintenance and repair is well known would also help provide stability for the American shipbuilding industry. In a study conducted on the subject in 2006, the RAND Corporation concluded that the rising costs of building ships is the result of a combination of unsteady U.S. Government procurement rates and a “monopsony relationship” between the government and the shipbuilders. In a monopsony a single purchaser is faced with a host of sellers. Because there is so little American shipbuilding outside of what the Navy purchases, U.S. firms are at the commercial mercy of the 9 percent of the Navy budget devoted to buying ships. A 2005 Government Accountability Office report attributed cost increases in shipbuilding to instability in the entire industry, the difficulty in recruiting and training qualified personnel, high rates of skilled personnel turnover and the shipbuilders’ dependence on a rapidly shrinking supplier base. Finally there are the consequences if U.S. seapower continues to decrease and proves unable to meet even the reduced goals it has set for itself. History is a good guide. Nations in the middle like to side with the winner. During our Civil War British political leadership considered recognizing the Confederacy but was eventually dissuaded by Union military success. In World War II Sweden declared neutrality but grew increasingly amenable to Allied requests as Germany’s military position worsened. Romania initially sided with Germany in the same war but changed sides following U.S. attacks on their oil fields and a coup that deposed the pro-German dictator, Antonescu. Bulgarians followed a similar path from siding with the Nazis to switching their allegiance to the Allies in 1944. Saudi Prince Bandar, acknowledging China’s increasing international prominence and power visited Beijing last year and met with President Hu. American weakness at sea, especially in the Indo-Pacific will change the current military, diplomatic, and commercial character of the region. Whether the U.S. fleet shrinks because of too little funding or because unreformed procurement practices have raised the price of ships or because ships have been called home to save on operational expense, the result is the same. While we were once present in strength, we would be no more. A nation burdened with massive debt whose ability to shape world events has been limited in tandem with its capacity to invest in research and technology will have more and more trouble finding markets. China’s potential hegemony would not only force its neighbors’ to reconsider whether the U.S. is a reliable ally. It would also become an increasingly powerful magnet for trade in the region—at the expense of U.S. commerce. Unlike the U.S. whose seapower has protected global sea lanes that other states have used to their benefit China has a different set of values. It views with suspicion a liberal trading system notwithstanding the benefits received from it. China’s friends include Iran and North Korea. Beijing is a poor candidate to support the international order that has been the keel of U.S. foreign and security policy for a century. Waning U.S. seapower is an invitation that China will regard as a complement to its rising military and navy in particular. It foreshadows a coercive resolution of territorial disputes in the South China Sea, the likelihood of an increased regional arms race, and the troubling international perception that the U.S. is—or has—abandoned its role as a great power. American seapower is the strategic keel of our foreign and security policy. Reducing it would be an exercise of history-making shortsightedness. Restoring it would be an act of statesmanship from which Americans and all who cherish political liberty would benefit for the remainder of this century. Thank you.

#### That’s the most likely scenario for US-China war

Glaser 12 Bonnie S., Senior Fellow – Center for Strategic and International Studies, “Armed Clash in the South China Sea,” CFR, April, http://www.cfr.org/east-asia/armed-clash-south-china-sea/p27883

The risk of conflict in the South China Sea is significant. China, Taiwan, Vietnam, Malaysia, Brunei, and the Philippines have competing territorial and jurisdictional claims, particularly over rights to exploit the region's possibly extensive reserves of oil and gas. Freedom of navigation in the region is also a contentious issue, especially between the United States and China over the right of U.S. military vessels to operate in China's two-hundred-mile exclusive economic zone (EEZ). These tensions are shaping—and being shaped by—rising apprehensions about the growth of China's military power and its regional intentions. China has embarked on a substantial modernization of its maritime paramilitary forces as well as naval capabilities to enforce its sovereignty and jurisdiction claims by force if necessary. At the same time, it is developing capabilities that would put U.S. forces in the region at risk in a conflict, thus potentially denying access to the U.S. Navy in the western Pacific. Given the growing importance of the U.S.-China relationship, and the Asia-Pacific region more generally, to the global economy, the United States has a major interest in preventing any one of the various disputes in the South China Sea from escalating militarily. The Contingencies Of the many conceivable contingencies involving an armed clash in the South China Sea, three especially threaten U.S. interests and could potentially prompt the United States to use force. The most likely and dangerous contingency is a clash stemming from U.S. military operations within China's EEZ that provokes an armed Chinese response. The United States holds that nothing in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) or state practice negates the right of military forces of all nations to conduct military activities in EEZs without coastal state notice or consent. China insists that reconnaissance activities undertaken without prior notification and without permission of the coastal state violate Chinese domestic law and international law. China routinely intercepts U.S. reconnaissance flights conducted in its EEZ and periodically does so in aggressive ways that increase the risk of an accident similar to the April 2001 collision of a U.S. EP-3 reconnaissance plane and a Chinese F-8 fighter jet near Hainan Island. A comparable maritime incident could be triggered by Chinese vessels harassing a U.S. Navy surveillance ship operating in its EEZ, such as occurred in the 2009 incidents involving the USNS Impeccable and the USNS Victorious. The large growth of Chinese submarines has also increased the danger of an incident, such as when a Chinese submarine collided with a U.S. destroyer's towed sonar array in June 2009. Since neither U.S. reconnaissance aircraft nor ocean surveillance vessels are armed, the United States might respond to dangerous behavior by Chinese planes or ships by dispatching armed escorts. A miscalculation or misunderstanding could then result in a deadly exchange of fire, leading to further military escalation and precipitating a major political crisis. Rising U.S.-China mistrust and intensifying bilateral strategic competition would likely make managing such a crisis more difficult

#### Extinction

Lieven 12 Anatol, Professor in the War Studies Department – King’s College (London), Senior Fellow – New America Foundation (Washington), “Avoiding US-China War,” New York Times, 6-12, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/06/13/opinion/avoiding-a-us-china-war.html

Relations between the United States and China are on a course that may one day lead to war. This month, Defense Secretary Leon Panetta announced that by 2020, 60 percent of the U.S. Navy will be deployed in the Pacific. Last November, in Australia, President Obama announced the establishment of a U.S. military base in that country, and threw down an ideological gauntlet to China with his statement that the United States will “continue to speak candidly to Beijing about the importance of upholding international norms and respecting the universal human rights of the Chinese people.” The dangers inherent in present developments in American, Chinese and regional policies are set out in “The China Choice: Why America Should Share Power,” an important forthcoming book by the Australian international affairs expert Hugh White. As he writes, “Washington and Beijing are already sliding toward rivalry by default.” To escape this, White makes a strong argument for a “concert of powers” in Asia, as the best — and perhaps only — way that this looming confrontation can be avoided. The economic basis of such a U.S.-China agreement is indeed already in place. The danger of conflict does not stem from a Chinese desire for global leadership. Outside East Asia, Beijing is sticking to a very cautious policy, centered on commercial advantage without military components, in part because Chinese leaders realize that it would take decades and colossal naval expenditure to allow them to mount a global challenge to the United States, and that even then they would almost certainly fail. In East Asia, things are very different. For most of its history, China has dominated the region. When it becomes the largest economy on earth, it will certainly seek to do so. While China cannot build up naval forces to challenge the United States in distant oceans, it would be very surprising if in future it will not be able to generate missile and air forces sufficient to deny the U.S. Navy access to the seas around China. Moreover, China is engaged in territorial disputes with other states in the region over island groups — disputes in which Chinese popular nationalist sentiments have become heavily engaged. With communism dead, the Chinese administration has relied very heavily — and successfully — on nationalism as an ideological support for its rule. The problem is that if clashes erupt over these islands, Beijing may find itself in a position where it cannot compromise without severe damage to its domestic legitimacy — very much the position of the European great powers in 1914. In these disputes, Chinese nationalism collides with other nationalisms — particularly that of Vietnam, which embodies strong historical resentments. The hostility to China of Vietnam and most of the other regional states is at once America’s greatest asset and greatest danger. It means that most of China’s neighbors want the United States to remain militarily present in the region. As White argues, even if the United States were to withdraw, it is highly unlikely that these countries would submit meekly to Chinese hegemony. But if the United States were to commit itself to a military alliance with these countries against China, Washington would risk embroiling America in their territorial disputes. In the event of a military clash between Vietnam and China, Washington would be faced with the choice of either holding aloof and seeing its credibility as an ally destroyed, or fighting China. Neither the United States nor China would “win” the resulting war outright, but they would certainly inflict catastrophic damage on each other and on the world economy. If the conflict escalated into a nuclear exchange, modern civilization would be wrecked. Even a prolonged period of military and strategic rivalry with an economically mighty China will gravely weaken America’s global position. Indeed, U.S. overstretch is already apparent — for example in Washington’s neglect of the crumbling states of Central America.

### 1AC Solvency

#### CONTENTION IV: SOLVENCY

#### Obama is expanding access now but the current plan is too restrictive

Reuters 12 June 28, 2012, “U.S. unveils final drilling plan, limits Arctic sales”, http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/06/28/us-usa-drilling-offshore-idUSBRE85R1MJ20120628?feedType=RSS&feedName=everything&virtualBrandChannel=11563

WASHINGTON (Reuters) – U.S. oil companies will be allowed to drill in more areas of the Gulf of Mexico but won only limited access to the Arctic under the final version of the Obama Administration’s five year drilling plan that was slammed by industry and some environmentalists.¶ The 2012-2017 plan calls for three potential lease sales in areas offshore Alaska but the auctions would not be held until the final years of the plan because of environmental concerns about operating in the Arctic.¶ “Put simply, this program opens the vast majority of known offshore oil and gas resources for development over the next five years and includes a cautious but forward-looking leasing strategy for the Alaska Arctic,” said Secretary Ken Salazar.¶ The plan was called “too restrictive” by the American Petroleum Institute and criticized by Republican lawmakers who are sure to blast the drilling blueprint on the campaign trail.¶ “Today, the Obama Administration has announced a bleak future for American energy production by keeping 85 percent of America’s offshore areas under lock and key and refusing to open any new areas to drilling,” said Doc Hastings, Republican chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee.

#### Arctic drilling’s inevitable---the US needs to take the lead

O’Keefe 12 William O'Keefe is CEO at the George C. Marshall Institute, a think tank that promotes better use of science in public policy, July 23, 2012, “Decision Isn't America's Alone To Make”, http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/07/is-arctic-oil-drilling-ready-f.php

The decision on whether Arctic oil drilling is ready for prime time is not the federal government’s to make. The United States does not have a monopoly on exploration and production in the Arctic Ocean.¶ Denmark, Canada, Norway, Russia, and the United States all have economic sovereignty in Arctic waters. The Arctic Ocean’s large resource potential, about 22 percent of the world’s undiscovered conventional oil and natural gas resources based on the US Geological Survey (USGS), ensures that it will be explored. Since the USGS believes that gas is the predominant resource there the rate of exploration is likely to be slow and deliberate because of the abundance of on-shore gas production and its current affordable price. But, in the end, the US can either be a leader or laggard in realizing the economic benefits of exploration.¶ The oil and gas industry has been drilling in hostile environments for decades and in the North Slope of Alaska since the late 1970s. Exploration there as well as in the North Sea and “Iceberg Alley” off the coast of Nova Scotia has provided the experience, knowledge, and technology for drilling in the Arctic Ocean.¶ Companies like Shell, Chevron, and ExxonMobil, just to name a few, are engineering technology companies. They have the talent, expertise, and the commitment to operating integrity and excellence to meet the challenges of the Arctic Ocean. Of course, much of the attention being given to the Arctic Ocean is a result of the government continuing to prohibit exploration in Alaska’s coastal plain, which might hold more oil and gas than Prudhoe Bay where over 11 billion barrels have been produced safely.¶ As we have seen over the past few years, domestic oil and gas development brings about important economic benefits. While the overall economy has been struggling to create jobs, the oil and gas industry has been creating them, 150,000 last year according to the energy consulting firm CERA. Those jobs and the investments that make them possible produce federal and state tax benefits. And, as has been said over and over, a barrel of oil produced here is a barrel that is not imported from unstable regions of the world.¶ It should be remembered that the oil industry has an excellent record in offshore exploration and production. Thousands of offshore wells, including deep-water ones, have been safely drilled around the world. From 1969 to 2010 when the Deepwater Horizon accident occurred, there were no major accidents. That is an impressive record. Environmental opposition to any energy development in Alaska, the Deep Horizon accident, and the general hostility of the Obama Administration to oil and gas development are factors that ensure that exploration will be done carefully and with an abundance of caution. Shell has no doubt demonstrated more than reasonable prudence in its engineering and operating plans to reduce risks as much as practical.¶ We do not live in a risk free world and no one or company can guarantee otherwise. Our advances in technology and innovation are the result of risk taking and our standard of living is better because of it. The point made at the beginning is worth repeating. Arctic Ocean oil resources will be developed. The only open question is by whom?

#### US leadership’s key---failure to drill in federal Alaskan waters causes other countries to fill in

Sullivan 12 Dan Sullivan, a former state attorney general, is the commissioner of Alaska's Department of Natural Resources, July 20, 2012, “It's time to develop our Arctic resources”, http://www.cnn.com/2012/07/20/opinion/sullivan-arctic-drilling/index.html

The United States is on the verge of an energy renaissance. We need to recognize and seize the opportunity.¶ This renaissance involves domestic production of natural resources ranging from clean renewables to hydrocarbons.¶ In particular, domestic hydrocarbon production -- both oil and gas -- is increasing dramatically, with some experts predicting that the United States could become the largest hydrocarbon producer in the word -- outstripping Saudi Arabia and Russia -- by 2020.¶ Increased domestic production of hydrocarbons is driven by two trends. First, new technology is unlocking unconventional resources such as shale-derived oil and gas. And second, investors and policy makers are recognizing that the U.S. still has an enormous resource base of conventional oil and gas, particularly in Alaska.¶ Federal agencies estimate that Alaska's North Slope and federal waters off Alaska's northern coast contain approximately 40 billion barrels of technically recoverable oil and more than 200 trillion cubic feet of conventional gas.¶ According to the U.S. Geological Survey, this region contains more oil than any comparable region located in the Arctic, including northern Russia.¶ However, the United States is lagging behind its Arctic neighbors in developing these resources. This is unfortunate, because we have some of the highest environmental standards in the world and we should be setting the bar for Arctic development.¶ Developing our Arctic resources will promote our nation's interests in many ways: securing a politically stable, long-term supply of domestic energy; boosting U.S. economic growth and jobs; reducing the federal trade deficit; and strengthening our global leadership on energy issues. Leading academic researchers and economists in Alaska have estimated that oil production from Alaska's outer continental shelf will bring federal revenues of approximately $167 billion over 50 years, and create 55,000 jobs throughout the country.¶ Developing U.S. resources in the Arctic has the added benefit of enhancing global environmental protection.¶ One of the arguments used by Arctic drilling opponents is that "we aren't ready," but it is obvious that no matter what preparations are made, they will argue that it isn't enough.¶ Shell, for example, has spent billions to prepare for drilling in the Arctic this summer, incorporating the lessons learned from the Deepwater Horizon spill in the Gulf of Mexico, state-of-the-art equipment and extensive scientific research. Recently, the Obama administration has publically expressed its confidence in the company's drilling plans.¶ The U.S. has created some of the highest standards in the world for environmental protection. When we delay or disallow responsible resource development, the end result is not to protect the environment, but to drive hydrocarbon investment and production to countries with much lower environmental standards and enforcement capacity.¶ Last year, it was reported that between 5 million and 20 million tons of oil leak in Russia per year. This is equivalent to a Deepwater Horizon blowout about every two months. Russia had an estimated 18,000 oil pipeline ruptures in 2010 -- the figure for the U.S. that year was 341.¶ If we do not pursue responsible development in the Arctic, countries such as Russia -- perhaps even China, which is interested in securing access to Arctic hydrocarbon resources -- will dominate energy production from the Arctic. Such a scenario does not bode well for the global environment.¶ By embracing the opportunities in the Arctic, the United States will show the world that it can be a strong leader in responsible energy development.

# 2AC

## Solvency

### AT: Won’t Drill

#### Tech makes Arctic drilling viable – reduces costs

Morse 12 ED MORSE is Global Head of Commodities Research for Citigroup and a former State Department official, SEPT/OCT 2012, “Boom Time”, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/08/13/boom\_time

It won't be easy for Saudi Arabia or any other OPEC country to increase production in an effort to bring down prices and prevent investment from flowing into North American production. OPEC countries need increasingly higher prices to meet their fiscal needs, and their market power allows them to put a high floor under prices to achieve their revenue goals. At the same time, these higher prices guarantee that North American production, which is costlier than production in OPEC countries, will be profitable. ¶ Levi is right in saying that costs are currently high for unconventional North American oil. But he evidently doesn't understand that high costs bring technological change and innovation, and that historically costs ultimately go down. This is bound to continue to be the case when it comes to North American shale, oil sands, and deepwater output.

#### Companies want to drill – market forces

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

ExxonMobil defines its Arctic territory as any place where sea ice affects oil production, said Jed Hamilton from ExxonMobil Upstream Research. He said that all offshore development has been in shallow seas, and that the real challenge will be exploiting reserves in deep water. Thus ExxonMobil’s new floating deep-water rigs must be able to navigate the numerous icebergs that drift through drilling areas, making development all the more difficult. Hamilton said that oil will be the driving force of Arctic exploration while gas extraction remains on the mainland. However, even when compared to cheaper gas, there must be at least 500 million barrels of high priced oil in a play for a well to become financially viable for development. The profitability of Arctic wells also depends on the type of oil found there. The process used to refine heavy and extra heavy oil would make Arctic production economically unfeasible. Associated costs, such as building icebreakers, also figure into the premium for Arctic oil, along with extra infrastructure, environmental, and shipping costs. While the price of development is high, market forces indicate that the rush for Arctic oil will not abate in the near future.

### AT: Slow TF

#### Even if oil takes time to be extracted, economic benefits are immediate

Hastings 11 Doc, Chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee, "Forget 10 Years--Drilling ANWR Would Pay Off Right Away", November 3, www.usnews.com/debate-club/is-it-time-to-drill-in-the-arctic-refuge/forget-10-years--drilling-anwr-would-pay-off-right-away

Critics argue that we shouldn't drill in ANWR because it will take 10 years for the oil produced to become available. This fuzzy logic has been used for the last 20 years by those who simultaneously argue that renewable energies like wind and solar need decades to mature, along with billions in government subsidies. This inconsistent comparison is illogical and fails to provide equity in America's need for an all-of-the-above energy policy. While oil from ANWR might take a couple of years to get online, the job creation and effect on the economy would be almost instantaneous, as infrastructure and development activity could start immediately, sending billions to the federal government and employing thousands of people.

## Environment/Russia

### Add-On

#### \*Putin rent-seeking dooms the economy

O.G.E. ’10 – Leading Oil and Gas Report on Eurasia

Russia's "Resource Curse": How High Oil Prices Are Stunting Reforms, Oil & Gas Eurasia, August 2, 2010

http://www.oilandgaseurasia.com/tech\_trend/russias-resource-curse-how-high-oil-prices-are-stunting-reforms/page/0/1

The resource curse means, of course, that Russian elites will prefer to postpone restructuring the economy and modernizing the country’s political and economic institutions. This will undermine economic performance, making it very unlikely that Russia will catch up with the advanced economies in the next 10-15 years, as officials promise.¶ Fast and sustainable economic growth requires the rule of law, accountable, meritocratic, and non-corrupt bureaucrats, protection of property rights, contract enforcement, and competitive markets. Such institutions are difficult to build in every society. In Russia, the task is especially problematic, because the ruling elite’s interests run counter to undertaking it.¶ In post-crisis Russia, the resource curse is reinforced by two factors. First, massive renationalization since 2004 has left state-owned companies once again controlling the commanding heights of the economy. These firms have no interest in developing modern institutions that protect private property and promote the rule of law.¶ Second, Russia’s high degree of economic inequality sustains the majority’s preference for redistribution rather than private entrepreneurship.¶ Russia’s leaders acknowledge the need for modernization, and pay it frequent lip-service, as is evidenced by President Dmitri Medvedev’s manifesto "Go, Russia!” But the incentives to escape the resource trap are weakened by the overwhelming importance of the resource rents to the wider political elite.¶ When the economy was near collapse during the recent crisis, we thought that the government would recognize the need to push ahead with radical reforms that would eventually lead to a diverse, de-centralized, and fast-growing economy. But, while stimulus policies were mostly effective in dealing with the immediate crisis, they did not address the long-term issues that impede growth.¶ Still, the government continues to tout plans to boost the economy. Vertical industrial policy, horizontal industrial policy, investment in education ― all have been tried in the last 10 years. Yet Russia’s public institutions remain as weak as ever (for example, corruption is as prevalent as it was 10 years ago, if not more so), and the economy is no less dependent on commodity prices.¶ Today’s economic silver bullet is an "innovation city” in Skolkovo, which the government hopes will spur inflows of modern technology. But there are no magic recipes for modernization. Moreover, there is no need to reinvent the wheel. A comprehensive and consistent reform plan was already included in then-President Vladimir Putin’s own economic agenda at the beginning of his first term in 2000.¶ The so-called Gref Program (named after former Minister of the Economy German Gref) foresaw many of the reforms that are vitally needed ― privatization, deregulation, accession to the World Trade Organization, and reform of the government, natural monopolies, and social security. Many of these reforms are outlined in the current government’s own "Long-Term Strategy for 2020.” The problem is that ― as with the Gref program in 2000 ― the Strategy is unlikely to be fully implemented, owing to the same old weak incentives.¶ Even the recently announced privatization of non-controlling stakes in the largest state-owned firms ― while timely and laudable ― will not create an irreversible commitment to reform. So far, the government does not want to let control over these firms get into private hands. Hence, the sales that Prime Minister Putin announced will not increase the demand for pro-market institutions.¶ By contrast, the "70-80” scenario seems increasingly likely. In June, during the St. Petersburg Economic Forum, participants in two sessions ― Russian government and business leaders, as well as influential foreign players ― were asked about the future of Russia’s economy. The results were drearily similar.¶ In one session, 61 percent of participants foresaw stagnation in the next 2-5 years (33 percent predicted growth and 5 percent expected a crisis). In the other session, 55 percent of participants foresaw stagnation in the next 10 years (with 41 percent projecting growth and 4 percent expecting collapse).¶ The factors that drove the Putin era of rapid economic growth ― high and rising oil prices, cheap labor, and unused production capacity ― are all exhausted. Russia will thus be forced to start spending the reserves that saved the economy in the recent crisis.¶ The "70-80” scenario will preserve the status quo, but eventually the economy will reach a dead end, at which point the only choice will be genuine economic reform or decline and dangerous civil disorder.

#### We trigger reforms---prevent Putin rise

Levitt ’11 – Arctic Researcher and Writer for The Ecologist

Arctic special: Putin’s Russia will lead a ‘new era of Arctic industrialisation’, Tom Levitt, 19th October, 2011,http://www.theecologist.org/News/news\_analysis/1092215/putins\_russia\_will\_lead\_a\_new\_era\_of\_arctic\_industrialisation.html

For Russia, more than any other Arctic nation except possibly Greenland, these new fossil fuel supplies are seen as vital for the country's future prosperity and for the survival of its political establishment.¶ As a so-called ‘petro-state’, the country is heavily dependent on revenues from existing oil and gas reserves, with 40 per cent of its GDP derived from oil exports (it vies with Saudi Arabia to be the largest producer in the world). It is also the second largest exporter of natural gas, after the US.   With the flow of oil from Russia's existing oil fields declining, it desperately needs the Arctic region to maintain its current production levels.¶ 'In the eyes of the Kremlin, producing Russia's Arctic resources is not a choice, it is a strategic necessity,' concludes Charles Emmerson in his recent book, 'The future history of the Arctic'.

#### Russian civil society is ready to challenge Putin – he’s hanging on only by dominating the political space

Whitmore 12-27, ’12 – Writer for Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty

The Year in Vladimir Putin, Brian Whitmore, Dec 27 2012, At the end of 2012, Russia is uneasily suspended between one political era resisting its end and another struggling to begin.

http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2012/12/the-year-in-vladimir-putin/266656/

A fundamental part of the Kremlin's problem, analysts say, is that Russian society is evolving rapidly and the political class has not kept pace. The unprecedented prosperity of the Putin years has led to the emergence of a middle class that, in turn, has formed the basis for a fledgling civil society that is now demanding its political rights. Confident, well-traveled, highly informed, and connected by social media, this newly empowered "power horizontal" is now ready to challenge Putin's "power vertical."¶ And as Masha Lipman of Moscow Carnegie Center says, it is not going away anytime soon. "The Kremlin continues to control the political space but they can't control the civil space. This civic awakening in irreversible. The Kremlin's policy toward this seems to be to bottle up this civic energy that emerged a year ago. I don't think this is possible," Lipman says.

#### Putin causes Russia-NATO war and expansionism

Cohen 12 Ariel, Ph.D., is Senior Research Fellow for Russian and Eurasian Studies and International Energy Policy at The Heritage Foundation, “Putin’s Crackdown Foretells “Fortress Russia””, October 18, 2012, http://www.heritage.org/research/commentary/2012/10/putins-new-fortress-russia

As the Russian punk-rock band members “Pussy Riot” appeal their two-year sentence for a political protest in the Russian Orthodox Cathedral, a pale of repression is settling over their country. This crackdown is wrapped in legislative garb, but the iron grip of authoritarianism is unmistakable.¶ The United States must specifically recognize that its “reset” policy of “see no evil, hear no evil,” has contributed to the trampling of human rights in Russia. Putin’s tightening of the screws is a part of a broader pattern, which includes a return to a confrontation with the United States and NATO.¶ Moscow is cozying up to China, supporting the Assad regime in Syria, and ignoring the Iranian nuclear race. The Kremlin is hard at work to create a sphere of influence along its periphery and a “pole” in the perceived multi-polar world, which would stand up to Washington.¶ Recent developments have an unmistakably Soviet flavor from the 1920s and 1930s, when people were sent to the GULAG for who they were, not for what they did. For example, the Cheka -- the grandfather of the FSB -- preventively arrested those of noble descent or with relatives abroad.¶ Vladimir Lenin, the founder of the Soviet state, and a lawyer by training, wrote: “The courts should not do away with terror -- to promise otherwise would be to deceive ourselves and others -- but should give it foundation and legality, clearly, honestly, and without embellishments.” In the past, Putin called Joseph Stalin “an effective manager.” One wonders if the sorcerer has become a role model for the apprentice.¶ ¶ In this spirit, three weeks ago, the Duma unanimously passed new amendments proposed by the FSB that will expand the definition of "high treason." The newly created crime can be applied to almost any Russian citizen who works with foreign organizations or has ever had contact with a foreigner.¶ The "treason" no longer refers only to a concrete crime, such as knowingly passing state secrets to a foreign power. It could apply to any behavior that the state secret services, prosecutors and judges deem undermining "constitutional order, sovereignty, and territorial and state integrity" in the eyes of the authorities.¶ Moreover, the courts, which will sit in judgment on treason cases, are not truly independent. The Kremlin expanded “telephone justice,” a Soviet practice, by which judges receive verbal instructions from the top on how to decide cases. Prominent opponents, such as Mikhail Khodorkovsky, the former CEO of the YUKOS oil company, are sentenced to lengthy prison terms, which many Russian and foreign experts view as politically motivated.¶ These changes are an addition to a package of draconian laws and practices that curtain the citizens’ rights and that were introduced this year, with nary a protest from the Obama administration:¶ • In June 2012, the Duma passed a law that criminalized unauthorized protests, giving the government the ability to fine organizers exorbitant sums.¶ • In July 2012, the Duma approved a bill that allows the government to block websites it deems harmful to the public. ¶ • The law on NGO registration now requires that every "politically active" non-governmental organization, which receives funding from abroad, must register as a "foreign agent." ¶ • The Duma is considering a bill "On the protection of religious feelings of the citizens of Russia," which criminalizes blasphemy, including the possibility of a prison term. The courts would use the “experts” who are close to the Orthodox Church, to decide what is blasphemous. The regime would then decide which offensive materials to censor, just as authorities in Rostov recently banned the rock opera “Jesus Christ Superstar.”¶ The blasphemy law is a sop to the Patriarch Kirill, who is expanding the Church’s function as an ideological crutch for the state. The law is an important step to distance Russia from European, Western values, which the liberal intelligentsia desperately tried to inculcate for the last quarter of a century. They seem to be losing out – Slavophiles and “Eurasianists” are on the ascendancy.¶ Since Putin’s return to the Kremlin, a crackdown is on its way in Russia, conveniently ignored by the Obama administration. Free from concern about a serious U.S. response, corruption and abuse of power in Russia continue to rise as well.¶ The recent legislative developments have severe geopolitical implications. There are clear signs of an authoritarian reversal: Putin is implementing a "Fortress Russia" policy, which is based on repression at home and confrontation abroad. It is used to justify an already-decided-upon $700 billion, massive military buildup.

#### Extinction

Helfand and Pastore 9 Ira, M.D., and John O, M.D., are past presidents of Physicians for Social Responsibility. March 31, 2009, “U.S.-Russia nuclear war still a threat”, http://www.projo.com/opinion/contributors/content/CT\_pastoreline\_03-31-09\_EODSCAO\_v15.bbdf23.html

President Obama and Russian President Dimitri Medvedev are scheduled to Wednesday in London during the G-20 summit. They must not let the current economic crisis keep them from focusing on one of the greatest threats confronting humanity: the danger of nuclear war. Since the end of the Cold War, many have acted as though the danger of nuclear war has ended. It has not. There remain in the world more than 20,000 nuclear weapons. Alarmingly, more than 2,000 of these weapons in the U.S. and Russian arsenals remain on ready-alert status, commonly known as hair-trigger alert. They can be fired within five minutes and reach targets in the other country 30 minutes later. Just one of these weapons can destroy a city. A war involving a substantial number would cause devastation on a scale unprecedented in human history. A study conducted by Physicians for Social Responsibility in 2002 showed that if only 500 of the Russian weapons on high alert exploded over our cities, 100 million Americans would die in the first 30 minutes. An attack of this magnitude also would destroy the entire economic, communications and transportation infrastructure on which we all depend. Those who survived the initial attack would inhabit a nightmare landscape with huge swaths of the country blanketed with radioactive fallout and epidemic diseases rampant. They would have no food, no fuel, no electricity, no medicine, and certainly no organized health care. In the following months it is likely the vast majority of the U.S. population would die. Recent studies by the eminent climatologists Toon and Robock have shown that such a war would have a huge and immediate impact on climate world wide. If all of the warheads in the U.S. and Russian strategic arsenals were drawn into the conflict, the firestorms they caused would loft 180 million tons of soot and debris into the upper atmosphere — blotting out the sun. Temperatures across the globe would fall an average of 18 degrees Fahrenheit to levels not seen on earth since the depth of the last ice age, 18,000 years ago. Agriculture would stop, eco-systems would collapse, and many species, including perhaps our own, would become extinct. It is common to discuss nuclear war as a low-probabillity event. But is this true? We know of five occcasions during the last 30 years when either the U.S. or Russia believed it was under attack and prepared a counter-attack. The most recent of these near misses occurred after the end of the Cold War on Jan. 25, 1995, when the Russians mistook a U.S. weather rocket launched from Norway for a possible attack. Jan. 25, 1995, was an ordinary day with no major crisis involving the U.S. and Russia. But, unknown to almost every inhabitant on the planet, a misunderstanding led to the potential for a nuclear war. The ready alert status of nuclear weapons that existed in 1995 remains in place today.

## Economy

### AT: SCS Impact D

#### SCS risk high, old impact defense doesn’t apply

Leszek Buszynski 12, Visiting Fellow at the Strategic and Defence Studies Centre at the Australian National University, “The South China Sea: Oil, Maritime Claims, and U.S.—China Strategic Rivalry,” The Washington Quarterly, Vol. 35, No. 2, p. 139-156

The risk of conflict escalating from relatively minor events has increased in the South China Sea over the past two years with disputes now less open to negotiation or resolution. Originally, the disputes arose after World War II when the littoral states - China and three countries of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), Indonesia, Malaysia and the Philippines, as well as Vietnam which joined later - scrambled to occupy the islands there. Had the issue remained strictly a territorial one, it could have been resolved through Chinese efforts to reach out to ASEAN and forge stronger ties with the region. Around the 1990s, access to the sea’s oil and gas reserves as well as fishing and ocean resources began to complicate the claims. As global energy demand has risen, claimants have devised plans to exploit the sea’s hydrocarbon reserves with disputes not surprisingly ensuing, particularly between China and Vietnam. Nevertheless, these energy disputes need not result in conflict, as they have been and could continue to be managed through joint or multilateral development regimes, for which there are various precedents although none as complicated as the South China Sea.¶ Now, however, the issue has gone beyond territorial claims and access to energy resources, as the South China Sea has become a focal point for U.S.—China rivalry in the Western Pacific. Since around 2010, the sea has started to become linked with wider strategic issues relating to China’s naval strategy and America’s forward presence in the area. This makes the dispute dangerous and a reason for concern, particularly as the United States has reaffirmed its interest in the Asia Pacific and strengthened security relations with the ASEAN claimants in the dispute.

### AT: Navy Not collapsing

#### Navy weakening

Mahnken 12 Tom, 2013, shadow.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/09/13/avoiding\_sea\_blindness

It is at times like this that the erosion of American sea power is most apparent. Today, the U.S. Navy is the smallest it has been since 1916 and is stretched thin beyond prudence and good operational sense. We should all hope that the United States will not need to evacuate American citizens or use force to defend them, for if we do, we may very well regret the neglect of sea power.

# Off-Case

## T

### 2AC T – In the US

#### We Meet – Alaskan OCS is part of the US

Hagerty 11 (Curry L. Hagerty is Specialist in Energy and Natural Resources Policy for the Congressional Research Service, May 6, 2011, “Outer Continental Shelf Moratoria on Oil and Gas Development”, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R41132.pdf)

**The OCS is a federal offshore area from the edge of state waters**, usually starting at 3 nautical miles from shore, seaward to a distance of about 200 nautical miles.7 Energy leasing on the OCS takes place in four regions: the Gulf of Mexico region, the Atlantic region, the Pacific region, and the Alaska region

#### Counter-interpretation – US means possessions of the US – their card highlighted wrong

US Code 12 (18 USC § 2340 – Definitions, http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/18/2340)

(3) “United States” means the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the commonwealths, territories, and possessions of the United States.

### 2AC T – Restrictions (Regulation)

#### We meet---OCS moratorium are restrictions

Hagerty 10 Curry, Specialist in Energy and Natural Resources Policy, “ Outer Continental Shelf Moratoria on Oil and Gas Development” CRS 2010

Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) moratoria provisions, enacted as part of the Department of the Interior appropriations over the last 26 years, prohibited federal spending on oil and gas development in certain locations and for certain activities. Annual **congressional moratoria restrictions** expired on September 30, 2008. While the expiration of this restriction does not make leasing and drilling permissible in all offshore areas, it is a significant development in conjunction with other changes in offshore leasing activity. Change in moratoria policy signals a shift in policy that may affect other OCS policies as well.

#### C/I – Restrictions make production more difficult or expensive

LVMI 96 Ludwig Von Mises Institute Original Book by Ludwig Von Mises, Austrian Economist in 1940, Evidence is cut from fourth edition copyright Bettina B. Greaves, “Human Action”<http://mises.org/pdf/humanaction/pdf/ha_29.pdf>

Restriction of production means that the government either forbids or makes more difficult or more expensive the production, transportation, or distribution of definite articles, or the application of definite modes of production, transportation, or distribution. The authority thus eliminates some of the means available for the satisfaction of human wants. The effect of its interference is that people are prevented from using their knowledge and abilities, their labor and their material means of production in the way in which they would earn the highest returns and satisfy their needs as much as possible. Such interference makes people poorer and less satisfied.

#### Default to reasonability---prevents race to the bottom to arbitrarily limit out the aff and is preferable in restrictions context

MME 12 Mexican Ministry of Economy, “Other Appellant Submission of Mexico”, UNITED STATES – CERTAIN COUNTRY OF ORIGIN LABELLING REQUIREMENTS, March, http://www.economia.gob.mx/files/comunidad\_negocios/comercio\_exterior/solucion\_controversias/EDO.EDO/ORGANIZACION%20MUNDIAL%20DE%20COMERCIO/Participaci%C3%B3n%20de%20M%C3%A9xico%20como%20reclamante/EU\_COOL/20COMUNICACIONDELOTROAPELANTEDEMEXICO.pdf

52. The ordinary meaning of “restrictive” is “imposing restrictions”63 “[i]mplying, conveying or expressing restriction or limitation” and “[h]aving the nature or effect of a restriction; imposing a restriction.”64 The term “restriction” is defined as “the act or an instance of restricting; the state of being restricted”65 and as “[a] thing which restricts someone or something, a limitation on action, a limiting condition or regulation.”66 The term “restrict” is defined as “confine, bound, limit”.67 53. The meaning of “restriction” has been elaborated upon in jurisprudence concerning other WTO provisions. The term “restriction” should not be given a narrow meaning.68 A “disguised restriction” in the context of Article XX of the GATT 1994 has been interpreted to include “disguised discrimination in international trade”.69 In the context of Article XI and other non-discrimination provisions of the GATT 1994, it has been found that GATT disciplines on the use of restrictions are not meant to protect “trade flows”, but rather the “competitive opportunities of imported products”.70 In Argentina – Hides and Leather, the Panel found that in determining whether a measure makes effective a restriction in the context of Article I, II, III and XI:1 of the GATT 1994 the focus is on the competitive opportunities of imported products, not the trade effects. That panel considered that the complaining party claiming the existence of a restriction need not prove actual trade effects.

## K

### 2AC Neolib

#### The most dangerous forms of neoliberalism are driven by authoritarians like Putin---no risk of a link to the plan because democracy checks neoliberalism here

Ian Bruff 12, Lecturer in International Relations in the Department of Politics, History and International Relations at Loughborough University. He has been Chair of the Critical Political Economy Research Network of the European Sociological Association since 2009, and a member of the Steering Committee for the Standing Group on International Relations of the European Consortium for Political Research, 2012, “Authoritarian Neoliberalism, the Occupy Movements, and IPE,” Journal of Critical Globalization Studies, Issue 5, <http://www.criticalglobalisation.com/issue5/114_116_AUTHORITARIAN_NEOLIBERALISM_JCGS5.pdf>

In the absence of any kind of hegemonic aura, neoliberal practices have proved increasingly unable to garner the consent, or even the reluctant acquiescence, necessary for more ‘normal’ modes of governance. Of particular importance in the post-2007 crisis has been the growing frequency with which constitutional and legal changes, in the name of economic ‘necessity’, are seeking to reshape the purpose of the state and associated institutions. This attempted reconfiguration is three-fold: (1) the more immediate appeal to material circumstances as a reason for the state being unable, despite ‘the best will in the world’, to reverse processes such as greater socioeconomic inequality and dislocation; (2) the deeper and longer-term recalibration of what kind of activity is feasible and appropriate for ‘non-market’ institutions to engage in, diminishing expectations in the process; and (3) the reconceptualisation of the state as increasingly non-democratic through its subordination to constitutional and legal rules that are ‘necessary’ for prosperity to be achieved.

This process, of states reconfiguring themselves in increasingly nondemocratic ways in response to profound capitalist crisis, is what I view as the rise of authoritarian neoliberalism. Authoritarian neoliberalism does not represent a wholesale ‘break’ from earlier neoliberal practices, yet it is qualitatively distinctive due to way in which dominant social groups are less interested in neutralising resistance and dissent via concessions and forms of compromise that maintain their hegemony, favouring instead the explicit exclusion and marginalisation of such groups. However, the global crisis has intensified the crisis of legitimation already confronting various capitalist states – for instance, declining voter turnout and party membership, greater electoral volatility, growing mistrust of the political elite – meaning that authoritarian neoliberalism is simultaneously strengthening and weakening the state as the latter reconfigures into a less open and therefore more fragile polity. As a result, the attempted ‘authoritarian fix’ is potentially a sticking plaster rather than anything more epochal.

The question, therefore, is whether the contradictions inherent to authoritarian neoliberalism – especially with regard to the strengthening/weakening of the state – will create the conditions in which a more progressive and radical politics can begin to reverse the tide of the last three decades. As things stand, the crisis has ambiguous implications for radical/progressive politics of the Left, not least because radical politics is often being practised most successfully by radical Right movements and parties. This is the case if one considers the rise of xenophobia and racism in Europe, the Tea Party in the US, or indeed the more general ‘anti-party’ dominance of charismatic figureheads such as Putin in various countries. However, the occupy movements have proved to be a welcome corrective to the pessimism that the above observations encourage (regarding Putin, too, as we have seen in recent weeks). In particular, they have forced onto the agenda a fundamental challenge to the dominant narratives of the crisis, which – combined with the decline of mass political parties and the imbrication of all main parties with a system in crisis – has made the state an increasingly direct target of a range of popular struggles, demands and discontent.

This is crucial, because the state and its associated institutions have often been viewed as somehow inherently more progressive and democratic than the ‘market’. As a result, ‘Left’ politics has frequently been guilty of taking the law to be somehow neutral, ignoring in the process how ‘non-market’ social forms have been central to the rise of neoliberalism and thus the growing inequalities of power which characterise the world in which we live. This was expressed vividly in the clearing of Zuccotti Park in New York, which not only displayed clearly (despite the attempts to herd journalists into one part of the park) the brute coercive capacities of state power, but also the denial of the constitutional right to expressive protest in the name of ‘democracy’. However, it is not an isolated case, with justifications of police violence and the mobilisation of juridical power against the occupy and other movements being a routine part of events across the globe (see for example the rather different response, compared to several months earlier, by the Egyptian security apparatuses to the occupation of Tahrir Square in late 2011). In consequence, the occupy movements have exposed the authoritarian neoliberal state to protest and struggle, and its continued delegitimation, from a radical/progressive perspective that continues to affirm the values embodied in notions of solidarity, equality and cooperation. This alerts us in a more expansive way to how inequalities of power are produced and reproduced in capitalist societies, enabling us to consider how other, more emancipatory and progressive, worlds are possible.

#### Neolib is sustainable and inevitable –

#### a) No political crises

Stelzer 9 Irwin Stelzer is a business adviser and director of economic policy studies at the Hudson Institute, “Death of capitalism exaggerated,” http://www.theaustralian.news.com.au/story/0,25197,26174260-5013479,00.html

A FUNNY thing happened on the way to the collapse of market capitalism in the face of the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression. It didn't. Indeed, in Germany voters relieved Chancellor Angela Merkel of the necessity of cohabiting with a left-wing party, allowing her to form a coalition with a party favouring lower taxes and free markets. And in Pittsburgh leaders representing more than 90 per cent of the world's GDP convened to figure out how to make markets work better, rather than to hoist the red flag. The workers are to be relieved, not of their chains but of credit-card terms that are excessively onerous, and helped to retain their private property - their homes. All of this is contrary to expectations. The communist spectre that Karl Marx confidently predicted would be haunting Europe is instead haunting Europe's left-wing parties, with even Vladimir Putin seeking to attract investment by re-privatising the firms he snatched. Which raises an interesting question: why haven't the economic turmoil and rising unemployment led workers to the barricades, instead of to their bankers to renegotiate their mortgages? It might be because Spain's leftish government has proved less able to cope with economic collapse than countries with more centrist governments. Or because Britain, with a leftish government, is now the sick man of Europe, its financial sector in intensive care, its recovery likely to be the slowest in Europe, its prime credit rating threatened. Or it might be because left-wing trade unions, greedily demanding their public-sector members be exempted from the pain they want others to share, have lost their credibility and ability to lead a leftward lurch. All of those factors contribute to the unexpected strength of the Right in a world in which a record number of families are being tossed out of their homes, and jobs have been disappearing by the million. But even more important in promoting reform over revolution are three factors: the existence of democratic institutions; the condition of the unemployed; and the set of policies developed to cope with the recession. Democratic institutions give the aggrieved an outlet for their discontent, and hope they can change conditions they deem unsatisfactory. Don't like the way George W. Bush has skewed income distribution? Toss the Republicans out and elect a man who promises to tax the rich more heavily. Don't like Gordon Brown's tax increases? Toss him out and hope the Tories mean it when they promise at least to try to lower taxes. Result: angry voters but no rioters, unless one counts the nutters who break windows at McDonald's or storm banks in the City. Contrast that with China, where the disaffected have no choice but to take to the streets. Result: an estimated 10,000 riots this year protesting against job losses, arbitrary taxes and corruption. A second factor explaining the Left's inability to profit from economic suffering is capitalism's ability to adapt, demonstrated in the Great Depression of the 1930s. While a gaggle of bankers and fiscal conservatives held out for the status quo, Franklin D. Roosevelt and his experimenters began to weave a social safety net. In Britain, William Beveridge produced a report setting the stage for a similar, indeed stronger, net. Continental countries recovering from World War II did the same. So unemployment no longer dooms a worker to close-to-starvation. Yes, civic institutions were able to soften the blow for the unemployed before the safety net was put in place, but they could not cope with pervasive protracted lay-offs. Also, during this and other recessions, when prices for many items are coming down, the real living standard of those in work actually improves. In the US, somewhere between 85 per cent and 90 per cent of workers have kept their jobs, and now see their living costs declining as rents and other prices come down. So the impetus to take to the streets is limited. Then there are the steps taken by capitalist governments to limit the depth and duration of the downturn. As the economies of most of the big industrial countries imploded, policy went through two phases. The first was triage - do what is necessary to prevent the financial system from collapse. Spend. Guarantee deposits to prevent runs on banks and money funds, bail out big banks, force relatively healthier institutions to take over sicker ones, mix all of this with rhetorical attacks on greedy bankers - the populist spoonful of sugar that made the bailouts go down with the voters - and stop the rot. Meanwhile, have the central banks dust off their dog-eared copies of Bagehot and inject lots of liquidity by whatever means comes to mind. John Maynard Keynes, meet Milton Friedman for a cordial handshake. Then came more permanent reform, another round of adapting capitalism to new realities, in this case the malfunctioning of the financial markets. Even Barack Obama's left-wing administration decided not to scupper the markets but instead to develop rules to relate bankers' pay more closely to long-term performance; to reduce the chance of implosions by increasing the capital banks must hold, cutting their profits and dividends, but leaving them in private hands; and to channel most stimulus spending through private-sector companies. This leaves the anti-market crowd little room for manoeuvre as voters seem satisfied with the changes to make capitalism and markets work better and more equitably. At least so far. There are exceptions. Australia moved a bit to the left in the last election, but more out of unhappiness with a tired incumbent's environmental and foreign policy. Americans chose Obama, but he had promised to govern from the centre before swinging left. And for all his rhetorical attacks on greedy bankers and other malefactors of great wealth, he sticks to reform of markets rather than their replacement, with healthcare a possible exception. Even in these countries, so far, so good for reformed capitalism. No substitutes accepted.

#### No root cause

Larrivee 10— PF ECONOMICS AT MOUNT ST MARY’S UNIVERSITY – MASTERS FROM THE HARVARD KENNEDY SCHOOL AND PHD IN ECONOMICS FROM WISCONSIN, 10 [JOHN, A FRAMEWORK FOR THE MORAL ANALYSIS OF MARKETS, 10/1, <http://www.teacheconomicfreedom.org/files/larrivee-paper-1.pdf>]

The Second Focal Point: Moral, Social, and Cultural Issues of Capitalism **Logical errors abound** in critical commentary on capitalism. Some critics observe a problem and conclude: “I see X in our society. We have a capitalist economy. Therefore capitalism causes X.” They draw their conclusion by looking at a phenomenon as it appears only in one system. Others merely follow a host of popular theories according to which capitalism is particularly bad. 6 The solution to such flawed reasoning is to be comprehensive, to look at the good and bad, in market and non-market systems. Thus the following section considers a number of issues—greed, selfishness and human relationships, honesty and truth, alienation and work satisfaction, moral decay, and religious participation—that have often been associated with capitalism, but have also been problematic in other systems and usually in more extreme form. I conclude with some evidence for the view that markets foster (at least some) virtues rather than undermining them. My purpose is not to smear communism or to make the simplistic argument that “capitalism isn’t so bad because other systems have problems too.” The critical point is that **certain people thought** various **social ills resulted from capitalism, and on this basis they took action to establish alternative economic systems** to solve the problems they had identified. That **they failed to solve the problems, and** in fact **exacerbated them** while also creating new problems, implies that capitalism itself wasn’t the cause of the problems in the first place, at least not to the degree theorized.

#### Alt fails---rejection doesn’t change production

### 2AC Complexity K

#### The complexity thesis is wrong---makes policymaking impossible

Dr. Sebastian L. V. Gorka et al 12, Director of the Homeland Defense Fellows Program at the College of International Security Affairs, National Defense University, teaches Irregular Warfare and US National Security at NDU and Georgetown, et al., Spring 2012, “The Complexity Trap,” Parameters, <http://www.carlisle.army.mil/USAWC/parameters/Articles/2012spring/Gallagher_Geltzer_Gorka.pdf>

We live in a world of unprecedented complexity, or so we are told. President Obama’s words above echo an increasingly common narrative in the American foreign policy and national security establishments: the forces of globalization, rising nonstate actors, irregular conflict, and proliferating destructive technologies have made crafting sound national security strategy more elusive than ever before. 2 If “strategy is the art of creating power” by specifying the relationship among ends, ways, and means, 3 then the existence of unprecedented complexity would seem to make this art not only uniquely difficult today but also downright dangerous, inasmuch as choosing any particular course of action would preclude infinitely adaptive responses in the future. As Secretary of Defense Robert Gates memorably described, the pre-9/11 challenges to American national security were “amateur night compared to the world today.” 4 And as former State Department Director of Policy Planning Anne-Marie Slaughter recently stated, there is a “universal awareness that we are living through a time of rapid and universal change,” one in which the assumptions of the twentieth century make little sense. 5 The “Mr. Y” article that occasioned her comments argued that, in contrast to the “closed system” of the twentieth century that could be controlled by mankind, we now live in an “open system” defined by its supremely complex and protean nature. 6 Unparalleled complexity, it seems, is the hallmark of our strategic age.¶ These invocations of complexity permeate today’s American national security documents and inform Washington’s post-Cold War and -9/11 strategic culture. The latest Quadrennial Defense Review begins its analysis with a description of the “complex and uncertain security landscape in which the pace of change continues to accelerate. Not since the fall of the Soviet Union or the end of World War II has the international terrain been affected by such farreaching and consequential shifts.” 7 In a similar vein, the National Intelligence Council’s Global Trends 2025 argues that the international system is trending towards greater degrees of complexity as power is diffused and actors multiply. 8 The Director of National Intelligence’s Vision 2015 terms our time the “Era of Uncertainty,” one “in which the pace, scope, and complexity of change are increasing.” 9 Disturbingly, the younger generation of foreign policy and national security professionals seems to accept and embrace these statements declaiming a fundamental change in our world and our capacity to cope with it. The orientation for the multi-thousand-member group of Young Professionals in Foreign Policy calls “conquering complexity” the fundamental challenge for the millennial generation. Complexity, it appears, is all the rage. ¶ We challenge these declarations and assumptions—not simply because they are empirically unfounded but, far more importantly, because they negate the very art of strategy and make the realization of the American national interest impossible. We begin by showing the rather unsavory consequences of the current trend toward worshipping at complexity’s altar and thus becoming a member of the “Cult of Complexity.” Next, we question whether the world was ever quite as simple as today’s avowers of complexity suggest, thus revealing the notion of today’s unprecedented complexity to be descriptively false. We then underscore that this idea is dangerous, given the consequences of an addiction to complexity. Finally, we offer an escape from the complexity trap, with an emphasis on the need for prioritization in today’s admittedly distinctive international security environment. Throughout, we hope to underscore that today’s obsession with complexity results in a dangerous denial of the need to strategize.

**Scenario planning is possible and key to making effective decisions**

**Kurasawa 4** (Professor of Sociology, York University of Toronto, Fuyuki, Constellations Volume 11, No 4)

A radically postmodern line of thinking, for instance, would lead us to believe that it is pointless, perhaps even harmful, to strive for farsightedness in light of the aforementioned crisis of conventional paradigms of historical analysis. If, contra teleological models, history has no intrinsic meaning, direction, or endpoint to be discovered through human reason, and if, contra scientistic futurism, prospective trends cannot be predicted without error, then the abyss of chronological inscrutability supposedly opens up at our feet. The future appears to be unknowable, an outcome of chance. Therefore, rather than embarking upon grandiose speculation about what may occur, we should adopt a pragmatism that abandons itself to the twists and turns of history; let us be content to formulate ad hoc responses to emergencies as they arise. While this argument has the merit of underscoring the fallibilistic nature of all predictive schemes, it conflates the necessary recognition of the contingency of history with unwarranted assertions about the latter’s total opacity and indeterminacy. Acknowledging the fact that the future cannot be known with absolute certainty does not imply abandoning the task of trying to understand what is brewing on the horizon and to prepare for crises already coming into their own. In fact, the incorporation of the principle of fallibility into the work of prevention means that we must be ever more vigilant for warning signs of disaster and for responses that provoke unintended or unexpected consequences (a point to which I will return in the final section of this paper). In addition, from a normative point of view, the acceptance of historical contingency and of the self-limiting character of farsightedness places the duty of preventing catastrophe squarely on the shoulders of present generations. The future no longer appears to be a metaphysical creature of destiny or of the cunning of reason, nor can it be sloughed off to pure randomness. It becomes, instead, a result of human action shaped by decisions in the present – including, of course, trying to anticipate and prepare for possible and avoidable sources of harm to our successors. Combining a sense of analytical contingency toward the future and ethical responsibility for it, the idea of early warning is making its way into preventive action on the global stage.

## CP

### 2AC SEP CP

#### SEPs create uncertainty and prevent environmental improvement

Bonorris 7 Steven, Associate Director for Research, Public Law Research Institute, UC Hastings College of the Law, 1/25, “Supplemental Environmental Projects: A Fifty State Survey with Model Practices,” <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/services/enforce/settlements/ABAHastingsSEPreport.pdf>

Another criticism of the SEP system is that it creates inconsistency in enforcement, apart from the problem of the opportunistic violator. Because regulators cannot accurately assess all of the relevant variables for penalty calculations (or the collateral economic benefits conferred to the violator), the resulting inaccuracy of penalty assessments creates inconsistency in the application of regulations. n167 The imposition of a SEP with its penalty calculations adds another layer of uncertainty and possibility of error to this enforcement picture. Apart from the inherent inequity in inconsistent penalties across violators, overly light penalties effectively confer unfair economic advantage over competitors, who have made the required expenditures to comply with environmental regulations. In addition, the possibility that some violators might receive lighter penalties could induce risk-tolerant would-be violators to adopt a different compliance strategy.¶ While some proponents of SEPs argue that SEPs encourage early adoption of innovative pollution prevention technology ("anticipatory compliance"); others opine, "SEP programs may actually discourage regulated entities from adopting environmental improvements on their own (that is, without government inducement)." n168 A violator that knows it may obtain reduced penalties [\*207] through SEP settlements might delay investments in environmentally beneficial projects until it has a civil penalty that it can be offset against. This violator may achieve a noncompliance benefit over its competitors by using those funds for other ventures; the violator later achieves its original plans for environmentally beneficial projects by carrying them out as a SEP. n169

#### That wrecks solvency

Chazan and Crooks 12 Guy Chazan and Ed Crooks, writers for the Financial Times, September 4, 2012, “Shell woes deter others from US Arctic”, http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/48b8471a-f6aa-11e1-9dff-00144feabdc0.html#axzz26B8B8Ak1

Royal Dutch Shell’s regulatory problems in the US Arctic, where it has faced repeated delays to an ambitious oil exploration campaign, **are deterring other energy groups** with licences in the US’s northern oceans, according to one of the most active companies in the region.¶ Tim Dodson, head of exploration at Norway’s Statoil, said Shell’s experience, which was a “bellwether” for the industry, had reduced the appeal of working in the Chukchi Sea north-west of Alaska.¶ “As long as Shell has not been able to show they can get the permits and start to drill, we’re a bit sceptical about moving forward,” he said in an interview. “**You need that kind of comfort that they will be allowed to do it in a predictable manner**.”

#### Perm do the CP – not enforcing a restriction removes it even if it remains on the books

Berger 1 - Justice for the Supreme Court of Delaware - Opinion, INDUSTRIAL RENTALS, INC., ISAAC BUDOVITCH and FLORENCE BUDOVITCH, Appellants Below, Appellants, v. NEW CASTLE COUNTY BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT and NEW CASTLE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF LAND USE, Appellees Below, Appellees. No. 233, 2000SUPREME COURT OF DELAWARE776 A.2d 528; 2001 Del. LEXIS 300April 10, 2001, Submitted July 17, 2001, Decided lexis

We disagree. HN2 Statutes must be read as a whole and all the words must be given effect. 3 HN3 The word "restriction" means "a limitation (esp. in a deed) placed on the use or enjoyment of property." 4 HN4 If a deed restriction has been satisfied, and no longer limits the use or enjoyment of the property, then it no longer is a deed restriction -- even though the paper on which it was written remains. [\*\*6] Thus, the phrase "projects containing deed restrictions requiring phasing…," in Section 11.130(A)(7) means presently existing deed restrictions. As of June 1988, the Acierno/Marta Declaration contained no remaining deed restrictions requiring phasing to coincide with improvements to the transportation system. As a result, the Acierno/Marta projects should not have been included in the scope of the Budovitches' TIS.

#### Won’t displace the penalty---if it does, causes businesses backlash

CG 96 Connecticut Government environmental policy division, February, “POLICY ON SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, ”http://www.ct.gov/dep/lib/dep/enforcement/policies/seppolicy.pdf

An SEP will not totally displace a monetary penalty2. A monetary penalty is still necessary in order to assure that the Department’s enforcement actions are effective in deterring future violations by this respondent and others in the regulated community. Penalties also help ensure a level playing field by ensuring that violators do not obtain an unfair economic advantage over their competitors who made the necessary expenditures to comply on time. Penalties also encourage companies to adopt pollution prevention and recycling techniques, so that they minimize their pollutant discharges and reduce their potential liabilities. Accordingly, a settlement of a case that warrants a penalty under the Department’s Enforcement Response Policy shall include a monetary penalty, calculated according to the Department’s Civil Penalty Policy, when adopted, which is set at a level that captures the respondents’s economic benefit of noncompliance plus some appreciable portion of the gravity component of the penalty.

#### **Businesses say no**

Brown 11 Mr. Brown holds an MBA from New York University and a BA from Brown University. Matthew Brown is President of InterEnergy Solutions, a consulting firm that focuses on clean energy policy and finance. 2011, "Brief #1: Funding Mechanisms for Energy Efficiency"ase.org/resources/brief-1-funding-mechanisms-energy-efficiency

Funds are not predictable because they depend on fines that state environmental agencies issue, as well as on the interest that industry may or may not have in paying for a particular project. Companies sometimes view SEPs as a cumbersome alternative **to simply paying a fine and moving on with business operations.¶** **Not likely to provide large amounts of funding.**

#### **The SEP will not be approved**

Bonorris 7 Steven, Editor, The Public Law Research Institute University of California, Hastings College of the Law, [http://www.ecy.wa.gov/services/enforce/settlements/ABAHastingsSEPreport.pdf](http://www.ecy.wa.gov/services/enforce/settlements/ABAHastingsSEPreport.pdf-http://www.ecy.wa.gov/services/enforce/settlements/ABAHastingsSEPreport.pdf)

Legal Principles¶ 1. A SEP will not be approved if the violator is otherwise legally required to perform¶ the proposed activity.¶ 2. SEPs should have a clear relationship to the violation. This relationship exists if the project reduces the overall environmental or public health impacts or risks to¶ which the violation contributes, or is designed to reduce the likelihood of similar violations in the future. A SEP may not be directly related to the violation if the¶ project is either: ¶ a. A pollution prevention project that provides significant environmental benefit; or¶ b. Some other multi-media or facility-wide activity that provides widespread¶ environmental benefit.

#### EPA won’t approve the proposed SEPs

Bonorris 7 Steven, Editor, The Public Law Research Institute University of California, Hastings College of the Law, [http://www.ecy.wa.gov/services/enforce/settlements/ABAHastingsSEPreport.pdf](http://www.ecy.wa.gov/services/enforce/settlements/ABAHastingsSEPreport.pdf-http://www.ecy.wa.gov/services/enforce/settlements/ABAHastingsSEPreport.pdf)

In addition, the allowance of a SEP as part of an enforcement action is a discretionary decision left up to the regulatory agency. 183 Under most SEP policies, if the agency believes that a proposed project would fail to provide a sufficient deterrent effect, then the agency will not permit the project and instead, demand the full payment of the civil penalty. 184 For example, if the proposed project primarily benefits the violator, rather than the environment or the public health, then it will not be approved as a SEP. 185 Similarly, if a project is approved but the agency finds that it still benefits the violator, those benefits will often be given a monetary value which the agency will then deduct from the mitigation amount of the SEP. 186

## DA

### 2AC Hagel DA

#### No Hagel---bipartisan opposition

Carlson 1-9 Margaret, Chicago Tribune, 2013, www.chicagotribune.com/site/newspaper/opinion/ct-perspec-0109-hagel-20130109,0,961154.story

Bipartisan opposition¶ Obama may think that Republicans will be less militant in defense of their foreign policy worldview than they were in defense of millionaires. Yet so far, they have set the alarm to DEFCON 1 for Hagel's nomination. Opposing it are hawks who resented Hagel's votes on Iraq (he voted for the war initially, though he gave a skeptical speech, and then against the troop surge) and the pro-Israel lobby, which resents him for a lot of reasons, especially his suggestion that the U.S. talk to Hamas.¶ Then there is the other side of the aisle: Because Hagel is not a Democrat, Democratic support for him is not a given. Those who count votes say there could be a dozen Democratic votes against Hagel. Democrats who don't like him have one main question: Why is the newly re-elected president nominating a Republican for one of the top four Cabinet posts? More to the point, now that Democrats have stolen a march on Republicans on national security issues, why is Obama turning to a Republican for defense? Obama might still be pining for bipartisanship, but congressional Democrats aren't.¶ One aspect of the opposition that appears to be truly bipartisan is from gay groups. Way back in the dark ages of 1998, Hagel called James C. Hormel, who eventually became ambassador to Luxembourg, "openly aggressively gay" and criticized his nomination.

#### Plan isn’t legislation

Janofsky 6 (Michael, Veteran Journalist, “Offshore Drilling Plan Widens Rifts Over Energy Policy,” New York Times, 4-9, http://www.nytimes.com/2006/04/09/washington/09drill.html)

A Bush administration proposal to open an energy-rich tract of the Gulf of Mexico to oil and gas drilling has touched off a tough fight in Congress, the latest demonstration of the political barriers to providing new energy supplies even at a time of high demand and record prices. The two-million-acre area, in deep waters 100 miles south of Pensacola, Fla., is estimated to contain nearly half a billion barrels of oil and three trillion cubic feet of natural gas, enough to run roughly a million vehicles and heat more than half a million homes for about 15 years. The site, Area 181, is the only major offshore leasing zone that the administration is offering for development. But lawmakers are divided over competing proposals to expand or to limit the drilling. The Senate Energy Committee and its chairman, Pete V. Domenici, Republican of New Mexico, are pushing for a wider drilling zone, while the two Florida senators and many from the state's delegation in the House are arguing for a smaller tract. Other lawmakers oppose any new drilling at all. The debate could go a long way toward defining how the nation satisfies its need for new energy and whether longstanding prohibitions against drilling in the Outer Continental Shelf, the deep waters well beyond state coastlines, will end. The fight, meanwhile, threatens to hold up the confirmation of President Bush's choice to lead the Interior Department, Gov. Dirk Kempthorne of Idaho. Mr. Kempthorne was nominated last month to replace Gale A. Norton, a proponent of the plan, who stepped down March 31. Like Ms. Norton, Mr. Kempthorne, a former senator, is a determined advocate of developing new supplies of energy through drilling. While environmental groups say that discouraging new drilling would spur development of alternative fuels, administration officials say that timely action in Area 181 and beyond could bring short-term relief to the nation's energy needs and, perhaps, lower fuel costs for consumers. "It's important to have expansions of available acres in the Gulf of Mexico as other areas are being tapped out," Ms. Norton said recently. She predicted that drilling in the offshore zone would lead to further development in parts of the Outer Continental Shelf that have been off-limits since the 1980's under a federal moratorium that Congress has renewed each year and that every president since then has supported. States are beginning to challenge the prohibitions. Legislatures in Georgia and Kansas recently passed resolutions urging the government to lift the bans. On Friday, Gov. Tim Kaine of Virginia, a Democrat, rejected language in a state energy bill that asked Congress to lift the drilling ban off Virginia's coast. But he did not close the door to a federal survey of natural gas deposits. Meanwhile, Representative Richard W. Pombo, Republican of California, the pro-development chairman of the House Resources Committee, plans to introduce a bill in June that would allow states to seek control of any energy exploration within 125 miles of their shorelines. Senators John W. Warner of Virginia, a Republican, and Mark Pryor of Arkansas, a Democrat, introduced a similar bill in the Senate last month. Currently, coastal states can offer drilling rights only in waters within a few miles of their own shores. Mr. Pombo and other lawmakers would also change the royalty distribution formula for drilling in Outer Continental Shelf waters so states would get a share of the royalties that now go entirely to the federal government. Senators from Alabama, Louisiana and Mississippi are co-sponsoring a bill that would create a 50-50 split. As exceptions to the federal ban, the western and central waters of the Gulf of Mexico produce nearly a third of the nation's oil and more than a fifth of its natural gas. But Area 181 has been protected because of its proximity to Florida and the opposition of Mr. Bush's brother, Gov. Jeb Bush. By its current boundaries, the pending lease area is a much smaller tract than the 5.9 million acres the Interior Department first considered leasing more than 20 years ago and the 3.6 million acres that the department proposed to lease in 2001. This year, two million acres of the original tract are proposed for lease as the only waters of the Outer Continental Shelf that the administration is making available for 2007-12. The proposal is an administrative action that does not require Congressional approval, but it is still subject to public comment before being made final. Unless Congress directs the administration to change course, the administration's final plan would lead to bidding on new leases in 2007.

#### Low PC inevitable and not key

Schier 11 Steven E. Schier is the Dorothy H. and Edward C. Congdon professor of political science at Carleton College, The contemporary presidency: the presidential authority problem and the political power trap. Presidential Studies Quarterly December 1, 2011 lexis

Implications of the Evidence¶ The evidence presented here depicts a decline in presidential political capital after 1965. Since that time, presidents have had lower job approval, fewer fellow partisans and less voting support in Congress, less approval of their party, and have usually encountered an increasingly adverse public policy mood as they governed.¶ Specifically, average job approval dropped. Net job approval plummeted, reflecting greater polarization about presidential performance.The proportion of fellow partisans in the public dropped and became less volatile. Congressional voting support became lower and varied more. The number of fellow partisans in the House and Senate fell and became less volatile. Public issue mood usually moved against presidents as they governed. All of these measures, with the exception of public mood, correlate positively with each other, suggesting they are part of a broader phenomenon.¶ That "phenomenon" is political authority. The decline in politicalcapital has produced great difficulties for presidential political authority in recent decades. It is difficult to claim warrants for leadership in an era when job approval, congressional support, and partisan affiliation provide less backing for a president than in times past.¶ Because of the uncertainties of political authority, recent presidents have adopted a governing style that is personalized, preemptive,and, at times, isolated. Given the entrenched autonomy of other elite actors and the impermanence of public opinion, presidents have had to "sell themselves" in order to sell their governance. Samuel Kernell (1997) first highlighted the presidential proclivity to "go public"in the 1980s as a response to these conditions. Through leveraging public support, presidents have at times been able to overcome institutional resistance to their policy agendas. Brandice Canes-Wrone (2001) discovered that presidents tend to help themselves with public opinion by highlighting issues the public supports and that boosts their congressional success--an effective strategy when political capital is questionable.¶ Despite shrinking political capital, presidents at times have effectively pursued such strategies, particularly since 1995. Clinton's centrist "triangulation" and George W. Bush's careful issue selection early in his presidency allowed them to secure important policy changes--in Clinton's case, welfare reform and budget balance, in Bush's tax cuts and education reform--that at the time received popular approval. This may explain the slight recovery in some presidential political capital measures since 1993. Clinton accomplished much with a GOPCongress, and Bush's first term included strong support from a Congress ruled by friendly Republican majorities. David Mayhew finds that from 1995 to 2004, both highly important and important policy changeswere passed by Congress into law at higher rates than during the 1947-1994 period. (2) A trend of declining political capital thus does not preclude significant policy change, but a record of major policy accomplishment has not reversed the decline in presidential political capital in recent years, either. Short-term legislative strategies can win policy success for a president but do not serve as an antidote to declining political capital over time, as the final years of both the Clinton and George W. Bush presidencies demonstrate.

#### Secretary of the Interior does the plan

OCS Lands Act 2K Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, December 29, 2000, http://epw.senate.gov/ocsla.pdf

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

#### That shields politics

Dobkin 8—past Chairperson of the Immigration Law Section of the Oakland County (Michigan) Bar Association and has lectured and presented seminars on immigration in the U.S., Canada and the U.K. (Donald, THE RISE OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE STATE: APRESCRIPTION FOR LAWLESSNESS, [www.law.ku.edu/publications/journal/pdf/v17n3/dobkin.pdf](http://www.law.ku.edu/publications/journal/pdf/v17n3/dobkin.pdf))

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

#### Winners win

Marshall and Prins 11 (BRYAN W, Miami University and BRANDON C, University of Tennessee & Howard H. Baker, Jr. Center for Public Policy, “Power or Posturing? Policy Availability and Congressional Influence on U.S. Presidential Decisions to Use Force”, Sept, Presidential Studies Quarterly 41, no. 3)

Presidents rely heavily on Congress in converting their political capital into real policy success. Policy success not only shapes the reelection prospects of presidents, but it also builds the president’s reputation for political effectiveness and fuels the prospect for subsequent gains in political capital (Light 1982). Moreover, the president’s legislative success in foreign policy is correlated with success on the domestic front. On this point, some have largely disavowed the two-presidencies distinction while others have even argued that foreign policy has become a mere extension of domestic policy (Fleisher et al. 2000; Oldfield and Wildavsky 1989) Presidents implicitly understand that there exists a linkage between their actions in one policy area and their ability to affect another. The use of force is no exception; in promoting and protecting U.S. interests abroad, presidential decisions are made with an eye toward managing political capital at home (Fordham 2002).

#### McConnell even sponsored legislation to open the arctic for drilling – it’s a pet project

Emilie Surrusco, 5-18-2011, “Senator McConnell fails to give Big Oil free pass to risky drilling in the Arctic Ocean,” Alaska Wilderness League, http://www.alaskawild.org/wp-content/uploads/Senator-McConnell-fails-to-give-Big-Oil-free-pass-to-risky-drilling-in-the-Arctic-Ocean.pdf

Today, the so-called “Offshore Production and Safety Act of 2011” bill (S. 953), sponsored by Senator Mitch McConnell (R-KY), just failed on the Senate floor by a vote of 42-57. This bill would have led to risky, aggressive drilling in America’s Arctic, by not only bringing back Arctic lease sales wisely cancelled by the president in the wake of the Deepwater Horizon disaster, but also wiping out adequate environmental review by declaring that environmental analyses found to be illegal by the courts, are in fact sufficient. Following is a statement by Cindy Shogan, Executive Director, Alaska Wilderness League: “Instead of addressing dire safety and environmental issues made clear by the Deepwater Horizon disaster, Senator McConnell pushed legislation to give Big Oil a free pass in the Arctic Ocean. His legislation resurrected leases in America’s Arctic Ocean that were prudently cancelled after the Gulf disaster, while allowing the federal government to sidestep a court order to analyze the importance of missing science in the Arctic’s Chukchi Sea.

#### McConnell key to Hagel

Mark Halperin 1-7, Time, “Team Hagel Versus Team Anti-Hagel”, <http://thepage.time.com/2013/01/07/team-hagel-versus-team-anti-hagel/>

The two most important senators in this nomination right now are McConnell and McCain. If Hagel has their support, he should be home free. If he loses one or both of them, and even a single Democrat, the dynamics become more challenging for the White House.

expenses.¶ "We have to do the scrutiny. It won't be pretty. There'll be some hurt feelings," he said.

#### No impact to Hagel

Taylor 1/8/13 (Robert, “Predator Drone Strikes Kill Up to 50 Civilians For Every 1 Terrorist Assassinated: Study”)

This is why the recent news that the president is nominating former Nebraska senator Chuck Hagel for secretary of defense admittedly left me a bit surprised and optimistic. Hagel has a history of [sober](http://original.antiwar.com/justin/2012/12/23/the-crucifixion-of-chuck-hagel/) foreign policy prescriptions — at least compared to the Beltway establishment and his fellow senators — and best of all, believes that U.S. foreign policy should defend [American interests](http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2013/jan/07/chuck-hagel-not-antisemitic-israel), not Israel's. But even if Hagel is confirmed, it is highly unlikely that he will have the ability to sway Obama's hand. The president, after all, is someone who relishes his nearly universally unquestioned authority to create "kill lists," suspend due process, and dispense arbitrary death from the sky. Besides, Obama wants drone-lover [John Brennan](http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Politics/2013/0107/With-John-Brennan-Obama-doubles-down-on-drone-strikes-video) to be the new CIA director, and Hagel's voice would likely be drowned out by the screeches of the hawks that surround the White House.

# 1AR

## Russia

### Plan Wrecks Putin

#### Not invincible --- Plan solves the only factor keeping Putin in power

Hulbert 12 Matthew Hulbert is an analyst at the Netherlands Institute for International Relations, July 19, 2012, “Arctic oil: Putin's last chance”, http://www.europeanenergyreview.eu/site/pagina.php?id=3813

President Putin is back, but this time he faces daunting challenges on the energy front. The easy times throughout the 2000s when prices were rising, production was steady, and petro-dollars kept rolling in, are gone. Russia is facing steep depletion rates on key oil fields in East Siberia, the Far East and West Siberia, a dynamic that has already seen the country slip back to second place on the international roster of oil producers behind Saudi Arabia. The only chance Putin has to retain his long term global energy stake is successful exploitation of Russia's Arctic reserves, but that's going to need serious foreign investment. The good news for Putin is that international oil companies have welcomed the initial 'policy certainty' his return has brought to the Kremlin, but if Russia wants to attract serious amounts of foreign capital, Moscow also needs to display very long term consistency. ¶ Russia still depends on hydrocarbons for two-thirds of its exports, half its federal budget and 20% of its GDP - not to mention balancing its budgetary books at staggeringly high $120/b breakeven prices. President Putin is painfully aware of this. No oil, no political pedestal for him to stand on. Pumping the ‘black gold’ is literally the only way Putin can keep the Russian political system in balance, not just to fulfil the $320bn spending commitments he's made to the Russian electorate by 2018, but to ‘price in’ more significant payments needed to keep the security services, military and oligarchs on-board.¶ Ramping up investment into mature onshore fields (and 'shale oil' plays) might help to fill some short term gaps, but if Russia wants to maintain its production of 10.5 million barrels per day (mb/d), or increase its output to 11mb/d, as the government intends, it only has one option: to develop its enormous offshore potential in the Arctic. Estimates vary, but anything up to 100 billion barrels of oil equivalent is sitting under the Russian part of the Arctic ice - in ballpark terms, that amounts to 70% of current Russian reserves. The snag for Putin is that Russia neither has the capital nor expertise to develop the fields by itself. State oil company Rosneft needs international oil companies (IOCs) to help it 'crack' the initial ice.

## Econ

### Blocked Now

#### 98% of offshore oil potential is locked up

Pyle 12 (Thomas – president of the Institute for Energy Research, “Energy Department sneaks offshore moratorium past public”, 7/9, http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2012/jul/9/energy-department-sneaks-offshore-moratorium-past-/)

While the Obama administration was taking a victory lap last week after the 5-4 Supreme Court decision to uphold the president’s signature legislative accomplishment, Obamacare, the Interior Department was using the media black hole to release a much-awaited five-year plan for offshore drilling. That plan reinstitutes a 30-year moratorium on offshore energy exploration that will keep our most promising resources locked away until long after President Obama begins plans for his presidential library. Given the timing, it is clear that the self-described “all of the above” energy president didn’t want the American people to discover that he was denying access to nearly 98 percent of America’s vast energy potential on the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS). The Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (OCSLA) of 1953 provided the interior secretary with the authority to administer mineral exploration and development off our nation’s coastlines. At its most basic level, the act empowers the interior secretary - in this case, former U.S. Sen. Kenneth L. Salazar of Colorado - to provide oil and gas leases to the highest-qualified bidder while establishing guidelines for implementing an oil and gas exploration-and-development program for the Outer Continental Shelf. In 1978, in the wake of the oil crisis and spiking gasoline prices, Congress amended the act to require a series of five-year plans that provide a schedule for the sale of oil and gas leases to meet America’s national energy needs. But since taking office, Mr. Obama and Mr. Salazar have worked to restrict access to our offshore oil and gas resources by canceling lease sales, delaying others and creating an atmosphere of uncertainty about America’s future offshore development that has left job creators looking for other countries’ waters to host their offshore rigs. More than 3 1/2 years into the Obama regime, nearly 86 billion barrels of undiscovered oil on the Outer Continental Shelf remain off-limits to Americans. Alaska alone has about 24 billion barrels of oil in unleased federal waters. The Commonwealth of Virginia - where Mr. Obama has reversed policies that would have allowed offshore development - is home to 130 million barrels of offshore oil and 1.14 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. But thanks to the president, Virginians will have to wait at least another five years before they can begin creating the jobs that will unlock their offshore resources. Once you add those restrictions to the vast amount of shale oil that is being blocked, the administration has embargoed nearly 200 years of domestic oil supply. No wonder the administration wanted to slip its plan for the OCS under the radar when the whole country was focused on the health care decision. But facts are stubborn things, and the Obama administration cannot run forever from its abysmal energy record. In the past three years, the government has collected more than 250 times less revenue from offshore lease sales than it did during the last year of the George W. Bush administration - down from $9.48 billion in 2008 to a paltry $36 million last year. Meanwhile, oil production on federal lands dropped 13 percent last year, and the number of annual leases is down more than 50 percent from the Clinton era. Under the new Obama plan, those numbers will only get worse. The 2012-17 plan leaves out the entire Atlantic and Pacific coasts and the vast majority of OCS areas off Alaska. It cuts in half the average number of lease sales per year, requires higher minimum bids and shorter lease periods and dramatically reduces lease terms. Yet, somehow, we’re supposed to believe that our “all of the above” president is responsible for increased production and reduced oil import. With oil hovering around $85 a barrel and nationwide gas prices nearly double what they were when Mr. Obama took office, you’d think the administration might implement a sensible plan to promote robust job creation and safe offshore energy development. Instead, what we get is the latest phase in the Obama administration’s war on affordable energy, filed under cover of media darkness while the nation was swallowing its Obamacare medicine.

### Squo Fails

#### Squo insufficient

IER 12 Institute for Energy Research, May 8, 2012, “Obama’s Offshore Plan: One Giant Leap Backwards”, http://www.instituteforenergyresearch.org/2012/05/08/obamas-offshore-plan-one-giant-leap-backwards/

After oil prices reached new highs in 2008, the Bush administration and Congress moved to open almost all of the outer continental shelf to oil and gas exploration and development. But in November 2011, the Obama administration released an offshore drilling plan that closes much of the offshore United States to oil and gas drilling that had been opened by President Bush and Congress. The Obama administration’s plan closes those offshore areas to energy exploration and production through at least 2017. The plan allows lease sales to occur in the portions of the Gulf of Mexico and Alaska that were already open to leasing, leaving the entire Atlantic and Pacific coasts off-limits.[i]¶ But, not only does the plan revert backward in time to limit offshore areas for lease, it also calls for a decrease in the number of offshore lease sales. In the past, lease plans for outer continental shelf development averaged five lease sales a year. The 2012 to2017 plan cuts those lease sale offerings in half.[ii] And, it contains higher minimum bids and shorter lease periods. Bonus bids are likely to go up by a factor of two for some deepwater tracts and lease terms are reduced to 5 or 7 years. Because developing offshore leases takes a long time, additional costs can make marginal properties subeconomic.[iii]

#### Current plan not enough – only 15% of OCS unlocked

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

The recent lease sale in the Central Gulf of Mexico was a welcoming sign (especially since the Administration delayed part of the sale in 2010), but the new five-year leasing plan for 2012–2017 is extremely disappointing. The Administration failed to unlock the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, as well as the Eastern Gulf of Mexico and areas off Alaska’s coast. As a result, a meager 15 percent of America’s territorial waters are available for oil and gas exploration. The Minerals Management Service estimates that 101 billion barrels of oil and 480 trillion cubic feet of natural gas of proven reserves and undiscovered resources are awaiting exploration in the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS). Opening these areas would generate hundreds of thousands of new jobs, generate hundreds of billions of dollars in government revenue, and bring more oil to the world market, thereby lowering gas prices.[9]

### Idle Leases Fail

#### Sitting on leases is impossible

IER 9 Institute for Energy Research, 2/11, “Offshore Energy Exploration: Myth vs. Fact”, http://www.instituteforenergyresearch.org/2009/02/11/offshore-energy-exploration-myth-vs-fact-2/

Myth: Oil companies are sitting on 68 million acres of untapped leases and don’t need access to new areas. Fact: Lease agreements already contain federal requirements that require oil companies to use leased land in a timely manner. The 1992 Comprehensive Energy Policy Act requires energy companies to comply with lease provisions and explore expeditiously or risk forfeiture of the lease. Energy companies cannot “stockpile” leases (even those found to contain no oil or gas) to drive prices up. What’s more, historical data show only one discovery results from every 60 leases granted to energy companies. Companies are not “sitting” on the leases they now have. Technology has allowed companies to increase their production on leased acreage.

## T – Restrictions

### 1AR We Meet

#### Limiting area available for leasing is a restriction

Bureau of Applied Research in Anthropology 11, School of Anthropology at the University of Arizona, November 28, 2011, “Offshore Oil and the Deepwater Horizon: Social Effects on Gulf Coast Communities Interim Findings”, <http://stormsmart.org/wp-content/blogs.dir/1/files/group-documents/22/1323196641-offshoreoilandthedeepwater-horizon-socialeffects-interimfindings.pdf>

The Macondo blowout also led to **a restriction on the offshore areas within which drilling would be permitted**. In late November, Interior Secretary Ken Salazar declared the eastern Gulf of Mexico and the entire Atlantic and Pacific coasts off-limits to drilling, reversing the administration’s earlier decision to open those areas. As of September 5, 2011, there were 617 manned platforms and 70 rigs operating in the Gulf (BOEMRE 2011b), but production had not reached pre-disaster levels. Consequently, some argued that the “permitorium” would be the most significant event in the Gulf of Mexico offshore industry since the 1980s bust in terms of its potential for causing major restructuring of the offshore petroleum industry.

## Px

### 1AR XT – No Nomination

#### Causes a political storm --- not enough votes to pass

ABC 1-7, “President Obama Names Chuck Hagel for Defense, John Brennan for CIA”, <http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/OTUS/president-obama-taps-chuck-hagel-defense-secretary-girds/story?id=18147109#.UOthvXexn_k>

But two weeks before his inauguration, Obama's selection of Hagel is expected to trigger a political storm over his confirmation in the Senate, where a bipartisan group of critics has already lined up against the pick.¶ "This is an in your face nomination by the president to all of us who are supportive of Israel," Sen. Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., told CNN on Sunday. "I don't know what his management experience is regarding the Pentagon -- little, if any, so I think it's an incredibly controversial choice."¶ The criticism stems from Hagel's controversial past statements on foreign policy, including a 2008 reference to Israel's U.S. supporters as "the Jewish lobby," public encouragement of negotiations between the United States, Israel and Hamas, a Palestinian group the State Department classifies as terrorists, and his stance on how to deal with Iran.¶ "Hagel has consistently been against economic sanctions to try to change the behavior of the Islamist regime, the radical regime in Tehran, which is the only way to do it, short of war," Sen. Joe Lieberman, I-Conn., said last month.¶ The Nebraska Republican has also drawn fire for his outspoken opposition to the 2003 U.S.-led war in Iraq and the subsequent troop "surge" ordered by then-President George W. Bush in 2007, which has been credited with helping bring the war to a close.¶ On the left, gay rights groups have criticized Hagel for comments he made in 1998 disparaging then-President Bill Clinton's nominee for U.S. Ambassador to Luxembourg James Hormel as "openly, aggressively gay." Hagel has since apologized for the remark as "insensitive."¶ In an interview with his hometown paper, the Lincoln Journal Star, Hagel today launched a rebuttal to critics, whom he said have "completely distorted his record." He said the confirmation process will allow him to show his "unequivocal, total support for Israel" and support for sanctions on Iran.¶ Obama also laid out a vigorous defense of Hagel's record, in spite of the controversial remarks, praising him as a "champion of troops, veterans and their families," noting his leadership at the USO and Department of Veterans Affairs and on Capitol Hill pushing for a post-9/11 GI bill.¶ Giving nod to some of Hagel's more controversial views, Obama even praised Hagel's "willingness to speak his mind even if it wasn't popular, defied conventional wisdom."¶ Top Senate Democrats tell ABC News there is no guarantee Hagel will win confirmation and that, as of right now, there are enough Democratic Senators with serious concerns about Hagel to put him below 50 votes.

#### Massive opposition --- former votes + perceived as anti-Jewish

CNN 1-6 “GOP senators: Hagel is in for a fight”, http://politicalticker.blogs.cnn.com/2013/01/06/gop-senators-hagel-is-in-for-a-fight/

(CNN) – Republican lawmakers voiced staunch opposition Sunday to their former colleague Chuck Hagel, who is expected to be nominated Monday to be President Barack Obama's next secretary of defense.¶ Hagel has taken withering criticism from Republicans and Democrats alike since his name was first floated as a potential successor to current Defense Secretary Leon Panetta more than a month ago. Republicans have struck upon comments in a 2007 interview that some perceive as anti-Jewish, when Hagel said the "Jewish lobby intimidated lawmakers."¶ They've also lambasted positions Hagel took as a GOP senator, including his opposition to unilateral sanctions against Iran, as well as votes opposing the labeling of Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps as a terrorist organization. He also opposed the "surge" of troops in Iraq favored by then-President George W. Bush and members of his administration.¶ On Sunday, Sen. Lindsey Graham of South Carolina said on CNN's "State of the Union" that Hagel was an "in-your-face" choice by Obama. Graham didn't rule out staging a filibuster to prevent a vote on Hagel's nomination.¶ "Hagel, if confirmed to be secretary of defense, would be the most antagonistic secretary of defense towards the state of Israel in our nation's history," Graham told CNN chief political correspondent Candy Crowley.¶ Sen. Ted Cruz, a Republican freshman from Texas elected with strong backing from the tea party, said on "Fox News Sunday" that it was "**very difficult to imagine** a circumstance in which I could support (Hagel's) confirmation."¶ "It's interesting, the president seems bound and determined to proceed down this path despite the fact that Hagel's record is very, very troubling on the nation of Israel," Cruz said. "He has not been a friend to Israel. And in my view the United States should stand unshakably with Israel."

### No Legislation

#### Specifically, DOI shields Obama

Foy 9 Paul, Huffington Post, "Ken Salazar Blamed By Oil And Gas Companies For Scant Interest In New Drilling Projects", 11/19, www.huffingtonpost.com/2009/11/19/ken-salazar-blamed-by-oil\_n\_364027.html

Ken Salazar Blamed By Oil And Gas Companies For Scant Interest In New Drilling Projects¶ SALT LAKE CITY — Drillers say it's getting so hard to obtain an oil-and-gas lease in the Rocky Mountains under the new administration of President Barack Obama that many aren't bothering to show up for auctions.¶ The criticism came after the government held an auction of public lands in Utah that was remarkable for how few parcels were offered or sold. Only five drilling leases sold Tuesday.¶ The Independent Petroleum Association of Mountain States says the new administration is scaring away drillers, who say it's holding up leases after taking their auction money.¶ "Why would any company want to go through the time and expense of participating in lease sales when there's zero certainty that the leases will be issued and that there will be any return on their investment?" asked Kathleen Sgamma, the association's government-affairs director, in an interview.¶ In part, that's a reaction to a series of decisions by the Department of the Interior that suspended the award of 60 of 77 leases sold at a contested December 2008 auction. Secretary of the Interior Ken Salazar faulted the outgoing Bush administration for rushing to award leases on the doorstep of many of Utah's national parks.¶ The Bureau of Land Management has turned exceedingly cautious about awarding leases in Utah, where many of the battles over vast swaths of public land have been playing out.

#### Agencies shield the President

Schoenbrod 93 (David, Professor of Law, New York Law School, Adjunct Scholar, Cato Institute, Former Staff Attorney and Co-director, Project on Urban Transportation, Natural Resources Defense Council, Former Director of Program Development, Bedford Stuyvesant Restoration Corporation, Former Staff Attorney, Association of the Bar, City of New York Committee on Electric Power and the Environment, Former Professor, Yale Law School, and Member, American Tree Farmers’ Association, Power Without Responsibility, p. 108)

Delegation allows the president to avoid personal involvement in lawmaking; an appointee adopts the law, and, as discussed earlier, presidents frequently distance themselves from the controversial decisions of their appointees.

### AT: Enviro Link

#### Plan’s a win for Obama---no environmental backlash

Geman 12 Ben, energy and environment reporter for The Hill, “Senator: Arctic drilling a political win for Obama,” 6-29, <http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/235679-senator-arctic-drilling-a-political-win-for-obama>

The Obama administration’s expected approval of Royal Dutch Shell's plan to drill in Arctic waters off Alaska’s coast this summer is a political plus for President Obama, according to Sen. Mark Begich (D-Alaska), an advocate of the project. “I think what he is showing is — and [Interior Secretary Ken] Salazar and the whole team and what we have been doing with them — is [saying] ‘look, let’s manage it right, let’s manage it carefully, and at the end of the day let’s also constantly review what we are doing,’ ” Begich said in the Capitol Friday. Interior is on the cusp of providing Shell its drilling permits for the long-planned, long-delayed project to drill exploratory wells in the Beaufort and Chukchi seas. The department is [vowing robust safety oversight](http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/232665-overnight-energy-interior-lays-groundwork-to-green-light-shells-arctic-drilling-plan-) — it plans to have inspectors on the rigs around-the-clock — and the permits will follow testing of Shell’s spill containment equipment and other inspections of the company’s infrastructure. But environmentalists oppose the project. They say there’s not sufficient capacity to respond to a potential oil spill in the harsh seas, which are home to polar bears, bowhead and beluga whales and other fragile species. Begich, however, said he did not think the decision will erode Obama’s standing with an environmental base that’s focused on many issues, but will allow Obama to show voters that he’s committed to developing domestic oil resources that displace imports from people that “hate us.” “If anything, I think it gives him something to talk about in the sense of ‘look, we are doing it, we are bringing domestic [resources],” Begich said, citing estimates of very large amounts of oil beneath the Arctic seas.

#### Environmentalists don’t think Arctic drilling is a major issue

Broder and Krauss 12 John M and Clifford, New York Times, "New and Frozen Frontier Awaits Offshore Oil Drilling", May 23, www.nytimes.com/2012/05/24/science/earth/shell-arctic-ocean-drilling-stands-to-open-new-oil-frontier.html?pagewanted=all&\_r=0

Environmental groups, though opposed, recognized the president’s commitment to Shell’s plan, and never formed a broad alliance with North Slope residents, many of whom resented intervention by organizations based mostly outside of Alaska.¶ National environmental groups focused instead on more promising targets, like defeating the Keystone XL pipeline from Canada and retiring coal-fired power plants.