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#### Immigration will pass---sustained momentum’s key

Cohen 2/8 Micah is a writer for NYT’s 538 blog. “Signs of a Shift on Immigration Among G.O.P. Rank-and-File,” 2013, http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/02/08/signs-of-a-shift-on-immigration-among-g-o-p-rank-and-file/

With notable speed after the Nov. 6 presidential election, a number of Republican politicians and opinions makers — from House Speaker John A. Boehner to the talk show host Sean Hannity — altered their positions on immigration and expressed a new openness to comprehensive reform.¶ Since then, the push to overhaul the nation’s immigration system appears to have sustained momentum. A new ABC News/Washington Post poll found a jump in public approval of President Obama’s handling of immigration, and most recent polls have found a majority of Americans support providing immigrants who have come here illegally a pathway to United States citizenship.¶ So, has the shift on immigration among some — but not all — Republican legislators, strategists and media personalities filtered down to rank-and-file Republicans?¶ The polling evidence — with a few significant caveats — says “possibly, yes.” There are signs of an uptick in Republican support for a pathway to citizenship, or at least a conditional pathway to citizenship.¶ First, the caveats. Tracking opinions on immigration policy over time is tricky because each pollster asks different questions with different options, making for apples-to-oranges comparisons. In addition, when narrowing the focus to self-identified Republicans and Republican leaners, small sample sizes and large margin of sampling errors become a problem. A typical national survey includes about 1,000 respondents, making the subsample of Republicans pretty small, usually around 200 to 300.¶ But keeping those disclaimers in mind, the most recent polls on immigration suggest an increase in the percentage of Republicans who favor immigration reform that includes a route to United States citizenship.¶ On average, the share of Republicans who favor providing undocumented immigrants with a path to citizenship is 48 percent among the six national polls released so far in 2013 and included in the PollingReport.com database. (The release of a CNN poll conducted Jan. 14-15 did not provide a breakdown by political party and is not included in the average).¶ Among the six previous polls that asked about a pathway to citizenship and released results by party identification, an average of only 38 percent of Republicans favored providing a path to citizenship.¶ Question wording has an effect here. Two of the polls that found the highest level of Republican support emphasized the requirements illegal immigrants might have to meet to become citizens. Conservative voters might be more likely to support a path to citizenship if it involves certain qualifications.¶ For instance, a Fox News poll conducted Jan. 15-17 among registered voters found that 56 percent of Republicans said the government should “allow illegal immigrants to remain in the country and eventually qualify for U.S. citizenship, but only if they meet certain requirements like paying back taxes, learning English, and passing a background check.”¶ And a Gallup poll released this week found that 59 percent of Republicans would vote for “a law that would allow undocumented immigrants living in the United States the chance to become legal residents or citizens if they meet certain requirements.”¶ On the other hand, a CBS News poll of adults conducted Jan. 24-27 found that only 35 percent of Republicans said illegal immigrants currently working in the country “should be allowed to stay in their jobs and to eventually apply for U.S. citizenship.” (CBS found that 25 percent of Republicans said illegal immigrants should be able to stay as guest workers and 36 percent said they should be required to leave the United States).¶ The apples-to-apples comparisons we have are more mixed: Republican support in the mid-January AP/GfK poll jumped to 53 percent from 31 percent in 2010. The latest ABC News/Washington Post poll moved to 42 percent Republican support for a path to citizenship from 37 percent in November 2012 (that’s inside the margin of sampling error). The CBS News poll did not move at all, finding 35 percent Republican support in both its December 2012 and late January 2013 surveys. And Quinnipiac polls, released on Thursday and in early December 2012, both found roughly 40 percent of registered Republicans support a path to citizenship and just more than 10 percent support legal status without citizenship.¶ An uptick in Republican support for a pathway to citizenship could be statistical noise. And even if it is real, it could reverse itself. Some political science research suggests that anti-immigrant attitudes increase when immigration is in the news.¶ But there are reasons to think that immigration, over all, has become less of a hot-button issue. A Pew study found that the number of illegal immigrants living in the United States has dropped since the 2007 push for change. Another Pew survey found that only 44 percent of Republicans see dealing with immigration as a top priority. That’s down from previous peaks of 69 percent in 2007 and 61 percent in 2011.¶ Further polling is needed before a more concrete picture of Republican attitudes emerges. But if Republican voters have warmed to providing a conditional path to citizenship, it could increase the likelihood of an overhaul becoming law by freeing House Republicans, in particular, to back some kind of reform.

#### Plan causes a political firestorm

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

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

#### PC’s key

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

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

#### Ag industry’s collapsing now---immigration’s key

Alfonso Serrano 12, Bitter Harvest: U.S. Farmers Blame Billion-Dollar Losses on Immigration Laws, Time, 9-21-12, http://business.time.com/2012/09/21/bitter-harvest-u-s-farmers-blame-billion-dollar-losses-on-immigration-laws/

The Broetjes and an increasing number of farmers across the country say that a complex web of local and state anti-immigration laws account for acute labor shortages. With the harvest season in full bloom, stringent immigration laws have forced waves of undocumented immigrants to flee certain states for more-hospitable areas. In their wake, thousands of acres of crops have been left to rot in the fields, as farmers have struggled to compensate for labor shortages with domestic help.¶ “The enforcement of immigration policy has devastated the skilled-labor source that we’ve depended on for 20 or 30 years,” said Ralph Broetje during a recent teleconference organized by the National Immigration Forum, adding that last year Washington farmers — part of an $8 billion agriculture industry — were forced to leave 10% of their crops rotting on vines and trees. “It’s getting worse each year,” says Broetje, “and it’s going to end up putting some growers out of business if Congress doesn’t step up and do immigration reform.”¶ (MORE: Why Undocumented Workers Are Good for the Economy)¶ Roughly 70% of the 1.2 million people employed by the agriculture industry are undocumented. No U.S. industry is more dependent on undocumented immigrants. But acute labor shortages brought on by anti-immigration measures threaten to heap record losses on an industry emerging from years of stiff foreign competition. Nationwide, labor shortages will result in losses of up to $9 billion, according to the American Farm Bureau Federation.

#### Key to small farms

Gual 10, 10/17/2010 (Frank, Farm job, anyone?, Associated Content, p. http://www.associatedcontent.com/article/5877166/farm\_job\_anyone.html)

Those calling for tougher immigration laws and the UFW claim that farmers have become accustomed to hiring undocumented workers who are willing to work for little, and now make up half the farm labor force. Legal immigrants make up a quarter of the farm labor. Those Americans who do get hired to do farm work often disappear quickly.¶ Farm work is often offered in remote locations which city dwellers find difficult to get to, and one solution would be to provide transportation from central cities with high unemployment to outlying farms. Another possibility would be to use prisoners incarcerated for minor offenses.¶ A shortage of farm labor will cause food prices to rise at a time when many people are out of work and may be receiving government assistance. It will also increase our dependence on imported food, which may not be up to FDA standards and could cause health problems, as has already happened.¶ Another effect of the farm labor shortage will be the continued disappearance of small family farms, which will either be abandoned or bought by large conglomerates whose management is far removed from the local community.

#### Prevents extinction

Altieri 8 - Professor of agroecology @ University of California, Berkeley. [Miguel Altieri (President, Sociedad Cientifica LatinoAmericana de Agroecologia (SOCLA), “Small farms as a planetary ecological asset: Five key reasons why we should support the revitalization of small farms in the Global South,” Food First, Posted May 9th, 2008, pg. http://www.foodfirst.org/en/node/2115]

The Via Campesina has long argued that farmers need land to produce food for their own communities and for their country and for this reason has advocated for genuine agrarian reforms to access and control land, water, agrobiodiversity, etc, which are of central importance for communities to be able to meet growing food demands. The Via Campesina believes that in order to protect livelihoods, jobs, people's food security and health, as well as the environment, food production has to remain in the hands of small- scale sustainable farmers and cannot be left under the control of large agribusiness companies or supermarket chains. Only by changing the export-led, free-trade based, industrial agriculture model of large farms can the downward spiral of poverty, low wages, rural-urban migration, hunger and environmental degradation be halted. Social rural movements embrace the concept of food sovereignty as an alternative to the neo-liberal approach that puts its faith in inequitable international trade to solve the world’s food problem. Instead, food sovereignty focuses on local autonomy, local markets, local production-consumption cycles, energy and technological sovereignty and farmer to farmer networks.¶ This global movement, the Via Campesina, has recently brought their message to the North, partly to gain the support of foundations and consumers, as political pressure from a wealthier public that increasingly depends on unique food products from the South marketed via organic, fair trade, or slow food channels could marshal the sufficient political will to curb the expansion of biofuels, transgenic crops and agro-exports, and put an end to subsidies to industrial farming and dumping practices that hurt small farmers in the South. But can these arguments really captivate the attention and support of northern consumers and philanthropists? Or is there a need for a different argument—one that emphasizes that the very quality of life and food security of the populations in the North depends not only on the food products, but in the ecological services provided by small farms of the South. In fact, it is herein argued that the functions performed by small farming systems still prevalent in Africa, Asia and Latin America—in the post-peak oil era that humanity is entering—comprise an ecological asset for humankind and planetary survival. In fact, in an era of escalating fuel and food costs, climate change, environmental degradation, GMO pollution and corporate- dominated food systems, small, biodiverse, agroecologically managed farms in the Global South are the only viable form of agriculture that will feed the world under the new ecological and economic scenario.¶ There are at last five reasons why it is in the interest of Northern consumers to support the cause and struggle of small farmers in the South:¶ 1. Small farmers are key for the world’s food security¶ While 91% of the planet’s 1.5 billion hectares of agricultural land are increasingly being devoted to agro-export crops, biofuels and transgenic soybean to feed cars and cattle, millions of small farmers in the Global South still produce the majority of staple crops needed to feed the planet’s rural and urban populations. In Latin America, about 17 million peasant production units occupying close to 60.5 million hectares, or 34.5% of the total cultivated land with average farm sizes of about 1.8 hectares, produce 51% of the maize, 77% of the beans, and 61% of the potatoes for domestic consumption. Africa has approximately 33 million small farms, representing 80 percent of all farms in the region. Despite the fact that Africa now imports huge amounts of cereals, the majority of African farmers (many of them women) who are smallholders with farms below 2 hectares, produce a significant amount of basic food crops with virtually no or little use of fertilizers and improved seed. In Asia, the majority of more than 200 million rice farmers, few farm more than 2 hectares of rice make up the bulk of the rice produced by Asian small farmers. Small increases in yields on these small farms that produce most of the world´s staple crops will have far more impact on food availability at the local and regional levels, than the doubtful increases predicted for distant and corporate-controlled large monocultures managed with such high tech solutions as genetically modified seeds.¶ 2.Small farms are more productive and resource conserving than large-scale monocultures¶ Although the conventional wisdom is that small family farms are backward and unproductive, research shows that small farms are much more productive than large farms if total output is considered rather than yield from a single crop. Integrated farming systems in which the small-scale farmer produces grains, fruits, vegetables, fodder, and animal products out-produce yield per unit of single crops such as corn (monocultures) on large-scale farms. A large farm may produce more corn per hectare than a small farm in which the corn is grown as part of a polyculture that also includes beans, squash, potato, and fodder. In polycultures developed by smallholders, productivity, in terms of harvestable products, per unit area is higher than under sole cropping with the same level of management. Yield advantages range from 20 percent to 60 percent, because polycultures reduce losses due to weeds, insects and diseases, and make more efficient use of the available resources of water, light and nutrients. In overall output, the diversified farm produces much more food, even if measured in dollars. In the USA, data shows that the smallest two hectare farms produced $15,104 per hectare and netted about $2,902 per acre. The largest farms, averaging 15,581 hectares, yielded $249 per hectare and netted about $52 per hectare. Not only do small to medium sized farms exhibit higher yields than conventional farms, but do so with much lower negative impact on the environment. Small farms are ‘multi-functional’– more productive, more efficient, and contribute more to economic development than do large farms. Communities surrounded by many small farms have healthier economies than do communities surrounded by depopulated, large mechanized farms. Small farmers also take better care of natural resources, including reducing soil erosion and conserving biodiversity.¶ The inverse relationship between farm size and output can be attributed to the more efficient use of land, water, biodiversity and other agricultural resources by small farmers. So in terms of converting inputs into outputs, society would be better off with small-scale farmers. Building strong rural economies in the Global South based on productive small-scale farming will allow the people of the South to remain with their families and will help to stem the tide of migration. And as population continues to grow and the amount of farmland and water available to each person continues to shrink, a small farm structure may become central to feeding the planet, especially when large- scale agriculture devotes itself to feeding car tanks.¶ 3. Small traditional and biodiverse farms are models of sustainability¶ Despite the onslaught of industrial farming, the persistence of thousands of hectares under traditional agricultural management documents a successful indigenous agricultural strategy of adaptability and resiliency. These microcosms of traditional agriculture that have stood the test of time, and that can still be found almost untouched since 4 thousand years in the Andes, MesoAmerica, Southeast Asia and parts of Africa, offer promising models of sustainability as they promote biodiversity, thrive without agrochemicals, and sustain year-round yields even under marginal environmental conditions. The local knowledge accumulated during millennia and the forms of agriculture and agrobiodiversity that this wisdom has nurtured, comprise a Neolithic legacy embedded with ecological and cultural resources of fundamental value for the future of humankind.¶ Recent research suggests that many small farmers cope and even prepare for climate change, minimizing crop failure through increased use of drought tolerant local varieties, water harvesting, mixed cropping, opportunistic weeding, agroforestry and a series of other traditional techniques. Surveys conducted in hillsides after Hurricane Mitch in Central America showed that farmers using sustainable practices such as “mucuna” cover crops, intercropping, and agroforestry suffered less “damage” than their conventional neighbors. The study spanning 360 communities and 24 departments in Nicaragua, Honduras and Guatemala showed that diversified plots had 20% to 40% more topsoil, greater soil moisture, less erosion, and experienced lower economic losses than their conventional neighbors.¶ This demonstrates that a re-evaluation of indigenous technology can serve as a key source of information on adaptive capacity and resilient capabilities exhibited by small farms—features of strategic importance for world farmers to cope with climatic change. In addition, indigenous technologies often reflect a worldview and an understanding of our relationship to the natural world that is more realistic and more sustainable that those of our Western European heritage.¶ 4. Small farms represent a sanctuary of GMO-free agrobiodiversity¶ In general, traditional small scale farmers grow a wide variety of cultivars . Many of these plants are landraces grown from seed passed down from generation to generation, more genetically heterogeneous than modern cultivars, and thus offering greater defenses against vulnerability and enhancing harvest security in the midst of diseases, pests, droughts and other stresses. In a worldwide survey of crop varietal diversity on farms involving 27 crops, scientists found that considerable crop genetic diversity continues to be maintained on farms in the form of traditional crop varieties, especially of major staple crops. In most cases, farmers maintain diversity as an insurance to meet future environmental change or social and economic needs. Many researchers have concluded that this varietal richness enhances productivity and reduces yield variability. For example, studies by plant pathologists provide evidence that mixing of crop species and or varieties can delay the onset of diseases by reducing the spread of disease carrying spores, and by modifying environmental conditions so that they are less favorable to the spread of certain pathogens. Recent research in China, where four different mixtures of rice varieties grown by farmers from fifteen different townships over 3000 hectares, suffered 44% less blast incidence and exhibited 89% greater yield than homogeneous fields without the need to use chemicals.¶ It is possible that traits important to indigenous farmers (resistance to drought, competitive ability, performance on intercrops, storage quality, etc) could be traded for transgenic qualities which may not be important to farmers (Jordan, 2001). Under this scenario, risk could increase and farmers would lose their ability to adapt to changing biophysical environments and increase their success with relatively stable yields with a minimum of external inputs while supporting their communities’ food security.¶ Although there is a high probability that the introduction of transgenic crops will enter centers of genetic diversity, it is crucial to protect areas of peasant agriculture free of contamination from GMO crops, as traits important to indigenous farmers (resistance to drought, food or fodder quality, maturity, competitive ability, performance on intercrops, storage quality, taste or cooking properties, compatibility with household labor conditions, etc) could be traded for transgenic qualities (i.e. herbicide resistance) which are of no importance to farmers who don’t use agrochemicals . Under this scenario risk will increase and farmers will lose their ability to produce relatively stable yields with a minimum of external inputs under changing biophysical environments. The social impacts of local crop shortfalls, resulting from changes in the genetic integrity of local varieties due to genetic pollution, can be considerable in the margins of the Global South.¶ Maintaining pools of genetic diversity, geographically isolated from any possibility of cross fertilization or genetic pollution from uniform transgenic crops will create “islands” of intact germplasm which will act as extant safeguards against potential ecological failure derived from the second green revolution increasingly being imposed with programs such as the Gates-Rockefeller AGRA in Africa. These genetic sanctuary islands will serve as the only source of GMO-free seeds that will be needed to repopulate the organic farms in the North inevitably contaminated by the advance of transgenic agriculture. The small farmers and indigenous communities of the Global South, with the help of scientists and NGOs, can continue to create and guard biological and genetic diversity that has enriched the food culture of the whole planet.¶ 5. Small farms cool the climate¶ While industrial agriculture contributes directly to climate change through no less than one third of total emissions of the major greenhouse gases — Carbon dioxide (CO2), methane (CH4), and nitrous oxide (N2O), small, biodiverse organic farms have the opposite effect by sequestering more carbon in soils**.** Small farmers usually treat their soils with organic compost materials that absorb and sequester carbon better than soils that are farmed with conventional fertilizers. Researchers have suggested that the conversion of 10,000 small- to medium-sized farms to organic production would store carbon in the soil equivalent to taking 1,174,400 cars off the road.¶ Further climate amelioration contributions by small farms accrue from the fact that most use significantly less fossil fuel in comparison to conventional agriculture mainly due to a reduction of chemical fertilizer and pesticide use, relying instead on organic manures, legume-based rotations, and diversity schemes to enhance beneficial insects. Farmers who live in rural communities near cities and towns and are linked to local markets, avoid the energy wasted and the gas emissions associated with transporting food hundreds and even thousands of miles.¶ Conclusions¶ The great advantage of small farming systems is their high levels of agrobidoversity arranged in the form of variety mixtures, polycultures, crop-livestock combinations and/or agroforestry patterns. Modeling new agroecosystems using such diversified designs are extremely valuable to farmers whose systems are collapsing due to debt, pesticide use, transgenic treadmills, or climate change. Such diverse systems buffer against natural or human-induced variations in production conditions. There is much to learn from indigenous modes of production, as these systems have a strong ecological basis, maintain valuable genetic diversity, and lead to regeneration and preservation of biodiversity and natural resources. Traditional methods are particularly instructive because they provide a long-term perspective on successful agricultural management under conditions of climatic variability.¶ Organized social rural movements in the Global South oppose industrial agriculture in all its manifestations, and increasingly their territories constitute isolated areas rich in unique agrobiodiversity, including genetically diverse material, therefore acting as extant safeguards against the potential ecological failure derived from inappropriate agricultural modernization schemes. It is precisely the ability to generate and maintain diverse crop genetic resources that offer “unique” niche possibilities to small farmers that cannot be replicated by farmers in the North who are condemned to uniform cultivars and to co-exist with GMOs. The “ cibo pulito, justo e buono” that Slow Food promotes, the Fair Trade coffee, bananas, and the organic products so much in demand by northern consumers can only be produced in the agroecological islands of the South. This “difference” inherent to traditional systems, can be strategically utilized to revitalize small farming communities by exploiting opportunities that exist for linking traditional agrobiodiversity with local/national/international markets, as long as these activities are justly compensated by the North and all the segments of the market remain under grassroots control.¶ Consumers of the North can play a major role by supporting these more equitable markets which do not perpetuate the colonial model of “agriculture of the poor for the rich,” but rather a model that promotes small biodiverse farms as the basis for strong rural economies in the Global South. Such economies will not only provide sustainable production of healthy, agroecologically-produced, accessible food for all, but will allow indigenous peoples and small farmers to continue their millennial work of building and conserving the agricultural and natural biodiversity on which we all depend now and even more so in the future.

## 1NR

#### Previous immigration pushes failed because Obama spent too much PC on other issues and couldn’t arm-twist the GOP effectively---their ev doesn’t account for the GOP’s tendency toward intransigence which makes PC true in the context of immigration

Earl Ofari Hutchinson 2-1, author and political analyst, associate editor of New America Media, host of the weekly Hutchinson Report on KPFK-Radio and the Pacifica Network, and KTYM Radio Los Angeles, 2/1/13, “No Risk for President Obama in Immigration Reform Fight,” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/earl-ofari-hutchinson/no-risk-for-obama\_b\_2591792.html

But Obama even as his popularity numbers slightly fell among Latinos did not totally ignore the issue. He lashed the GOP for torpedoing comprehensive immigration reform legislation in Congress on the two occasions when it appeared that an immigration bill might be reintroduced.¶ Obama was not to blame that this didn't happen. The crushing problems and bruising fights over deficit reduction, spending, health care reform, coupled with high soaring gas prices and the jobless crisis were endless and time consuming. The fights required every bit of his political capital and arm twisting to make any headway against an obstructionist, intransigent and petty GOP determined to make him pay a steep political price for every inch of legislative ground he sought to gain.¶ The 2012 election changed only one thing with the GOP. That was its in your face, xenophobic rants against illegals supposedly stealing jobs from Americans and breaking the law. GOP leaders had no choice but to tamp down their saber rattle immigration rhetoric for the simple fact that Latino voters punished the party mightily in 2012 for that rhetoric, and sent an even stronger signal that it would continue to punish the GOP if it didn't change at least its tone on immigration. The 2012 election changed one other thing. It gave Obama the long sought and awaited opening he needed to go full throttle on immigration reform. ¶ The election result was not the only strong point for Obama on reform. In 2007, then President George W. Bush was widely and unfairly blamed for making a mess of the immigration reform fight in Congress by not pushing hard enough for passage of the bill. Immigrant rights groups lambasted Republican senators for piling crippling demands for tight amnesty, citizenship and border security provisions in the bill. Leading Republican presidential contenders didn't help matters by flatly opposing the bill as much too soft on amnesty and border enforcement. ¶ This did much to kill whatever flickering hope there was for the bill's passage. This undid the inroads that Bush made in the 2000 and 2004 presidential elections when he scored big with Latino voters. A big part of that then was due to the perception (and reality) that Bush would push hard for immigration reform. But the GOP didn't learn a thing from this. It was almost as if Bush's Latino vote ramp up was an aberration. The GOP's metallic ear on immigration culminated in the idiotic quip from GOP presidential loser Mitt Romney that the best way to solve the immigration crisis was for undocumented workers to "self-deport." ¶ Obama's battle for the Latino vote in 2012 was never intended to head off any mass defection of Latino voters to the GOP. There was never any chance of that. The polls that showed Latinos less than enthusiastic about Obama also showed absolutely no enthusiasm for any GOP would-be presidential candidate, let alone that there would be a massive vote for GOP candidates. ¶ Still, Obama's frontal challenge to the GOP to do something about immigration reform is not only a long overdue move to right a long simmering policy wrong, but a move that if handled right can do much to shove the wrenching issue of what to do about the nation's millions that are here without papers, and are here to stay, off the nation's political table. There's absolutely no risk, only gain, for Obama in taking the point on immigration reform to try and make that happen.

#### Hirsh’s point is that PC’s not key because some GOP Senators want immigration after losing the Latino vote

Hirsh 2/7 Michael, chief correspondent for National Journal, previously served as the senior editor and national economics correspondent for Newsweek, has appeared many times as a commentator on Fox News, CNN, MSNBC, and National Public Radio, has written for the Associated Press, The New York Times, The Washington Post, Foreign Affairs, Harper’s, and Washington Monthly, and authored two books, "There's No Such Thing as Political Capital", 2013, [www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207](http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207)

Meanwhile, the Republican members of the Senate’s so-called Gang of Eight are pushing hard for a new spirit of compromise on immigration reform, a sharp change after an election year in which the GOP standard-bearer declared he would make life so miserable for the 11 million illegal immigrants in the U.S. that they would “self-deport.” But this turnaround has very little to do with Obama’s personal influence—his political mandate, as it were. It has almost entirely to do with just two numbers: 71 and 27. That’s 71 percent for Obama, 27 percent for Mitt Romney, the breakdown of the Hispanic vote in the 2012 presidential election. Obama drove home his advantage by giving a speech on immigration reform on Jan. 29 at a Hispanic-dominated high school in Nevada, a swing state he won by a surprising 8 percentage points in November. But the movement on immigration has mainly come out of the Republican Party’s recent introspection, and the realization by its more thoughtful members, such as Sen. Marco Rubio of Florida and Gov. Bobby Jindal of Louisiana, that without such a shift the party may be facing demographic death in a country where the 2010 census showed, for the first time, that white births have fallen into the minority. It’s got nothing to do with Obama’s political capital or, indeed, Obama at all.

#### That thesis is wrong---GOP members of Congress win elections by bashing immigrants, even if national politicians can’t do it---they have to be dragged kicking and screaming---clearly makes PC key

Robert Mann 1-28, holds the Manship Chair at the Manship School of Mass Communication at Louisiana State University and is director of the school’s Reilly Center for Media & Public Affairs, 1/28/13, “The GOP and Latinos: Will immigration reform change their relationship? Not likely,” http://bobmannblog.com/2013/01/28/the-gop-and-latinos-will-immigration-reform-change-their-relationship-not-likely/

Having lost the popular vote in five of the last six presidential elections, some Republican leaders in Congress have finally decided to tack a different course this week by throwing their support behind major immigration reform. ¶ To put it another way, they’ve discovered that attacking large swaths of the American public as lazy moochers is not the best way to win back the White House. ¶ As Louisiana Gov. Bobby Jindal famously told Republican leaders in Charlotte last week, “We must compete for every single vote. The 47 percent and the 53 percent. And any other combination of numbers that adds up to 100 percent.” ¶ In a bit of unintended humor (isn’t that the only way Jindal is ever funny?), the Republican governor also asserted, “President Barack Obama and the Democrats can continue trying to divide America into groups of warring communities with competing interests, but we will have none of it. We are going after every vote as we work to unite all Americans.” ¶ Now, should the GOP adopt this philosophy that would be a major change. But don’t be surprised if many party regulars ignore Jindal and continue to attack the poor, immigrants and minorities. ¶ Truth is, it’s still the way that too many Republican members of Congress win elections. Perhaps attacking the poor no longer works in presidential races, but it’s still a very effective strategy in some local and state politics in many places around the country.

#### Depends on picking the right issues --- links prove the plan is wrong

Hirsh 2/7 Michael Hirsh - chief correspondent for National Journal, previously senior editor and national economics correspondent for Newsweek, “There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital” February 7, 2013 http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207

And then **there are the presidents who get the politics, and the issues, wrong**. It was the last president before Obama who was just starting a second term, George W. Bush, who really revived the claim of political capital, which he was very fond of wielding. Then Bush promptly demonstrated that he didn’t fully understand the concept either.¶ At his first news conference after his 2004 victory, a confident-sounding Bush declared, “I earned capital in the campaign, political capital, and now I intend to spend it. That’s my style.” The 43rd president threw all of his political capital at an overriding passion: the partial privatization of Social Security. He mounted a full-bore public-relations campaign that included town-hall meetings across the country.¶ Bush failed utterly, of course. But the problem was not that he didn’t have enough political capital. Yes, he may have overestimated his standing. Bush’s margin over John Kerry was thin—helped along by a bumbling Kerry campaign that was almost the mirror image of Romney’s gaffe-filled failure this time—but that was not the real mistake. **The problem was** that **whatever credibility** or stature Bush thought **he had earned** as a newly reelected president **did nothing to make Social Security privatization a better idea in most people’s eyes**. Voters didn’t trust the plan, and four years later, at the end of Bush’s term, the stock-market collapse bore out the public’s skepticism. Privatization just didn’t have any momentum behind it, no matter who was pushing it or how much capital Bush spent to sell it.¶ The mistake that Bush made with Social Security, says John Sides, an associate professor of political science at George Washington University and a well-followed political blogger, “was that just because he won an election, he thought he had a green light. But **there was no sense of any kind of public urgency on Social Security reform**. It’s like he went into the garage where various Republican policy ideas were hanging up and picked one. I don’t think Obama’s going to make that mistake.… **Bush decided he wanted to push a rock up a hill**. He didn’t understand how steep the hill was. I think Obama has more momentum on his side because of the Republican Party’s concerns about the Latino vote and the shooting at Newtown.” Obama may also get his way on the debt ceiling, not because of his reelection, Sides says, “but because Republicans are beginning to doubt whether taking a hard line on fiscal policy is a good idea,” as the party suffers in the polls.

#### Hirsh’s central point is that PC isn’t objectively measurable---but it still exists and is key to immigration---Obama has to make behind the scenes deals to avoid poisoning the well on immigration---persuasion and ability to bargain even on other issues are key

Jonathan Bernstein 1-28, Assistant Professor of Political Science at UTSA, 1/28/13, “On immigration, Obama should opt for a persuasive vagueness,” http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/post-partisan/wp/2013/01/28/on-immigration-obama-should-opt-for-a-persuasive-vagueness/

Ezra Klein made an excellent point about Barack Obama and immigration reform today:¶ Republicans will fight most anything Obama proposes…This is a frustrating fact of life for the Obama administration — and perhaps even a sick commentary on how our political system works — but it is, nevertheless, a fact: Their involvement polarizes issues. And it’s not unique to them: Presidential involvement in general polarizes issues. By staying out, at least for now, the Obama administration is making it easier for Republicans to stay in.¶ The political scientist Richard Neustadt said that the power of the presidency really just meant the power to persuade. But by that he didn’t really mean winning debate-style arguments. Yes, that can happen, but usually presidents persuade by bargaining — by capitalizing on all the things presidents can do to convince others that they should do what the president wants them to do.¶ In this instance, if Klein is correct — and I’m pretty sure he is — the way for Obama to “persuade” is to be as vague about the new bipartisan Senate proposal as he can, at least in public. At the same time, the White House may need to push for specific provisions behind the scenes.¶ And the dance is probably more complicated than that, because it’s not just presidents who polarize, after all. A full-throated embrace of the bipartisan deal by the “usual suspect” liberal groups could easy scare off Republican support; on the other hand, if they oppose the deal, it could make it hard for mainstream liberals to support it. Assuming that the administration both wants the bipartisan package to be the basis for a bill that passes — but that the president also has preferences on details that are up for grabs — he may have strong preferences on how liberal groups react. And yet the president cannot force them to do what he wants; he can only, yes, persuade them. In doing so, he may call upon whatever trust they have in their past history together, or he may be bargaining with them. After all, each group involved has other things they want from the Obama Administration.¶ All of which is only to say that the correct steps for the president are usually difficult to find. The president needs the cooperation of all sorts of people (not just Members of Congress) who don’t have to do what he wants; then again, no one else in the American political system has more potential ways to influence (“persuade”) others. And from the outside, not only is it sometimes hard to know what the president should be doing to persuade — but it’s not even always obvious who needs persuading (Members of Congress? Which ones? Interest groups? Again, which ones? Parts of the bureaucracy?).

#### Winners lose specifically for Obama’s second term

Walsh 12 Ken covers the White House and politics for U.S. News. “Setting Clear Priorities Will Be Key for Obama,” 12/20, http://www.usnews.com/news/blogs/Ken-Walshs-Washington/2012/12/20/setting-clear-priorities-will-be-key-for-obama

And there is an axiom in Washington: Congress, the bureaucracy, the media, and other power centers can do justice to only one or two issues at a time. Phil Schiliro, Obama's former liaison to Congress, said Obama has "always had a personal commitment" to gun control, for example.¶ But Schiliro told the New York Times, "Given the crisis he faced when he first took office, there's only so much capacity in the system to move his agenda." So Obama might be wise to limit his goals now and avoid overburdening the system, or he could face major setbacks that would limit his power and credibility for the remainder of his presidency.

#### **Immigration’s top of the docket**

Papich 2/6 Michael is a writer for The Pendulum. “**Immigration reform returns to** legislative forefront,” 2013, http://www.elonpendulum.com/2013/02/immigration-reform-returns-to-legislative-forefront/

Four years ago, it was the stimulus package and the health care bill. Now, it’s immigration reform. Recent proposals from the Senate and the president may make immigration reform the first big legislative push of Barack Obama’s next four years.¶ A bipartisan committee of eight senators put out a framework for an immigration reform bill Jan. 28. Among other things, the proposal includes a system to provide undocumented immigrants currently in the United States a way to obtain “probationary legal status” after completing a background check and paying various fines and taxes. To receive a green card, these individuals would complete mandatory English and civics courses, show a history of employment and undergo further background checks.

#### Immigration before anything else---predictive and insiders

Miller 1/27 Zeke, "Reaching For History, Obama Could Make Same Mistakes As George W. Bush", 2013, www.buzzfeed.com/zekejmiller/reaching-for-history-obama-poised-to-make-same-mi

While Obama's relationship with the last Congress was defined by dealing with manufactured crises — government shutdown threats, fiscal cliffs — he is now suddenly trying to shape a broader legacy by taking on marquee issues like climate change, gun control, and immigration reform. Each goal would be ambitious in its own right, but tackled together, they could produce a legislative nightmare.¶ "It's a lot of stuff," conceded White House Press Secretary Jay Carney on Friday, adding, "but it's important."¶ Indeed, outside forces have conspired in recent months to place three of the most polarizing political issues front and center for the president. Since Hurricane Sandy pummeled the East Coast, Obama has made repeated rhetorical nods — including prominent placement in his second inaugural address — toward addressing climate change; he's making a push to act on gun control while the nation's memories of the Sandy Hook shooting are still fresh; and with many Republicans suddenly eager to find a solution to the immigration issue, Obama will deliver a speech in Las Vegas Tuesday with the intention of jump-starting reform efforts.¶ To date, the White House has pushed ahead on all three fronts simultaneously, something likely to change by the State of the Union on Feb. 12. Democrats familiar with the administration's thinking believe immigration will move to the forefront, with the others dependent on a successful outcome.¶ "Obama needs to get something passed without poisoning the well, and immigration is where he has to start before anything else will get done," said one Democratic operative close to the White House.

#### Exports won’t drain PC

Ayesha Rascoe and Emily Stephenson, 6-27-2012, “As Congress looks away, U.S. tiptoes toward exporting a gas bounty,” Reuters, http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/06/27/us-usa-lng-exports-idUSBRE85Q05820120627

In a bitterly divided U.S. political environment, there's at least one thing Republicans and Democrats can agree on: Avoid a public showdown on natural gas exports, arguably the most important energy policy decision in recent memory. While fluctuating gasoline prices, the Keystone pipeline and the fight over fracking steal headlines, the question of how much of the newfound U.S. shale gas bounty should be shared with the rest of the world goes largely without comment or coverage -- despite holding far wider and longer-lasting consequences. The reason is clear: unlike the relatively simple, black-and-white issues that politicians often favor and voters connect to, liquefied natural gas (LNG) is deep, deep gray. It affects a tangled web of constituents, from Big Oil to international allies such as Japan, pits free-trade orthodoxy against the domestic economy, and requires an awkward explanation of why allowing some exports -- inevitably raising U.S. energy prices in the short term, even if at the margin -- may ultimately be better for the country in the long run. All the same, this U.S. president or the next will have to make a tricky decision, and its consequences may only become clear years from now: How much U.S. gas should be sold to other countries if it means boosting prices for consumers at home? "Right now I don't think this issue is getting anywhere near the attention it deserves," said Democratic congressman Edward Markey, one of a small number of politicians actively seeking to rein in energy exports. "Keystone and Solyndra are election-year political sideshows," he said, referring to the bankruptcy of a government-funded solar panel maker. "This is the main event." But lobbyists on both sides of the issue say it suits them best to keep the subject out of the headlines. The gas producers that stand to benefit from higher selling prices see no upside from a public brawl, while many manufacturers who could benefit from continuing low prices shy away from anti-export statements. With Congress unlikely to weigh in, the decision falls to a small, obscure unit of the Energy Department, the Office of Natural Gas Regulatory Activities.

#### Gun control doesn’t pound the DA

Voxxi 1/14 “Why immigration reform and gun control aren’t in competition,” 2013, http://www.voxxi.com/immigration-reform-gun-control/

This doesn’t mean, however, that work has simply stopped on everything else. For years now, the White House has had people working full-time on immigration matters; numerous reports suggest that both the White House and DHS are engaged in crafting more specific legislative proposals on immigration. Similarly, House and Senate staffers, and their bosses, continue to meet and discuss and write proposals that are expected to turn into legislation by the spring. The mere fact that they may also have to discuss gun safety at some point this year doesn’t mean that immigration simply stops being a priority.¶ It is up to the Senate to decide how much time goes to immigration reform¶ The legislative calendar is tricky. It is certainly the case that “must pass” legislation—extending the debt ceiling, for instance—will take priority over other pieces of legislation, but on any given day, committee hearings and mark ups are taking place on a range of issues, even if the House or Senate is engaged in a debate on something else. Senate leaders, in particular, have already indicated that they intend to take an immigration bill through “regular order,” meaning that it will be introduced, debated and amended in committee and then brought to the floor of the Senate. Ultimately, Senator Reid will decide how much time to allocate to an immigration bill, potentially sandwiching that debate between other issues. The Senate and House calendars are rarely all or nothing affairs, but instead juggle many issues and many votes on a given day.¶ Ultimately, it is too simplistic to try to rank issues like immigration reform and gun safety. Both are important, both can help to make this country a better place. What will drive actual legislation, however, is how deeply and with what vigor public sentiment on these issues translates into a demand that our legislators act. In this regard, the necessary policy ideas, the voters demands and the political necessity all exist to make immigration reform top the charts for both parties.

#### Agencies link to politics

Thomas McGarity, Endowed Chair in Administrative Law, University of Texas School of Law, May 2012, ARTICLE: ADMINISTRATIVE LAW AS BLOOD SPORT: POLICY EROSION IN A HIGHLY PARTISAN AGE, 61 Duke L.J. 1671

The interchange-fee rulemaking experience illustrates how stakeholders in high-stakes rulemakings have begun going beyond the conventional responses to rulemaking initiatives by adopting a new toolbox of strategies better suited to the deeply divided political economy. If the players on one side of the policy debate perceive that they are unlikely to prevail in the administrative arena, they will move the implementation game to another arena - the White House, a congressional hearing, a political fundraising dinner, a think-tank white paper, talk-radio programs, attack advertising, telephone solicitation and "push polls," or Internet blogs. Many of these new venues were amply used in the battle that accompanied the interchange-fee rulemaking. In addition, although lawyers for the stakeholders employ the careful language of administrative law in arenas in which that language is expected, spokespersons and allies also employ the heated rhetoric of modern political discourse in arenas in which that language is more likely to succeed. This Part probes these, among other, contours of blood-sport rulemaking.

#### Bipartisan opposition to the plan---causes big fights

Greenwire 6 (“Rough going seen for efforts to lift congressional moratoria,” 5-26-6,

http://www.noia.org/website/download.asp?id=295)

With a growing number of Republican lawmakers facing stiff midterm races, efforts to open more offshore areas to oil and gas drilling will find tough going on Capitol Hill, environmentalists and others tracking the issue say. For now, industry groups say momentum is on their side. Though the House voted 217-203 on Thursday to reject removing congressional moratoria on most offshore natural gas drilling, industry lobbyists point out that Rep. John Peterson's (R-Pa.) plan got 46 more votes than it did last year. If there is an offshore drilling component to an upcoming House energy package, it is expected to be shaped largely by House Resources Committee Chairman Richard Pombo (R-Calif.). Pombo's plan would allow states to "opt-out" of offshore oil and gas drilling bans. States that opt-out would receive a share of offshore production revenues. Environmentalists are hopeful the **bipartisan coastal coalition** that opposes wider leasing will not be swayed in sufficient numbers to endorse an opt-out plan or other efforts that are less aggressive than Peterson's but still relax current bans. Heather Taylor, deputy legislative director for the Natural Resources Defense Council, called the argument that Thursday's vote puts industry within striking distance of winning changes to current restrictions a "stretch." "We still won. Period," Taylor said in an interview Friday. "The bottom line is that [the] vote proves that people care about our coasts, and any proposal that comes through that hurts our coasts will be rejected." Also, a House floor vote last week that would also have lifted congressional coastal oil drilling bans lost by a large margin. That prompted an environmentalist to note that an opt-out covering both oil and gas would face hurdles that could be greater than Peterson's gas-only proposal. One lobbyist who works on environmental and energy issues does not believe the House is ready to adopt the opt-out idea, which was most recently floated through legislation offered by Rep. Bobby Jindal (R-La.) that largely mirrors an opt-out and state revenue-sharing plan Pombo floated last year. "I don't see how an opt-out passes," the lobbyist said. "We have never lost a vote on this on the floor," added an aide to a Democratic lawmaker. "To succeed, Pombo has to play the middle ground. I am not sure if he is there yet." Still, an industry lobbyist seeking wider drilling said Friday the vote on Peterson's plan "proves a nuanced approach to things ... has a lot of credibility on the Hill right now." Yet the fight could get tougher if it does not happen this year. Republicans are bracing for a tough midterm election, and while votes on offshore drilling are not quite partisan showdowns, more Democrats oppose wider offshore leasing.

#### Offshore natural gas is mired in gridlock---huge backlash

Gardner 11 Timothy is a writer for Reuters. “Senate blocks move to open up offshore drilling,” May 19, http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/05/19/us-usa-drilling-republicans-idUSTRE74I3XM20110519

The Senate blocked a move by Republicans to speed domestic offshore oil and natural gas drilling on Wednesday, a fresh sign of congressional gridlock on energy issues even as drivers endure gasoline prices near $4 a gallon. Republicans only got 42 of the 60 votes needed to consider a bill, known as the Offshore Production and Safety Act, that would have directed the Interior Department to conduct previously scheduled offshore lease sales in the Gulf of Mexico, Virginia, and Alaska. The bill, introduced by Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, also would have extended lease terms by one year in the Gulf which the Obama administration suspended last year after the BP oil spill. It did not get approval from some Democrats in energy producing states who Republicans had hoped to get, such as Mary Landrieu from Louisiana. The bill was a response by Senate Republicans to high gasoline prices, but also to a Democratic effort that failed on Tuesday to repeal billions of dollars in tax breaks for the top five oil companies operating in the United States. Ahead of presidential and congressional elections next year, calls by politicians to do something about high gasoline prices have become louder, but analysts said there is little they can do to push prices lower in the short-term. McConnell said the Democratic bill would have done three things: "Destroy jobs, send American jobs overseas, make us more dependent on foreign sources of oil." Democrats have already painted Republicans who voted to block the oil tax break effort as standing with the top five energy companies while their profits hit $36 billion in the first quarter of the year. Republicans hope to cast Democrats who opposed their bill opening up leases as against increasing production of domestic oil. But President Barack Obama, aiming to quiet some of those arguments, has pushed his Department of the Interior to expand drilling in Alaska and the Gulf of Mexico. McConnell's bill was similar to several bills that passed recently in the Republican-controlled House of Representatives. Environmentalists praised the vote in the Senate. "After only a year since the BP Oil Disaster ... now is not the time for 'Drill, Baby, Drill,'" said Michael Brune, the executive director of the Sierra Club.

#### Will pass but there are sticking points

Graham 2/7 David is an associate editor of The Atlantic. “Why Immigration-Reform Advocates Feel Good About Their Chances,” 2013, http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2013/02/why-immigration-reform-advocates-feel-good-about-their-chances/272977/

The way John McCain and Michael Bennet talk about it, you'd be surprised immigration reform hasn't passed already.¶ "We have the opportunity to pass a broad-based bill that deals not just with one problem or two problem but takes on the entire of array in ways this touches our economy," said Bennet, a Democratic U.S. senator from Colorado, at an Atlantic conference in Washington Thursday. (Bennet is the brother of Atlantic Editor in Chief James Bennet.) "I do think you've got two parties that've got reasons to get this done."¶ And McCain, as usual, was colorful and blunt. A veteran of several failed attempts at reform, he offered one big explanation for why this time would be different.¶ "**The climate has changed,** American opinion has changed, elections have changed ... and I'm working with people who are effective," he said. "Chuck Schumer is effective. I hate him! But he's effective."¶ Of course, there's more to it, especially for Republicans like McCain, who along with Bennet is a member of the "Gang of Eight" senators working on a bipartisan proposal. The Arizonan pinpointed three reasons this is the time to get reform done. One is simple political math: As many Republicans seem to be realizing, the GOP will find it harder and harder to win elections if it continues to alienate Latino voters. A second is technological, he said, repeatedly citing drones and other technological advances developed to fight the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan as useful tools for policing the border with Mexico more effectively.¶ But much of it comes down to fairness, he concluded.¶ "Can we leave 11 million people in the shadows forever?" McCain asked, referring to the estimated number of illegal immigrants in the country. "The people that wash our dishes, cut our lawns, take care of our children -- is it right to leave them in the shadows forever? I don't think so."¶ Intriguingly, the two Democratic senators who bookended McCain's appearance -- Bennet and Minnesota's Amy Klobuchar -- offered economic rationales for reform, while the Republican made the compassionate case. But what's interesting is how views often associated with one party or the other seem to have been pushed aside, if not totally dispensed with. Bennet said it was reasonable to expect immigrants to learn English, and he said it was fine to make legislation contingent upon border security as long as employee verification, the standard Democratic priority, was part of a comprehensive bill. Bennet would offer only oblique criticism of GOP hardliners like David Vitter and Ted Cruz, saying, "There are some people that are better at putting themselves in other people's shoes that others."¶ Meanwhile, the occasionally cranky McCain was all smiles and jokes, with praise for both Klobuchar and Bennet; he saved his fire for budgetary matters. Asked about the sequester -- which he voted for -- he said, "It's insane, and it's unacceptable." And he criticized his 2008 rival Barack Obama's campaign-style strategy of barnstorming the country to drum up grassroots backing for his side. The real solution, McCain said, was to invite legislators to the White House to hash out a compromise. "There's no point in going out and giving another speech."¶ There should be no illusion that the road forward on immigration reform will be smooth. Panelists identified two big ones. First is the already-cliched "path to citizenship" for illegal immigrants, which McCain pointed out was likely to disappoint some advocates -- it **won't be a walk in the park**. The second sticking point is likely to be a guest-worker program. While lawmakers in both parties seem to agree that the country should lift caps on visas for highly skilled workers, the fate of agricultural and other low-skill workers seems certain to provoke acrimonious debate.¶ For the time being, however, it's the not-inconsiderable common ground between the parties that's on display.

#### Will pass including path to citizenship---momentum

Karst 2/7 Tom is a writer @ The Packer. “House committee considers immigration reform,” 2013, http://www.thepacker.com/fruit-vegetable-news/House-Judiciary-Committee-considers-path-to-immigration-reform-190283571.html

Though some House Republicans still seem hesitant to support a pathway to citizenship for 11 million illegal immigrants in the U.S., Congress opened the door on immigration reform with a hearing by the House Judiciary Committee.¶ With rumors of comprehensive immigration legislation being worked on by **bipartisan groups in the House and Senate,** Washington sources said there appears to be momentum for reform.

#### Turns economy/competitiveness

Hinojosa-Ojeda 12 Founding Director of the North American Integration and Development Center at UCLA Raúl Hinojosa-Ojeda, The Economic Benefits of Comprehensive Immigration Reform Cato Journal, Vol. 32, No. 1 Winter 2012

The historical experience of legalization under the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act indicates that comprehensive immigration reform **would raise wages, increase consumption, create jobs, and generate additional tax revenue.** Even though IRCA was implemented during a period that included a recession and high unemployment (1990–91), it still helped raise wages and spurred increases in educational, home, and small business investments by newly legalized immigrants. Taking the experience of IRCA as a starting point, we estimate that comprehensive immigration reform would yield at least $1.5 trillion in added U.S. gross domestic product (GDP) over 10 years. 1 This is a compelling economic reason to move away from the current “vicious cycle” where enforcement-only policies perpetuate unauthorized migration and exert downward pressure on already low wages, and toward a “virtuous cycle” of worker empowerment in which legal status and labor rights exert upward pressure on wages.

#### Solves US-India relations --- builds trade relationships

LA Times 12, 11/9/2012 (Other countries eagerly await U.S. immigration reform, p. http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/world\_now/2012/11/us-immigration-reform-eagerly-awaited-by-source-countries.html)

"Comprehensive immigration reform will see expansion of skilled labor visas," predicted B. Lindsay Lowell, director of policy studies for the Institute for the Study of International Migration at Georgetown University. A former research chief for the congressionally appointed Commission on Immigration Reform, Lowell said he expects to see at least a fivefold increase in the number of highly skilled labor visas that would provide "a significant shot in the arm for India and China."¶ **There is widespread consensus** among economists and academics that skilled migration **fosters new trade and business relationships between countries** and enhances links to the global economy, Lowell said.¶ "Countries like India and China weigh the opportunities of business abroad from their expats with the possibility of brain drain, and I think they still see the immigration opportunity as a bigger plus than not," he said.

#### US/India relations are key to prevent South Asian nuclear war

Schaffer 2, Spring 2002 (Teresita – Director of the South Asia Program at the Center for Strategic and International Security, Washington Quarterly, p. Lexis)

Washington's increased interest in India since the late 1990s reflects India's economic expansion and position as Asia's newest rising power. New Delhi, for its part, is adjusting to the end of the Cold War. As a result, both giant democracies see that they can benefit by closer cooperation. For Washington, the advantages include a wider network of friends in Asia at a time when the region is changing rapidly, as well as a **stronger position from which to help calm possible future nuclear tensions in the** region. Enhanced **trade** and investment benefit both countries and are a **prerequisite for improved U.S. relations with India**. For India, the country's ambition to assume a stronger leadership role in the world and to maintain an economy that lifts its people out of poverty depends critically on good relations with the United States.

#### CIR’s key to Latin American relations

Shifter 12 Michael is the President of Inter-American Dialogue. “Remaking the Relationship: The United States and Latin America,” April, IAD Policy Report, http://www.thedialogue.org/PublicationFiles/IAD2012PolicyReportFINAL.pdf

Some enduring problems stand squarely in the way of partnership and effective cooperation. The **inability of Washington to reform its broken immigration system is a constant source of friction between the U**nited **S**tates **and** nearly **every other country in the Americas**. Yet US officials rarely refer to immigration as a foreign policy issue. Domestic policy debates on this issue disregard the United States’ hemispheric agenda as well as the interests of other nations.

#### Relations are key to solve a laundry list of existential threats---the brink is now

Shifter 12 Michael is the President of Inter-American Dialogue. “Remaking the Relationship: The United States and Latin America,” April, IAD Policy Report, http://www.thedialogue.org/PublicationFiles/IAD2012PolicyReportFINAL.pdf

There are compelling reasons for the United States and Latin America to pursue more robust ties. Every country in the Americas would benefit from strengthened and expanded economic relations, with improved access to each other’s markets, investment capital, and energy resources. Even with its current economic problems, the United States’ $16-trillion economy is a **vital** market and source of capital (including remittances) and technology **for Latin America**, and it could contribute more to the region’s economic performance. For its part, **Latin America’s rising economies will** inevitably **become** more and more **crucial to the U**nited **S**tates’ economic future. The United States and many nations of Latin America and the Caribbean would also gain a great deal by more cooperation on such **global matters as climate change**, nuclear **non-proliferation,** and **democracy and human rights.** With a rapidly expanding US Hispanic population of more than 50 million, the cultural and demographic integration of the United States and Latin America is proceeding at an accelerating pace, setting a firmer basis for hemispheric partnership Despite the multiple opportunities and potential benefits, relations between the United States and Latin America remain disappointing . If new opportunities are not seized, relations will likely continue to drift apart . The longer the current situation persists, the harder it will be to reverse course and rebuild vigorous cooperation . Hemispheric affairs require urgent attention—both from the United States and from Latin America and the Caribbean.

## 2NR

#### Obama can’t win on energy

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

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

#### Obama’s putting energy on the back-burner---immigration’s first

Becker 2/7 Bernie is a writer for The Hill. “Senior Dem: Obama vows to tackle climate – eventually,” 2013, http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/281839-senior-dem-obama-vows-to-tackle-climate-eventually-

President Obama’s message to House Democrats on Thursday: Yes, acting on climate change is important. **But it’s going to have to wait in line.¶** Obama barely touched on energy policy during his roughly 20-minute address to the Democratic caucus on Thursday, spending more time on fiscal issues, guns and immigration. ¶ But Democratic lawmakers questioned the president about climate change during Obama’s appearance at their retreat in Lansdowne, Virginia, Rep. Sandy Levin (D-Mich.) told reporters.¶ Reporters were not allowed at the question-and-answer session of the president’s visit.¶ ¶ “He said it’s very serious, and he wants it on the agenda. But **you can’t do everything at once**,” said Levin, the top Democrat on the House Ways and Means Committee.¶ “I think his message is, it’s a major, major issue. We need to address it. We need to make sure we sequence each effort so we accomplish each,” the Michigan Democrat added. “I think you know, jobs is number one, economic growth, and that’s why sequestration is so important.” ¶ Obama has vowed to make global warming a priority during his second term. ¶ Major climate legislation remains frozen in Congress, so green groups are pressing for new executive actions, including carbon emissions standards for existing power plants.

#### Plan angers Obama’s base

Maize 10 (Kennedy, “Copenhagen: The Case for Climate Adaptation”, Managing Power, March 1, http://www.managingpowermag.com/opinion\_and\_commentary/Copenhagen-The-Case-for-Climate-Adaptation\_227.html)

Energy legislation is dead for 2010, except for possible subsidies for nuclear power, clean coal, and offshore drilling, designed to appeal to Republicans. But that reach across the partisan divide likely will enrage Obama’s base among liberals and environmentalists. The predictable outcome: more gridlock and name-calling. No action.

#### Kills the agenda

Campbell 11 (James E., Distinguished Professor of Political Science and Chair of the Department and the University of Buffalo, “Political Forces on the Obama Presidency: From Elections to Governing”, http://www.polsci.buffalo.edu/documents/ObamaPresidencyChapter4.pdf)

Since neither the ideological base of a party not its supporters in the center can be ignored-—and since both have different demands—presidents must arrive at some balance between them. In no small part, the success of presidents in governing depends on their success in striking the right balance between governing to please their party’s base and governing to please the political center. Like every presidency before his, **this is the challenge for Obama’s presidency.** Its success in governing the nation, as well as the possibility of a second term, may hinge on how well the president strikes the right balance between appealing to his liberal base and simultaneously to his supporters in the political center. The principal reason why a president’s success in office depends on his ability to maintain the support of the president’s electoral coalition **(the combined partisan base and centrist supporters)** is that this is also **his governing coalition**. Since political views are generally stable, a president should expect to receive most of his support while in office from the same quarters that supported him in his election. As a consequence, the success of a president in office depends to a great extent on his ability to maintain both the support of his base and the center. Just as the president’s electoral success depended on maintaining his electoral coalition, his success in governing depends on maintaining the support of that same coalition. In effect, there is no bright line between the politics of governing and the politics of elections. In its most basic sense, the “permanent campaign” to maintain the president’s constituency of supporters from election to office and on to the next election is fundamental to presidential politics.

# Prices
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#### Shale’s sustainable

#### a) Production’s only down because it’s so cheap now---but prices are self-correcting

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

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

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

#### b) Nelder concludes rebounding prices reverse production declines

Chris Nedler 12, Smart Planet, 2/8/12, “Everything you know about shale gas is wrong,” http://www.smartplanet.com/blog/energy-futurist/everything-you-know-about-shale-gas-is-wrong/341

A word of caution is in order here: A one-year decline in production in an unprofitable environment is not proof that shale gas has “peaked.” It’s certainly possible that renewed drilling could bring higher production when gas prices rise again. The operative question in that case is when. If gas prices recover within the next year or two, it will be relatively easy to bring new wells online rapidly. But if gas prices languish for longer than that, the most productive “core” areas of the plays could become exhausted because the wells deplete so quickly. Without sustained new drilling to replace their production, by the time producers begin drilling again in the remaining, less productive prospects, an air pocket could form in the supply line.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Costs Versus Gas Prices

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

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

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

#### Berman sucks - All their authors cite him and he’s wrong

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### The status quo locks in manufacturing gains---impossible to reverse it

Philip K. Verleger 12, Jr., visiting fellow at the Peterson Institute for International Economics and was director of the Office of Energy Policy at the US Treasury in the Carter administration, 4/23/12, “The coming US boom and how shale gas will fuel it,” http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/09fbb2ac-87b8-11e1-ade2-00144feab49a.html#axzz2KHYJuFvm

Ten years from today, the CEA and Federal Reserve chairman will again celebrate a decade of unexpected strong growth. This time the credit will go to countrywide gains from the very low energy prices found only in the US. Low-cost energy will have spawned an export surge in all sorts of goods, from chemicals to tyres. Fracking and the other technologies that gave us low natural gas prices will have added more than 1 per cent a year to US growth, repeating the 2000 surprise.

Today, few realise that the US stands on the cusp of significant economic gains stimulated by low energy costs.

The consensus view discounts the economic boost from natural gas, arguing that the energy sector cannot generate so many jobs.

The doubters wear blinkers; they see nothing but the energy market. They commit the mistake made by forecasters in 1991. They miss the tectonic shifts in trade, shifts that US economist Tyler Cowen identified in his paper in the US magazine The American Interest, What Export-Oriented America Means .

The backward-focusing observers who dismiss the impact of shale gas fail to understand four conditions that will contribute permanently to a big improvement in the competitive position of the US.

First, the US has perfected a means of “manufacturing” natural gas from shale, in effect breaking the monopolistic control on hydrocarbon supply once enjoyed by the majors.

Second, this advantage gives manufacturing plants in the US a 60 per cent, 70 per cent or even 80 per cent cost advantage over those operating in China, Japan, South Korea or European countries.

Third, US financial markets (principally futures markets) enable producers and consumers to lock in profits for years ahead. Low cash prices now do not deter producers that sold today’s production a year ago at much higher and profitable prices.

Fourth, competitive and open pipeline systems prevent any single large participant from denying these economic benefits to any producer or consumer.

No country other than Canada enjoys US competitive conditions. Nor will any other country probably enjoy them in the future. Recognising this, groups such as Michelin and Shell intend to build plants in the US to take advantage of the country’s permanently lower-cost energy supplies. Steel mills are also being planned.

In short, low-cost energy provided primarily by shale gas production advances will almost certainly contribute to an investment boom across the US economy.

Leaders outside the US recognise the threat shale gas poses to their competitive position. Vladimir Putin has warned that Russia’s national energy company must respond to the challenge. State energy groups, as well as the world’s integrated oil companies, will no doubt try. One can be confident of their failure, though. The development of shale oil and gas involves drilling hundreds of thousands of low-cost wells. Large energy companies fall flat on their faces every time they attempt such endeavours.

The big multinationals cannot run projects involving thousands of workers on many small sites. This is not their forte. Instead they excel at developing a few very expensive, highly productive projects that yield high-cost supplies. Their executives and shareholders should be thankful that the unique institutional conditions behind the US shale revolution cannot be found anywhere else.

The US and Canada will be, for the foreseeable future, a low-cost energy hegemony. We are the only nations that have promoted small, efficient, low-cost energy producers. Every other country relies on the Exxon type.

As a result of these circumstances, the benefits of low-cost energy supplies will spread throughout the US economy, stimulating exports of goods and services and creating millions of jobs.

#### Prices would have to hit $17 for the U.S. to lose competitive advantage

Gordon Pickering 12, Director of the Energy Practice at Navigant Consulting, April 2012, “The Resurgence of the U.S. Petrochemical Sector and the Natural Gas Industry - 'Strange Bed Fellows' or a 'Match Made in Heaven'?,” <http://www.navigant.com/~/media/WWW/Site/Insights/Energy/NG_Notes_April_2012.ashx>

Finally, U.S. gas prices will need to rise dramatically before the relative advantage of the U.S. petrochemical industry disappears. As a general rule of thumb in the chemical industry, gas-based steam crackers will be economically favorable (as compared to oil-based crackers) when the oil-gas price ratio is higher than 7\*. Today's Brent price level of $120 per barrel, then, implies that Henry Hub prices will need to rise beyond $17/MMBtu before the U.S. petrochemical players lose their cost advantage. The possibility of this looks inconceivable for the foreseeable future. Therefore, even at long-term sustainable prices in the range of $5-7/MMBtu (unless there is a drastic crash of the oil prices), the U.S. chemical industry will remain comfortably competitive against foreign competitors.

#### Manufacturing not key to the economy

Wessel 12 (David Wessel, economics editor of The Wall Street, “Manufacturing Industry Gained Momentum In 2011,” 1-19-12, <http://www.npr.org/2012/01/19/145437593/are-more-u-s-manufacturing-jobs-being-created>)

WESSEL: Well, that's a good question. So basically, factories have added more than 300,000 jobs in the past two years, and that's pretty good news - certainly better than losing jobs. But it would take two million more jobs to get manufacturing back to where it was in 2007 before the recession. Factories are managing to produce more without hiring a lot more workers, because they're getting more productive; technology, reorganization, making people work harder, making them work smarter. It's all made for a remarkable surge of productivity. Factories get 40 percent more output out of every out of work today, compared to what they got 10 years ago. MONTAGNE: Still though, if sales keep growing, would factories not hire more? Maybe not as many workers as they had before, but more, and couldn't that be one part of the answer, at least, to the jobs problem? WESSEL: Well, it would definitely be one part, but it's a small part. For all the romance about manufacturing, we are no longer a manufacturing economy when it comes to jobs. Only nine percent of the jobs in America today are in manufacturing. It just isn't big enough to put Americans back to work. Even if factory employment doubled, which isn't going to happen, that wouldn't be enough new jobs to put all the 13 million unemployed people back to work. So yes, it's a plus. But no, it's not enough to solve our unemployment problem.

#### Low natural gas prices determine the success of new biofuel ventures---the plan sends a key market signal that triggers a wave of ethanol investment

Jim Lane 12, Biofuels Digest, April 20, 2012, “Falling natural gas prices and the bio-based opportunity,” online: http://www.biofuelsdigest.com/bdigest/2012/04/20/falling-natural-gas-prices-and-the-bio-based-opportunity/

Think that falling natural gas prices mean bad news for bio-based technologies? Don’t bet on it. There’s opportunity in there.

On the chance that you were engaged in interstellar travel, or cryogenically frozen, over the past two years – US natural gas prices and global oil prices have completely decoupled, for the first time in living memory. For a long, long time, a barrel of oil cost just around 10 times the cost of a million BTUs of natural gas, or about 70 percent more on a BTU basis.

Today, a barrel of oil is available at 50 times the cost of a million BTUs of natural gas. In addition to oil prices rising, primarily as the result of Middle East tensions and rising demand from developing countries – there has been, in the US, a massive drop in natural gas prices owing to the impact of new technologies for liberating gas from shale.

For chemical plants that utilize natural gas as a feedstock, it means opportunity, and they have responded vigorously. Yesterday, Dow unveiled plans for a new, $1.7 billion, 1.5 million metric ton steam cracker in Freeport, Texas that will start producing ethylene in 2017, part of a $4 billion investment by the company in expanded US production in response to falling feedstock prices.

Only last month, Shell announced a strikingly similar, $2 billion project in Pennsylvania, while Chevron Phillips (a JV of ConocoPhillips and Chevron) is planning a project in Texas, Formosa Plastics has announced a $1.7 billion project for Texas, along with a liquid natural gas project announced by Freeport Development. LyondellBasell and Occidental are also looking at major projects along the Gulf Coast.

Falling feedstock prices?

That catalyst for economic activity should be a watched carefully by bio-based growers, whose technologies currently are scheduled to produce liquid fuels and chemicals at prices competitive with anywhere from $30 oil to $100 oil. Nothing is scheduled to compete with $20 oil, which is where oil prices were the last time natural gas was available for $2 per MMBTUs, back in 2002.

Many have described the divergence between natural gas and oil as a temporary phenomenon that will return to equilibrium because of a slowdown in development of gas projects. But high oil prices encourage more drilling, and natural gas is a by product of those projects, Fully 75 percent of the increase in US gas production this year is expected to be a consequence of increase oil drilling, according to Bloomberg Business Week.

The key takeaway from falling natural gas prices

Processing technology investments follow cheap feedstock, and transformational processing technology is a liberator of value by unlocking low-cost feedstocks that were previously untappable.

One of the reasons why technologies from the likes of Enerkem, Terrabon, INEOS Bio and Fulcrum, that utilize zero-cost municipal solid waste, remain highly prized, and may push the Enerkem and Fulcrum IPOs over the finishing line this spring.

Problem there is abundance of aggregated feedstock. Generally speaking, the projects contemplated by the developers range from 10-30 million gallons, and that is generally a function of the transportation cost for the feedstock, which generally must be brought in by truck, barge or rail.

For biofuels, it reminds that feedstock yield intensification is an absolute must for expansion – both in providing lower overall costs (while providing sufficient return to the grower), and in providing larger concentrations of biomass that will make larger projects more feasible. Larger projects have lower technology costs – and attract more attention from end-use fuels and chemical companies who, on the whole, have been generally underwhelmed by the scale of proposed biofuels operations.

Other potential winners in the bio-based space from high oil prices and falling gas prices?

Outside the North American market

From the EU to Asia, gas and oil prices remain largely in their traditional relationship. There, consumers should be expected to demand diversification away from oil as a strategy to limit price volatility and combat emissions.

Many first generation ethanol plants.

The more modern plants use natural gas – and a lot of of it, to provide the process heat for ethanol production. Lower natural gas input prices, lower ethanol prices. That simple.

LanzaTech

As the company says, “our patented, wholly-owned microbe that uses gas feeds as its sole source of carbon and energy for fuel and chemical production. Our microbe is feedstock agnostic and [can use] steam reformed methane that is rich in hydrogen.

Sundrop Fuels

In Colorado, Sundrop Fuels announced that they have agreed to purchase about 1,200 acres of land near Alexandria, Louisiana to build their first plant. Using forest waste and hydrogen from natural gas, their plant will produce up to 50 MGy of renewable gasoline. The plant will cost $450 to $500 million to build and will be financed in part through the sale of tax-exempt Private Activity Bonds.

The biofuels plant will salvage wood waste from renewable forests in Central Louisiana and adjacent regions and use that biomass as a feedstock. Sundrop Fuels also will extract hydrogen from abundant supplies of Louisiana natural gas, combining the hydrogen in a proprietary reactor with carbon extracted from wood waste. The result — up to 50 million gallons of fuel a year — will represent the world’s first renewable green gasoline that’s immediately adaptable to existing pumps, pipelines, engines and transportation infrastructure.

Siluria

Last October, we reported, “In California, Siluria has attracted $20 million for a technology platform to convert methane to chemicals, plastics, and fuels. Siluria’s Series B financing was led by the U.K. based Wellcome Trust, joining Siluria’s founding investors Alloy Ventures, ARCH Venture Partners, Kleiner Perkins Caufield & Byers, Altitude Life Science Ventures, Lux Capital, and Presidio Ventures in this Series B.”

Siluria’s technology? Researchers Erik Scher and Alex Tkachenko of Siluria Technologies in San Francisco stated that the metals coating the virus form a nanotube structure they refer to as a “hairball”, giving the catalyst a greater surface area, which enhances the reactions. This conversion happens at temperatures 200 to 300 below current steam cracking methods, greatly reducing the energy needed by current technology to produce ethylene. This attempt to commercialize a bio-technique of forming nanostructures is based on Dr. Angela Belcher’s work at M.I.T, where she leads the Biomolecular Materials Group. Her lab is currently researching a number of uses including biofuels and hydrogen production for fuel cells.”

Glori Energy

Glori Energy’s mission is to sustainably and efficiently recover oil trapped in reservoirs using existing oil wells through the deployment of its microbe-based Activated Environment for Recovery of Oil (AERO) System. AERO enhances production from waterflooded wells by stimulating a reservoir’s naturally occurring microbes to improve water sweep and oil mobility. Waterflood technology injects water into reservoirs to release additional quantities of oil that were unrecoverable during primary recovery. Conventional waterflooding only extracts a fraction of all discovered oil, leaving the majority underground. The AERO System provides a new, viable option to recover this trapped oil with minimal new footprint or investment.

The Bottom Line

Last month, we urged observers of the bio-based space to think beyond green, to think about the opportunities in the Olive Economy – where the new green meets the old brown. This week demonstrates that chemical producers, for one, will put their capital to work if they see real, transformational shifts in feedstock opportunities.

#### Large-scale ethanol production causes extinction

Tad Patzek 8, professor of Civil and Environmental Engineering at UC-Berkeley, 2008, “Can the Earth Deliver the Biomass-for-Fuel we Demand,” in Biofuels, Solar, and Wind as Renewable Energy Systems, ed. Pimentel, p. 36-44

Physics, chemistry and biology say clearly that there can be no sustained net mass output from any ecosystem for more than a few years. A young forest in a temperate climate grows fast in a clear-cut area, see Fig. 2.16, and transfers nutrients from soil to the young trees. The young trees grow very fast (there is a positive NPP). but the amount of mass accumulated in the forest is small. When a tree burns or dies some or most of its nutrients go back to the soil. When this tree is logged and hauled away, almost no nutrients are returned. After logging young trees a couple of times the forest soil becomes depleted, while the populations of insects and pathogens are well-established, and the forest productivity rapidly declines (Patzek and Pimemel. 2006). When the forest is allowed to grow long enough, its net ecosystem productivity becomes zero on the average.

Therefore, in order to export biomass (mostly water, but also carbon, oxygen, hydrogen and a plethora of nutrients) an ecosystem must import equivalent quantities of the chemical elements it lost, or decline irreversibly. Carbon comes from the atmospheric CO2 and water flows in as rain, rivers and irrigation from mined aquifers and lakes. The other nutrients, however, must be rapidly produced from ancient plant matter transformed into methane, coal, petroleum, phosphates.17 etc., as well as from earth minerals (muriate of potash, dolomites, etc.), - all irreversibly mined by humans. Therefore, to the extent that humans are no longer integrated with the ecosystems in which they live, they are doomed to extinction by exhausting all planetary stocks of minerals, soil and clean water. The question is not if, but how fast.

It seems that with the exponentially accelerating mining of global ecosystems for biomass, the time scale of our extinction is shrinking with each crop harvest. Compare this statement with the feverish proclamations of sustainable biomass and agrofuel production that flood us from the confused media outlets, peer-reviewed journals, and politicians.

2.5.3 Is There any Other Proof of NEP = 0?

I just gave you an abstract proof of no trash production in Earth's Kingdom, except for its dirty human slums.

Are there any other, more direct proofs, perhaps based on measurements? It turns out that there are two approaches that complement each other and lead to the same conclusions. The first approach is based on a top-down view of the Earth from a satellite and a mapping of the reflected infrared spectra into biomass growth. I will summarize this proof here. The second approach involves a direct counting of all crops, grass, and trees, and translating the weighed or otherwise measured biomass into net primary productivity of ecosystems. Both approaches yield very similar results.

2.5.4 Satellite Sensor-Based Estimates

Global ecosystem productivity can be estimated by combining remote sensing with a carbon cycle analysis. The US National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Earth Observing System (EOS) currently "produces a regular global estimate of gross primary productivity (GPP) and annual net primary productivity (NPP) of the entire terrestrial earth surface at 1-km spatial resolution, 150 million cells, each having GPP and NPP computed individually" (Running et al.. 2000). The MOD17A2/A3 User's Guide (Heinsch et al.. 2003) provides a description of the Gross and Net Primary Productivity estimation algorithms (MOD17A2/A3) designed for the MODIS1\* sensor.

The sample calculation results based on the MODI7A2/A3 algorithm are listed in Table 2.2. The NPPs for Asia Pacific. South America, and Europe, relative to North America, are shown in Fig. 2.17. The phenomenal net ecosystem productivity of Asia Pacific is 4.2 larger than that of North America. The South American ecosystems deliver 2.7 times more than their North American counterparts, and Europe just 0.85. It is no surprise then that the World Bank19, as well as agribusiness and logging companies - Archer Daniel Midlands (ADM). Bunge. Cargill. Monsanto. CFBC. Safbois. Sodefor. ITB. Trans-M. and many others - all have moved in force to plunder the most productive tropical regions of the world, see Fig. 2.18.

According 10 a MODIS-based calculation (Roberts and Wooster, 2007) of biomass burned in Africa in February and August 2004. prior to the fires shown here, the resulting carbon dioxide emissions were 120 and 160 million tonnes per month, respectively.

The final result of this global "end-game" of ecological destruction will be an unmitigated and lightcning-fast collapse of ecosystems protecting a large portion of" humanity.20

2.5.5 NPP in the US

The overall median values of net primary productivity may be converted to the higher heating value (HHV) of NPP in the US. see Fig. 2.19. In 2003. thus estimated net annual biomass production in the US was 5.3 Gt and its HHV was 90 EJ. One must be careful, however, because the underlying distributions of ecosystem productivity are different for each ecosystem and highly asymmetric. Therefore, lumping them together and using just one median value can lead to a substantial systematic error. For example, the lumped value of US NPP of 90 EJ. underestimates the overall 2003 estimate21 of 0.408 x 7444068 x 106 x 17 x 106 x 2.2 x 10"18 = 113EJ by some 20%.

To limit this error, one can perform a more detailed calculation based on the 16 classes of land cover listed in Table 2.2 in (Hum et al.. 2001). The MODIS-derived median NPPs are reported for most of these classes. The calculation inputs are shown in Table 2.3. Since the spatial set of land-cover classes cannot be easily mapped onto the administrative set of USDA classes of cropland, woodland, pastureland/rangeland. and forests. Hunt et al. (2001) provide an approximate linear mapping between these two sets, in the form of a 16x4 matrix of coefficients between 0 and 1.1 have lumped the land-cover classes somewhat differently (to be closer to USDA's classes), and the results are shown in Table 2.4 and Fig. 2.20.

The Cropland 4- Mosaic class here comprises die USDA's cropland, woodland, and some of the pasture classes. The Remote Vegetation class comprises some of the USDA's rangeland and pastureland classes. The USDA forest class is somewhat larger than here, as some of the smaller patches of forest, such as parks, etc.. are in the Mosaic class. Thus calculated 2003 US NPP is 118 EJ yr"1, 74 EJ yr"1 of above-ground (AG) plant construction and 44 EJ yr in root construction. In addition 12/74 = 17% of AG vegetation is in remote areas, not counting the remote forested areas. Note that my use of land-cover classes and their typical root-to-shoot ratios yields an overall result (118 EJ yr~') which is very similar to that derived by the Numerical Terradynamic Simulation Group {113 EJ yr-1).

Therefore, the DOE/USDA proposal to produce 130 billion gallons of ethanol from 1400 million tonnes of biomass (Perlack et a!., 2005) each year - and year-after-year-, would consume 32% of the remaining above-ground NPP in the US. see Fig. 2.20. if one assumes a 52% energy-efficiency of the conversion.~ At the current 26% overall efficiency of the corn-ethanol cycle (Patzek, 2006a), roughly 64% of all AG NPP in the US would have to be consumed to achieve this goal with zero harvest losses.23 To use more than half of all accessible above-ground plant growth in all forests, rangeland. pastureland and agriculture in the US to produce agrofuels would be a continental-scale ecologic and economic disaster of biblical proportions.24

2.6 Conclusions

I have shown that the Earth simply cannot produce the vast quantities of biomass we want to use to prolong our unsustainable lifestyles, while slowly committing suicide as a global human civilization.

In passing- I have noted that the "cellulosic biomass" refineries are very inefficient, currently impossible to scale, and incapable of ever catching up with the runaway need to feed one billion gasoline- and diesel-powered cars and trucks.

[NPP is net primary productivity – biomass produced by the earth annually]

#### Econ’s strong

Miner 1/25, Scott is Chief Investment Officer and a Managing Partner of Guggenheim Partners, LLC, a privately held global financial services firm with more than $160 billion in assets under supervision., "The U.S. Economy Is Reaching Escape Velocity", seekingalpha.com/article/1134471-the-u-s-economy-is-reaching-escape-velocity?source=google\_news

The U.S. economy is reaching "escape velocity," powered by the monetary rocket fuel from central banks around the world. Almost every domestic economic indicator is now positive, and the economic backdrop is stronger than it has been in the last seven years. We are in the healthiest financial condition since 2003. If the post-2003 experience were to be repeated, we could see an uninterrupted economic expansion for four years. Although pockets of uncertainty remain, such a favorable outlook for the economy and markets cannot to be ruled out.¶ Investors can expect a continuation of the themes that have dominated the environment since the recovery began: tighter credit spreads, low interest rates, improving employment, modest inflation, and sustained economic growth. Historically low interest rates and continued earnings growth will support higher equity valuations. As leveraged buyouts come back into play, undervalued companies with large cash balances are sure to be targets. More merger and acquisition activity would lift share prices higher, furthering the expansionary trend that is already underway.

#### No impact

Robert Jervis 11, Professor in the Department of Political Science and School of International and Public Affairs at Columbia University, December 2011, “Force in Our Times,” Survival, Vol. 25, No. 4, p. 403-425

Even if war is still seen as evil, the security community could be dissolved if severe conflicts of interest were to arise. Could the more peaceful world generate new interests that would bring the members of the community into sharp disputes? 45 A zero-sum sense of status would be one example, perhaps linked to a steep rise in nationalism. More likely would be a worsening of the current economic difficulties, which could itself produce greater nationalism, undermine democracy and bring back old-fashioned beggar-my-neighbor economic policies. While these dangers are real, it is hard to believe that the conflicts could be great enough to lead the members of the community to contemplate fighting each other. It is not so much that economic interdependence has proceeded to the point where it could not be reversed – states that were more internally interdependent than anything seen internationally have fought bloody civil wars. Rather it is that even if the more extreme versions of free trade and economic liberalism become discredited, it is hard to see how without building on a preexisting high level of political conflict leaders and mass opinion would come to believe that their countries could prosper by impoverishing or even attacking others. Is it possible that problems will not only become severe, but that people will entertain the thought that they have to be solved by war? While a pessimist could note that this argument does not appear as outlandish as it did before the financial crisis, an optimist could reply (correctly, in my view) that the very fact that we have seen such a sharp economic down-turn without anyone suggesting that force of arms is the solution shows that even if bad times bring about greater economic conflict, it will not make war thinkable.

#### Impact’s empirically denied

Preble 10 – Former prof, history, Temple U. PhD, history, Temple (Christopher, U.S. Military Power: Preeminence for What Purpose?, 3 August, http://www.cato-at-liberty.org/u-s-military-power-preeminence-for-what-purpose/)

Goure and the Hadley-Perry commissioners who produced the alternate QDR argue that the purpose of American military power is to provide global public goods, to defend other countries so that they don’t have to defend themselves, and otherwise shape the international order to suit our ends. In other words, the same justifications offered for American military dominance since the end of the Cold War. Most in Washington still embraces the notion that America is, and forever will be, the world’s indispensable nation. Some scholars, however, questioned the logic of hegemonic stability theory from the very beginning. A number continue to do so today. They advance arguments diametrically at odds with the primacist consensus. Trade routes need not be policed by a single dominant power; the international economy is complex and resilient. Supply disruptions are likely to be temporary, and the costs of mitigating their effects should be borne by those who stand to lose --- or gain --- the most. Islamic extremists are scary, but hardly comparable to the threat posed by a globe-straddling Soviet Union armed with thousands of nuclear weapons. It is frankly absurd that we spend more today to fight Osama bin Laden and his tiny band of murderous thugs than we spent to face down Joseph Stalin and Chairman Mao. Many factors have contributed to the dramatic decline in the number of wars between nation-states; it is unrealistic to expect that a new spasm of global conflict would erupt if the United States were to modestly refocus its efforts, draw down its military power, and call on other countries to play a larger role in their own defense, and in the security of their respective regions. But while there are credible alternatives to the United States serving in its current dual role as world policeman / armed social worker, the foreign policy establishment in Washington has no interest in exploring them. The people here have grown accustomed to living at the center of the earth, and indeed, of the universe. The tangible benefits of all this military spending flow disproportionately to this tiny corner of the United States while the schlubs in fly-over country pick up the tab.

## 2NC

#### Berman’s totally stupid---his arg relies on winning that shale well decline rates are linear, but they’re actually hyperbolic---decades of shale well data proves

Bill Holland 11, Associate Editor, Gas Daily, December 2011, “Prices and Profits: US Shale Gas,” <http://www.platts.com/IM.Platts.Content%5Caboutplatts%5Cmediacenter%5Cpriceshale.pdf>

Hedging—locking in futures prices with buyers through swaps and collars—also helps shale producers keep their realized prices high. The US’ top shale producer and number two natural gas producer, Chesapeake Energy, has been particularly adept at keeping its realized prices higher than the NYMEX benchmark. The company adds millions of dollars to the well head price of its gas through hedging, although sharp reversals in prices, as occurred in 2008 when gas prices plunged from record highs, can deeply dent the company’s results when it has to mark its books to market every quarter.

For Chesapeake and other independents, hedging routinely adds $1/Mcf to their realized sales prices. But, as gas prices stay below $5/Mcf and remain stable there, it is becoming harder and harder to ﬁnd customers willing to lock in higher futures prices.

Shale gas critic Art Berman, quoted extensively by the New York Times and others, uses 2009 well data from both the Haynesville and the Barnett shales (and operators Chesapeake and Devon) to show that the promise of shale is wildly overestimated by producers. Shale gas wells produce at very high rates for the ﬁrst 12-18 months of their lives, but then decline rapidly. Flows are often reduced 66% from the initial production rate to an inﬂection point. What happens at that point is where critics like Berman and producers part ways. Berman says the 2009 data shows that the decline of the well post inﬂection is along a linear slope, constantly and inexorably down, until after 10 years the well is played out.

Since the ﬁrst year’s high rate pays for the well, the shape of the tail determines it estimated ultimate recovery (EUR) over its life, and thus the eventual proﬁtability of the project. Berman’s linear tail results in EUR’s that are half, by his calculation, what shale producers are telling themselves and their investors.

Berman’s views have been well known in the industry for years and he is a frequent speaker on the conference circuit, but when his analysis found a nationwide audience in the New York Times, the “news” prompted US politicians to call for the US Securities and Exchange Commission to investigate the reserve reporting and production numbers of shale gas producers. The SEC launched a “fact ﬁnding” probe this summer that involved subpoenas for data from several small US independents. The subpoenaed ﬁ rms pledged to cooperate fully.

The shale gas independents don’t think they have anything to hide. Where Berman and others think old well data shows a linear drop, they point to mounds of data on shale wells dating back a decade. These, they say, show that the production decline is hyperbolic, not linear. Instead of dropping off at a constant rate after the initial ﬂush of high production, the decline curve bends slightly up from linear and trails off slowly over the next 20-30 years, justifying their EUR numbers and projected proﬁts. After all, they say, the well pays for itself in the ﬁrst year. Every other year after is pure proﬁt.

They are also happy to note that many of Berman’s predictions have been wrong. Gleefully, they point out that, in 2008, Berman predicted that production from the Barnett Shale would top out at 6 Tcf. The play has produced 9.6 Tcf worth of gas through this year and still produces 5.6 Bcf/d.

#### Offshore drilling doesn’t reduce prices---companies just reduce onshore production in response to the plan

Robert Pirog 12, Specialist in Energy Economics at the Congressional Research Service, and Michael Ratner, Specialist in Energy Policy at the CRS, 11/6/12, “Natural Gas in the U.S. Economy: Opportunities for Growth,” http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R42814.pdf

If offshore drilling opportunities were expanded, as oil and natural gas were discovered, domestic supplies would increase, causing the price of natural gas to fall. Falling prices would benefit consumers in the short-term, but would likely reduce the development of on-shore shale resources in the longer term, depending upon which sources had lower costs.

These two examples show that unintended consequences of policy decisions could affect natural gas markets. The results could upset the calculation of net economic benefits that the United States might expect to experience from development of the expanded shale gas resource base.

#### Allowing OCS drilling doesn’t increase gas production

CBO 12 – Congressional Budget Office, 8/12, “Potential Budgetary Effects of Immediately Opening Most Federal Lands to Oil and Gas Leasing,” <http://www.cbo.gov/sites/default/files/cbofiles/attachments/08-09-12_Oil-and-Gas_Leasing.pdf>

The geographic scope of leasing on the Outer Continental Shelf has changed often over the past few decades. 3 CBO anticipates that, under current law, DOI will offer leases for most of the acreage in the OCS over the next several decades. Until the early 1980s, DOI offered leases in all of the OCS, including the areas off the Atlantic, Pacific, and Florida coasts. In 1990, after the Congress imposed a series of temporary restrictions, President George H.W. Bush withdrew large portions of the OCS in the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans and the eastern Gulf of Mexico from the leasing program. Those restricted areas were subsequently expanded by President Clinton. Then, in 2008, President George W. Bush narrowed the restrictions to include only areas that had been designated as National Marine Sanctuaries. In 2010, President Obama removed Alaska’s Bristol Bay area from the leasing program until the end of June 2017.

Since 2008, policies on leasing in the Atlantic and Pacific OCS have varied, reflecting differences between the two most recent Administrations. In January 2009, DOI issued a proposed five-year plan that included lease sales in the Atlantic and Pacific OCS for the 2010–2015 period. The program proposed in June 2012 does not include an option for sales in those areas between 2012 and 2017. Neither plan involved the areas in the Gulf of Mexico adjacent to the Florida coast in which leasing is now prohibited until the end of June 2022.4

Other than the temporary ban on leasing in the eastern Gulf of Mexico, there currently are no statutory restrictions on OCS leasing. Decisions about leasing are made administratively—in consultation with industry and the states—for five-year periods. Leases cannot be offered for areas that are not included in a five-year plan, but the available regions may change whenever a new plan is adopted. The next plan is expected to go into effect in August 2012 and will extend for five years unless a future Administration chooses to restart the process before that plan expires.

Historical experience suggests that only a fraction of the leases awarded in the OCS will eventually be brought into production. Almost 60 percent of the OCS leases issued in the Gulf of Mexico through 2007 either expired or were relinquished without producing any oil or natural gas. 5 CBO estimates that almost 90 percent of the 2011 OCS production was from leases issued before 2001, reflecting the long lead times associated with exploring and developing oil and gas fields.6

#### Their ev says the plan results in 80tcf of natural gas

Medlock, 8 [Medlock is a fellow in Energy Studies at Rice University's James A Baker III Institute for Public Policy and an adjunct assistant professor in the [Economics Department](http://www.chron.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=opinion%2Foutlook&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Economics+Department%22) at Rice, “Open outer continental shelf”, http://www.chron.com/opinion/outlook/article/Open-outer-continental-shelf-1597898.php]

A confluence of factors is responsible for the recent price run-up at the pump. One important factor behind the strength of oil prices is the expectation of inadequate oil supply in the future. This has led to a debate regarding the removal of drilling access restrictions in the U.S. Outer Continental Shelf (OCS). According to the Department of Interior's Minerals Management Service (MMS), the OCS in the Lower 48 states currently under moratorium holds 19 billion barrels of technically recoverable oil. Some analysts claim that opening the OCS will not matter that much, as the quantity of oil is only about two years of U.S. consumption. But a more appropriate way to look at the issue is this: If the OCS could provide additional production of 1 million barrels per day of oil, our import dependence on Persian Gulf crude oil would be reduced by about 40 percent. Moreover, at 1 million barrels per day, the currently blocked OCS resource would last about 50 years. Of course, opening the OCS will not bring immediate supplies because it would take time to organize the lease sales and then develop the supply delivery infrastructure. However, as development progressed, the expected growth in supply would have an effect on market sentiment and eventually prices. Thus, opening the OCS should be viewed as a relevant part of a larger strategy to help ease prices over time because an increase in activity in the OCS would generally improve expectations about future oil supplies. Lifting the current moratorium in the OCS would also provide almost 80 trillion cubic feet of technically recoverable natural gas that is currently off-limits. A recent study by the Baker Institute indicates that removing current restrictions on resource development in the OCS would reduce future liquefied natural gas import dependence of the United States and lessen the influence of any future gas producers' cartel.

#### Total U.S. gas is estimated at 1809tcf---means the plan adds 4% to overall gas reserves

Robert Pirog 12, Specialist in Energy Economics at the Congressional Research Service, and Michael Ratner, Specialist in Energy Policy at the CRS, 11/6/12, “Natural Gas in the U.S. Economy: Opportunities for Growth,” http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R42814.pdf

Reserves and production data do not tell the whole story when looking at the U.S. transformation regarding natural gas supply. The term reserves has a specific industry definition that includes a technological component, an economic factor, and a probability of success among other criteria. To more fully understand the changes to the U.S. natural gas sector it is more appropriate to look at reserves and estimates for undiscovered, technically recoverable resources (UTRR) (see Figure 2). UTRR is an estimate of what can be extracted using current technology regardless of price. Using UTRR plus reserves, the United States has a natural gas resource base of 1,809 tcf or enough gas for approximately 79 years of production at 2011 levels. Compared with data from 2006, U.S. UTRR for natural gas has jumped almost 25%. Even this measure may not accurately reflect what will be extracted from the ground as technology is constantly changing. Just over the last few years, industry has been able to improve its shale gas extraction rate from about 5% to about 15%, thereby tripling what is recoverable.

#### Brazil’s ethanol production is ruined---sugar prices and government necglect

Josephs 5/13 Leslie is a writer at The Wall Street Journal. “Push for Ethanol Sours in Brazil Amid Low Sugar Prices,” 2012, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304203604577398662980151678.html>

\*brackets in original

Sugar prices near 20-month lows have raised questions over Brazil's future as a leader in both the sugar and ethanol industries.¶ The South American nation is the largest grower of sugar cane, which can be used to make sugar or ethanol from fermented sugar-cane juice. Its cane fields are growing old, and Brazil is grappling with how to reinvigorate them amid low prices and years of neglect in the wake of the 2008 financial crisis.¶ The industry is also trying to plot a course for ethanol production at a time when Brazil's government—which determines how much ethanol is used in ethanol-gasoline blends and whose state-controlled oil company Petróleo Brasileiro SA, PBR +0.13% controls gasoline prices—is focusing attention on large offshore oil reserves.¶ This Wednesday, sugar and ethanol producers, economists, commodity traders and analysts will mull over these issues at the sixth New York Sugar Conference, an annual event that is kicking off on a sour note with sugar prices down more than 12% this year.¶ At the one-day event, organized by the London-based International Sugar Organization and closely followed Brazilian consultancy Datagro, participants will discuss the gloomy outlook for sugar prices this year. Supplies are expected to outpace demand, with the International Sugar Organization raising its estimate to 6.5 million metric tons of extra sugar in the season ending Sept. 30, a 25% increase from its previous forecast of 5.2 million tons. The organization said it had been too conservative with projections from Asian countries including Thailand and China.¶ While a slide in prices may be good news for food producers, it could hurt sugar growers and processors. Another year of low prices would make it harder for sugar growers to invest in their crops, such as by purchasing new plants to replace older ones. Younger cane produces more sugar or ethanol than older plants.¶ Still, even with low sugar prices and estimates for ample supplies, Brazil may favor producing more sugar than ethanol, which could push prices for the sweetener even lower. For one, Brazil's currency, the real, hit a nearly three-year low against the U.S. dollar last week. That favors sugar exports, since producers receive more reais back for sugar that is sold abroad in dollars.¶ Increasing ethanol exports isn't seen as an option for Brazil, where producers have struggled in the past two seasons to supply the domestic fuel market. The root of the problem is the aged cane itself. The government has kept the amount of ethanol blended into gasoline low because the sweetener yielded by the cane has fallen short of expectations, clipping supplies of the fuel.¶ In addition, fixed gasoline prices establish a de facto cap on the price at which ethanol can be sold, while Brazil's ever-rising production costs steadily eat away at producers' profit margins and any incentive for investing in the sector.¶ "The situation is such that because of the ethanol price where it is, because of the currency and the local costs, it's not ideal for expansions," said Alberto Weisser, chief executive of commodities giant Bunge, BG +0.34% which produces ethanol in Brazil.¶ Fellow U.S.-based ethanol maker Archer Daniels Midland, ADM +0.11% when asked recently how it saw the current biofuel market conditions in the country, said it is "currently seeking options for our Brazilian ethanol asset."¶ So where does this leave the future of Brazil's ethanol industry?¶ "The government's view on ethanol changed because they have oil resources to develop," said Michael McDougall, a senior vice president at brokerage Newedge, and a panelist at the sugar conference. "The whole ethanol [push] was started because they were importing large amounts of fuel. That expansion has now ground to a halt."

#### No trade impact

Fletcher 11 Ian Fletcher is Senior Economist of the Coalition for a Prosperous America, former Research Fellow at the U.S. Business and Industry Council M.A. and B.A. from Columbia and U Chicago, "Avoid Trade War? We're Already In One!" August 29 2011 www.huffingtonpost.com/ian-fletcher/avoid-trade-war-were-alre\_b\_939967.html

The curious thing about the concept of trade war is that, unlike actual shooting war, it has no historical precedent. In fact, there has never been a significant trade war, "significant" in the sense of having done serious economic damage. All history records are minor skirmishes at best.¶ Go ahead. Try and name a trade war. The Great Trade War of 1834? Nope. The Great Trade War of 1921? Nope Again. There isn't one.¶ The standard example free traders give is that America's Smoot-Hawley tariff of 1930 either caused the Great Depression or made it spread around the world. But this canard does not survive serious examination, and has actually been denied by almost every economist who has actually researched the question in depth -- a group ranging from Paul Krugman on the left to Milton Friedman on the right.¶ The Depression's cause was monetary. The Fed allowed the money supply to balloon during the late 1920s, piling up in the stock market as a bubble. It then panicked, miscalculated, and let it collapse by a third by 1933, depriving the economy of the liquidity it needed to breathe. Trade had nothing to do with it.¶ As for the charge that Smoot caused the Depression to spread worldwide: it was too small a change to have plausibly so large an effect. For a start, it only applied to about one-third of America's trade: about 1.3 percent of our GDP. Our average tariff on dutiable goods went from 44.6 to 53.2 percent -- not a terribly big jump. Tariffs were higher in almost every year from 1821 to 1914. Our tariff went up in 1861, 1864, 1890, and 1922 without producing global depressions, and the recessions of 1873 and 1893 managed to spread worldwide without tariff increases.¶ As the economic historian (and free trader!) William Bernstein puts it in his book A Splendid Exchange: How Trade Shaped the World,¶ Between 1929 and 1932, real GDP fell 17 percent worldwide, and by 26 percent in the United States, but most economic historians now believe that only a miniscule part of that huge loss of both world GDP and the United States' GDP can be ascribed to the tariff wars. .. At the time of Smoot-Hawley's passage, trade volume accounted for only about 9 percent of world economic output. Had all international trade been eliminated, and had no domestic use for the previously exported goods been found, world GDP would have fallen by the same amount -- 9 percent. Between 1930 and 1933, worldwide trade volume fell off by one-third to one-half. Depending on how the falloff is measured, this computes to 3 to 5 percent of world GDP, and these losses were partially made up by more expensive domestic goods. Thus, the damage done could not possibly have exceeded 1 or 2 percent of world GDP -- nowhere near the 17 percent falloff seen during the Great Depression... The inescapable conclusion: contrary to public perception, Smoot-Hawley did not cause, or even significantly deepen, the Great Depression.¶ The oft-bandied idea that Smoot-Hawley started a global trade war of endless cycles of tit-for-tat retaliation is also mythical. According to the official State Department report on this very question in 1931:¶ With the exception of discriminations in France, the extent of discrimination against American commerce is very slight...By far the largest number of countries do not discriminate against the commerce of the United States in any way.¶ That is to say, foreign nations did indeed raise their tariffs after the passage of Smoot, but this was a broad-brush response to the Depression itself, aimed at all other foreign nations without distinction, not a retaliation against the U.S. for its own tariff. The doom-loop of spiraling tit-for-tat retaliation between trading partners that paralyzes free traders with fear today simply did not happen.¶ "Notorious" Smoot-Hawley is a deliberately fabricated myth, plain and simple. We should not allow this myth to paralyze our policy-making in the present day.¶ There is a basic unresolved paradox at the bottom of the very concept of trade war. If,

 as free traders insist, free trade is beneficial whether or not one's trading partners reciprocate, then why would any rational nation start one, no matter how provoked? The only way to explain this is to assume that major national governments like the Chinese and the U.S. -- governments which, whatever bad things they may have done, have managed to hold nuclear weapons for decades without nuking each other over trivial spats -- are not players of realpolitik, but schoolchildren.¶ When the moneymen in Beijing, Tokyo, Berlin, and the other nations currently running trade surpluses against the U.S. start to ponder the financial realpolitik of exaggerated retaliation against the U.S. for any measures we may employ to bring our trade back into balance, they will discover the advantage is with us, not them. Because they are the ones with trade surpluses to lose, not us.¶ So our present position of weakness is, paradoxically, actually a position of strength.¶ Likewise, China can supposedly suddenly stop buying our Treasury Debt if we rock the boat. But this would immediately reduce the value of the trillion or so they already hold -- not to mention destroying, by making their hostility overt, the fragile (and desperately-tended) delusion in the U.S. that America and China are still benign economic "partners" in a win-win economic relationship.¶ At the end of the day, China cannot force us to do anything economically that we don't choose to. America is still a nuclear power. We can -- an irresponsible but not impossible scenario -- repudiate our debt to them (or stop paying the interest) as the ultimate counter-move to anything they might contemplate. More plausibly, we might simply restore the tax on the interest on foreign-held bonds that was repealed in 1984 thanks to Treasury Secretary Donald Regan.¶ Thus a certain amount of back-and-forth token retaliation (and loud squealing) is indeed likely if America starts defending its interests in trade as diligently as our trading partners have been defending theirs, but that's it. The rest of the world engages in these struggles all the time without doing much harm; it will be no different if we join the party.

####  Competitiveness not key to heg and not zero-sum

Dr. Subhash Kapila 10 is an International Relations and Strategic Affairs analyst and the Consultant for Strategic Affairs with South Asia Analysis Group and a graduate of the Royal British Army Staff College with a Masters in Defence Science and a PhD in Strategic Studies., “21st Century: Strategically A Second American Century With Caveats,” June 26, http://www.eurasiareview.com/201006263919/21st-century-strategically-a-second-american-century-with-caveats.html

Strategically, the 20th Century was decidedly an American Century. United States strategic, military, political and economic predominance was global and undisputed. In the bi-polar global power structure comprising the United States and the Former Soviet Union it was the United States which globally prevailed. The 20th Century's dawn was marked by the First World War which marked the decline of the old European colonial powers, noticeably Great Britain. The Second World War marked the total eclipse of Great Britain and other colonial powers. The United States replaced Great Britain as the new global superpower. The 20th Century's end witnessed the end of the Cold War, with the disintegration of the Former Soviet Union as the United States strategic challenger and counter-vailing power. On the verge of the new millennium the United States strode the globe like a colossus as the sole global super power. With a decade of the 21st Century having gone past, many strategic and political analysts the world over have toyed with projections that United States global predominance is on the decline, and that the 21st Century will not be a second American Century. Having toyed, with such projections, these analysts however shy away from predicting whose century the 21st Century will strategically be? The trouble with such projections is that they are based predominantly on analyses of economic trends and financial strengths and less on detailed analyses of strategic and military strengths, and more significantly strategic cultures. Presumably, it is easier for such analysts to base trends on much quoted statistical data. Strategic analysis of global predominance trends is a more complex task in the opinion of the Author, as it cannot be based on statistical data analysis. Global predominance trends need unravelling of strategic cultures of contending powers, the reading of national intentions and resolve and the inherent national strengths and willpower demonstrated over a considerable time span of half-centuries and centuries. Crisply put, one needs to remember that in the 1980's, **Japan and Germany as "economic superpowers" could not emerge as global superpowers**. Hence global predominance **calls for more than economic strengths**. The United States getting strategically bogged down in Iraq and Afghanistan in the first decade of the 21st Century has not led to any noticeable decline in American global predominance. Despite Iraq and Afghanistan, the United States **reigns supreme globally** even in East Asia where China could have logically challenged it. More significantly, and normally forgotten, is the fact that the off-quoted shift of global and economic power from the West to East was facilitated by United States massive financial direct investments in China, Japan, South Korea and India. China quoted as the next superpower to rival the United States would be economically prostate, should the United States surgically disconnect China's economic and financial linkages to the United States. More significantly, while examining the prospects of the 21st Century as a "Second American Century" it must be remembered that besides other factors, that out of the six multipolar contenders for global power, none except China have shown any indications to whittle down US global predominance. Even China seems to be comfortable with US power as long as it keeps Japan in check. This Paper makes bold to assert that **the 21st Century would be a Second American Century** despite China's challenge and the strategic distractions arising from the global Islamic flash-points.

#### No impact to hegemony

Friedman 10 Ben, research fellow in defense and homeland security, Cato. PhD candidate in pol sci, MIT, Military Restraint and Defense Savings, 20 July, http://www.cato.org/testimony/ct-bf-07202010.html

Another argument for high military spending is that U.S. military hegemony underlies global stability. Our forces and alliance commitments dampen conflict between potential rivals like China and Japan, we are told, preventing them from fighting wars that would disrupt trade and cost us more than the military spending that would have prevented war. The theoretical and empirical foundation for this claim is weak. It overestimates both the American military's contribution to international stability and the danger that instability abroad poses to Americans. In Western Europe, U.S. forces now contribute little to peace, at best making the tiny odds of war among states there slightly more so.7 Even in Asia, where there is more tension, the history of international relations suggests that without U.S. military deployments potential rivals, especially those separated by sea like Japan and China, will generally achieve a stable balance of power rather than fight. In other cases, as with our bases in Saudi Arabia between the Iraq wars, U.S. forces probably create more unrestthan they prevent. Our force deployments can also generate instability by prompting states to develop nuclear weapons. Even when wars occur, their economic impact is likely to be limited here.8 By linking markets, globalization provides supply alternatives for the goods we consume, including oil. If political upheaval disrupts supply in one location, suppliers elsewhere will take our orders. Prices may increase, but markets adjust. That makes American consumers less dependent on any particular supply source, undermining the claim that we need to use force to prevent unrest in supplier nations or secure trade routes.9 Part of the confusion about the value of hegemony comes from misunderstanding the Cold War. People tend to assume, falsely, that our activist foreign policy, with troops forward supporting allies, not only caused the Soviet Union's collapse but is obviously a good thing even without such a rival. Forgotten is the sensible notion that alliances are a necessary evil occasionally tolerated to balance a particularly threatening enemy. The main justification for creating our Cold War alliances was the fear that Communist nations could conquer or capture by insurrection the industrial centers in Western Europe and Japan and then harness enough of that wealth to threaten us — either directly or by forcing us to become a garrison state at ruinous cost. We kept troops in South Korea after 1953 for fear that the North would otherwise overrun it. But these alliances outlasted the conditions that caused them. During the Cold War, Japan, Western Europe and South Korea grew wealthy enough to defend themselves. We should let them. These alliances heighten our force requirements and threaten to drag us into wars, while providing no obvious benefit.

# Warming
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#### NG can only be a bridge to 450ppm at best---that’s still catastrophic warming

David Roberts 13, writer for Grist, 1/7/13, “Natural gas: It’s a hedge, not a bridge,” http://grist.org/climate-energy/natural-gas-its-a-hedge-not-a-bridge/

Boosters of natural gas frequently argue that it can serve as a “bridge fuel,” spanning the chasm between our current global electricity systems, dominated by coal, and systems mostly or completely comprised of low-carbon sources like wind and solar. The idea is, we ramp up natural gas, the least dirty of the fossil fuels, to displace coal, thereby giving ourselves a few more decades to develop renewable energy, which will then replace natural gas. Natgas gets us from here to there. ¶ This argument has become popular for a broad swath of U.S. elites, not only typical fossil-fuel boosters but lefty luminaries like Center for American Progress founder John Podesta and green leaders like Environmental Defense Fund President Fred Krupp. ¶ Despite the notion becoming common to the point of cliché, however, there’s been almost no effort to model a natural gas bridge — that is to say, to construct a climate scenario that a) stabilizes atmospheric carbon dioxide at a safe level and b) includes a large-but-temporary increase in natural gas consumption. There have been climate scenarios that incorporate a baseline level of natural gas consumption (assuming no significant policy shifts), and some that model consumption substantially and permanently increasing, but none that explicitly model a bridge, that is, a rise and subsequent decline. ¶ Into the breach steps Michael Levi of the Council on Foreign Relations, with a new paper, “Climate consequences of natural gas as a bridge fuel,” published in the journal Climatic Change. It’s a fascinating and timely bit of work that takes as its goal “to explore the properties of scenarios that feature natural gas as a bridge and that stabilize CO2 concentrations at or near the oft discussed targets of 450 and 550 ppm.” ¶ The paper’s got some intriguing things to say about methane emissions from natural gas production, which is a hot topic right now. (Long story short, the paper claims that methane emissions don’t have much bearing on long-term climate outcomes.) But I hope that doesn’t distract from the more central conclusion, which is that true climate safety leaves very, very little room for a natural gas bridge. ¶ Here’s how the abstract puts it: ¶ In the context of the most ambitious stabilization objectives (450 ppm CO2), and absent carbon capture and sequestration, a natural gas bridge is of limited direct emissions-reducing value, since that bridge must be short. Natural gas can, however, play a more important role in the context of more modest but still stringent objectives (550 ppm CO2), which are compatible with longer natural gas bridges. [my emphasis] ¶ It’s important to note that 450 ppm is not the most ambitious stabilization objective. Climate scientist James Hansen and others have argued that anything over 350 ppm is an unacceptable risk. (Hitting 350 would mean reducing current atmospheric CO2 levels — we recently hit 394.) I asked Levi about this and he said that there just aren’t many 350 ppm scenarios to work with in the climate modeling world. Nonetheless, I think it stands to reason that if the natural gas bridge in a 450 ppm scenario is “short,” the bridge in a 350 ppm scenario is … not there at all. ¶ There are detailed proposals out there for getting to 350 ppm, but they involve a heroic, wholesale shift directly to carbon-free energy. They do not include a ramping up of natural gas, temporary or otherwise. ¶ The conclusion is inescapable: There is no natural gas bridge to true climate safety. ¶ What natural gas is, then, is not a bridge but a hedge. Levi says as much: ¶ Collectively, these results suggest that it may be useful to think of a natural gas bridge as a potential hedging tool against the possibility that it will be more difficult to move away from coal than policymakers desire or can achieve, rather than merely (or primarily) as a way to achieve particular desired temperature outcomes. [my emphasis] ¶ Now, this doesn’t necessarily mean that natural gas should be opposed by climate hawks. It may be that a temporary push for natural gas, while it doesn’t have much direct emissions-reductions benefit, has political or economic benefits. As Levi emphasizes, his paper says nothing about those aspects of natural gas; it’s purely a physical modeling of the supposed bridge. There’s an argument to be made that a temporary shift to natural gas would positively affect the political prospects for clean energy; there’s an argument to be made that it would offer an economic boost; there’s an argument to be made that it would reduce non-CO2 pollutants like soot and mercury. ¶ And as Levi notes, there’s an argument to be made that a natural gas bridge could be a kind of backup strategy, an insurance policy just in case politicians don’t get a clue and tackle climate change seriously. ¶ But there is no credible argument that a temporary switch to natural gas is a direct means to reach a safe level of carbon in the atmosphere. It is not. It’s a hedge-the-bets strategy, a way to soften the coming blows. If we’re serious about the welfare of future generations, we won’t keep casting about for bridges. We’ll screw up our courage and make the leap.

#### Warming’s too fast for gas to be a bridge

Susan Phillips 13, NPR Reporter, 1/7/13, “Study: Natural Gas No Bridge to Zero Fossil Fuel Future,” <http://stateimpact.npr.org/pennsylvania/2013/01/07/study-natural-gas-no-bridge-to-zero-fossil-fuel-future/>

Proponents of natural gas tout new shale deposits, such as Pennsylvania’s Marcellus, as a way to reduce carbon emissions while the world eases itself off fossil fuels, and moves toward alternatives such as wind and solar. Natural gas power plants emit less CO2 than coal, which still dominates electricity generation worldwide. In the U.S., low natural gas prices have allowed natural gas to catch up with coal-fired electricity. But this “bridge fuel” scenario is controversial. ¶ Some say the world is warming too quickly to even consider the concept legitimate. Still others say the process of extracting natural gas at the wellhead emits enough methane, a greenhouse causing gas, to negate any benefits of lower carbon dioxide emissions at power plants. ¶ Climatic Change, a peer-reviewed scientific journal, has just published online a report that has something to make both sides happy and sad. Written by Michael Levi, “Climate consequences of natural gas as a bridge fuel,” is one of the only reports to look at the issue from a vantage point of global emissions reduction goals. The bottom line, says Levi, is that any potential “natural gas bridge” would be useless because it would be so short. He does say, however, that natural gas can play a role in easing nations off of coal. ¶ “Collectively, these results suggest that it may be useful to think of a natural gas bridge as a potential hedging tool against the possibility that it will be more difficult to move away from coal than policymakers desire or can achieve, rather than merely (or primarily) as a way to achieve particular desired temperature outcomes.”

#### Gas locks in infrastructure that means we never get off the bridge to lower-carbon fuels

Christopher F. Jones 12, the Ciriacy-Wantrup Fellow, University of California-Berkeley, 8/29/12, “Natural Gas: Bridge or Dead End?,” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/christopher-f-jones/bridge-or-dead-end\_b\_1837015.html

Natural gas is often touted as a bridge fuel: an interim step between the heavily polluting fossil fuels we depend on today and the clean renewable energy systems we hope for tomorrow. But the infrastructure we deploy to increase natural gas may actually inhibit the transition to solar and wind power. Rather than a bridge, natural gas may be a dead end. ¶ The idea of natural gas as a bridge draws on three main points. First, natural gas produces significantly less carbon dioxide than coal or oil. Second, it releases fewer impurities like sulfur and mercury compared with other fossil fuels. Third, many experts anticipate that obtaining even 20 percent of our energy from renewables in the next couple decades will be difficult. Natural gas, advocates argue, offers a more realistic large-scale carbon reduction strategy in the short-term because we have already addressed many of the technical challenges of producing, transporting, and consuming it. ¶ These considerations merit attention from the pragmatic environmentalist. Greatly reducing carbon emissions without lowering overall energy consumption is a laudable goal if it can be done in an environmentally responsible manner. Yet in addition to thinking about how we build a natural gas bridge, it is imperative that we devote equal attention to how we get off. A good bridge requires off-ramps. If we consider the role of infrastructure in energy transitions, this might be harder than we think. ¶ Critics of natural gas have typically focused on issues of pollution rather than infrastructure. First, there has been widespread opposition to 'fracking' shale gas reserves, a process that may contaminate drinking water, trigger minor earthquakes, and produce many other environmental consequences. Second, there are debates over whether natural gas really has a beneficial impact on climate. It may produce less greenhouse gas, but leaks of methane might more than offset these gains. These are important issues, but it is also worth examining the impact that expanding natural gas infrastructure will have on renewable energy systems. ¶ Building a natural gas bridge will require a significant expansion of infrastructure: drilling wells for production, pipelines for distribution, and a range of devices for consumption including power plants, home furnaces, and industrial ovens. Investing in these systems will increase the supply of natural gas and lower its costs through economies of scale. As a result, consumers will find it cheaper and easier to use natural gas. This is a straightforward account of what infrastructure does -- it facilitates certain types of behaviors. ¶ What is less appreciated is the fact that infrastructure cuts two ways. These systems will not simply provide an advantage for natural gas; they will make it progressively harder and more expensive to transition to renewables

. We can examine this point by thinking about relative prices and sunk costs. ¶ Relative prices often matter more than absolute prices for energy transitions. For consumers, it is not simply the price of an energy source that matters; it is how much more or less that energy source costs than other options. Right now, natural gas is already cheaper than solar and wind for electricity production in most analyses. With significant investments in natural gas infrastructure, this price gap is only likely to grow. Therefore, even though the absolute price of renewable energy will not change, wind and solar will become less attractive to consumers because they will cost relatively more. ¶ What's more, these inequalities are likely to become more extreme over time due to sunk costs. Most of the systems designed to burn natural gas, like furnaces and electrical generating equipment, are expensive and designed to last for decades. Once large sums have been paid to purchase such systems, short-term price changes matter far less to consumers. Even if natural gas triples in price, prior investments in these systems will still act as a disincentive for switching to renewables. The sunk costs in infrastructure, therefore, further suggest that once we get on the bridge, it will be hard to get off.

#### No impact---mitigation and adaptation will solve---no tipping point or “1% risk” args

Robert O. Mendelsohn 9, the Edwin Weyerhaeuser Davis Professor, Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, Yale University, June 2009, “Climate Change and Economic Growth,” online: http://www.growthcommission.org/storage/cgdev/documents/gcwp060web.pdf

The heart of the debate about climate change comes from a number of warnings from scientists and others that give the impression that human-induced climate change is an immediate threat to society (IPCC 2007a,b; Stern 2006). Millions of people might be vulnerable to health effects (IPCC 2007b), crop production might fall in the low latitudes (IPCC 2007b), water supplies might dwindle (IPCC 2007b), precipitation might fall in arid regions (IPCC 2007b), extreme events will grow exponentially (Stern 2006), and between 20–30 percent of species will risk extinction (IPCC 2007b). Even worse, there may be catastrophic events such as the melting of Greenland or Antarctic ice sheets causing severe sea level rise, which would inundate hundreds of millions of people (Dasgupta et al. 2009). Proponents argue there is no time to waste. Unless greenhouse gases are cut dramatically today, economic growth and well‐being may be at risk (Stern 2006).

These statements are largely alarmist and misleading. Although climate change is a serious problem that deserves attention, society’s immediate behavior has an extremely low probability of leading to catastrophic consequences. The science and economics of climate change is quite clear that emissions over the next few decades will lead to only mild consequences. The severe impacts predicted by alarmists require a century (or two in the case of Stern 2006) of no mitigation. Many of the predicted impacts assume there will be no or little adaptation. The net economic impacts from climate change over the next 50 years will be small regardless. Most of the more severe impacts will take more than a century or even a millennium to unfold and many of these “potential” impacts will never occur because people will adapt. It is not at all apparent that immediate and dramatic policies need to be developed to thwart long‐range climate risks. What is needed are long‐run balanced responses.

#### Can’t solve – CO2stays in the atmosphere for hundreds of years

Mayer Hillman, Senior Fellow at the Policy Studies Institute, 2007

*The Suicidal Planet: How To Prevent Global Climate Catastrophe*, p. 25-6

The effects of climate change cannot quickly be reversed by reducing or even eliminating future emissions of greenhouse gases. There are two reasons for this. First, greenhouse gases released into the atmosphere linger for decades (in the case of relatively short-lived gases like methane), or hundreds of years (for carbon dioxide), or even thousands of years (for the long-lived gases like per-fluorocarbons). Carbon dioxide and methane concentrations in the atmosphere are respectively one-third and more than twice as high as those at any time over the last 650,000 years. Even if no additional carbon dioxide were emitted from now on, atmospheric concentrations would take centuries to decline to pre-Industrial Revolution levels. While elevated levels of greenhouse gases remain in the atmosphere, additional warming will occur.
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#### Plan can’t solve --- methane is unconventional

Ruppel, Methane Hydrates Project at the USGS, ’11 Carolyn, “Methane Hydrates and the Future of Natural Gas,” 2011, <http://mitei.mit.edu/system/files/Supplementary_Paper_SP_2_4_Hydrates.pdf>, accessed 1-6-13

For decades, gas hydrates have been discussed as a potential resource, particularly for countries with limited access to conventional hydrocarbons or a strategic interest in establishing alternative, unconventional gas reserves. Methane has never been produced from gas hydrates at a commercial scale and, barring major changes in the economics of natural gas supply and demand, commercial production at a large scale is considered unlikely to commence within the next 15 years. Given the overall uncertainty still associated with gas hydrates as a potential resource, they have not been included in the EPPA model in MITEI’s Future of Natural Gas report. Still, gas hydrates remain a potentially large methane resource and must necessarily be included in any consideration of the natural gas supply beyond two decades from now.

#### DOE investment

Platts Energy Research 8-31-12 DOE invests $5.6 million in methane hydrates research, 8-31-12, <http://www.platts.com/RSSFeedDetailedNews/RSSFeed/NaturalGas/6604245> , accessed 9-19-12

The US Department of Energy on Friday announced it is investing $5.6 million in 14 research projects on methane hydrates, which the agency says could be a major source of natural gas.¶ Methane hydrates are ice-lattice structures with frozen natural gas, and they are found worldwide, including under the Arctic permafrost and on the ocean floor.¶ DOE said the projects announced Friday would complement a successful, first-of-its-kind test earlier this year that was able to extract a steady flow of natural gas from methane hydrates on the North Slope of Alaska.

#### No extinction from climate change

NIPCC 11 – the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change, an international panel of nongovernment scientists and scholars, March 8, 2011, “Surviving the Unprecedented Climate Change of the IPCC,” online: http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2011/mar/8mar2011a5.html

In a paper published in Systematics and Biodiversity, Willis et al. (2010) consider the IPCC (2007) "predicted climatic changes for the next century" -- i.e., their contentions that "global temperatures will increase by 2-4°C and possibly beyond, sea levels will rise (~1 m ± 0.5 m), and atmospheric CO2 will increase by up to 1000 ppm" -- noting that it is "widely suggested that the magnitude and rate of these changes will result in many plants and animals going extinct," citing studies that suggest that "within the next century, over 35% of some biota will have gone extinct (Thomas et al., 2004; Solomon et al., 2007) and there will be extensive die-back of the tropical rainforest due to climate change (e.g. Huntingford et al., 2008)."

On the other hand, they indicate that some biologists and climatologists have pointed out that "many of the predicted increases in climate have happened before, in terms of both magnitude and rate of change (e.g. Royer, 2008; Zachos et al., 2008), and yet biotic communities have remained remarkably resilient (Mayle and Power, 2008) and in some cases thrived (Svenning and Condit, 2008)." But they report that those who mention these things are often "placed in the 'climate-change denier' category," although the purpose for pointing out these facts is simply to present "a sound scientific basis for understanding biotic responses to the magnitudes and rates of climate change predicted for the future through using the vast data resource that we can exploit in fossil records."

Going on to do just that, Willis et al. focus on "intervals in time in the fossil record when atmospheric CO2 concentrations increased up to 1200 ppm, temperatures in mid- to high-latitudes increased by greater than 4°C within 60 years, and sea levels rose by up to 3 m higher than present," describing studies of past biotic responses that indicate "the scale and impact of the magnitude and rate of such climate changes on biodiversity." And what emerges from those studies, as they describe it, "is evidence for rapid community turnover, migrations, development of novel ecosystems and thresholds from one stable ecosystem state to another." And, most importantly in this regard, they report "there is very little evidence for broad-scale extinctions due to a warming world."

In concluding, the Norwegian, Swedish and UK researchers say that "based on such evidence we urge some caution in assuming broad-scale extinctions of species will occur due solely to climate changes of the magnitude and rate predicted for the next century," reiterating that "the fossil record indicates remarkable biotic resilience to wide amplitude fluctuations in climate."

#### Nuclear war turns warming

Duncan Clark 9, editorial environmental consultant to the London Guardian, co-director of GreenProfile, January 2, 2009, “The carbon footprint of nuclear war,” online: http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/blog/2009/jan/02/nuclear-war-emissions

Almost 700m [million] tonnes of CO2 would be released into the Earth's atmosphere by even the smallest nuclear conflict, according to a US study that compares the environmental costs of developing various power sources

Just when you might have thought it was ethically sound to unleash a nuclear attack on a nearby city, along comes a pesky scientist and points out that atomic warfare is bad for the climate. According to a new paper in the journal Energy & Environmental Science, even a very limited nuclear exchange, using just a thousandth of the weaponry of a full-scale nuclear war, would cause up to 690m tonnes of CO2 to enter the atmosphere – more than UK's annual total.

The upside (kind of) is that the conflict would also generate as much as 313m tonnes of soot. This would stop a great deal of sunlight reaching the earth, creating a significant regional cooling effect in the short and medium terms – just like when a major volcano erupts. Ultimately, though, the CO2 would win out and crank up global temperatures an extra few notches.

The paper's author, Mark Z Jacobson, a professor of civil and environmental engineering at Stanford University, calculated the emissions of such a conflict by totting up the burn rate and carbon content of the fabric of our cities. "Materials have the following carbon contents: plastics, 38–92%; tyres and other rubbers, 59–91%; synthetic fibres, 63–86%; woody biomass, 41–45%; charcoal, 71%; asphalt, 80%; steel, 0.05–2%. We approximate roughly the carbon content of all combustible material in a city as 40–60%."

But why would a Stanford engineer bother calculating such a thing? Given that the nuclear exchange would also kill up to 17 million people, who's going to be thinking about the impact on global warming?

The purpose of the paper is to compare the total human and environmental costs of a wide range of different power sources, from solar and wind to nuclear and biofuels. One of the side-effects of nuclear power, the report argues, is an increased risk of nuclear war: "Because the production of nuclear weapons material is occurring only in countries that have developed civilian nuclear energy programs, the risk of a limited nuclear exchange between countries or the detonation of a nuclear device by terrorists has increased due to the dissemination of nuclear energy facilities worldwide."

"As such," Jacobson continues, "it is a valid exercise to estimate the potential number of immediate deaths and carbon emissions due to the burning of buildings and infrastructure associated with the proliferation of nuclear energy facilities and the resulting proliferation of nuclear weapons … Although concern at the time of an explosion will be the deaths and not carbon emissions, policy makers today must weigh all the potential future risks of mortality and carbon emissions when comparing energy sources."

#### Nuke war outweighs warming

Harrell 9 quoting Robock, Rutgers professor who uses NASA data 1/22, Eben, Time, “Regional nuclear war and the environment”,http://www.time.com/time/health/article/0,8599,1873164,00.html

Some scientists, most notably Freeman Dyson of The Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, have stirred controversy by arguing that nuclear weapons are a more urgent environmental threat than global warming. Do you agree? Yes. If India and Pakistan engaged in nuclear war, they would use about 0.3% of the global nuclear stockpile

. And still the effects on the climate would be dramatic. Our calculations on nuclear winter from the early 1980s have been confirmed by modern climate models. And fundamentally the situation hasn't changed — even with reduced stockpiles there still exists enough weapons to cause nuclear winter. That's something that maybe people don't realize. I think we have to solve the problem of the existence of all these weapons before we have the luxury of worrying about global warming.

# States
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#### TEXT: The governments of 50 states and sub-federal territories should remove state and local restrictions on onshore natural gas production, including fracking, and provide substantial incentives for onshore natural gas production. The governments of 50 states and sub-federal territories with jurisdiction over offshore territories should remove restrictions on offshore natural gas production in areas under their jurisdiction.

#### Lifting state restrictions on fracking boosts production – harmonizes the state regulatory regime

Tennis 13 Mark P. Fitzsimmons and Rachel S., lawyers, 1-8, “A Continuing Wave: The Debate Over Regulation of Fracking Rolls On,” Power Magazine, http://www.powermag.com/environmental/A-Continuing-Wave-The-Debate-Over-Regulation-of-Fracking-Rolls-On\_5274.html

Whatever your opinion on fracking, it is clear there will be significant investment and development going forward. Government estimates of U.S. shale gas reserves have increased over the past five years, and some researchers claim that even those increased estimates are grossly understated. In its 2012 Annual Energy Outlook, the Energy Information Administration (EIA) reported that the U.S. has 2,203 trillion cubic feet of technically recoverable natural gas—enough to supply more than 90 years of use at 2011 consumption rates. The EIA also predicts that the U.S. will become a net exporter of natural gas by 2020. A study prepared for America’s Natural Gas Alliance predicts that by 2035 the U.S. shale gas industry will support 1.6 million jobs, contribute more than $231 billion to the GDP, and add $57 billion in government revenues. Meanwhile, legal and technical barriers could delay shale gas development in other parts of the world for up to a decade. (In the European Union, several countries, such as France and Bulgaria, have passed laws banning fracking.) Particularly in this economic climate, these numbers are impossible to ignore. How much of this potential will be unlocked ultimately depends on several factors, not least the development and stabilization of a still-uncertain and multilayered regulatory regime. Fracking currently is regulated chiefly at the state level, and industry generally supports continued state-level regulation. In waging its battle against state regulators, the anti-fracking movement has succeeded in persuading local officials to further limit the practice at the municipal level. Many localities have instituted zoning controls or outright bans, though they have had mixed results defending these laws against state constitutional challenges. Meanwhile, the federal government has shown increasing willingness to regulate fracking. The Obama administration has been cautious initially, focusing largely on research and promoting regulatory efficiency. In April, industry praised President Obama for creating an interagency working group to coordinate efforts among the EPA, the Department of Energy, and the Department of the Interior. At the same time, some federal agencies have begun to exercise their regulatory authority. The Bureau of Land Management’s (BLM’s) proposed rule for regulating fracking operations on federal lands and the EPA’s new Clean Air Act requirements for natural gas wells represent the most significant developments to date. It remains to be seen whether the administration’s reelection “mandate” will include stricter controls. As this complicated regulatory framework continues to develop, it will require careful monitoring by any company reliant on expectations of inexpensive and abundant natural gas. Following our earlier article on U.S. fracking regulation last year, this article provides an update on the significant developments of recent months. State fracking laws differ widely. At the most stringent, a few states continue to enforce statewide bans or moratoria. Of states that allow fracking, some have very specific requirements, while others rely on performance-based standards or permit-specific controls. States with similar laws on the books may also enforce them very differently. An ongoing survey of state regulations shows that many states have requirements related to site development and preparation, well drilling and production, flowback/wastewater storage and disposal, and well plugging and abandonment. Several states in the mid-Atlantic’s Marcellus Shale region that have been cautious about allowing fracking in the past appear to be moving toward a somewhat more tolerant stance. New York has had a moratorium on fracking since 2008, when the state Department of Environmental Conservation began studying health impacts. Although the moratorium was set to expire on November 29, 2012, it was extended for 90 days to await completion of the ongoing study. Meanwhile, New York has issued a new set of draft regulations that would open a large swath of the state to fracking—but with significant limitations. Both environmental and industry groups have criticized the changes, which currently are open for public comment until January 12. New Jersey is also poised to move forward. In early 2012, Governor Chris Christie vetoed a bill that would have imposed a statewide fracking ban, instead instituting a one-year moratorium to allow the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection to “evaluate the findings of still outstanding and ongoing federal studies.” The moratorium is set to expire on January 27, although there is now a bill pending in the New Jersey legislature that would establish a new moratorium. Since there are no known shale gas deposits in New Jersey, the level of attention devoted to regulation there is somewhat surprising. Maryland, which has also had a de facto moratorium on fracking since 2011 while the state conducts safety studies, remains more uncertain. In response to recent industry pressure to move ahead, one Maryland legislator has announced her intention to propose a formal statutory moratorium in 2013. Pennsylvania has undoubtedly been the state most enthusiastic about Marcellus Shale development. In February 2012, Pennsylvania passed new legislation to further encourage the state’s already robust natural gas industry. Among other provisions, the new law included a statewide zoning plan to reduce municipalities’ ability to prevent fracking within their borders. Several municipalities challenged the law in state court, and on July 26, 2012, a seven-judge panel invalidated the statewide zoning program. Three judges dissented from the decision, which the state appealed to the Pennsylvania Supreme Court. The case was argued in October, and the decision is still pending. Even if the state does not succeed on appeal, the new law will still encourage municipalities to allow fracking by providing for impact fees, which producers must pay to communities to cover impacts on roads and services. Along with likely developments in New York and New Jersey, this change will contribute to the Marcellus Shale’s growing importance to national shale gas production. Several states outside of the Marcellus Shale region are also in the midst of regulatory overhauls. In July, the North Carolina legislature legalized fracking over Governor Beverly Perdue’s veto, but provided that no permits may be issued until a regulatory program has been established and approved by the legislature. The Texas Railroad Commission, that state’s oil and gas regulatory agency, is updating its rules concerning drilling, cementing, and completing oil and gas wells. On the West Coast, the California Department of Conservation released proposed rules on December 18, and the California legislature will consider fracking legislation in its new session. The Alaska Oil and Gas Conservation Commission has also proposed new regulations. In response to health and safety concerns, several states have beefed up requirements related to well construction and setback, chemical disclosure, and wastewater disposal. Pennsylvania recently issued new regulations requiring operators to develop emergency response plans. Both Ohio and Pennsylvania included new well-casing and siting requirements in their 2012 laws. Many states now require disclosure of chemicals used in fracking fluids, though the specific rules vary. Some states require industry to disclose both the volume and concentration of chemicals used (Arkansas, Louisiana, Montana, Ohio, and Pennsylvania), while others require only volume (Maryland, Minnesota, New Mexico, and Oklahoma) or concentration (Wyoming). Protections for confidential business information also differ. Ohio’s rule does not require any disclosure of trade secret information, while Pennsylvania’s rule requires disclosure of trade names and concentration to regulators and provides that the information is available to the public upon request. Wastewater disposal remains a contentious issue, since there are issues associated with each method of disposal (discharge to public treatment works, storage pits, or underground injection wells). In response to accidental releases of oil, drilling wastewater, and other fluids, in 2012, North Dakota regulators issued new rules banning the storage of liquid waste from oil and gas drilling operations in open pits. Ohio’s Department of Natural Resources also recently addressed concerns about underground injection well disposal by passing new rules to allow the Department to request well safety tests. The Department has now lifted a moratorium on underground injection well permitting that was instituted in response to a number of earthquakes in 2011. Particularly in light of the ongoing studies in several states, it is clear that state regulations will continue to evolve as more information about the science becomes available. Private sector research will also continue to be influential. To date, studies of varying quality on both ends of the spectrum have received significant attention and influenced the conversation. Local Regulation: Questionable Validity? While anti-fracking forces have waged war at all levels of government, they have had measurable success in getting strict measures passed at the local level. About 300 municipalities in 16 states have passed measures limiting fracking or banning it outright. Not all of these measures will have a practical effect, since some were passed in areas without shale gas reserves, but they are nonetheless symbolic of generalized public concern. The legal status of municipal controls depends on the state and the context. The authority of Pennsylvania municipalities to control fracking remains in question pending the state’s appeal of its invalidated legislation. A similar state-local battle is playing out in Colorado. In July 2012, the town of Longmont adopted an “operating agreement” with a drilling company that included a ban on fracking in residential neighborhoods. The state quickly sued to invalidate the agreement as preempted under state law. More recently, during the November 6 election, Longmont passed a ballot initiative banning fracking altogether. Governor John Hickenlooper has since announced that the state will not challenge the ban. Meanwhile, the Colorado Oil and Gas Association has filed suit in state court seeking to overturn it. While the New York Department of Environmental Conservation continues to sit on its draft rules, the state appears to have embraced local initiatives to some extent. The current draft rules require industry to analyze the applicability of local ordinances when applying for state permits. Meanwhile, more than 170 New York municipalities have instituted controls, with more being enacted seemingly every day. State courts have upheld bans imposed by the towns of Dryden and Middlefield. In a more recent case, the New York Supreme Court held that a municipality may not enact a moratorium on fracking without providing evidence to support “a justification, based on the safety and health of the community, for the banning of gas exploration, storage and extraction.” The reach of this decision will likely be limited, since the court also agreed with the Dryden and Middlefield cases that such measures are not preempted by state law. Cities have traditionally retained authority over land use and zoning, and fracking opponents argue that retaining such control is essential to protecting citizens from unwanted industrial uses and risks to health and the environment. Depending on where they are in force, however, such laws have the potential to limit opportunities for developing the shale gas industry in an economical manner and could significantly limit states’ ability to promote economic development on a statewide basis.
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#### Removing state fracking restrictions sparks major new production – as long as there’s money to be made, companies will drill

Mireya Navarro, 1-3-2013, “Bans and Rules Muddy Prospects for Gas Drilling,” NYT, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/04/nyregion/bans-and-new-rules-make-gas-drillings-future-uncertain-in-new-york.html

Years after he negotiated leases for gas drilling in upstate New York, strict rules on hydraulic fracturing that state environmental officials proposed threaten to put 20 percent of that land off limits, he estimated. And local drilling bans adopted by town boards could put him out of business altogether, he said. “Why should I put money in the ground if any one of the towns can say no at the next town meeting?” said Mr. Holko, the president of Lenape Resources in western New York. “The issue of home rule is the demise of the industry.” In November, he sued the State Department of Environmental Conservation and Avon, N.Y., in Livingston County, seeking $50 million in damages for lost business since the town enacted a ban on all drilling last summer. By late February, Gov. Andrew M. Cuomo, a Democrat, is expected to make a decision on whether hydraulic fracturing, a controversial natural gas drilling process that is already under way from Pennsylvania to Texas to North Dakota, will be allowed in New York. Any decision will be made against a backdrop of ferocious opposition from environmental groups, which say the drilling process — also known as fracking — poses too high a risk of groundwater contamination, air pollution and other environmental problems. But a mix of local drilling bans and some of the tightest drilling regulations in the country raise questions about whether the process could flourish here. Beyond those constraints, natural gas prices have declined sharply in recent years, limiting potential profits even as technology opens the way for the exploitation of vast shale gas resources. Fracking involves pumping millions of gallons of water and chemicals into underground shale to release natural gas. Gas companies have a long history of conventional drilling in New York, and if prices rise from their current lows and there is money to be made, there is no question that gas companies will want to do business in the state, industry officials say. “Certainly there are companies that, once they get a green light, will come in and drill,” said Brad Gill, executive director of the Independent Oil and Gas Association of New York, which represents 400 drillers and drilling-related businesses. But he and others in the industry argue that New York’s proposed rules, which are undergoing public comment until next Friday, would significantly limit opportunities for both companies and the upstate communities that hope for a surge in drilling jobs and an economic boom. Mr. Gill contends that the drawn-out nature of state deliberations on whether to allow fracking — the process has been under way for four years — has allowed many land leases to expire and prompted some companies to walk away and focus their resources on drilling in other states. Companies like Talisman Energy and Inflection Energy, which have drilled with conventional methods in New York and had hoped to expand into hydraulic fracturing, have moved operations to Pennsylvania, Mr. Gill said. Another company based in New York, Norse Energy, filed for bankruptcy in early December. Gas industry officials contend that the proposed regulations would block access to up to half the land they might have drilled — by mandating setbacks, for example, or by prohibiting drilling through aquifers, in grasslands or near streams, private water wells and water supplies used for crops and livestock. (This is in addition to outright bans in the New York City watershed in the Catskills and other sensitive areas.) Meanwhile, Governor Cuomo has said that towns and cities should have a say in a decision about allow drilling within their boundaries, which companies say raises far too much uncertainty for their business. So far, two of the bans have withstood court challenges. In a Nov. 19 letter to Mr. Cuomo, Mr. Gill said that his own trade group had lost at least 10 member companies to other states in the last year and that he could not overstate “the dramatic unattractiveness of New York to our industry.” Tom S. West, an industry lawyer in Albany, said the proposed rules would add anywhere from $500,000 to more than $1 million more per well in extra fees and planning costs. But in documents, officials with the State Department of Environmental Conservation have deemed some of the industry’s cost estimates “excessive.” They predict that fracking in New York would be undertaken by large multinational companies that could afford the costs of drilling in the state. Studies commissioned by the state project that the drilling process in New York could create 17,600 construction jobs and more than 29,000 indirect jobs. Under a conservative chain of events, state officials say, more than 42,000 horizontal and vertical wells would be developed over 30 years. Michael A. Levi, an expert on energy and the environment at the Council on Foreign Relations in New York, said too many variables were at work for anyone to predict how many companies would invest in fracking in the state, and how quickly, should the state give the go-ahead. Companies with leases and other investments in New York will be more likely to drill than companies that are doing business elsewhere and prefer to wait and see what the first wells drilled in New York yield, he said. “It’ll vary from company to company,” he said. But if there is money to be made, he said, “that will be done.” Mr. Holko of Lenape Resources, which has acquired drilling rights on about 100,000 acres of land in more than a dozen towns, said the amount of land actually opened up to drilling would make the difference in deciding whether it was economically viable. “When you start taking away land mass” through state regulations, he said, “everybody will evaluate their individual acreage, and from that they’ll decide whether it’s worth pursuing in New York.” To those seeking a ban on hydraulic fracturing, no set of state rules would suffice to safeguard water supplies, public health and the environment. “We’re putting fracking in the same category as smoking,” said Sandra Steingraber, a distinguished scholar in residence in environmental studies at Ithaca College who leads the coalition New Yorkers Against Fracking. “The only way to make smoking safe is to not smoke.” Despite the constraints, Dennis Holbrook, executive vice president of Norse Energy, which is reorganizing under Chapter 11, said he looked forward to the day when the industry could prove the naysayers wrong. He said his company still held drilling rights over 130,000 acres of land and planned to seek new capital by forming a partnership with an investor once hydraulic fracturing is allowed. “My hope is that if the industry has an opportunity to drill,” he said, “the public will be reassured that this can be done safely.”

#### State support for fracking ensures expanded production – federal law irrelevant

Dennis Cauchon, 11-20-2012, “Fracking boom gains momentum,” Democrat and Chronicle, http://www.democratandchronicle.com/usatoday/article/1715743

Political obstacles to oil and gas production are starting to fall away at the state and local levels as voters, elected officials and courts jump on the energy boom bandwagon. Voters are rewarding local politicians who support production. Ballot measures are distributing potential tax windfalls broadly. And most state legislatures are focused on managing the economic and environmental consequences of hydraulic fracturing, or fracking, so the drilling boom can speed up rather than slow down. The trend is crucial to the nation's energy future because oil and gas production is regulated and taxed almost entirely by state and local governments. The federal government's role is largely advisory, except on federal lands and on pipelines. "Fracking is happening and it's not going to stop, so we have to take the high road of good regulation and taxes so communities are better off, not worse off, after it's done," says Ted Boettner, executive director of the liberal West Virginia Center on Budget and Policy. Most states were caught off guard when fracking turned Pennsylvania into a major natural gas producer in 2009. Fracking could produce oil or gas in as many as 36 states. Result: The USA will become the world's No. 1 producer of natural gas in 2015 and oil in 2017, overtaking Russia and Saudi Arabia, respectively, predicts the International Energy Agency. Clearing the way: Elections. Pro-drilling candidates are winning at the local level, including a sweep in southern New York. "It wasn't the only issue, but it was a hot one ," says Broome County executive Debbie Preston, who won re-election Nov. 6. She's creating a department to help drillers. The state now has a moratorium on fracking. Pipelines. The industry is winning approval to build pipelines. Williams Partners. the largest pipeline company, got a thumbs-up Nov. 7 to expand one pipeline and has applied to build another to move natural gas to Boston and New York City. Even the controversial Keystone XL pipeline from Canada looks more likely. Pro-pipeline Democrat Heidi Heitkamp, winner in North Dakota's U.S. Senate race, predicts federal approval early next year. Natural Resources Defense Council lawyer Kate Sinding says loopholes in federal law make it hard to stop fracking. "A lot of traditional litigation tools are not available," she says.

#### California alone solves

John Vlahakis, 12-21-2012, “California On The Verge Of Fracking Boom,” Earthy Report, http://www.earthyreport.com/site/california-on-the-verge-of-fracking-boom/

Just below California’s surface lies enough shale oil to fundamentally transform the state’s entire economy. California has been a major oil producer for over a century and is one of the top five oil-producing states in the nation. A report issued last year by the U.S. Energy Information Administration released information that could easily kick state fracking production into overdrive. The research found that the Monterey Shale, a rock formation running underneath much of Central California, contains 15 billion barrels of oil, or some 64 percent of all the recoverable shale oil in the United States. “This shale alone could provide for our domestic oil needs for 50 years,” said Dave Quast of the industry-backed research and public outreach group Energy In Depth. Despite the area’s enormous oil reserves, the formation’s unique geology has impeded previous efforts to drill. The conditions underground vary widely from one location to another, making it difficult to predict the productivity of any given well based on its neighbors. One well could yield a torrent of oil while the one next door could turn up dry. As a result, it’s a lot riskier, therefore significantly more expensive, to tap directly into the Monterey Shale than continue to rely on the traditional plays that have long been the backbone of the state’s oil production. No one yet has been able to find the key to unlocking vast oil wealth hidden inside the Monterey Shale. When they do, however, not only will those techniques likely involve fracking, but the economic and environmental implications have the potential to be enormous. Environmentalists predict that much drilling would be devastating. “The 15 billion barrels of oil in the Monterey Shale are a carbon bomb,” Siegel said. “If we dig this up and burn it, we’re going to counteract all of California’s pollution reduction efforts.” State regulators are re-evaluating current fracking rules prior to allowing new hydraulic fracturing wells to be dug. Culver City and Los Angeles have moved on their own to ban fracking from within their city limits.

#### Repealing state drilling moratoria spills up to cause rollback of federal moratoria too

CCPP 10 – Collins Center for Public Policy, identifies, researches, frames and implements nonpartisan, creative and meaningful solutions to the toughest issues facing Florida and elsewhere, April 2010, “Potential Impacts of Oil & Gas Explorations in the Gulf,” A Report to the Century Commission for a Sustainable Florida, <http://www.mote.org/clientuploads/MPI/offshore%20oil%20drilling%20report_lr.pdf>

Q(2) How do state and federal moratoriums affect one another?

A There is no direct effect. State and federal governments maintain control over their respective jurisdictions and have the authority to modify or maintain moratoriums on oil and gas activities independent of one another. Because a major reason for the imposition of moratoriums off Florida is due to political pressure from the state, lifting the state moratorium would undoubtedly weaken political and legal support for the federal moratorium, while lifting or relaxing the federal moratorium would not necessarily have the same impact on the state moratorium.

The state currently prohibits the granting, selling or executing of oil or gas leases within the submerged lands over which Florida has jurisdiction (3.45 statute miles from the coastline on the East Coast and 10.36 statute miles on the Gulf Coast). State law also prohibits both the issuing of permits to drill exploratory wells and the issuing of permits for structures used for drilling or producing oil and gas.

Federal moratoriums are in flux due to the tension between Florida's concerns for leasing off its shores, pressure for more offshore oil and gas production and military uses of the Gulf off the Florida coast. A Congressional ban on new leasing enacted in 2006 created a 125-mile buffer from Florida's coastlines in the eastern zone of the Gulf that encompasses all of peninsular Florida, and a 100-mile buffer in the central zone of the Gulf that encompasses a portion of Florida's Panhandle region.

In addition, there are restrictions on oil and gas activities east of a north-south federal border known as the Military Mission Line that extends into the Gulf from the Panhandle near Destin. That ban is to protect the flight paths of military aircraft on training missions over the Gulf. In effect- the line extends the federal moratorium to about 230 statute miles west of Tampa Bay. Both federal moratoriums are in effect until 2022, unless Congress repeals them.

State and federal governments can lift their bans independently of one another, and the lifting of one ban does not necessarily mean the other will be lifted. However, it would be hard to maintain Congressional support for a ban on oil and gas activity from 10.36 to 125 miles from the Florida coastline when the state is allowing it inside of 10.36 miles. Lifting the state moratorium might weaken the state's position when protesting oil and gas activities in submerged lands under federal jurisdiction, but if the federal moratoriums were removed or modified, there might not be any immediate political or legal implications for the state moratorium.

# ASPEC

#### Agency discussions are essential to education about energy policy

Valentine 10 Scott Victor Valentine - Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, National University of Singapore, Singapore, “Canada’s constitutional separation of (wind) power” Energy Policy, Volume 38, Issue 4, April,

http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301421509009227

Should policymakers facilitate renewable energy capacity development **through distributive policies (i.e. subsidies), regulatory policies** (i.e. CO2 emission caps), redistributive policies (i.e. carbon taxes) or constituent policies (i.e. green energy campaigns) (Lowi, 1972)? A preponderance of research has gone into addressing this question from **various conceptual perspectives**, which include popular themes such as comparing the efficacy of various policy instruments (cf. Blakeway and White, 2005; EWEA, 2005; Menza and Vachona, 2006; cf. Lipp, 2007), championing the efficacy of one specific instrument (cf. Sorrell and Sijm, 2003; cf. Mathews, 2008), assessing the impact that socio-economic dynamics have on the selection or design of policy instruments (cf. Maruyama et al., 2007; cf. Huang and Wu, 2009), investigating policy instrument selection in stakeholder networks (cf. Rowlands, 2007; cf. Mander, 2008), investigating hurdles to effective policy instruments implementation (cf. Alvarez-Farizo and Hanley, 2002), and examining challenges associated with evaluating policy instrument efficacy (cf. Mallon, 2006; cf. Vine, 2008).

**Despite the proliferation of studies on policy instruments in the** renewable **energy policy field**, there are no prominent examples of studies which investigate the impact that the federal form of government has on strategic selection of policy instruments. Federal government systems are characterized by power-sharing between the central authority and the regions comprising the federation. For federal policymakers, the manner in which power is divided can pose significant policy-making problems (Thorlakson, 2003). Specifically, federal attempts to apply coercive policy instruments in policy areas of regional or concurrent (shared) authority can generate political, legal or operational resistance by regional authorities. Even when developing policy for areas under federal jurisdiction, regional authorities have to avail their various “thrust and riposte” tactics to undermine the efficacy of disagreeable federal policies (Braun et al., 2002). Given that there are 24 nations with a federal government structure (including the major economies of the United States, Germany, Canada, Australia, Russia, India, Spain, Brazil and Mexico), a **formal enquiry into the impact that federal structure has on renewable energy policy instrument development is merited.**

#### VI for limits and ground---hundreds of relevant actors, from the DoE to DOD, courts, executive all conduct different energy programs and have different restrictions ---overstretches our research burden and wrecks 1NC strategy.

# T

#### Energy production is only electricity creation, not extraction

Vaekstfonden 6 Vaekstfonden is a Danish government backed investment fund that facilitates the supply of venture capital in terms of start-up equity and high-risk loans "THE ENERGY INDUSTRY IN DENMARK- perspectives on entrepreneurship andventure capital" No Specific Cited, Latest Data From 2006 s3.amazonaws.com/zanran\_storage/www.siliconvalley.um.dk/ContentPages/43667201.pdf

In all, 20 industry experts were interviewed about the composition and dynamics of the Danish energy sector. Insights from a minimum of 3 industry experts have been assigned to each of the stages in the value chain. Following is a brief description of what the different stages encompass.

Raw material extraction

This stage encompass the process before the actual production of the energy. As an example it is increasingly expensive to locate and extract oil from the North Sea. Likewise coal, gas and waste suitable for energy production can be costly to provide.

Energy production

Energy production encompasses the process, where energy sources are transformed into heat and power.Transmission and distribution

Energy transmission and distribution is in this report defined as the infrastructure that enables the producers of energy to sell energy to consumers.

Consumption

The last stage in the value chain is consumption. This stage encompasses products and services that geographically are placed near the consumers. As an example, decentralized energy production via solar power systems is part of the consumption stage.

#### VI for limits, ground and grammar---they double the size of the topic, make it bidirectional by allowing affs to affect both supply and demand sides of each energy and make it impossible to have wind/solar affs since they are naturally produced raw material---wrecks preparedness for all debates

# Coal DA

#### U.S. coal exports to China are low, but downward pressure on domestic demand expands them massively

Bryan Walsh 12, Senior Editor at TIME, May 31, 2012, “Drawing Battle Lines Over American Coal Exports to Asia,” online: http://science.time.com/2012/05/31/drawing-battle-lines-over-american-coal-exports-to-asia/

But across the Pacific Ocean, the demand for coal has never been hotter, with China burning 4.1 billion tons in 2010 alone, far more than any other country in the world. That insatiable demand forced China in 2009 to become a net coal importer for the first time, in part because congested rail infrastructure raised the cost of transporting coal from the mines of the country’s northwest to its booming southern cities. In April, Chinese coal imports nearly doubled from a year earlier. Right now Australia and Indonesia supply much of China’s foreign coal. U.S. coal from the Powder River Basin could be a perfect addition to the Chinese market. Montana and Wyoming are just short train trips to ports on the Pacific Northwest coast, and from there it’s a container ship away from Asian megacities where coal doesn’t have to compete with cheap natural gas and air-pollution regulations are far weaker than in the U.S. To a wounded Big Coal, China is a potential savior.¶ As I write in the new edition of TIME, there’s just one problem: right now, ports on the West Coast lack the infrastructure needed to transfer coal from railcars into container ships. (Just 7 million of the 107 million tons of U.S.-exported coal left the country via Pacific Ocean ports last year.) That’s why coal companies like Peabody and Ambre Energy are ready to spend millions to build coal-export facilities at a handful of ports in Washington and Oregon. If all those plans go forward, as much as 150 million tons of coal could be exported from the Northwest annually—-nearly all of it coming from the Powder -River -Basin and headed to Asia. Even if the U.S. kept burning less and less coal at home, it would have a reason to keep mining it.

#### Utilities will switch from gas to coal in 2013, but the plan locks in low gas prices and reverses switching

Keith Schaefer 12, Publisher, the Oil & Gas Investments Bulletin, 10/4/12, “The Swing Vote That Could Switch Natural Gas Back to Coal,” http://oilprice.com/Energy/Natural-Gas/The-Swing-Vote-That-Could-Switch-Natural-Gas-Back-to-Coal.html

So, as natural gas prices are now rising-up to $3.50/mmBtu (1 mmBtu ~ 1.1 mcf), coal prices have dropped to around US$52 per ton from US$78 per ton, the equivalent of US$2.03 per mmBtu.

The $1.40+ per mmBtu discount to natural gas this week is the largest relative price difference since August 2011, according to Reuters data—providing, on paper at least, lots of incentive for electricity producers to start switching back and reducing natural gas demand—potentially a lot.

However, the tipping price point for fuel switching depends on the utility and the age of the generator.

A Reversal for Natural Gas Prices?

The U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA) predicts natural gas consumption, which is estimated to rise by 5% this year from 2011 on power generation demand, will reverse in 2013 as prices rise and utilities switch back to coal.

“Because of the projected increase in natural gas prices relative to coal, EIA expects the recent trend of substituting coal-fired electricity generation with natural gas generation to slow and likely reverse over the next year,” the agency said in its September short-term energy

“EIA expects that coal-fired electricity generation will increase by nine percent in 2013, while natural gas generation will fall by about 10 percent.”

The other side of the coin is voiced by Ziff Energy analysts in Calgary, Alberta, who argue rising volumes of natural gas – produced as associated gas with shale oil and natural gas liquids, as well as shale gas – will conspire to put a ceiling on prices, despite low drilling activity on both sides of the border.

#### U.S. exports lock in expanded Chinese coal capacity---causes warming over the tipping point – turns case

Thomas M. Power 12, Research Professor and Professor Emeritus, Department of Economics, University of Montana; Principal, Power Consulting; February 2012, “The Greenhouse Gas Impact of Exporting Coal from the West Coast: An Economic Analysis,” <http://www.sightline.org/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2012/02/Coal-Power-White-Paper.pdf>

The cumulative impact of these coal port proposals on coal consumption in Asia could be much larger than even that implied by the two pending proposals. If Arch, Peabody, and other western U.S. coal producers’ projections of the competitiveness of western coal in Asia are correct, facilitating the opening of the development of West Coast coal ports could have a very large impact on the supply of coal to China and the rest of Asia.

6.4 The Long-term Implications of Fueling Additional Coal-Fired Electric Generation

Although the economic life of coal-fired generators is often given as 30 or 35 years, a permitted, operating, electric generator is kept on line a lot longer than that, as long as 50 or more years through ongoing renovations and upgrades. Because of that long operating life, the impact of the lower Asian coal prices and costs triggered by PRB coal competing with other coal sources cannot be measured by the number of tons of coal exported each year. Those lower coal costs will lead to commitments to more coal being burned for a half-century going forward.

That time-frame is very important. During exactly this time frame, the next half-century, the nations of the world will have to get their greenhouse gas emission stabilized and then reduced or the concentrations of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere may pass a point that will make it very difficult to avoid massive, ongoing, negative climate impacts. Taking actions now that encourage fifty-years of more coal consumption around the world is not a minor matter. Put more positively, allowing coal prices to rise (and more closely approximate their full cost, including “external” costs) will encourage extensive investments in improving the efficiency with which coal is used and the shift to cleaner sources of energy. This will lead to long-term reductions in greenhouse gas emissions that will also last well into the next half-century. 57

#### Chinese emissions are sufficient to cause extinction

John Copeland Nagle 11, the John N. Matthews Professor, Notre Dame Law School, Spring 2011, “How Much Should China Pollute?,” Vermont Journal of Environmental Law, 12 Vt. J. Envtl. L. 591

Third, the rest of the world suffers because of the inability of China and the United States to agree on a method for reducing their greenhouse gas emissions. Even if the rest of the world were to reach such an agreement, the failure to include China and the United States would doom the project from the start. Together, China and the United States account for forty-one percent of the world's greenhouse gas emissions. [FN19] Left unchecked, China's emissions alone could result in many of the harms associated with climate change. [FN20] That is why many observers believe that “[t]he decisions taken in Beijing, more than anywhere else, [will] determine whether humanity thrive[s] or perishe[s].”

# Exports CP

#### TEXT: The United States Department of Energy and Federal Energy Regulatory Commission should approve applications to export natural gas.

#### Massively boosts domestic production

Matthews 12—Merrill Matthews, resident scholar at the Institute for Policy Innovation, 12/27/12, Don't ban natural-gas exports, http://blogs.providencejournal.com/ri-talks/this-new-england/2012/12/merrill-matthews-dont-ban-natural-gas-exports.html
"'There's nothing like being a victim of your own success." That must be what American natural-gas producers are thinking right now.¶ Their profound success in recent years in expanding our national energy supply has inspired American policymakers to consider strapping them with strict new trade restrictions.¶ These regulatory efforts are deeply misguided and will ultimately deprive the country of jobs and growth.¶ Thanks to major innovations in drilling techniques, America faces a natural-gas surplus, with the per-unit price of gas now sitting at just $3 - about one-third to one-fifth the price in Europe and Asia. Utility plants have shifted from cheap coal to even cheaper - and cleaner - natural gas.¶ As a result, energy-related carbon emissions have been declining rapidly and now sit at levels not seen since the early 1990s.¶ But natural-gas supply is outpacing demand. So, producers have cut back on extraction and the drilling of new wells. Many are turning back to more profitable oil plays. The number of natural-gas rigs now in operation is half the total of a year ago.¶ As a result, natural gas producers are looking for new markets. The U.S. currently exports some natural gas to Canada and Mexico, but the real opportunities lie in overseas markets, where prices are much higher.¶ Shipping natural gas across great distances is challenging. It can't be easily loaded on a tanker like crude oil, so producers have to liquify it. The process involves super cooling gas to -260 degrees Fahrenheit, and the necessary facilities to cool it are predictably quite costly.¶ Most distressingly, however, is that the Department of Energy has been dragging its feet when considering natural gas firms' applications to establish export facilities. The department was waiting on a just-released study intended to assess the impact of natural-gas exports on domestic natural-gas prices. The study concluded that expanding natural-gas exports would be an economic winner.¶ "In all of these cases, benefits that come from export expansion more than outweigh the losses from reduced capital and wage income to U.S. consumers, and hence LNG exports have net economic benefits in spite of higher domestic natural gas prices," according to the report. We'll have to see how the DOE responds.¶ Private-sector companies have also been raising concerns that expanding exports could also force them to pay higher gas prices. They claim that cheap natural gas is spurring economic growth here at home and providing America's manufacturing sector with a valuable competitive advantage.¶ But their concerns, while understandable, are overblown. Allowing natural-gas exports would, at worst, drive up domestic prices only slightly. The consulting firm Deloitte took a close look at the issue and determined that allowing exports would increase domestic prices by just 1.7 percent over the next 20 years.¶ What's more, banning exports might have the unintended consequence of driving gas prices up. Firms are already cutting back on production because of historically low prices. If they can't sell at higher prices in foreign markets, this ratcheting back will continue, causing the domestic gas supply to shrink anyway and forcing prices skyward. That's the very last thing we want.¶ And even if expanding gas exports pushes domestic prices up initially, natural-gas producers would have a new, substantial financial incentive to further ramp up production and develop more wells. This expansion would increase supply and put downward pressure on domestic prices.¶ Plus, expanding natural gas production to meet new foreign demand would create new jobs right here at home. Banning exports would deprive Americans of those opportunities.

#### Massive Atlantic Drilling collapses the marine ecosystem.

NRDC 12 [Natural Resources Defense Council, “Deep Sea Treasures Protecting the Atlantic Coast's Ancient Submarine Canyons and Seamounts,” March 2012

Out at Sea, But Not Out of¶ Harm’s Way

The Atlantic canyons and seamounts remain largely¶ unscathed by humans. Because of their depth and¶ ruggedness, they have been out of reach to destructive¶ bottom trawling, a type of fishing using heavily weighted¶ nets to target bottom-dwelling fish, crushing, ripping, and¶ ultimately destroying fragile bottom habitats in the process.¶ So far the oil and gas industry has not been allowed to¶ commercially develop oil resources on the Eastern seaboard.

But that could quickly change. Elsewhere, so-called¶ “canyon buster” and “rock hopper” trawl gear are opening up challenging seascapes to fishermen seeking out new populations or species to catch. These bottom trawl nets¶ can remove in minutes what took nature centuries to build,¶ leaving barren, scarred clay, mud, and rock where rich gardens of corals, sponges, and anemones once thrived.¶ With the moratoria against oil and gas development in¶ the Atlantic now lifted, full-scale commercial drilling in the canyons is possible. Proposals for oil and gas exploration are already under consideration, threatening the canyons’¶ sensitive resources. Seismic surveys are used to detect the¶ presence of oil and gas and use high-decibel acoustic energy¶ pulses blasted from ships. Surveys can damage or kill fish and fish larvae and have been implicated in whale beaching¶ and stranding incidents.10 The auditory assault disrupts and displaces vital behaviors, leaving marine animals unable to locate prey or mates or communicate with each other, and pushing animals out of critical migratory corridors and their¶ nursery, foraging, and breeding habitat.11

After the Deepwater Horizon and Exxon Valdez disasters,¶ we now all know the widespread ecological devastation that results from a well blow-out or a catastrophic spill. Even small oil spills can kill marine organisms and disrupt marine ecosystems. Marine mammals like dolphins and whales can also inhale oil when they surface to breathe, which causes¶ damage to mucous membranes and airways and can be¶ fatal.12 Aside from posing a spill risk, each drilled well also generates drilling muds and cuttings, and produces water that contains toxic metals, such as lead, chromium, mercury, and carcinogens like toluene and benzene.13

The Atlantic’s Submarine Canyons¶ and Seamounts Need Our Protection

We have a unique opportunity now to protect the rich and¶ vulnerable resources of the Atlantic canyons and seamounts before irreversible harm is done. To date, only four of these¶ canyons have been protected from bottom trawling. None¶ of the canyons or seamounts are protected from oil and gas¶ exploration activities. We need to fully protect these special¶ places for the future before it is too late.

#### Drilling will destroy numerous biological hotspots

Gravitz 9—Oceans Advocate for Environment America [Michael Gravitz, Statement at the Department of Interior Hearing On Offshore Ocean Energy Development in Atlantic City, New Jersey, April 6, 2009, pg. http://tinyurl.com/cxkzanz]

3. When deciding whether to approve seismic testing or exploration and production off the east coast, your department needs to balance the safety of those special areas against the potential for damage from oil drilling. The only way to adequately assess the balance would be for your department (with the participation of NOAA and possibly the National Academy of Science) to do a comprehensive census of those special places and analyze possible impacts on them from drilling.

1. The Ocean: More Like A Diverse Forest Than A Desert

Many people look at the ocean and see it as a pretty, shiny surface. They may imagine a few fish swimming below the surface and a plain featureless bottom. This is not an accurate picture of the ocean in most places. Unless the bottom is sandy and continually disturbed by wind, wave or current the bottom of the ocean is filled with communities of diverse creatures. Depending on depth, penetration of light, type of bottom (i.e., muddy, sandy, pebbles, boulders) and other factors, the ocean’s floor is teaming with diverse communities of plants, invertebrates, shellfish, crustaceans and fish. Numerous kinds of fish live on the bottom. Other fish swim above the bottom in the water column at different levels. Thousands of types of phytoplankton, zooplankton and larvae at the base of most food chains ‘float’ around. Marine mammals, sea turtles and sea birds spend most of their time at or near the surface of the ocean.

All of these creatures are sensitive to the impacts of oil and pollution from oil and gas drilling; some are more sensitive than others. But none are immune to the short or long term effects of oil.

With this as background, it is important to recognize the special places in the ocean that are unique, especially sensitive to pollution or those that are especially productive. These include: submarine canyons cutting across the continental shelf; deep water coral gardens; plateaus where the floor of the ocean rises and becomes unusually productive because deeper nutrient rich waters come closer to the warmer temperatures and light of the surface; migratory pathways for marine mammals and sea turtles; and areas where fish aggregate to spawn or where larval stages of animals are concentrated. Finally, the margins of the ocean: beaches, bays and marshes are often unusually sensitive to oil pollution.

2. Special Places in the Atlantic Ocean Deserving of Protection

Based on the Environmental Sensitivity Index (ESI) and a crude measure of marine productivity that your own department uses, the New England, Mid Atlantic and South Atlantic planning areas are all very environmentally sensitive and highly productive. The South Atlantic planning area and Mid Atlantic have the first and third most environmentally sensitive coastlines, respectively, of all 22 MMS planning areas. New England comes in at #11. The South Atlantic and Mid Atlantic are ranked first and second respectively in terms of primary productivity among all the planning areas with North Atlantic being #12.

There are 14 submarine canyons between Massachusetts and Virginia that slice through the continental shelf (See attached list). Submarine canyons, some with a mouth as wide as eight to ten miles and 30-40 miles long, are important because they shelter unusual species, provide hard bottoms and sidewalls for creatures to attach to or burrow in, provide nursery areas for many commercially important fish and bring nutrients from the deep ocean up to more shallow waters. Sea life in these canyons is unusually diverse which is why drilling in or near submarine canyons with their risk from spills and chronic pollution from production would be a very bad idea.

There are a number of important underwater plateaus and reefs off the eastern seaboard which serve as fish baskets, places of unusual marine productivity where very high populations of fish reproduce and grow. Often these are called ‘banks’ or ‘reefs’ with names like Georges Bank, Stellwagen Bank, Gray’s Reef or Occulina Bank. Some of these areas of the ocean are shallow enough to allow sunlight to penetrate to the seafloor and nutrients from the deeper ocean feed a richer abundance of life. These banks and reefs sometimes offer the only hard substrate for creatures to attach in a wide area. . Drilling in biological hot spots like these and jeopardizing productive commercial and recreational fisheries would make no sense.

Like on land, certain areas of the ocean support migration corridors for fish, marine mammals, sea turtles and sea birds. For much of the Mid Atlantic there is a coastal corridor extending out 20 miles from shore in which endangered marine mammals like the northern right whale, various sea turtles and migratory fish travel. For example, the last 350 northern right whales on earth travel each year from the Georgia-Florida border where they give birth and nurse their calves to an area off Cape Cod where they spend the summer feeding. Loggerheads, leatherback and Kemp’s ridley turtles all use this corridor at various times of the year.

Another corridor, farther offshore at the edge of the continental shelf break and slope provides food for various endangered sea turtles and other kinds of whales and dolphins. Whales and dolphins are typically migratory and each is only seasonally present but taken together the area is important year round to these marine mammals.

There are four more hotspots of marine diversity and unusual productivity off the Mid Atlantic caused by ocean currents, type of bottom, [and] submarine canyons and other special characteristics. These include: the coastal waters off North Carolina near and south of Cape Hatteras, the mouth of the Chesapeake and Delaware Bays and off New York harbor. Coastal waters and sandy bottoms off New Jersey support a large and economically important clam and scallop industry.

#### Extinction

Nautiyal & Nidamanuri 10—Centre for Ecological Economics and Natural Resources @ Institute for Social and Economic Change & Department of Earth and Space Sciences @ Indian Institute of Space Science and Technology [SUNIL NAUTIYAL1 & RAMA RAO NIDAMANURI “Conserving Biodiversity in Protected Area of Biodiversity Hotspot in India: A Case Study,” International Journal of Ecology and Environmental Sciences 36 (2-3): 195-200, 2010

The hotspots are the world’s most biologically rich areas hence recognized as important ecosystems not important¶ only for the rich biodiversity but equally important for the human survival as these are the homes for more than¶ 20% of the world’s population. India got recognition of one of the mega-diversity countries of world as the country¶ is home of the two important biodiversity hotspots: the Himalaya in north and the Western Ghats in the southern¶ peninsula. Policy makers and decision takers have recognized the importance of biodiversity (flora and fauna) and¶ this has resulted to segregate (in the form of protected areas) the rich and diverse landscape for biodiversity¶ conservation. An approach which leads towards conservation of biological diversity is good efforts but such¶ approaches should deal with humans equally who are residing in biodiversity hotspots since time immemorial. In¶ this endeavor, a study was conducted in Nagarahole National Park of Nilgiri Biosphere Reserve, in Karnataka. Our¶ empirical studies reveal that banning all the human activities in this ecosystem including agriculture, animal¶ husbandry has produced the results opposite to the approach ‘multiple values’ of national park. To monitor the¶ impact, existing policies have been tested from an economic and ecological view-point. Unfortunately, the local¶ livelihoods (most of them belongs to indigenous tribes) in the area have received setbacks due to the¶ implementation of the policies, though unintentionally. However, the ecological perspective is also not showing¶ support for the approach and framework of the current policies in the hotspots. Satellite data showed that the¶ temporal pattern of ecosystem processes has been changing. An integrated approach for ecosystem conservation and¶ strengthening local institutions for sustainable ecosystem management in such areas is therefore supported by this¶ study.