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#### Energy production policy is grounded within a global system of inequality and militarism – Enables continued reactionary violence and environmental destruction in the name of continued economic growth

**Byrne and Toly ‘6** (“Energy as a Social Project: Recovering a Discourse” John Byrne and Noah Toly, pp 1-32, Energy, Environment, and Society in Conflict 2006 Center for Energy and Environmental Policy Established in 1980 at the University of Delaware, the Center is a leading institution for interdisciplinary graduate education, research, and advocacy in energy and environmental policy. CEEP is led by Dr. John Byrne, Distinguished Professor of Energy & Climate Policy at the University. For his contributions to Working Group III of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) since 1992, he shares the 2007 Nobel Peace Prize with the Panel's authors and review editors. Dr. Toly’s chief interests are in urban and global environmental governance. He has co-edited three books and has authored numerous other publications on topics such as global cities, environmental issues, and religion. He is editor of the Routledge series, Cities and Global Governance and was selected to the Chicago Council on Global Affairs Emerging Leaders Program for 2011-2013. His expertise includes issues related to urban and environmental politics, global cities, and public policy. Dr. Toly directs the Urban Studies and Wheaton in Chicago programs.

From climate change to acid rain, contaminated landscapes, mercury pollution, and biodiversity loss, **the origins of many of our least tractable environmental problems can be traced to the operations of the modern energy system.** A scan of nightfall across the planet reveals a social dilemma that also accompanies this system’s operations: invented over a century ago, electric light remains an experience only for the socially privileged. Two billion human beings—almost one-third of the planet’s population—experience evening light by candle, oil lamp, or open fire, reminding us that **energy modernization has** left intact—and sometimesexacerbated**—social** inequalities **that its architects promised would be banished** (Smil, 2003: 370 - 373). And there is the disturbing link between modern energy and war.3 Whether as a mineral whose control is fought over by the powerful (for a recent history of conflict over oil, see Klare, 2002b, 2004, 2006), **or as the enablement of an atomic war of extinction,** modern energy makes modern life possible and threatens its future. With environmental crisis, social inequality, and military conflict among the significant problems of contemporary energy-society relations, the importance of a social analysis of the modern energy system appears easy to establish. One might, therefore, expect a lively and fulsome debate of the sector’s performance, including critical inquiries into the politics, sociology, and political economy of modern energy. **Yet, contemporary discourse on the subject is disappointing: instead of a social analysis of energy regimes, the field seems to be *a captive* of euphoric technological visions and associated studies of “energy futures” that imagine the pleasing consequences of new energy sources and devices.** 4 One stream of euphoria has sprung from advocates of conventional energy, perhaps best represented by the unflappable optimists of nuclear power 12 Transforming Power who, early on, promised to invent a “magical fire” (Weinberg, 1972) capable of meeting any level of energy demand inexhaustibly in a manner “too cheap to meter” (Lewis Strauss, cited in the New York Times 1954, 1955). In reply to those who fear catastrophic accidents from the “magical fire” or the proliferation of nuclear weapons, a new promise is made to realize “inherently safe reactors” (Weinberg, 1985) that risk neither serious accident nor intentionally harmful use of high-energy physics. Less grandiose, but no less **optimistic, forecasts can be heard from fossil fuel enthusiasts who,** likewise, **project more energy, at lower cost**, and **with little ecological harm** (see, e.g., Yergin and Stoppard, 2003). Skeptics of conventional energy, eschewing involvement with dangerously scaled technologies and their ecological consequences, find solace in “sustainable energy alternatives” that constitute a second euphoric stream. Preferring to redirect attention to smaller, and supposedly more democratic, options, “green” energy advocates conceive devices and systems that prefigure a revival of human scale development, local self-determination, and a commitment to ecological balance. Among supporters are those who believe that greening the energy system embodies universal social ideals and, as a result, can overcome current conflicts between energy “haves” and “havenots.” 5 In a recent contribution to this perspective, Vaitheeswaran suggests (2003: 327, 291), “today’s nascent energy revolution will truly deliver power to the people” as “micropower meets village power.” Hermann Scheer echoes the idea of an alternative energy-led social transformation: the shift to a “solar global economy... can satisfy the material needs of all mankind and grant us the freedom to guarantee truly universal and equal human rights and to safeguard the world’s cultural diversity” (Scheer, 2002: 34). 6 The euphoria of contemporary energy studies is noteworthy for its historical consistency with a nearly unbroken social narrative of wonderment extending from the advent of steam power through the spread of electricity (Nye, 1999). The modern energy regime that now powers nuclear weaponry and risks disruption of the planet’s climate **is a product of promises pursued without sustained public examination of the** political, social, economic, and ecological **record of the regime’s operations**. However, the discursive landscape has occasionally included thoughtful exploration of the broader contours of energy-environment-society relations. As early as 1934, Lewis Mumford (see also his two-volume Myth of the Machine, 1966; 1970) critiqued the industrial energy system for being a key source of social and ecological alienation (1934: 196): The changes that were manifested in every department of Technics rested for the most part on one central fact: the increase of energy. Size, speed, quantity, the multiplication of machines, were all reflections of the new means of utilizing fuel and the enlargement of the available stock of fuel itself. Power was dissociated from its natural human and geographic limitations: from the caprices of the weather, from the irregularities that definitely restrict the output of men and animals. 02Chapter1.pmd 2 1/6/2006, 2:56 PMEnergy as a Social Project 3 By 1961, Mumford despaired that modernity had retrogressed into a lifeharming dead end (1961: 263, 248): ...**an orgy of uncontrolled production and equally uncontrolled reproduction: machine fodder and cannon fodder: surplus values and surplus populations**... The dirty crowded houses, the dank airless courts and alleys, the bleak pavements, the sulphurous atmosphere, the over-routinized and dehumanized factory, the drill schools, the second-hand experiences, the starvation of the senses, the remoteness from nature and animal activity—here are the enemies. The living organism demands a life-sustaining environment. Modernity’s formula for two centuries had been to increase energy in order to produce overwhelming economic growth. While diagnosing the inevitable failures of this logic, Mumford nevertheless warned that **modernity’s supporters would seek to derail present-tense 7 evaluations of the era’s social and ecological performance with forecasts of a bountiful future in which, finally, the perennial social conflicts over resources would** **end**. Contrary to traditional notions of democratic governance, Mumford observed that the modern ideal actually issues from a pseudomorph that he named **the “democratic-authoritarian bargain” (1964: 6) in which the modern energy regime and capitalist political economy join in a promise to produce “every material advantage**, every intellectual and emotional stimulus [one] may desire, in quantities hardly available hitherto even for a restricted minority” on the condition that society demands only what the regime is capable and willing to offer. **An authoritarian energy order thereby constructs an aspirational democracy while facilitating the abstraction of production and consumption from non-economic social values**. The premises of the current energy paradigms are in need of critical study in the manner of Mumford’s work if a world measurably different from the present order is to be organized. Interrogating modern energy assumptions, this chapter examines the social projects of both conventional and sustainable energy as a beginning effort in this direction. The critique explores the neglected issue of the political economy of energy, underscores the pattern of democratic failure in the evolution of modern energy, and considers the discursive continuities between the premises of conventional and sustainable energy futures.

#### The impact is Extinction – The K turns and solves the root cause of their impacts – the aff causes error replication

**Ahmed 12** Dr. Nafeez Mosaddeq Ahmed is Executive Director of the Institute for Policy Research and Development (IPRD), an independent think tank focused on the study of violent conflict, he has taught at the Department of International Relations, University of Sussex "The international relations of crisis and the crisis of international relations: from the securitisation of scarcity to the militarisation of society" Global Change, Peace & Security Volume 23, Issue 3, 2011 Taylor Francis

The twenty-first century heralds the unprecedented acceleration and convergence of multiple, interconnected global crises – climate change, energy depletion, food scarcity, and economic instability. While the structure of global economic activity is driving the **unsustainable** depletion of hydrocarbon and other natural resources, this is simultaneously escalating greenhouse gas emissions resulting in global warming. Both global warming and energy shocks are impacting detrimentally on global industrial food production, as well as on global financial and economic instability. Conventional policy responses toward the intensification of these crises have been decidedly inadequate because scholars and practitioners largely view them as separate processes. Yet increasing evidence shows they are deeply **interwoven manifestations** of a global political economy that has breached the limits of the wider environmental and natural resource systems in which it is **embedded**. In this context, orthodox IR's flawed diagnoses of global crises lead inexorably to their ‘securitisation’, **reifying** the militarisation of policy responses, and naturalising the proliferation of violent conflicts. Global ecological, energy and economic crises are thus directly linked to the ‘**Otherisation’** of social groups and problematisation of strategic regions considered pivotal for the global political economy. Yet this relationship between global crises and conflict is not necessary or essential, but a function of a **wider** epistemological failure to holistically interrogate their structural and systemic causes**.** In 2009, the UK government's chief scientific adviser Sir John Beddington warned that without mitigating and preventive action 'drivers' of global crisis like demographic expansion, environmental degradation and energy depletion could lead to a 'perfect storm' of simultaneous food, water and energy crises by around 2030.1 Yet, for the most part, conventional policy responses from national governments and international institutions have been decidedly inadequate. Part of the problem is the way in which these crises are conceptualised in relation to security. Traditional disciplinary divisions in the social and natural sciences, compounded by bureaucratic compartmentalisation in policy-planning and decision-making, has meant these crises are frequently approached as largely separate processes with their own internal dynamics. While it is increasingly acknowledged that cross-disciplinary approaches are necessary, these have largely failed to recognise just how inherently interconnected these crises are. As Brauch points out, 'most studies in the environmental security debate since 1990 have ignored or **failed** to integrate the contributions of the global environmental change community in the natural sciences. To a large extent the latter has also failed to integrate the results of this debate.\*" Underlying this problem is the **lack** of a **holistic systems approach** to **thinking** about not only global crises, but their causal **origins** in the social, political, economic, ideological and value structures of the contemporary international system. Indeed, it is often assumed that these contemporary structures are largely what need to be 'secured\* and protected from the dangerous impacts of global crises, rather than transformed precisely to ameliorate these crises in the first place. Consequently, policy-makers frequently overlook existing **systemic and structural obstacles** to the implementation of desired reforms. In a modest effort to contribute to the lacuna identified by Brauch, this paper begins with an **empirically-oriented, interdisciplinary exploration** of the **best** available **data** on four major global crises — climate change, energy depletion, food scarcity and global financial instability — illustrating the **systemic interconnections** between different crises, and revealing that their causal origins are not accidental but inherent to the structural failings and vulnerabilities of existing global political, economic and cultural institutions. This empirical evaluation leads to a critical appraisal of orthodox realist and liberal approaches to global crises in international theory and policy. This critique argues principally that orthodox IR reifies a highly fragmented, de-historicised ontology of the international system which underlies a reductionist, technocratic and compartmentalised conceptual and methodological approach to global crises. Consequently, rather than global crises being understood causally and **holistically** in the systemic context of the structure of the international system, they are 'securitised\* as amplifiers of traditional security threats, requiring counter-productive militarised responses and/or futile inter-state negotiations. While the systemic causal context of global crisis convergence and acceleration is thus elided, this simultaneously **exacerbates** the danger of **reactionary violence**, the problematisation of populations in regions impacted by these crises and the naturalisation of the consequent proliferation of wars and humanitarian disasters. This moves us away from the debate over whether resource 'shortages\* or 'abundance\* causes conflicts, to the question of how either can generate crises which undermine conventional socio-political orders and confound conventional IR discourses, in turn radicalising the processes of social polarisation that can culminate in **violent conflict**.

#### VOTE NEG – Interrogating dominant policy frameworks creates space for new ways of approaching energy policy – our role as energy policy researchers should be to interrogating the framing of our policies

**Scrase and Ockwell 10** (J. Ivan - Sussex Energy Group, SPRU (Science and Technology Policy Research), Freeman Centre, University of Sussex, David G - Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research, SPRU, Freeman Centre, University of Sussex, “The role of discourse and linguistic framing effects in sustaining high carbon energy policy—An accessible introduction,” Energy Policy: Volume 38, Issue 5, May 2010, Pages 2225–2233)

We hope that this article has served to provide an accessible introduction to the ways in which discourse and linguistic framing effects might be playing a role in sustaining **energy policy frameworks** that are **resistant to** the many insightful **changes** often advocated in the pages of Energy Policy. If the influence of such framing effects is accepted, we begin to see how the process of effecting changes in energy policy is not just a technical or economic task, but also a political task. Moreover, this highlights an urgent need for civil society to engage directly with the existing framing of energy policy and the problems it seeks to address in an effort to reframe it around more sustainable, low carbon principles and concerns. The demonstration of the value of a **discourse analytic approach** in this paper, together with other emerging contributions in this field (cited above), also serves to highlight some **important considerations for energy policy researchers**. Moving away from the traditional **linear understanding** of the policy process **requires** researchers to critically reflect on the interplay of values, beliefs, entrenched interests and institutional structures that serve to **facilitate** or constrain **the policy traction** of certain framings of **energy policy problems and solutions**. Further than this, it also highlights the role in this process that we ourselves play as **researchers**, and the extent to which our own values, beliefs and interests influence the **framing of our research practice and communication**. This has important and far reaching implications, both **methodological** and normative, raising considerations that are likely to continue to gain traction as researchers and policy makers alike increasingly appreciate the need for reflexivity in our approach to **framing**, interpreting and implementing **energy policy** in the decades to come.[2](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301421509009471#fn2)

### Oil

#### Saudi would flood the market in response to the plan and crash oil prices

HULBERT ’12 - Lead Analyst at European Energy Review; Senior Research Fellow, Netherlands Institute for International Relations; Senior Research Fellow at the Center for Security Studies (Hulbert, Matthew. “OPEC's Pending Bloodbath”. June 10, 2012. http://www.forbes.com/sites/matthewhulbert/2012/06/10/opecs-pending-bloodbath/)

That’s unlikely to happen, precisely because Riyadh can bring further pricing pressures to bear **if it wants to get its way** in the cartel. The Kingdom’s policy space has admittedly tightened over the past couple of years, but they remain **the only producer capable of significantly increasing or reducing production at will**. Initial tanker data from Europe suggests Riyadh may have started reigning in production that was running around 6% over OPEC quota. It’s also raised July benchmarks for Arab Light grades in Asia. But Iran, Venezuela, Nigeria, Angola and Algeria will want restraint to come far faster and far deeper to firm prices. The line being spun from the ‘free lunch’ brigade is that storage should easily cover any Iranian spikes when EU sanctions come into full effect 1st July, while OPEC quotas should be pared down to 29.5mb/d (or less). Cheap words from petro-hawks, not least because they’ll all continue to cheat on quotas to squeeze out every last drop they have. Riyadh knows that of course; hawks want a price floor to be set at $100/b to sustain political regimes, but to do so entirely at Saudi expense. Russia is no different outside the cartel: free riding 101. Saudi Arabia (and its GCC partners) might be willing to play ball given ongoing concerns from the Arab Awakening, but with some budgetary tweaks and counter-cyclical cash to burn, they could all easily survive at $85/b making Iran et al sweat. Tehran might decide to rip up formal quotas as it did in June 2011, but that would be a costly mistake. If the Saudis let prices fall, political outages across smaller producer states could help to set a floor for them anyway. Iran would have no say in the matter. Given such ‘pricing perils’, Saudi Arabia holds all the aces to settle institutional issues, not to mention giving the global economy more breathing space (and Washington greater leeway over Iranian sanctions). But the real reason to let prices fall a little further isn’t just to make very clear to OPEC states where the ultimate volume and pricing power rests, but to fight Riyadh’s **bigger battle** over the next decade: **Retaining** 40% of **OPEC market share in the midst of supposedly huge non-OPEC supply growth**. It didn’t go unnoticed that despite Saudi production averaging 31 year highs and prices hitting $128/b in March 2012, the forward curve for 2018 was trading at $30/b discounts relative to spot. You’d think with the cartel maxed out and proximate demand side problems looking bleak, five year curves would be exactly the other way, in sharp contango (i.e. far above prompt prices) once the global economy and demand side fundamentals were fixed. The fact they weren’t is principally because the market thinks vast swathes of unconventional production will come online, not just in North America where production is back above 6mb/d, but in Canada, Brazil and even Arctic extremes. At $100/b that was a fair bet to place, but once benchmark prices drop back to two figures, the 6.4 trillion barrels of unconventional reserves sitting in the Americas look a far less certain prospect. Canadian tar distinctly sticky; Brazilian pre-salt horribly deep; Russian Arctic plays simply impossible. So when OPEC meets in Vienna expect Saudi Arabia to call the shots. The new Secretary General will either be a Saudi national, or a compromise candidate Riyadh can live with. Quotas will stay close to 30mb/d with minor reductions possible. Thinly veiled threats of sustained (or increased) production will be made if Iran doesn’t play ball. Yet the long term price point to watch isn’t just one that keeps OPEC in business and Riyadh in control, but where the al-Saud can maintain secular market share. Letting prices **informally slide** to $85-90/b **might be the** kind of warning shot **Riyadh wants** to send to scrub unconventional plays off global balance sheets. Its OPEC colleagues will see that as sailing far too close to the political wind, but a Saudi bloodbath now, might be just the medicine OPEC requires to sustain its long term health, not unless the cartel is absolutely determined to keep pricing itself out of existence.

#### Oil prices are key to Russian military modernization

BENNETT ‘12 – MA from the University of Chicago; Emory University School of Law (John T. “Oil Prices Fueling Russia's Disruption of U.S. Foreign Policy”. April 04, 2012. http://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2012/04/03/oil-prices-fueling-russias-disruption-of-us-foreign-policy)

Russia's return to the fore as a check against America's global whims has escalated in recent months, as Russian Prime Minister Vladimir Putin was elected as President, and is setting his agenda for a third term. U.S.-Russian relations returned to the front pages last week after Obama urged outgoing Russian President Dmitry Medvedev to "give me space" on several issues, including a European missile defense shield that Moscow opposes. Likely GOP presidential nominee Mitt Romney soon after called Russia America's "top geopolitical enemy." "Putin still aspires for Russia to be a superpower," says Steven Pifer, a former U.S. ambassador to Ukraine. "There are only two ways for Russia to achieve that: nuclear weapons, and oil and natural gas sales." The price of a barrel of oil was nearly $105 at midday Tuesday, steadily climbing from a 52-week low of $76.35 per barrel in October. Oil prices began to rise in late 2010, peaking at $113 per barrel in May 2011, before dipping last summer and then rising again. Russia is the world's second-largest oil exporter at 5 million barrels a day, and its the ninth-leading natural gas exporter at 38.2 billion cubic meters a year, according to the CIA World Factbook. Russia rakes in nearly $500 billion annually in exports, with the CIA listing petroleum and natural gas as its top two commodities. Frances Burwell, vice president of the Atlantic Council, says Russia's oil revenues "give it a comfort zone" from which its leaders feel they have the global cache to make things tough for Washington. Burwell says she "places more weight" for Russia's recent global muscularity on "Putin's re-emergence." The Russian once-and-soon-again president "clearly sees playing the national card as the strong guy internationally benefits him," she says. But, make no mistake, bloated national coffers from high oil and gas prices underwrite Putin's muscle-flexing, experts say. Putin made a number of big domestic promises during the presidential race, including plans to usher in sweeping pension and wage hikes. He also put forth "a rather ambitious military modernization program," Pifer says. "If oil prices remain high, he might be able to do all of those things," Pifer says. "If prices come down, however, Putin will have some very tough decisions to make at home ... between guns versus butter." **Should** oil and gas **prices tumble, experts say Putin would** likely **pick butter**. "In 2007 when oil was doing well, Putin [as president] could have modernized the Russian military," says Pifer. Instead, Putin made a number of economic moves, such as the creation of a rainy day fund that was used during the recent global financial crisis," Pifer notes. What's more, Putin returns to power with his sharp eyes locked on his opposition, which is composed of the country's urban, middle-class populations. Experts agree that Putin would be hard-pressed to break his pension and wage promises in favor of a few more missiles. But even an economically weaker Russia would likely pick its spots to block Washington's desires.

#### Impact is Russian nuclear preemption—modernization key to lower nuclear reliance and Russian threat perception

RENZ AND THORNTON 12 – lectures on international security in the Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Nottingham (Bettina., Rod. “Russian Military Modernization Cause, Course, and Consequences” Problems of Post-Communism Volume 59, Number 1 / January / February 2012. P 52-54)

The perceived weakness of this triad means that the Kremlin was pleased with the START agreement of March 2010. The treaty limits favor Moscow in that it does not have to cut any of its own nuclear warheads or delivery systems—the numbers of ICBMs and warheads in its own triad are actually below the negotiated caps. Only the United States has had to bring its numbers down.58 Normally, in the arranging of such international security treaties, negotiating from a position of military weakness—as Russia was—is not conducive to the ability to drive a hard bargain. Moscow has been lucky, however, in that Washington seems not to be too interested in the shape of Russia’s current and future nuclear arsenal. Rather, in terms of perceived security threats, Washington has its eye more on the terrorist ball than on the Russian one. Additionally, under START, Russia does not have to reduce the number of its tactical nuclear weapons. It has more of these than the United States. These are prized and important assets to Moscow, and they have become even more prized and important as Russia’s conventional military has become weaker. They are seen more and more as the fallback option if Russia one day faces some sort of defeat in a conventional conflict—against the likes of Georgia or China. In the largest Russian military exercise held since the end of the cold war—conducted recently in the Russian Far East—**tactical nuclear weapons** (i.e., mines) **were** notionally “**exploded**” as part of the exercise play.59 This fact alone seems to confirm that **Russia’s conventional** military **weakness** has **led to a reduction in its nuclear-use threshold**. Conclusion The current modernization in the Russian military is long overdue. Because it is long overdue, it has to be completed in a rushed, haphazard fashion and against a backdrop of a military–industrial complex unable to fulfill its role in the process. Traditionally, military modernization is not achieved lightly, given the bureaucratic inertia and cultural norms that are always present. When, as in the current situation in Russia, such barriers to change are aided and abetted by any number of additional problems (not to mention the rampant corruption that is endemic across all levels of Russian state institutions, including the military), then it must be expected that Russia’s armed forces will be striving for some time to become truly “modern.”60 In essence, what should have been accomplished as an evolution over many years, and should have begun during the Yeltsin era, is now being attempted as a revolution in the post–Georgian war era. As with any revolutionary change, a good deal of disruption and disaffection has been created. Moreover, the current Russian military is a weakened military. The psychology of the tsarist/Soviet/Russian military has always been that numbers counted, that mass would prevail. Numbers inspired confidence, and numbers could deter. But the current Russian military is losing numbers while not making up for them by creating smaller, more professional forces equipped with the requisite technologies. Quality is not replacing quantity. The military is in a state of flux. Russian **politicians and military** **figures** both now **lack** a genuine **confidence in the armed forces’** ability to deter. This can have two consequences. Either Russia takes large steps to avoid the possibility of military confrontation by stressing diplomatic solutions to possible threat scenarios (as the tsarist government did in 1914), or it goes the opposite way, fearing that if any state is threatening military action against Russia then the hair trigger comes into operation (Israeli-style). That is, the mentality of the first, preemptive strike becomes paramount—taking advantage of surprise—and using what assets Russia now has. The alternative is to take the risk of waiting to be attacked and maybe “losing.” What is clear is that, with its armed forces currently weakened by the process of change, the sense of vulnerability generated has led Russia, in classic confirmation of the security dilemma concept, to magnify the threats it faces, or thinks it faces. Conscious of its vulnerability to threats, real or imagined, Moscow may begin to look more and more toward the inflexible tool of its tactical nuclear weapons as its principal defense mechanism. While no one really supposes that such weapons will be used in any confrontation with the West, the same cannot be said of any possible conflict with the Chinese. Ironically, Beijing’s military still relies on mass. The best modern military counter to mass is to employ either PGMs or tactical nuclear weapons. The Russian military has hardly any of the former but plenty of the latter. Hair triggers and tactical nuclear weapons are not comfortable bedfellows.

### Ptx

#### CIR pass – top Democrats.

Reuters 2-3. ["Reid predicts Congress will pass immigration legislation" -- news.yahoo.com/reid-predicts-u-congress-pass-immigration-legislation-172812947.html]

The top Senate Democrat on Sunday predicted that Congress will pass and send to President Barack Obama legislation overhauling the U.S. immigration system, saying "things are looking really good."¶ Obama last week expressed hope Congress can get a deal done on immigration, possibly in the first half of the year.¶ The president is proposing to give the roughly 11 million U.S. illegal immigrants - most of whom are Hispanics - a pathway to citizenship, a step that many Republicans have long fought.¶ Obama's fellow Democrats control the Senate, but Republicans control the House of Representatives.¶ Appearing on the ABC program "This Week," Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid was asked whether immigration legislation can win House passage.¶ "Well, it's certainly going to pass the Senate. And it would be a bad day for our country and a bad day for the Republican Party if they continue standing in the way of this. So the answer is yes," Reid said.¶ Obama choose Reid's home state of Nevada, with a sizable Hispanic population, as the site for a major speech last Tuesday pushing Congress to pass an immigration bill.¶ Hispanic voters were crucial in helping Obama beat Republican nominee Mitt Romney - who advocated "self-deportation" of illegal immigrants - in Nevada in November.¶ "It has to get done," Reid said of immigration legislation.¶ "It's really easy to write principles. To write legislation is much harder. And once we write the legislation, then you have to get it passed. But I think things are looking really good," Reid added.¶ After years on the back burner, immigration reform has suddenly looked possible as Republicans, chastened by the fact that more than 70 percent of Hispanic voters backed Obama in the November election, appear more willing to accept an overhaul.

#### Natural gas is politically explosive

Mantius, 11 – DC Bureau staff

(Peter, "Cuomos Hydrofracking Honeymoon Ends July 1," DC Bureau, 6-30-11, l/n, accessed 9-2-12, mss)

Throughout his first legislative session, New York Gov. Andrew Cuomo had the luxury of sitting on the fence on the **politically explosive** question of whether or not his state can safely open its borders to a **controversial** natural gas drilling technique. During that grace period, Cuomo successfully backed gay marriage, watched his approval rating soar above 60 percent and heard buzz about his potential as a 2016 presidential candidate. But the honeymoon ends July 1 when the state Department of Environmental Conservation releases its latest draft of requirements for permits to use high volume hydraulic fracturing when drilling in New Yorks Marcellus Shale formation. According to The New York Times, the Cuomo administration will lift what has been a moratorium on hydraulic fracturing. The governor bought time in the first half of 2011 by insisting that experts at the DEC “not politicians “ write the rules for gas drilling. To address criticism that the DECs previous draft rules on hydrofracking were inadequate, Cuomo, in one of his first acts as governor, gave the agency a quick makeover. He appointed Joseph Martens as DEC commissioner and then turned his attention to other matters. œCuomo made a point of saying that he and Martens had actually never spoken on hydrofracking, said Roger Downs of the Sierra Clubs Atlantic Chapter. œHe wanted a firewall. Meanwhile, New Yorks Republican-controlled Senate took a rigid stance against passing gas drilling legislation in the 2011 session before the DEC issued its latest version of gas drilling rules. That meant that three bills that passed the Democratically-controlled Assembly “ a moratorium on fracking the New York Marcellus until next summer, a œhome rule measure guaranteeing the rights of communities to ban hydrofracking, and a bill to end the oil and gas industrys exemption from rules applying to hazardous waste “ all died quietly in the Senate. Everything was left hanging on the DECs revised rules, due July 1. Those rules are spelled out in a supplemental generic environmental impact statement, or SGEIS. The agency intends to allow drillers to cite the document instead of developing their own environmental impact statements for each gas well they drill, a process that has the potential to greatly speed up the well permitting process. The DECs previous draft of the SGEIS drew criticism from not only environmental groups, but also government agencies such as the federal Environmental Protection Agency, the New York State Department of Health and the New York City Department of Environmental Protection. Critics tended to focus on the drafts scant attention to the cumulative impact of hundreds, if not thousands, of hydrofracked wells and the failure to comprehensively address the regions lack of capacity to deal with millions of gallons of contaminated well flowback water.

#### PC shapes uq

Des Moines Register 1-22-13. www.desmoinesregister.com/article/20130122/OPINION03/301220049/0/NEWS/?odyssey=nav%7Chead&nclick\_check=1

Taken as an agenda for his second term, Monday’s inaugural address included references to immigration, climate change, gay rights, voting rights and safe schools. Achieving those things will require the president mounting his bully pulpit to put heat on Congress to pass comprehensive immigration reform, protections for the rights of gays and lesbians, gun control, environmental regulation and expansion of renewable forms of energy.¶ President Obama again demonstrated his gift of oratory on Monday. He delivered a well-crafted inaugural address with inspiring themes woven throughout and a call to action for our generation to achieve the ideals of previous generations.¶ But Obama should have learned in his first term that it is not enough to state lofty goals in great speeches. It takes hard work, perseverance and tough-mindedness to deal with members of Congress who may not want him to succeed.

#### Comprehensive reform is key to food security

**ACIR ‘7** (December 4, 2007 THE AGRICULTURE COALITION FOR IMMIGRATION REFORM

Dear Member of Congress: The Agriculture Coalition for Immigration Reform (ACIR) is deeply concerned with pending immigration enforcement legislation known as the ‘Secure America Through Verification and Enforcement Act of 2007' or ‘SAVE Act’ (H.R.4088 and S.2368). While these bills seek to address the worthy goal of stricter immigration law enforcement, they fail to take a comprehensive approach to solving the immigration problem. History shows that a one dimensional approach to the nation’s immigration problem is doomed to fail. Enforcement alone, without providing a viable means to obtain a legal workforce to sustain economic growth is a formula for disaster. Agriculture best illustrates this point. Agricultural industries that need considerable labor in order to function include the fruit and vegetable, dairy and livestock, nursery, greenhouse, and Christmas tree sectors. Localized labor shortages have resulted in actual crop loss in various parts of the country. More broadly, producers are making decisions to scale back production, limit expansion, and leave many critical tasks unfulfilled. Continued labor shortages could force more producers to shift production out of the U.S., thus stressing already taxed food and import safety systems. Farm lenders are becoming increasingly concerned about the stability of affected industries. This problem is aggravated by the nearly universal acknowledgement that the current H-2A agricultural guest worker program does not work. Based on government statistics and other evidence, roughly 80 percent of the farm labor force in the United States is foreign born, and a significant majority of that labor force is believed to be improperly authorized. The bills’ imposition of mandatory electronic employment eligibility verification will screen out the farm labor force without providing access to legal workers. Careful study of farm labor force demographics and trends indicates that there is not a replacement domestic workforce available to fill these jobs. This feature alone will result in chaos unless combined with labor-stabilizing reforms. Continued failure by Congress to act to address this situation in a comprehensive fashion is placing in jeopardy U.S. food security and global competitiveness. Furthermore, congressional inaction threatens the livelihoods of millions of Americans whose jobs exist because laborintensive agricultural production is occurring in America. If production is forced to move, most of the upstream and downstream jobs will disappear as well. The Coalition cannot defend of the broken status quo. We support well-managed borders and a rational legal system. We have worked for years to develop popular bipartisan legislation that would stabilize the existing experienced farm workforce and provide an orderly transition to wider reliance on a legal agricultural worker program that provides a fair balance of employer and employee rights and protections. We respectfully urge you to oppose S.2368, H.R.4088, or any other bills that would impose employment-based immigration enforcement in isolation from equally important reforms that would provide for a stable and legal farm labor force.

#### Food insecurity sparks World War 3

**Calvin ’98** (William, Theoretical Neurophysiologist – U Washington, Atlantic Monthly, January, Vol 281, No. 1, p. 47-64)

The population-crash scenario is surely the most appalling. Plummeting crop yields would cause some powerful countries to try to take over their neighbors or distant lands -- if only because their armies, unpaid and lacking food, would go marauding, both at home and across the borders. The better-organized countries would attempt to use their armies, before they fell apart entirely, to take over countries with significant remaining resources, driving out or starving their inhabitants if not using modern weapons to accomplish the same end: eliminating competitors for the remaining food. This would be a worldwide problem -- and could lead to a Third World War -- but Europe's vulnerability is particularly easy to analyze. The last abrupt cooling, the Younger Dryas, drastically altered Europe's climate as far east as Ukraine. Present-day Europe has more than 650 million people. It has excellent soils, and largely grows its own food. It could no longer do so if it lost the extra warming from the North Atlantic.

### CP

#### Text: The United States federal government should pass the Responsible Helium Administration and Stewardship Act.

#### Solves the case and prevents a helium shortage –

Bonner 2/8/13 (Loren, “Bipartisan Bill Introduced to Save U.S. Helium Supply”)

Members of the House Committee on Natural Resources have introduced a bipartisan bill into Congress that would keep the Federal Helium Reserve open, a global supply of helium that's critical to manufacturing and running MRI scanners. By law, the reserve is supposed to close later this year when the government is required to sell it off by 2015 in an effort to pay down the system's debts. But it should be able to pay off the debt by October 2013 instead — earlier than expected — without having sold off all the helium. The Responsible Helium Administration and Stewardship Act (H.R. 527), introduced on Wednesday, prevents a premature closure of the reserve, which supplies 30 percent of the world's helium supply. The bill is also intended to ensure taxpayers get a fair price for helium sold by the Bureau of Land Management since the market price of helium has risen higher than the federal government pricing formula in recent years. Without immediate reforms the world will soon face a global helium shortage, which will threaten tens of thousands of American jobs, make life-saving medical devices unreliable and disrupt national defense efforts," said Rep. Doc Hastings (R-Wash.), chairman of the committee, in a prepared statement. The bipartisan bill spells out a three-part approach for operating the reserve over the next decade — the estimated time it will take for the helium to be emptied out. The first phase is to let the Federal Helium Reserve continue operating under current law until one year after the date of enactment of the new law; phase two sets up a quarterly helium auction to promote competition and ensure a better return for taxpayers; and the final phase leaves the remaining helium — starting when there is 3 billion cubic feet of it left — available only for national security and scientific needs. The Medical Imaging & Technology Alliance (MITA), an OEM lobby, applauded the bill for presenting a solution to the problem. Gail Rodriguez, executive director of MITA said: "Failure to preserve our domestic helium supply will have reverberating effects on medical imaging manufacturers as well as the entire health care industry, as manufacturing facilities will have no choice but to slow or shut down production and physicians will be forced to turn away patients due to the shortage." The last bill aimed at extending the life of the reserve slipped through the cracks during a congressional "lame duck" session last year and expired when the 113th Congress began on Jan. 1, 2013.

### CP

#### Counterplan Text: The United States federal government should exempt companies that agree to post bond requirements four times the current limit from production restrictions on federal lands in the Arctic Outer Continental Shelf for conventional gas.

#### Current policy ensures risky action because of loopholes but bonding makes safety economically salient and solves accidents better if they occur

Nath 11 (Ishan, consultant, MA economics for development at Oxford, “ECONOMISTS’ PERSPECTIVES ON LIABILITY CAPS AND INSURANCE FOR THE OFFSHORE OIL AND GAS INDUSTRY IN THE WAKE OF THE MACONDO BLOWOUT” National Commission on the BP Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill and Offshore Drilling, 3/11)

Basic economic theory posits that holding firms liable only works when they actually have the assets to pay the costs. If a firm goes bankrupt and is shielded from the full cost of damages, their liability is essentially limited and prevents them from having the proper incentive to invest in safety. Furthermore, absent taxpayer contribution, compensation will not be available for victims of an accident. While it appears BP will be big enough to bear the full costs of the Deepwater Horizon accident after they waived the liability cap, that would not have been the case with a smaller firm. Thus, unlimited liability actually creates a strong advantage for smaller firms who do not have to worry about damages they cannot pay. This also creates, as Sweeney puts it, “incentive for corporations to spin-off separate companies that will be doing the riskier things.” Greenstone describes the problem further and proposes a set of possible solutions: There are a series of corporate reorganizations that firms could take to evade a higher cap. This might include dividing themselves into smaller entities and making liberal use of bankruptcy statutes in the case of a spill or the formation of limited partnerships. To prevent such practices, any increase in the cap should be accompanied by a requirement for proof of liability insurance, a certificate of financial responsibility, or the posting of a bond to cover damages.43 A financial responsibility requirement means firms must demonstrate the ability to pay for a certain amount of potential damages, either through external or self insurance. The current requirement for offshore facilities is $150 million, which would have to be raised by orders of magnitude to ensure the ability to pay for an accident resembling the Deepwater Horizon. 44 Mark Cohen, a Vanderbilt University law professor, does believe, however, that doing so would effectively prevent the threat of firms creating small limited-liability entities to do drilling.45 A stronger version of demonstrating financial liability would actually require drilling firms to post a bond before drilling in offshore wells. Such a system would ensure the availability of funds to pay out damage claims in the event of an accident, not only protecting potential spill victims from the risk of bankruptcy, but also serving to make safety far more salient to the company. As Wolak puts it: “That’s quite salient to them. Instead of us trying to get money out of you, it’s you trying to get money back from us.” In light of concerns that firms will not rationally account for the threat of low-probability, high-consequence events such as oil spills, this salience could be an important consequence of bonding. An additional benefit of bonding requirements goes to victims who do not have to wait for court decisions to compel companies to pay for damages. Wolak says that “part of putting this money in escrow is if you have [an accident], we immediately have this money available to confiscate to do whatever we want with.” Noll adds a description of further benefits So you can avoid the problem . . . [of] lots of people going out of business – going into bankruptcy – who actually are probably eventually going to get paid, but the process is so slow they don’t get it [in time]. It would be a two-step process. It would not only be to create the fund, but have an advance plan of ‘how do I in two days get people down there writing checks to avert short-term impacts that have arisen.’ I think that’s a perfectly good way to reduce the human cost of the disaster. The human cost referred to by Noll can be seen in victims of the Exxon Valdez disaster who waited nearly two decades before receiving any compensation for that spill, clearly underscoring the importance of a bonding program.

#### **Offshore natural gas wrecks ecosystems – impact’s whales, oceans, groundwater withdrawal, and soil erosion**

NPC 11 – National Petroleum Council (“Operations and Environment,” http://www.npc.org/reports/NARD/NARD\_Ops-Environment.pdf)

Environmental Challenges Expanded potential of natural gas and oil resources has dramatically improved the North American energy supply outlook. The increased use of natural gas is likely to reduce the overall carbon intensity of recoverable. Continuous attention to reducing risks is essential to ensure pollution prevention, public and worker safety and health, and environmental protection. These are essential outcomes in order to enjoy access to the resources for extraction and ultimate satisfaction of consumers’ energy demand. Due to the importance of these issues, their influence on the study process has been significant. Risk to the environment exists with natural gas and oil development, as with any energy source. Local, state, and federal governments have developed a mix of prohibitions, regulations, and scientific study to reduce potential environmental impacts of natural gas and oil development. Parties discussing energy policy can be missing a common vocabulary and set of references to have a constructive conversation and make educated decisions. No form of energy comes without impacts to the environment. An appropriate framework for discussing energy sources is necessary. Environmental challenges associated with natural gas and oil development vary by location, such as onshore versus offshore, and by the methods employed to extract the resource. Although each well involves drilling into the crust of the earth and constructing well casing using steel pipe and cement, differences arise from the affected environment, resource type, regional and operating conditions, and proximity to environmental receptors. The public, policymakers, and regulators have expressed the following environmental concerns about onshore operations: yyHydraulic Fracturing – Consumption of freshwater (volumes and sources), treatment and disposal of produced water returned to the surface, seismic impacts, chemical disclosure of fracture fluid additives, potential ground and surface water contamination, chemical and waste storage, and the volume of truck traffic. yyWater Management – Produced water handling and disposal has created apprehension about existing water treatment facilities and the ability to treat naturally occurring radioactive material, adjust salinity, and safely discharge effluent. yyLand Use Encroachment – The encroachment into rural and urban areas results in perceived changes to quality of life, especially in newly developed or redeveloped natural gas and oil areas. yyMethane Migration – Methane in domestic drinking water wells, either naturally occurring or from natural gas development. yyAir Emissions – Emissions generated from combustion, leaks, or other fugitive emissions during the production and delivery of natural gas and oil present challenges regarding climate change and human health impacts. Offshore operations environmental challenges are somewhat different than onshore due to the sensitivities of the marine environment, harsh operating conditions, remote locations in the case of the Arctic, and advanced technologies employed. These challenges include: yyPrevention of and Response to a Major Release – The pressures and temperatures associated with remote wellhead locations that are difficult to access on the bottom of the ocean floor, and high flow rate of deepwater wells, make the containment of a subsea release challenging. yy Safety – Offshore natural gas and oil drilling practices, called into question by the recent Deepwater Horizon incident, have resulted in a weakened public perception of offshore process and worker safety. The limited operating space coupled with significant production volumes can create a higher-risk work environment. yyMarine Impacts – Seismic noise generated by offshore natural gas and oil exploration activities is recognized as a concern for whale populations and other marine life, including fish. yyArctic Ice Environments – Responding to an oil spill in seasonal subzero temperatures with the presence of broken sea ice and 24-hour darkness is difficult and presents challenges not faced in other marine environments. The development of oil sands poses unique environmental challenges that differ from those associated with other onshore oil resources, including: yyWater Consumption – Large volumes of water have generated public and regulatory issues associated with water sourcing, groundwater withdrawals, and protecting water quality. yyLand Disturbances – Removal of overburden for surface mining can fragment wildlife habitat and increase the risk of soil erosion or surface runoff events to nearby water systems, resulting in impacts to water quality and aquatic species. yyGreenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions – Transportation fuels produced solely from oil sands result in well-to-wheels life-cycle GHG emissions 5% to 15% higher than the average crude oil refined. The carbon intensity of oil sands can vary based on extraction, refining and transport method. And, in 2009, well-to-wheel emissions from oil sands processed in the United States were only 6% higher than the average crude oil consumed in the United States. Over time, incremental efficiency improvements, as well as new technologies, such as the application of solvents to mobilize oil in situ (as an alternative to heat) are expected to continue to reduce the GHG intensity of unconventional operations.

#### Collapse of ocean biodiversity extinguishes all life

**Craig 3** – Associate Professor of Law, Indiana University School of Law (Robert Kundis, Winter, “Taking Steps Toward Marine Wilderness Protection? Fishing and Coral Reef Marine Reserves in Florida and Hawaii,” 34 McGeorge L. Rev. 155, Lexis)

The world's oceans contain many resources and provide many services that humans consider valuable. "Occupy[ing] more than [seventy percent] of the earth's surface and [ninety-five percent] of the biosphere," n17 oceans provide food; marketable goods such as shells, aquarium fish, and pharmaceuticals; life support processes, including carbon sequestration, nutrient cycling, and weather mechanics; and quality of life, both aesthetic and economic, for millions of people worldwide. n18 Indeed, it is difficult to overstate the importance of the ocean to humanity's well-being: "The ocean is the **cradle of life** on our planet, and it remains the **axis of existence**, the locus of planetary biodiversity, and the engine of the chemical and hydrological cycles that create and maintain our atmosphere and climate." n19 Ocean and coastal ecosystem services have been calculated to be worth over twenty billion dollars per year, worldwide. n20 In addition, many people assign heritage and existence value to the ocean and its creatures, viewing the world's seas as a common legacy to be passed on relatively intact to future generations. n21

### Solvency

#### Fossil fuel lobby floods offshore drilling debate with misinformation

Kaplun, 8 -- Greenwire reporter

[Alex, "ANWR efforts flounder despite growing support for domestic production," Greenwire, 7-16-8, l/n, accessed 2-6-13, mss]

Athan Manuel, a lobbyist for the Sierra Club, also said that the long fight over ANWR has hardened positions on the issue, though he also said the push for offshore oil and gas production has been **fueled by the industry's ability to provide** what he called "**misinformation**." "I think probably the biggest issue," Manuel said, "is that the proponents of offshore drilling have gotten away with misinformation easier than the proponents of ANWR drilling."

#### Alt cause- worker shortage [not enough workers for current rigs]

Sixel, 12 -- Fuel Fix writer

[L.M., "Drilling company looks high and low for workers," Fuel Fix, 12-10-12, fuelfix.com/blog/2012/12/10/drilling-company-looks-high-and-low-for-workers/, accessed 2-6-12, mss]

Drilling company looks high and low for workers

How hot is offshore drilling? So hot that it’s hard to find enough roustabouts, mechanics and experienced managers to staff all the rigs **under construction**. So hot that Ensco, with six new rigs set to debut over the next two years, will need 1,000 more people, said Kurt Basler, the company’s manager of strategic staffing in Houston. So hot that some 20,000 to **25,000** offshore workers will be needed industrywide over the next two to three years, Basler said. “**The shortages are acute everywhere**,” said Steve Colville, president and CEO of the International Association of Drilling Contractors in Houston. The search for workers with the right skills who would be the right fit has sent companies like Ensco looking outside traditional oil and gas businesses. Not everyone is enthusiastic about working 12 hours a day for up to 28 days straight on a drilling rig half a world away.

**No solvency- timeframe**

**Manuel, 6** -- U.S. Public Interest Research Group preservation director

[Athan, "House Shreds Offshore Drilling Moratorium," Common Dreams, 6-29-6, www.commondreams.org/news2006/0629-14.htm, accessed 1-17-13, mss]

New offshore drilling won't help address problems today, tomorrow or next year. It's **the slowest**, dirtiest and most expensive way to meet our energy needs and it would threaten our beaches with pollution and potential oil spills and destroy billion-dollar tourism and fishing industries. There are faster, cheaper, cleaner and longer-term energy solutions like energy efficiency and clean, renewable energy that will start saving families and businesses money today and protect our coastal waters, beaches and economies. In the seven years we would wait for offshore gas to come online, we could reduce natural gas demand by 8% through efficiency and renewables.

#### Access is irrelevant- shale and economics

Weiss, 12 -- Center for American Progress Action Fund senior fellow

[Daniel, "The American Energy Initiative," Congressional Documents and Publications, 9-13-12, l/n, accessed 1-31-13, mss]

In addition to the idle leases, there have been several indications that the industry is less interested in the actual resources available on public lands and waters. As the Energy Information Administration put it: The rapid increase in natural gas production from shale resources over the last 5 years has significantly affected natural gas prices and the relative attractiveness of Federal and Indian lands as areas for development of conventional natural gas resources. n92 As the price of natural gas dropped, there was a dramatic decline in the amount of public land nominated by the industry for leasing. Since fiscal year 2006 there has been nearly a 67 percent decline in the amount of onshore public land nominated by the industry in the Rocky Mountain States. n93 As one industry expert told The Wall Street Journal, "It is safe to say that there will be fewer natural gas wells drilled in 2012." n94 Given the current low price of natural gas, **there is simply less demand from industry to drill at all**, let alone on public lands. In addition, the oil and gas industry has been less focused on public lands and waters, since many of the **best resources** are currently located on private land. And oil companies drill where the best resources are.

### Arctic

#### No Arctic war- cooperation high now

Aruliah, 9-28 -- Asia Pacific Foundation of Canada Post-Graduate research fellow

(Charles, "The Cold Truth: Why the Arctic isn’t the same as Asia’s island disputes," iPolitics, 9-28-12, www.ipolitics.ca/2012/09/28/charles-aruliah-the-cold-truth-why-the-arctic-isnt-the-same-as-asias-island-disputes/, accessed 10-7-12, mss)

But if one looks past such public displays, it becomes increasingly clear that, unlike territorial disputes in Asia, Arctic relations remains primarily characterized by cooperation rather than conflict. And here’s why: First and foremost, despite the fact that in August, the Arctic melted at an unprecedented 91,700 km2 per day, it remains one of the harshest environments on the planet. While it’s true that sailing through the Arctic could potentially cut the distance for international shipping in half, it can only be achieved during the late summer melt – less than one quarter of the entire year. Even then, ships must be wary of left-over multi-year ice, icebergs, and floating growlers, some of which can be as hard as concrete. Ships hoping to traverse the passage will still require constant monitoring and icebreaker escorts, all of which incur significant additional costs. This is why Arctic states are closely cooperating in areas such as Search and Rescue. Contrast this with the significantly busier Malacca Straits located near the South China Seas, which draws about 50 percent of the world’s oil tanker traffic, and saw some 70,000 transits in 2007 (compared with the Northwest Passage’s 26 in 2010). The East China Sea too, remains a busy waterway and central hub located between some of the world’s busiest ports. In general, the cost of controlling Arctic shipping just isn’t worth the risk of provoking conflict through the exercise of such dominance. Secondly, unlike the Arctic, territorial disputes in East Asia remain intimately linked to historical grievances and nationalistic passions from the region’s conflict-ridden past. South Korea attributes Japanese claims to the Dokdo/Takeshima islands to its imperial annexation of the Korean peninsula in 1905. China too has argued that the Senkaku/Diaoyu islands were historically administered by China, until the territories were ‘unfairly’ redistributed to Japan by the post-war powers following Japan’s defeat in the Second World War. Throw in other long-standing disputes like China-Taiwan relations and it’s no wonder why mobs of zealous citizens have taken to the streets in anger over supposed incursions of national territory. In the Arctic, the main sources of territorial aggravation exists between long-standing allies (United States and Canada in the Beaufort Sea), and peace-minded Middle Powers (Canada and Denmark over Hans Island) whose idea of conflict involves marking territory with a bottle of Schnapps or Canadian Club. Even the ‘Great Power’ of the region, Russia, has gone through great lengths with Norway to settle a 40 year territorial dispute in the Barents Sea which has also laid the foundations for future joint economic ventures in the area. On the contrary, **nationalist rhetoric may actually be driving Arctic cooperation**. The encroachment of Arctic ‘outsiders’ such as the EU, China, Japan, South Korea and India, some of whom have argued that the Arctic be declared as ‘a common heritage of mankind’ has led Arctic states, who fear losing territorial integrity, to adopt an ‘us vs. them’ mindset. This has partly resulted in the denial of these countries’ applications for permanent observer status in the exclusive Arctic council, the preeminent intergovernmental forum on the Arctic. Finally, the prominence of scientific/environmental issues and community sustainability in Arctic discussions has mitigated potential nationalistic posturing. The Arctic Council remains geared towards Arctic preservation and studying the effects of environmental change – issues where international scientific collaboration is the norm. Furthermore, the Arctic Council’s endeavor to promote the well-being of indigenous communities, as evidenced by the inclusion of six indigenous organizations as permanent participants in Council discussions, means that Arctic issues are dispersed amongst a variety of actors, and are not the sole realm of national governments.

#### Their impact is misleading

Young ’11 (Professor – Institutional and International Governance, Environmental Institutions @ UCSB, Arctic expert, PhD – Yale, ‘11 (Oran R, “The future of the Arctic: cauldron of conflict or zone of peace?” *International Affairs* 87:1, p. 185-193)

Popular accounts of the Arctic’s jurisdictional issues are regularly couched in terms of provocative phrases like the afore-mentioned ‘who owns the Arctic’ or ‘use it or lose it’. But these phrases turn out to be highly misleading in this context. There are virtually no disputes in the Arctic regarding sovereignty over northern lands; no one has expressed a desire to redraw the map of the Arctic with regard to the terrestrial boundaries of the Arctic states. Most of the disagreements are to do with jurisdiction over marine areas where the idea of ownership in the ordinary sense is irrelevant. While some of these disagreements are of long standing and feature relatively entrenched positions, they are not about establishing ownership, and they do not indicate that some level of ‘use’ is required to avoid the erosion of sovereignty. There is little prospect that these disputes will spawn armed clashes. As both Michael Byers and Shelagh Grant make clear in their excellent analyses of Arctic sovereignty, recent efforts to address matters involving sovereignty in the Arctic are marked by a spirit of rule-based problem-solving, rather than an escalating spiral of politically charged claims and counterclaims. The process of delineating jurisdictional boundaries regarding the seabed beyond the limits of Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZs) is taking place in conformity with the rules and procedures set forth in Article 76 of UNCLOS. Norway and Russia have signed an international treaty resolving their differences regarding jurisdictional boundaries in the Barents Sea. There are signs that Canada and the United States are interested in a similar approach with regard to the Beaufort Sea. The Russians, whose much ballyhooed 2007 initiative to plant the Russian flag on the seabed at the North Pole is widely discussed in the books under review, have acted in conformity with the relevant rules of international law in addressing jurisdictional matters and repeatedly expressed their readiness to move forward in a cooperative manner in this realm. There are, of course, significant sensitivities regarding the legal status of the Northern Sea Route and especially the Northwest Passage. But given that commercial traffic on these routes is likely to be limited during the near future, and that the use of these routes will require the active cooperation of the coastal states, regardless of their formal legal status, opportunities arise for devising pragmatic arrangements governing the use of these waterways. The progress now being made regarding the development of a mandatory Polar Code covering Arctic shipping is good news. The fact that ‘hot spots’ in the search for oil and gas in the Arctic are located, for the most part, in areas that are not subject to jurisdictional disputes is also helpful. Overall, it seems fair to conclude that the Arctic states are living up to their promises to deal with jurisdictional issues in the region in a peaceful manner.

#### It won’t escalate

**Ackerman 11** (Spencer, National Security Reporter @ WIRED, " War For the Arctic: Never Mind," June 8th, http://www.wired.com/dangerroom/2011/06/war-for-the-arctic-never-mind/,

It wasn’t long ago that the press was running wild with hyperbolic claims of the U.S. losing out in an impending Arctic conflict. After all, global warming is freeing up access to large deposits of oil, gas and minerals right in the backyard of the Russians. But the press forgot to tell other polar nations to freak out. Indeed, at a forum convened on Wednesday by the Center for Strategic and International Security, ambassadors from four polar nations, including some traditionally menaced by Russia, were sanguine about the future of polar exploration. “We actually think we handled these areas for decades during the Cold War rather well,” said Wegger Strommen, Norway’s man in Washington. The U.S Geological Survey assesses that the North Pole holds about 13 percent of the world’s untapped oil supplies. Companies and nations are champing at the bit to expand exploration as the ice caps melt. The Russians have an advantage: a fleet of six nuclear powered icebreakers on its northern shore. By contrast, the U.S. Coast Guard has just one, the cutter Healy. But no one’s sweating it. Should there actually be an arctic sea conflict, the U.S. submarine fleet is second to none, as my colleague David Axe has pointed out. And a massive Arctic oil rush is “years off,” Strommen added, since the “climate is harsh, the conditions are difficult and it’s incredibly expensive.” Beyond that, the Russians are warm in the Arctic. Russia finalized a maritime border with Norway on Tuesday that took 30 years to negotiate. Strommen’s colleagues from Greenland, Canada and Sweden gave high marks to a meeting last month of the Arctic Council, the diplomatic contact group of arctic nations, in which Russia signed onto an accord for search and rescue missions in the cold waters. Think of it as a diplomatic thaw.

#### All studies prove

IN ‘9 (Ice News – Iceland national news source, 11/29/’9 (“Military dispute over Arctic resources unlikely,” <http://www.icenews.is/index.php/2009/12/29/military-dispute-over-arctic-resources-unlikely/>)

The natural resources of the Arctic region are unlikely to lead to any military conflict in the region according to new research by the Fridtjof Nansen Institute (FNI) of Norway. The study further found that a diplomatic solution to any dispute resolution is far likelier and more rational than armed action. In a statement posted on their website, FNI downplays the threat of lawlessness in the Arctic. “Contrary to the general picture drawn by the media and some commentators over the last couple of years, the Arctic region does not suffer under a state of virtual anarchy. The era when states could claim rights to territory and resources by simply planting their flag is long gone,” the statement reads. International law largely regulates any issues in the Arctic region that have been dubbed “security policy challenges” in the past, SikuNews reports, while adding that the report claims that regional states prefer an observation-based approach over any desire for military conflict. Those issues which arise that are not clearly governed by international law in respect to resolution procedures are generally only minor, say researchers. The focus of the majority of the case studies contained in the findings was on relations in the Barents Sea, between Russia and Norway. These included the management of ocean resources, the status of the continental shelf and waters around Svalbard and the delimitation of unresolved boundaries. These case studies collectively found little or no threat of armed dispute likely and concluded that the Arctic region has little rationale or legal space for military conflict resolution.

#### No US russia war - generals

**Graham ‘7** (Thomas Graham, senior advisor on Russia in the US National Security Council staff 2002-2007, September 2007, "Russia in Global Affairs” July - September 2007, The Dialectics of Strength and Weakness

An astute historian of Russia, Martin Malia, wrote several years ago that “Russia has at different times been demonized or divinized by Western opinion less because of her real role in Europe than because of the fears and frustrations, or hopes and aspirations, generated within European society by its own domestic problems.” Such is the case today. To be sure, mounting Western concerns about Russia are a consequence of Russian policies that appear to undermine Western interests, but they are also a reflection of declining confidence in our own abilities and the efficacy of our own policies. Ironically, this growing fear and distrust of Russia come at a time when Russia is arguably less threatening to the West, and the United States in particular, than it has been at any time since the end of the Second World War. Russia does not champion a totalitarian ideology intent on our destruction, its military poses no threat to sweep across Europe, its economic growth depends on constructive commercial relations with Europe, and its strategic arsenal – while still capable of annihilating the United States – is under more reliable control than it has been in the past fifteen years and the threat of a strategic strike approaches **zero probability**. Political gridlock in key Western countries, however, precludes the creativity, risk-taking, and subtlety needed to advance our interests on issues over which we are at odds with Russia while laying the basis for more constructive lon-term relations with Russia.

#### No Russia war – blowback

Weitz 11 - senior fellow at the Hudson Institute and a World Politics Review senior editor(Richard, 9/27/2011, “Global Insights: Putin not a Game-Changer for U.S.-Russia Ties,” http://www.scribd.com/doc/66579517/Global-Insights-Putin-not-a-Game-Changer-for-U-S-Russia-Ties)

Fifth, there will inevitably be areas of conflict between Russia and the United States regardless of who is in the Kremlin. Putin and his entourage can never be happy with having NATO be Europe's most powerful security institution, since Moscow is not a member and cannot become one. Similarly, the Russians will always object to NATO's missile defense efforts since they can neither match them nor join them in any meaningful way. In the case of Iran, Russian officials genuinely perceive less of a threat from Tehran than do most Americans, and Russia has more to lose from a cessation of economic ties with Iran -- as well as from an Iranian-Western reconciliation. On the other hand, these conflicts can be managed, since they will likely **remain** limited and compartmentalized. Russia and the West do not have *fundamentally* conflicting **vital interests of the kind countries would go to war over**. And as the Cold War demonstrated, nuclear weapons **are a** great ***pacifier*** under such conditions. Another novel development is that Russia is much more **integrated into the** international **economy** and global society than the Soviet Union was, and Putin's popularity depends heavily on his economic track record. Beyond that, there are objective criteria, such as the smaller size of the Russian population and economy as well as the difficulty of controlling modern means of social communication, that **will constrain** whoever is in charge of **Russia**.

#### No risk of a bioterror attack, and there won’t be retaliation - your evidence is hype

Matishak 10 (Martin, Global Security Newswire, “U.S. Unlikely to Respond to Biological Threat With Nuclear Strike, Experts Say,” 4-29, http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw\_20100429\_7133.php)

WASHINGTON -- The United States is not likely to use nuclear force to respond to a biological weapons threat, even though the Obama administration left open that option in its recent update to the nation's nuclear weapons policy, experts say (See GSN, April 22). "The notion that we are in imminent danger of confronting a scenario in which hundreds of thousands of people are dying in the streets of New York as a consequence of a biological weapons attack is fanciful," said Michael Moodie, a consultant who served as assistant director for multilateral affairs in the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency during the George H.W. Bush administration. Scenarios in which the United States suffers mass casualties as a result of such an event seem "to be taking the discussion out of the realm of reality and into one that is hypothetical and that has no meaning in the real world where this kind of exchange is just not going to happen," Moodie said this week in a telephone interview. "There are a lot of threat mongers who talk about devastating biological attacks that could kill tens of thousands, if not millions of Americans," according to Jonathan Tucker, a senior fellow with the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies. "But in fact, no country out there today has anything close to what the Soviet Union had in terms of mass-casualty biological warfare capability. Advances in biotechnology are unlikely to change that situation, at least for the foreseeable future." No terrorist group would be capable of pulling off a massive biological attack, nor would it be deterred by the threat of nuclear retaliation, he added. The biological threat provision was addressed in the Defense Department-led Nuclear Posture Review, a restructuring of U.S. nuclear strategy, forces and readiness. The Obama administration pledged in the review that the United States would not conduct nuclear strikes on non-nuclear states that are in compliance with global nonproliferation regimes. However, the 72-page document contains a caveat that would allow Washington to set aside that policy, dubbed "negative security assurance," if it appeared that biological weapons had been made dangerous enough to cause major harm to the United States. "Given the catastrophic potential of biological weapons and the rapid pace of biotechnology development, the United States reserves the right to make any adjustment in the assurance that may be warranted by the evolution and proliferation of the biological weapons threat and U.S. capacities to counter that threat," the posture review report says. The caveat was included in the document because "in theory, biological weapons could kill millions of people," Gary Samore, senior White House coordinator for WMD counterterrorism and arms control, said last week after an event at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Asked if the White House had identified a particular technological threshold that could provoke a nuclear strike, Samore replied: "No, and if we did we obviously would not be willing to put it out because countries would say, 'Oh, we can go right up to this level and it won't change policy.'" "It's deliberately ambiguous," he told Global Security Newswire. The document's key qualifications have become a lightning rod for criticism by Republican lawmakers who argue they eliminate the country's previous policy of "calculated ambiguity," in which U.S. leaders left open the possibility of executing a nuclear strike in response to virtually any hostile action against the United States or its allies (see GSN, April 15). Yet experts say there are a number of reasons why the United States is not likely to use a nuclear weapon to eliminate a non-nuclear threat. It could prove difficult for U.S. leaders to come up with a list of appropriate targets to strike with a nuclear warhead following a biological or chemical event, former Defense Undersecretary for Policy Walter Slocombe said during a recent panel discussion at the Hudson Institute. "I don't think nuclear weapons are necessary to deter these kinds of attacks given U.S. dominance in conventional military force," according to Gregory Koblentz, deputy director of the Biodefense Graduate Program at George Mason University in Northern Virginia. "There's a bigger downside to the nuclear nonproliferation side of the ledger for threatening to use nuclear weapons in those circumstances than there is the benefit of actually deterring a chemical or biological attack," Koblentz said during a recent panel discussion at the James Martin Center. The nonproliferation benefits for restricting the role of strategic weapons to deterring nuclear attacks outweigh the "marginal" reduction in the country's ability to stem the use of biological weapons, he said. In addition, the United States has efforts in place to defend against chemical and biological attacks such as vaccines and other medical countermeasures, he argued. "We have ways to mitigate the consequences of these attacks," Koblentz told the audience. "There's no way to mitigate the effects of a nuclear weapon." Regardless of the declaratory policy, the U.S. nuclear arsenal will always provide a "residual deterrent" against mass-casualty biological or chemical attacks, according to Tucker. "If a biological or chemical attack against the United States was of such a magnitude as to potentially warrant a nuclear response, no attacker could be confident that the U.S. -- in the heat of the moment -- would not retaliate with nuclear weapons, even if its declaratory policy is not to do so," he told GSN this week during a telephone interview. Political Benefits Experts are unsure what, if any, political benefit the country or President Barack Obama's sweeping nuclear nonproliferation agenda will gain from the posture review's biological weapons caveat. The report's reservation "was an unnecessary dilution of the strengthened negative security and a counterproductive elevation of biological weapons to the same strategic domain as nuclear weapons," Koblentz told GSN by e-mail this week. "The United States has nothing to gain by promoting the concept of the biological weapons as 'the poor man's atomic bomb,'" he added.

#### Weather blocks and solves death toll

Laquer 99 (Walter, Cochair of the International Research Council at The Center for Strategic and International Studies, “The New Terrorism”)

Ironically, the major factor retarding the use of gases and germs by states and terrorists is no the revulsion or moral constraints but technical difficulties. “Ideal” conditions for an attack seldom if ever exist, and the possibility of things going wrong is almost unlimited, aerosols may nor function, the wind may blow in the wrong direction, missiles carrying a deadly load may land in the wrong place or neutralize the germs on impact. In the course of time these technical difficulties may be overcome, but it is still very likely that roughly nine out of ten of the early attempts by terrorists to wage chemical or biological warfare will fail. But they will not pass unnoticed; the authorities and the public will be alerted, and the element of surprise lost. The search for perpetrators may begin even before the first successful attack. And what has just been said with regard to terrorists may also be to state terrorism.

### Helium

#### Not a supply and demand problem- artificial short term shortage thumps the da, but long term supplies solve

Belsie ’10-2-12 (Laurent Belsie Business Editor By Laurent Belsie, Staff writer / October 2, 2012, http://www.csmonitor.com/Environment/Energy-Voices/2012/1002/Helium-shortage-Bureaucrats-firms-are-creating-too-little-hot-air

Helium may be the second most abundant element in the universe, but it's becoming increasingly scarce here in the United States, which is raising prices worldwide for everyone from physicists to computer chipmakers to mylar balloon vendors. And because the US supplies 75 percent of the world market for the stuff, the helium shortage has become a global problem. But the supply-demand imbalance isn't coming from market forces, **it's a public-private vacuum. The federal government is getting out of the business** after more than eight decades, and so far private industry hasn't stepped in to fill the void. RELATED: What are the Top 5 rare earth minerals? The result: **a shortage of hot air that may last until sometime next year.** There are no reports that the helium shortage has caused any huge crises. Hospitals, which use liquid helium to freeze the magnets in MRI scanners, are still getting supplies. So are arc welders and particle physicists. Balloon racers are switching to hydrogen. Helium balloon retailers are raising prices. And the University of Nebraska, which last month filled only half the usual 5,000 red helium balloons it normally releases at the beginning of football season, has put its seven-decade tradition on hiatus**. The US holds an even more dominant role in helium than Saudi Arabia does in oil** because natural gas fields in Texas and Kansas have an unusually high concentration of helium. Natural gas production is currently **the only way to profitably extract the** lighter-than-air **gas**. Canada, Russia, Qatar, and Algeria are among the only other helium producers in the world. Considered a critical resource, the US government has been extracting the element since 1929, when it built a helium extraction and purification plant in Texas, and later maintained a helium reserve. But in 1996, Congress passed the Helium Privatization Act, which aimed to get private industry to take over from the government in supplying helium to the marketplace. The Federal Helium Reserve has been raising prices to pay off the debt it incurred decades ago to build its helium plant. But the reserve is dwindling and the federal government will be forced to cut back supplies after 2014. It hasn't helped that natural gas production is also down because of low prices. Private firms were supposed to fill the helium vacuum. But new plants in **Qatar and Russia aren't expected to come online until next year**. A Wyoming natural gas plant, which was due to open last year and supply 10 percent of the **world's helium**, has been delayed by a host of issues. It's owner, Denver-based Denbury Resources, recorded a pretax $4 million charge in the second quarter related to the delay and does not expect the plant to open until "near **the end of** **2012**." So the **man-made** helium shortage looks likely to continue for the **months** ahead**,** even in the Saudi Arabia of hot air.

#### Slow price rise of natural gas now- new wells being built now

Schwartzel ’13 (Erich Schwartzel, “U.S. report predicts rising natural gas prices in 2013-14”, <http://pipeline.post-gazette.com/news/archives/24983-u-s-report-predicts-rising-natural-gas-prices-in-2013-14>, January 9, 2013)

Marcellus Shale drillers who have had to cut costs and disassemble rigs because of recent record-low natural gas prices should expect a reprieve over the next two years, according to the latest projections from the U.S. Energy Information Administration. The average price of natural gas is expected to increase by almost a dollar in 2013, hitting $3.74 per million British thermal units. That's a significant jump from the $2.75 average seen last year, when accelerated drilling created a glut in supply that caused prices to drop and made drilling in many places unprofitable. Increases are expected to continue into 2014, when prices are predicted to hit $3.90. The EIA report released Tuesday is the first look into 2014 for the domestic and international energy scene, and it includes projections that could affect gas and coal activity in Pennsylvania and surrounding states. The report is the latest set of tea leaves for an industry that's been in flux: Enthusiasm for drilling was tempered in recent years by economic realities that made it risky for every rig to turn a profit. The low prices made natural gas an easy sell to large, industrial customers who consume a lot of energy, but slowed lease activity as companies waited for prices to rebound. Higher gas prices would send reverberations across multiple sectors, helping coal become competitive with natural gas again as an electricity source and allowing drillers to broaden their focus beyond shale formations that are rich in oil. In addition, the federal energy agency projects increased domestic oil production will break new records over the next couple of years and eventually lead to lower prices at the gasoline station. If natural gas prices continue an upward trend toward $4 per mcf, companies that had drilled wells but weren't bringing the gas to market could decide it is worth hooking those wells up to pipelines and selling the gas, said Adam Sieminski, the EIA administrator. Natural gas consumption, meanwhile, is expected to be relatively flat in 2013, though the EIA forecasts an increase in its use to heat homes and offices over the next two years. Consumption in 2012 was low due to an unnaturally warm winter. Over the next several years, the EIA's projections call for a steady rise in natural gas prices, said Mr. Sieminski, "continuing to go up to $5 or $6 in the longer term." That would be welcome news to drillers who found the bargain-basement prices unsustainable for rapid-fire drilling in the Marcellus region, which includes much of Pennsylvania, and in other shale formations around the country. Companies in recent years have concentrated on shale regions where more lucrative oil and natural gas liquids are housed, and a rise in regular natural gas prices "might turn the drift from natural gas to oil around," said Mr. Sieminski. Pennsylvania gets one shout-out in the administration's Short-Term Energy Outlook, with researchers saying Marcellus production "continues at a strong pace as producers target oil-and-gas wells." Nationwide, the natural gas rig count was at 431 at the end of 2012 -- almost half of the 811 rigs seen in the beginning of the year. But domestic gas production is expected to remain relatively steady despite the drop in rig count, which the EIA said suggests greater rig efficiency in extracting more gas from a single location. Coal producers may welcome an increase in natural gas prices, as well. Low gas prices had helped erode coal's place as the top source in the electricity generation market. Coal consumption in the electric power sector last year was at its lowest level since 1992. With the difference in costs between the two fuels shrinking, coal's share of the electricity generation market should rise from 37.6 percent in 2012 to 39 percent in 2013, and then to 39.6 percent in 2014, the report said. The rise of natural gas as an alternative to coal was starkly seen in April 2012, when coal and natural gas each provided 32 percent of the nation's total generation -- the first time the two power sources were tied since the EIA began collecting data. The rapid changes in gas prices and production are largely a result of hydraulic fracturing technology that has unlocked reserves across the country. That same technology has helped fuel a rise in domestic crude oil production, which is expected to increase from 6.4 million barrels per day in 2012 to 7.3 million barrels in 2013 and then 7.9 million barrels in 2014. The 2014 projection would mark the highest annual production average since 1988. Record-setting production should trickle down into good news for consumers: The drop in crude prices is expected to cause gasoline prices to drop almost 20 cents from last year to an average of $3.44 per gallon in 2013 and then to $3.34 per gallon in 2014.

#### Cheap natural gas blocks renewables feedstock development- key to solve toxic chemicals

Bozell ‘8 (University of Tennessee Biomass Chemistry professor

(Joseph, Ph. D. from Colorado State University in organic synthesis and organometallic chemistry, "Feedstocks for the Future," Clean - Soil, Air, Water, 36.3, 8-5-8, WileyOnlineLibrary, accessed 10-2-12, mss)

Incorporation of domestic renewable carbon as part of the petrochemical industry’s raw material supply has been the topic of a large number of reviews [4 – 15] suggesting advantages not available with petrochemical feedstocks. Renewable carbon sources afford industrial processes that are nearly CO2 neutral. At the end of their life cycle, biobased products release no more CO2 than was originally metabolized in the biological production of the raw material [16]. Biotechnology offers the ability to tailor plants for production of structurally defined intermediates, or enhanced production of particularly useful biorefinery process streams [17]. Biorefinery operation also offers benefits for the chemical industry by addressing several of the principles of green chemistry [18]. Carbohydrate process streams within the biorefinery are well suited for transformations in aqueous media. Biobased materials can be designed to give products that can break down in the environment at the end of their useful life, leading to environmentally beneficial processes when considered from the perspective of life cycle analyses [19], and heat and energy use in the chemical industry [20]. A number of evaluations indicate that new process technology based on renewable carbon offers a way to reduce the industry’s environmental footprint [21]. In his review of progress on sustainable development, Metzger concluded, “renewables are the only workable solution” [22]. Yet the chemical feedstock supply of the U. S. remains completely dominated by nonrenewable carbon – only about 2% comes from biomass [23]. However, this dependence, and the concomitant consumption of large amounts of nonrenewable feedstocks, is relatively recent. The transition to a nonrenewables based economy occurred mostly in the period between 1920 and 1950 [24]. Prior to this time, the chemurgical movement of the early 20 th century realized the potential of biobased raw materials, and promoted a variety of technologies to convert renewable carbon into both fuels and chemicals [25 – 27]. However, the low cost and ready availability of crude oil, natural gas, and coal, coupled with the advent of modern organic chemistry, spurred the development of today's highly successful petrochemical industry and the tens of thousands of products it offers to the marketplace [28]. The great majority (A90%) of today's production is for high volume, low value transportation fuels, with the remainder being allocated for high value, but lower volume chemicals. The U. S. economy and its position among the world's industrialized nations is the result of easy access to large amounts of carbon-containing raw material supplies. This success has come at a price. World oil production is peaking and could begin to decline in the next 5 – 10 years [29 – 31], but it is unlikely that a similar decline in demand will occur, especially with significantly increased consumption expected in China and India. In the U.S., energy consumption has increased by more than 33% to about 100 quads (1 quad = 10 15 Btus) during the last 25 years, with more than half of this energy growth occurring in the last 6 – 8 years [32]. Moreover, the release of CO2, geologically sequestered for millennia as various nonrenewable carbon reserves, has had a demonstrated impact on the environment. Balancing fuel and chemical needs with the needs of the environment will therefore require that we identify and learn how to efficiently manipulate alternative feedstock sources. Renewable carbon in the form of biomass offers a vast supply of raw material, when used and managed in a sustainable manner. Accordingly, this paper will briefly review several aspects of biorefinery operation, and will illustrate how integration of chemical and fuel production is an effective means to ensure the biorefinery's economic viability.

#### Extinction

Shabecoff 7 -- NYT environmental reporter 1977 to 1999 (Philip, founder and publisher of Greenwire, Society for Environmental Journalists founding member, and Alice, "Poisoned Profits," May 2007, www.poisonedforprofit.net/PDF/Introduction.pdf, accessed 10-2-12, mss)

The toxification of the environment by industrial and commercial activity has been a fact of modern life for decades. But this plague of pollution is so insidious, like the slowly heating pot of water that boils the unsuspecting frog, that its true dimensions have crept up on us largely unheeded. So has its impact on the health of our children. There have been warnings, of course. Rachel Carson’s Silent Spring sounded what should have been an arousing alarm nearly half a century ago. Scientists, physicians and environmentalists have told us of the danger. Some initial but ultimately ineffectual steps were taken by government to slow the tide of poisons into the environment. For most of us, however, the threat has seemed abstract, a problem for other places, other families other children. Preoccupied with what we regard as more immediate concerns, we tend to ignore the degradation of our habitat and its toll on our children, or assume that someone else—the government, the medical community, industry—is correcting the problem. It is a false assumption. As we looked around, we found that a surprisingly large number of children were suffering from chronic illnesses. In one of our grandson’s neighborhoods alone, a quarter of all the young boys, by our count, were afflicted with some sort of cognitive or behavioral problems of varying degrees of severity. And, as we began to probe more deeply, to study the data, we found what we consider to be clear, alarming evidence that there has been a steep increase in the incidence of a variety of serious chronic childhood illnesses over the past half century. These include childhood cancer, asthma, birth defects, and a range of neurological problems. The data also underscored that Americans were experiencing growing difficulty conceiving children. This sharp rise in chronic childhood increase has been paralleled by an increase in the volume and range of toxic substances into the environment that we perceive as astonishing in magnitude. These substances pervade our habitat—our air, our water, our soil, our homes, our schools and our places of work. They come not only from toxic waste sites, industrial sites, power plant smokestacks, automotive tailpipes and pesticide sprayed fields, but also can lurk in our food and many if not most of our commonplace consumer products such as cleaning products, cosmetics, plastic bottles, and clothing. As far as we are concerned, the link between these substances and chronic childhood illness is inescapable. There is not a human on earth who is not exposed to toxic pollution. But it is the children who are most vulnerable. We undertook this book because we felt it our duty to do whatever little we could to end this toxic assault on our grandchildren—and all children. While we may try to rationalize and ignore the impact of toxic contamination of the environment, we cannot ignore the health and welfare of our children. Perhaps the information we present here will persuade some Americans of the seriousness of the problem and the need to act. Over the long run, the toxification the environment will probably be understood as as serious a threat to human welfare and **the future of life on earth** as most of us now understand global warming to be. Warnings about human-induced climate change and its consequences have been issued periodically by the scientific community for several decades now. Only recently, however, have a majority of Americans been persuaded of the reality of the threat and the urgent need to address it. We hope and believe there also will be an awakening to the dangers of an increasingly poisoned environment. It cannot happen too soon.

**Alt cause to helium- Balloons**

**McKie 12** -- Observer Science Editor (Robin, "Helium stocks run low – and party balloons are to blame," Guardian, 3-17-12, www.guardian.co.uk/science/2012/mar/18/helium-party-balloons-squandered, accessed 10-28-12, mss)

Helium stocks **run low – and party balloons are to blame** The world supply of helium, which is essential in research and medicine**, is being squandered, say scientists** Oleg Kirichek, the leader of a research team at the Isis neutron beam facility at the UK's Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, had an unpleasant shock last week. One of his key experiments, designed to probe the structure of matter, **had to be cancelled – because the facility had run out of helium**. The gas, used to cool atoms to around -270C to reduce their vibrations and make them easier to study, is now becoming worryingly scarce, said Kirichek. Research facilities probing the structure of matter, medical scanners and other advanced devices that use the gas **may** soon **have to reduce operations** or close **because we are frittering away** the world's limited supplies of **helium on party balloons.**

#### Status sqo solves the impact – hydrogen gas generators

AZom 2/7/13 (“Solutions to the World Helium Shortage Offered by Peak Scientific”) http://www.azom.com/news.aspx?newsID=35638

Helium has dominated gas chromatography due to the level comparison between it, hydrogen and nitrogen. Nitrogen is less efficient than helium and hydrogen has been avoided in the past due to safety concerns with hydrogen cylinders. These concerns are based on hydrogen cylinders being fairly unstable if not stored correctly or containing too much pressure. Peak Scientific’s solution to this is the [Hydrogen Gas Generator](http://www.peakscientific.com/page/410-laboratory-hydrogen-generator/). Much more efficient in gas chromatography than nitrogen, Hydrogen Gas Generators now eliminate many of the original safety concerns associated with hydrogen cylinders as well as providing laboratories with a continuous supply of hydrogen for gas chromatography applications. Hydrogen Gas Generators are small enough to fit into most labs, are easy to use and very efficient. Rather than being created remotely and then bottled, transported and stored the hydrogen is generated on demand right there in the lab through the electrolysis of water. This means that switching to this alternative will ensure gas chromatographers no longer need to worry about[gc carrier gas](http://www.peakscientific.com/page/428-applications-peak-scientific) supply or increasing in cost of helium. Switching can be achieved with very little effect on previous Gas Chromatography analysis and provides a safe, sustainable, affordable and long-term supply.

#### US is falling behind in science leadership now – STEM shortage

Casey 12 (Bob, Report by the Joint Economic Committee Chairman’s Staff, “STEM Education: Preparing for the Jobs of the Future”) http://www.jec.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?a=Files.Serve&File\_id=6aaa7e1f-9586-47be-82e7-326f47658320

The United States is falling behind in international comparisons when it comes to providing an adequate supply of STEM workers. While we should be cautious in making international comparisons of countries which have dramatically varying sizes, diversity of populations, and industrial policies, the U.S. continues to fall behind key international competitors across a wide set of different measures of STEM preparedness. While the U.S. produces by far the greatest number of STEM degree recipients among OECD countries (348,484 in 2008), adjusting for the overall number of degrees and for the population paints a different picture. By one measure – the share of students receiving degrees in STEM fields – the U.S. compares unfavorably with other global competitors. For example, NAFTA members Canada and Mexico, and many European nations including economic powerhouse Germany, graduate more STEM students as a share of all degrees than the United States does. 30 (See Table below.) This is also true when looking at STEM graduates as a share of the employed 25-34 year old population, where the U.S. ranks 23rd among OECD countries. American students’ performance on international standardized tests suggests problems earlier in the STEM pipeline. For example, U.S. 15-year-olds rank 25th in math and 17th in science in PISA scores among OECD nations. As discussed below, other international comparisons as well as performance on domestic examinations suggest that problems in U.S. STEM education may begin as early as elementary school and continue through students’ secondary and post-secondary education.

#### No impact to science diplomacy – Cart before horse

Dickson 9 - Director, SciDev.Net [David, , June 2, 2009, “ Science diplomacy: the case for caution,” http://scidevnet.wordpress.com/category/new-frontiers-in-science-diplomacy-2009/]

Indeed, a case can be made that where scientific projects have successfully involved substantial international collaboration, such success is often **heavily dependent on a *prior* political commitment** to cooperation, rather than a mechanism for securing cooperation where the political will is lacking.

#### No impact or timeframe to science diplomacy – this was empirically denied

Dickson 9 - Director, SciDev.Net [David, , June 2, 2009, “ Science diplomacy: the case for caution,” http://scidevnet.wordpress.com/category/new-frontiers-in-science-diplomacy-2009/]

One of the frustrations of meetings at which scientists gather to discuss policy-related issues is the **speed** with which the requirements for evidence-based discussion they would expect in a professional context can go out of the window. Such has been the issue over the past two days in the meeting jointly organised in London by the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) and the Royal Society on the topic “New Frontiers in Science Diplomacy“. There has been much lively discussion on the value of international collaboration in achieving scientific goals, on the need for researchers to work together on the scientific aspects of global challenges such as climate change and food security, and on the importance of science capacity building in developing countries in order to make this possible. But there remained **little evidence** at the end of the meeting on how useful it was to lump all these activities together under the umbrella term of “science diplomacy”. More significantly, although numerous claims were made during the conference about the broader social and political value of scientific collaboration – for example, in establishing a framework for collaboration in other areas, and in particular reducing tensions between rival countries – little was produced **to demonstrate whether this hypothesis is true**. If it is not, then some of the arguments made on behalf of “science diplomacy”, and in particular its value as a mechanism for exercising “soft power” in foreign policy, do not [confront] stand up to close scrutiny. Indeed, a case can be made that where scientific projects have successfully involved substantial international collaboration, such success is often heavily dependent on a prior political commitment to cooperation, rather than a mechanism for securing cooperation where the political will is lacking. Three messages appeared to emerge from the two days of discussion. Firstly, where the political will to collaborate does exist, a joint scientific project can be a useful expression of that will. Furthermore, it can be an enlightening experience for all those directly involved. But it is seldom a magic wand that can secure broader cooperation where none existed before.

#### Data disproves hegemony impacts

FETTWEIS 11 Christopher J. Fettweis, Department of Political Science, Tulane University, 9/26/11, Free Riding or Restraint? Examining European Grand Strategy, Comparative Strategy, 30:316–332, EBSCO

It is perhaps worth noting that there is no evidence to support a direct relationship between the relative level of U.S. activism and international stability. In fact, the limited data we do have suggest the opposite may be true. During the 1990s, the United States cut back on its defense spending fairly substantially. By 1998, the United States was spending $100 billion less on defense in real terms than it had in 1990.51 To internationalists, defense hawks and believers in hegemonic stability, this irresponsible “peace dividend” endangered both national and global security. “No serious analyst of American military capabilities,” argued Kristol and Kagan, “doubts that the defense budget has been cut much too far to meet America’s responsibilities to itself and to world peace.”52 On the other hand, if the pacific trends were not based upon U.S. hegemony but a strengthening norm against interstate war, one would not have expected an increase in global instability and violence. The verdict from the past two decades is fairly plain: The world grew more peaceful while the United States cut its forces. No state seemed to believe that its security was endangered by a less-capable United States military, or at least none took any action that would suggest such a belief. No militaries were enhanced to address power vacuums, no security dilemmas drove insecurity or arms races, and no regional balancing occurred once the stabilizing presence of the U.S. military was diminished. The rest of the world acted as if the threat of international war was not a pressing concern, despite the reduction in U.S. capabilities. Most of all, the United States and its allies were no less safe. The incidence and magnitude of global conflict declined while the United States cut its military spending under President Clinton, and kept declining as the Bush Administration ramped the spending back up. No complex statistical analysis should be necessary to reach the conclusion that the two are unrelated. Military spending figures by themselves are insufficient to disprove a connection between overall U.S. actions and international stability. Once again, one could presumably argue that spending is not the only or even the best indication of hegemony, and that it is instead U.S. foreign political and security commitments that maintain stability. Since neither was significantly altered during this period, instability should not have been expected. Alternately, advocates of hegemonic stability could believe that relative rather than absolute spending is decisive in bringing peace. Although the United States cut back on its spending during the 1990s, its relative advantage never wavered. However, even if it is true that either U.S. commitments or relative spending account for global pacific trends, then at the very least stability can evidently be maintained at drastically lower levels of both. In other words, even if one can be allowed to argue in the alternative for a moment and suppose that there is in fact a level of engagement below which the United States cannot drop without increasing international disorder, a rational grand strategist would still recommend cutting back on engagement and spending until that level is determined. Grand strategic decisions are never final; continual adjustments can and must be made as time goes on. Basic logic suggests that the United States ought to spend the minimum amount of its blood and treasure while seeking the maximum return on its investment. And if the current era of stability is as stable as many believe it to be, no increase in conflict would ever occur irrespective of U.S. spending, which would save untold trillions for an increasingly debt-ridden nation. It is also perhaps worth noting that if opposite trends had unfolded, if other states had reacted to news of cuts in U.S. defense spending with more aggressive or insecure behavior, then internationalists would surely argue that their expectations had been fulfilled. If increases in conflict would have been interpreted as proof of the wisdom of internationalist strategies, then logical consistency demands that the lack thereof should at least pose a problem. As it stands, the only evidence we have regarding the likely systemic reaction to a more restrained United States suggests that the current peaceful trends are unrelated to U.S. military spending. Evidently the rest of the world can operate quite effectively without the presence of a global policeman. Those who think otherwise base their view on faith alone.

#### NCW can’t solve conflict—asymmetric warfare

Wilson 4 (Clay Wilson, Specialist in Technology and National Security Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division at the Congressional Research Service, June 2, 2004, “Network Centric Warfare: Background and Oversight Issues for Congress”,<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/33858.pdf> bcliff)

The term “asymmetric”, when referring to strategies in warfare, is often intended to describe attacks launched by a weaker, or less-well-equipped enemy, as they learn to exploit a stronger opponent’s vulnerabilities. Technology has provided an asymmetric advantage for U.S. forces in recent conflicts. However, asymmetry sometimes leads to unanticipated outcomes. For example, video images showing the overwhelming power of the U.S. military in recent urban conflicts have been on display in the global news media. Such images, resulting from the technological efficiency of U.S. forces, may have given terrorist organizations such as Al Qaeda added power to spread rhetoric, recruit more members, and gain more indigenous loyalty.46 Asymmetric countermeasures may include actions taken by an enemy to bypass NCW sensors, or to negate the usefulness of high technology weapons. Some examples may include (1) suicide bombings; (2) hostile forces intermingling with civilians used as shields; (3) irregular fighters and close-range snipers that swarm to attack, and then disperse quickly; (4) use of bombs to spread “dirty” radioactive material, or (5) chemical or biological weapons. Persons associated with terrorist groups are sometimes found to have received advanced education in high-technology, and may also have knowledge of how to use technology in an asymmetric attack against the supporting infrastructure for NCW.47 For example, Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, who was arrested in 2003 for possible links with Al Qaeda, reportedly studied engineering at a university in North Carolina. A student at the University of Idaho, who was recently arrested for alleged terrorist connections, was studying in a Ph.D. program for cyber security,48 and several of the 9/11 terrorists reportedly had degrees in technology.

#### No terrorism impact – weak leadership and no recent attacks

Zenko and Cohen 12, \*Fellow in the Center for Preventive Action at the Council on Foreign Relations, \*Fellow at the Century Foundation, (Micah and Michael, "Clear and Present Safety," March/April, Foreign Affairs, www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137279/micah-zenko-and-michael-a-cohen/clear-and-present-safety

 NONE OF this is meant to suggest that the United States faces no major challenges today. Rather, the point is that the problems confronting the country are manageable and pose minimal risks to the lives of the overwhelming majority of Americans. None of them -- separately or in combination -- justifies the alarmist rhetoric of policymakers and politicians or should lead to the conclusion that Americans live in a dangerous world. Take terrorism. Since 9/11, no security threat has been hyped more. Considering the horrors of that day, that is not surprising. But the result has been a level of fear that is completely out of proportion to both the capabilities of terrorist organizations and the United States' vulnerability. **On 9/11, al Qaeda got *tragically* *lucky***. Since then, the United States has been preparing for the one percent chance (and likely even less) that it might get lucky again. But al Qaeda lost its safe haven after the U.S.-led invasion of Afghanistan in 2001, and further military, diplomatic, intelligence, and law enforcement efforts have decimated the organization, which has essentially lost whatever ability it once had to seriously threaten the United States. According to U.S. officials, al Qaeda's leadership has been **reduced to *two* top lieutenants**: Ayman al-Zawahiri and his second-in-command, Abu Yahya al-Libi. Panetta has even said that the defeat of al Qaeda is "within reach." The near collapse of the original al Qaeda organization is one reason why, in the decade since 9/11, the U.S. homeland **has not suffered *any*** large-scale **terrorist assaults**. All subsequent attempts have failed or been thwarted, owing in part to the incompetence of their perpetrators. Although there are undoubtedly still some terrorists who wish to kill Americans, their dreams will likely **continue to be frustrated by** their own limitations and by the intelligence and law enforcement agencies of the United States and its allies.

#### Technology is nowhere near ready to colonize space

Clark 2k (Greg, Staff Reporter – Space.com, “Will Nuclear Power Put Humans on Mars?”, Space.com, 5-21,

<http://www.space.com/scienceastronomy/solarsystem/nuclearmars_000521.html>)

When it comes to attracting interest in new mission plans to far-out places in the solar system, it is often the wildly futuristic concepts that get the attention. Antimatter propulsion, solar and magnetic sails all make great stories, but such futuristic concepts don't do anything to get humans out to the moon, or Mars, or to various local comets or asteroids within the foreseeable future. With these futuristic technologies barely out of their conceptual phases, practical use of such far-out concepts for human space transportation is decades away at best.

#### U.S. isn’t key

Kaufman 8 (Marc, Staff – Washington Post, “US Finds It’s Getting Crowded Out There”, Global Policy Forum, 7-9,

http://www.globalpolicy.org/empire/challenges/competitors/2008/0709space.htm)

Six separate nations and the European Space Agency are now capable of sending sophisticated satellites and spacecraft into orbit -- and more are on the way. New rockets, satellites and spacecraft are being planned to carry Chinese, Russian, European and Indian astronauts to the moon, to turn Israel into a center for launching minuscule "nanosatellites," and to allow Japan and the Europeans to explore the solar system and beyond with unmanned probes as sophisticated as NASA's. While the United States has been making incremental progress in space, its global rivals have been taking the giant steps that once defined NASA: • Following China's lead, India has announced ambitious plans for a manned space program, and in November the European Union will probably approve a proposal to collaborate on a manned space effort with Russia. Russia will soon launch rockets from a base in South America under an agreement with the European company Arianespace, whose main launch facility is in Kourou, French Guiana. • Japan and China both have satellites circling the moon, and India and Russia are also working on lunar orbiters. NASA will launch a lunar reconnaissance mission this year, but many analysts believe the Chinese will be the first to return astronauts to the moon. • The United States is largely out of the business of launching satellites for other nations, something the Russians, Indians, Chinese and Arianespace do regularly. Their clients include Nigeria, Singapore, Brazil, Israel and others. The 17-nation European Space Agency (ESA) and China are also cooperating on commercial ventures, including a rival to the U.S. space-based Global Positioning System. • South Korea, Taiwan and Brazil have plans to quickly develop their space programs and possibly become low-cost satellite launchers. South Korea and Brazil are both developing homegrown rocket and satellite-making capacities. This explosion in international space capabilities is recent, largely taking place since the turn of the century. While the origins of Indian, Chinese, Japanese, Israeli and European space efforts go back several decades, their capability to pull off highly technical feats -- sending humans into orbit, circling Mars and the moon with unmanned spacecraft, landing on an asteroid and visiting a comet -- are all new developments

 A Different Space Race In contrast to the Cold War space race between the United States and the former Soviet Union, the global competition today is being driven by national pride, newly earned wealth, a growing cadre of highly educated men and women, and the confidence that achievements in space will bring substantial soft power as well as military benefits. The planet-wide eagerness to join the space-faring club is palpable. China has sent men into space twice in the past five years and plans another manned mission in October. More than any other country besides the United States, experts say, China has decided that space exploration, and its commercial and military purposes, are as important as the seas once were to the British empire and air power was to the United States.

# 2nc

## CP

#### Emptying the reserve solves-

Bruno 12 (Paul, “Helium Conservation Legislation: Will Helium Policy be Strengthened in 2013”) http://maritime.about.com/od/shipbuilding/a/Helium-Conservation-Legislation.htm

Ongoing mismanagement of the global helium supply continues to threaten many industries essential to national defense. Shipbuilding is strongly impacted by this mismanagement because aluminum based alloys are seeing increased use in military and domestic high efficiency designs. The [helium shortages](http://maritime.about.com/od/shipbuilding/a/Helium-Shortages-Are-Coming.htm) are compounded by two factors; the great majority of the essential gas is held in reserves in the south central plains of the U.S., and that reserve is managed by the U.S. Congress which is particularly dysfunctional at this time. The main reason helium is in short supply is its finite nature. There will never be helium in the amount that are available today. It is the second most abundant element in the universe but we mine it from natural gas deposits in the ground where it is created by radioactive decay over millions of years. If the gas is used for shielding during a weld that gas escapes into outer space soon after release.

#### It’s got bipartisan support – doesn’t cost capital

Mother Jones 2/6/13 (“Saving Helium: Something Lawmakers Actually Agree On”) http://www.motherjones.com/blue-marble/2013/02/saving-helium-something-lawmakers-actually-agree

But now the House of Representatives—in a rare bipartisan effort—is trying to change that. On Wednesday, Democratic Reps. Ed Markey (Mass.) and Rush Holt (N.J.) and Republican Reps. Doc Hastings (Wash.) and Bill Flores (Texas) announced that they are working together on the [Responsible Helium Administration and Stewardship Act](http://naturalresources.house.gov/news/documentsingle.aspx?DocumentID=318987). The bill would change how the Helium Reserve, which provides half of all helium used in the United States and a third of the helium used all over the world, works and extend its life beyond 2015. It would auction off most of the helium in the reserve at market value (which will be determined by the Secretary of Interior), instead of selling it at cut rates. It will also require that we keep the last 3 billion cubic feet of helium in the reserve for use for research purposes.

#### Lobbyist pressure will get it done – Balloon Council ☺

Flock 1/28/13 (“10 Strange Lobbying Groups That We Swear are Real”) http://www.usnews.com/news/blogs/washington-whispers/2013/01/28/10-strange-lobbying-groups-that-we-swear-are-real

The [Balloon Council](http://www.theballooncouncil.org/) has had quite the busy year, because of what it calls the very "real problem" of a shortage in helium. Its efforts include drumming up support for the [Helium Stewardship Act](http://www.theballooncouncil.org/helium-stewardship-act.html), legislation that lays out how to maintain a helium reserve for the future. The council [spent $60,000](http://www.opensecrets.org/lobby/clientsum.php?id=D000047602&year=2012) on its lobbying efforts in 2012.

## Oil

### Trends Uniqueness – 2NC Wall

#### Oil prices are going into bull market mode ----- Trends prove oil will stabilize, and our links assumes all of their uniqueness: (A) Saudi will stabilize ----– future predictive evidence and empirical examples prove that recent price changes are just matching supply and demand

WSJ 2/7/13 http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887323951904578290202298829438.html

Gulf members of the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries, including top oil exporter Saudi Arabia, aren't inclined to increase their production--even though oil prices have soared well above the $100-a-barrel price the group sees as ideal, Gulf OPEC officials said. Brent crude prices Thursday rose slightly compared to the previous session, but earlier in the day rose to $117.83 a barrel, their highest level in more than four months. Prices for contracts on both sides of the Atlantic have rallied since the new year began, though the rise has been most pronounced in Brent. News that OPEC member Iran has rejected the notion of direct talks with the United States over its nuclear ambitions has caused some investors to worry about oil supply from the region, underpinning the price rise. Yet some other OPEC members from the Gulf region shrugged off the rise in crude prices. "Saudi Arabia and other Gulf producers are not worried about the recent price hikes," a senior Gulf OPEC official said. "The Gulf stands ready to supply their customers with what they need and stabilize the crude markets, but at the moment there is no call for action." Saudi Arabia kept its crude output steady around 9 million barrels a day in January for the second straight month, a Gulf official with knowledge of the country's oil policy said. The kingdom's production reached 9.05 million barrels a day in January, compared with 9.025 million barrels per day in December, while its supplies to the market rose to 9.26 million barrels a day in January from 9.15 million a month earlier. "Don't get me wrong; we would like oil prices to stabilize around $100 a barrel, as high prices could slow down economic growth, but a price rise for a couple of days is not a call for worry," another Gulf OPEC official said Thursday. "The supply/demand situation has not changed, there are no fundamental reasons behind the price rise, so we are not going to do anything for now." In late January, OPEC Secretary General Abdalla Salem el-Badri said, "At present, we believe the market is well balanced," adding that the organization expected the market "to remain well supplied to meet oil-demand growth" for the rest of the year.

#### Reject short term uniqueness ----- fluctuations are snapshots that revolve around the long-term price

#### (B) The market is under control ----– we’re just seeing the same patterns from 08

GRAEBER ’12 Senior Journalist; extensively with UPI (Graeber, Daniel. “Will 2012 Play Out Like 2008 for Oil Markets?”. June 26, 2012. http://www.cnbc.com/id/47960423)

In July 2008, oil prices moved close to $150 per barrel. By December of that year, roughly $100 was off the price as the global economy began to sink. Nearly **four years later**, and **not much has changed**. Most political statements are still couched in promises of employment prospects and last week, the Dow Industrials lost two percent of its value. That suggests there's not much in the markets to give investors any sense of optimism. The US economy is sluggish, China's is slowing down and reports of a dismal European economy have resonated to the point of redundancy. Last week, forecasts of Tropical Storm Debby pushed crude oil to higher territory as some international oil companies shut production as a precautionary measure. By Monday, however, those gains had proved short-lived. By mid-day, most markets were sinking quickly on concerns that Spain may be the latest candidate to freeze the European economy. That sent bank stocks spiraling and erased any gains made in oil. Most analysts had said sentiment in the oil market is, at best, dismal. There is seemingly plenty of oil available in the markets, which may in part explain prices. In the U.S., crude oil production is so prolific that the country lacks the infrastructure to do much with it. Globally, the Saudis may even consider **constraining markets in an effort to keep oil prices** under control. Much of the oil glut may be temporary protection against the series of sanctions set to go into force against Iran, however. That suggests there will likely be no major long-term impacts from the shortage of Iranian crude despite a few jitters the first week of July. Investors say hope is long gone from conversations about European recovery. It's hard to say if dismantling the Eurozone would ease some of the restrictions. Recent commentary suggests that's not the case. Domestic protectionism rarely works in an international market either. **OPEC**, in its monthly report for June, **suggested** markets look an awful lot like they did in December 2008. The cartel, however, said it saw some resiliency in the US economy. With retail gasoline prices in the United States moving close to $3 per gallon, some benefits could come as economically depressed Americans take to the road for summer holiday. By the time OPEC pens its next report, U.S. and European sanctions against Iran will be two weeks old. The story of the Great Recession isn't over but it's been a **steady** story **long enough** to suggest that as much as negativity lingers, there's still at least talk of hope.

#### (C) Trends prove ----- prices will rise, but they’re volatile

PLUMER ’12 - Reporter, Washington Times (Plumer, Brad. “ For first time in years, the world is producing more oil than it needs “. June 5, 2012. http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/ezra-klein/post/oil-prices-are-collapsing--is-that-a-good-thing/2012/06/05/gJQAYm3zFV\_blog.html)

One caveat, though: It’s still entirely possible that oil prices won’t keep falling. Stuart Staniford notes that Saudi Arabia could decide to cut production in the near future. Remember, most OPEC countries **need** relatively **high** oil **prices to pay for** the domestic **spending** programs they’ve recently put in place **to placate protestors**. And there’s always the possibility of a surprise plot twist. Negotiations with Iran could break down. Or Europe could suddenly fix its problems But that’s just another way of saying that we’ve reached an era in which oil **prices are extremely volatile** — and difficult to predict. Which is why Kevin Drum wonders if the United States would be better off with some sort of variable tax on oil that kept prices at a steady (but fairly high) price. That would allow the country to slowly but steadily reduce its reliance on crude, rather than lurching from panic to complacency and back to panic every time there’s a sudden kink in the world oil markets.

### Link Uniqueness – US Demand High – 2NC Wall

#### Demand for Saudi oil high – assumes all their squo solves arguments [also in A2 Production Increasing]

KRAUSS ’12 – Business correspondent for NYT (Krauss, Clifford. “U.S. Reliance on Oil From Saudi Arabia Is Growing Again”. August 16, 2012. http://www.nytimes.com/2012/08/17/business/energy-environment/us-reliance-on-saudi-oil-is-growing-again.html?pagewanted=all)

The United States is increasing its dependence on oil from Saudi Arabia, raising its imports from the kingdom by more than 20 percent this year, even as fears of military conflict in the tinderbox Persian Gulf region grow. The increase in Saudi oil exports to the United States began slowly last summer and has picked up pace this year. Until then, the United States had decreased its dependence on foreign oil and from the Gulf in particular. This reversal is driven in part by the battle over Iran’s nuclear program. The United States tightened sanctions that hampered Iran’s ability to sell crude, the lifeline of its troubled economy, and Saudi Arabia agreed to increase production to help guarantee that the price did not skyrocket. While prices have remained relatively stable, and Tehran’s treasury has been squeezed, the United States is left increasingly vulnerable to a region in turmoil. The jump in Saudi oil production has been welcomed by Washington and European governments, but Saudi society faces its own challenges, with the recent deaths of senior members of the royal family and sectarian strife in the eastern part of the country, making the stability of Saudi energy and political policies uncertain. The United States has had a **political alliance** with the Saudi leadership that has lasted for decades, one that has become even more pivotal to Washington during the turmoil of the Arab spring and rising hostilities with Iran over that nation’s nuclear program. (Saudi Arabia and Iran are bitter regional rivals.) The development underscores how difficult it is for the United States to lower its dependence on foreign oil — **especially the heavy grades** of crude that Saudi Arabia exports — **even as domestic oil production is soaring**. It is a development that has alarmed conservative and liberal foreign policy experts alike, especially with oil prices and Mideast tensions rising in recent weeks. “At a time when there is a rising chance of either a nuclear Iran or an Israeli strike on Iran’s nuclear facilities, we should be trying to reduce our reliance on oil going through the Strait of Hormuz and not increasing it,” said Michael Makovsky, a former Defense Department official who worked on Middle East issues in the George W. Bush administration. Senior Iranian officials have repeatedly threatened to close the Strait of Hormuz, the narrow neck through which most Gulf oil is shipped, and the Iranian navy has held maneuvers to back up the threats. Most analysts say it is doubtful the Iranians would take such an extreme measure because that would block exports vital to the country’s economy, but the United States Navy has been preparing for such a contingency. Many oil experts say that the increasing dependency is probably going to last only a couple of years, or until more Canadian and Gulf of Mexico production comes on line. “Until we have the ability to access more Canadian heavy oil through improved infrastructure, the vulnerability will remain,” said David L. Goldwyn, former State Department coordinator for international energy affairs in the Obama administration. “The potential for an obstruction of the Strait of Hormuz therefore poses a physical threat to U.S. supply as well as a potential price shock on a global level.” Obama administration officials said they were not overly worried for several reasons. In the event of a crisis, the United States could always dip into strategic petroleum reserves; domestic production continues to climb; and Gulf of Mexico refineries could be adjusted to use higher-quality, sweeter crude oil imported from other countries. “There are going to be tensions in the Middle East whether that oil is going to the United States or going to somewhere else,” said Adam Sieminski, administrator of the Energy Department’s Energy Information Administration. “And if oil prices go up because of a problem in the Middle East, that causes a problem for the world in general and not one that is specific to the United States.” In the United States, several oil refining companies have found it **necessary to buy *more crude* from Saudi** Arabia and Kuwait to make up for declining production from Mexico and Venezuela, insufficient pipeline connections between the United States and Canadian oil sands fields, and the fallout from the 2010 BP disaster, which led to a yearlong drilling moratorium in the Gulf of Mexico. “As refiners, we buy from wherever the supply is readily available and where we can get the best price,” said Bill Day, a spokesman for Valero Energy, the largest domestic refiner.

### Link

#### Disad comes faster than solvency – speculators will crush oil prices immediately

LOTT ’12 – Ph.D. in economics from UCLA (Lott, John. “Yes, government policies could help bring down the price of gas – today”. March 13, 2012. http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2012/03/13/yes-government-policies-could-help-bring-down-price-gas-today/)

Still government policies can help lower gas prices **today**. Democrats and even some conservatives claim that there is nothing that can be done immediately to reduce oil prices. After all, they argue, even if the go ahead were given today to drill for more oil, it would take years before we would actually see it. But lower future prices do lower current prices. Just as speculators save oil for future consumption if they think that prices will rise, **lower future prices mean** that **they won't keep their inventories**, and selling them off now will lower today's prices. Thus, President Obama's bans on drilling raise prices in the future, but also raise them now. The US is only a relatively small part of a worldwide market for oil, but relatively inelastic demand for oil even small changes in quantity can produce significant changes in prices. Despite all the subsidies for so-called “green energy,” what is being produced there doesn’t come close to offsetting the energy lost from this oil production.

#### Goldilocks link – prices have stabilized, but government policy will trigger oil price movement

DOMM ’12 – CNBC Executive News Editor, responsible for news coverage of the markets and economy (Domm, Patti. “Why oil prices are lowest they've been in months”. June 22, 2012. http://bottomline.msnbc.msn.com/\_news/2012/06/22/12360063-why-oil-prices-are-lowest-theyve-been-in-months?lite)

“I think that we are seeing asset classes **moving in response to expectations related to government policy** in Europe and the U.S," said Edward Morse, head of commodities research at Citigroup. "I think they are short-term moves that will not be very long in duration. That doesn’t mean there’s not plenty of bearish news in commodity markets, in general, and the oil market, in particular.” West Texas intermediate plunged 3.5 percent Thursday, following government reports of ample supply and domestic production at a 13-year high. WTI finished $3.05 lower at $78.20 per barrel, the first close below $80 since October. Brent, the international benchmark, fell to $89.23 per barrel, the lowest level in 18 months. While Morse **doesn’t expect oil to keep falling** for long, **he doesn’t expect it to get back to its year highs** soon either.

## Helium

### Impact

#### Low natural gas prices trade-off with renewable feed-stock in the chemical industry- causes environmental collapse

#### Outweighs on magnitude- environment collapse takes carrying capacity down with it- extinction

#### Risks under-estimated- we don’t understand relevant biological interactions

Monosson, 12 -- University of Massachusetts Amherst environmental toxicology professor

(Emily, Evolution in a Toxic World, 3-29-12, pg153, google books, accessed 10-2-12, mss)

Furthermore, there is growing evidence that some chemicals once thought to be safe and allowed into common and, in some cases, abundant commercial use may not be as benign as previously assumed.13 Some commercial chemicals will come and go, leaving little if any trace-even as they cause toxicity to individual members of a species. Others will leave their mark buried deep within the earth's soils and sediments. And some will leave their mark on life in the form of altered allele frequencies, the result of selective processes. Chemical testing and regulation have no doubt improved when it comes to protecting humans and wildlife from acutely toxic chemicals. Yet the more problematic chemicals are those that slip through unnoticed, causing subtle impacts on biological systems. We **overlook the dangers** of many chemicals because we **fail to understand the biological relevance of the system with which they interact**; or we are unable to predict how very small amounts might behave in the presence of other chemicals; or we focus on one response and neglect the networked nature of life's response to chemicals and other stressors. While predicting toxicity is an ongoing challenge, our ability to detert chemicals has greatly im- proved-to the extent that an ever-growing list of industrial use a11d consumer use chemicals are routinely measured in both human and wildlife populations." Some of these chemicals have been banned for years, while others remain a large part ofour chemical culture. In the appendix, I've included very brief profiles of a few select chemicals: PCBs, mercury, CFCS, endocrine-disrupting chemicals in general, and nanoparticles. Most have been discussed in earlier chapters and all are important- not only because presence in the environment and therefore in life itself, but also because they serve an example of the risks we take by allowing the large-scale release of chemicals. These chemicals are, for now and the foreseeable future, a part of life on Earth. Of course, these few examples are just the tip of the chemical iceberg.

#### Destroys clean water- extinction

Greenpeace, 11

("The Detox Campaign," 7-7-11, www.greenpeace.org/international/en/campaigns/toxics/water/detox/intro/, accessed 10-2-12, mss)

These chemicals are a serious threat to human health and the environment, poisoning precious waterways around the world. The Problem Clean water is not only a basic human right - it is the world’s **most threatened essential resource**. Aside from being critical habitats for wildlife, waterways such as rivers and lakes also provide vital resources for almost **all life on Earth**. Many people rely on this water for drinking, for farming, and for foods like fish and shellfish. Yet these vital water sources are often abused by industry and treated as if they are private sewers.

#### Prices are rising now- increasing supply would reduce those prices

Moors 12/14 (Dr. Kent, Dr. Kent F. Moors is an internationally recognized expert in global risk management, oil/natural gas policy and finance, cross-border capital flows, emerging market economic and fiscal development, political, financial and market risk assessment. He is the executive managing partner of Risk Management Associates International LLP (RMAI), a full-service, global-management-consulting and executive training firm. Moors has been an advisor to the highest levels of the U.S., Russian, Kazakh, Bahamian, Iraqi and Kurdish governments, to the governors of several U.S. states, and to the premiers of two Canadian provinces. He’s served as a consultant to private companies, financial institutions and law firms in 25 countries and has appeared more than 1,400 times as a featured radio-and-television commentator in North America, Europe and Russia, appearing on ABC, BBC, Bloomberg TV, CBS, CNN, NBC, Russian RTV and regularly on Fox Business Network. A professor in the Graduate Center for Social and Public Policy at Duquesne University, where he also directs the Energy Policy Research Group, Moors has developed international educational programs and he runs training sessions for multiple U.S. government agencies. And until recent revisions in U.S. policy, Dr. Moors was slated to be the deputy director of the Iraq Reconstruction Management Office (IRMO) in Baghdad,

[http://moneymorning.com/2012/12/14/2013-natural-gas-forecast-six-bullish-reasons-why-now-is-the-time-to-buy/\](http://moneymorning.com/2012/12/14/2013-natural-gas-forecast-six-bullish-reasons-why-now-is-the-time-to-buy/%5C), December 14, 2012)

A rise on the supply side would generally reduce prices, especially if the number of operators continues to increase. More gas moving on the market from more suppliers results in a downward pressure on prices.¶ The second dynamic, however, is moving in the other direction, enticing the increase in drilling and expansion of infrastructure.¶ This factor considers the demand side, and there are at least six major trends colliding to increase the prospects for gas usage as we move through 2013.¶ As a result, I expect natural gas prices to see a 25% increase from current levels... here's why.¶ 2013 Natural Gas Forecast¶ 1) Winter Chill Increases Natural Gas Demand¶ The first factor driving price increases will come from a colder winter throughout the United States. Traditionally, gas prices have been quite sensitive to seasonal shifts. The overly mild winter in the East last winter was enough to depress gas prices across the board. In 2011, NYMEX futures contracts declined to less than $2 per 1,000 cubic feet (or million BTUs).¶ The price has recovered to as much as $3.90 recently, although it is currently down to about $3.50. Nonetheless, the recovery (largely a result of companies pulling drilling rigs out of service and reducing the number of new wells) combined with a colder winter, will provide a base pushing the price to $4 as we start the new year.¶ The other five elements are more directly affecting demand increases moving forward. These will have primary effects on the gas balance between anticipated needs and drilling volume.¶ 2/3) Industrial and Petrochemical Usage on the Rise¶ The second and third elements are increasing industrial and petrochemical uses for gas. Industrial use has been building for a while, but it is one of the last demand factors to emerge during an economic recovery. That is now beginning to kick in.¶ However, petrochemical usage is resulting in an appreciating demand situation. Gas, natural gas liquids, and byproducts are replacing crude oil and oil products as feeder stock for an entire range of petrochemicals - from solvents and polymers, to plastics and fibers.¶ The intense competition over where the next "crackers" will be located in the U.S. is clear testimony to the added demand coming from petrochemicals. These facilities will break down gas flows, making the feeder stock ingredients more accessible. This development is also putting some additional weight on the processing of "wet" gas, raw material containing value-added byproducts.¶ 4) Natural Gas Fleets Expand Across the U.S.¶ The fourth demand factor is the increasing use of natural gas as a vehicle fuel. We have been witnessing a rise in interest here for several years, but the move to using liquefied natural gas (LNG) and compressed natural gas (CNG) to replace gasoline and diesel has been gaining strength.¶ Entire fleets of heavy-duty trucks have been retrofitted across Canada, while refueling terminals have been popping up near interstates in the U.S. to service company-designated vehicles. The cost savings in fuel is significant, usually representing more than two dollars per gallon.¶ The downside is on the infrastructure side. It will take several years of heavy capital investment to provide the network of transport pipelines, storage and terminal facilities, filling stations, and related requirements.¶ And we must consider the cost of retrofitting engines. At an average of $35,000 per vehicle, it will remain an obstruction for some.¶ I expect to see an increase in natural gas-as-fuel usage continuing, but remaining on the truck side for 2013. Personal autos will stay a niche market in the near-term. Still, this will comprise an improving demand area for natural gas.¶ 5) Electricity Consumption from Gas Set to Spike¶ Fifth is the massive transfer underway from coal to gas as the preferred fuel for generating electricity. Coal will remain a fuel of choice in several sectors of the world and will still be cost effective in certain regions in the U.S. But the days of "King Coal" in the generation of electricity are drawing to a close.¶ The figures here are massive. The American market is replacing more than 90 gigawatts (GW) of generating capacity by 2020, virtually all of this coal-fired. In addition, the phasing in of non-carbon regulations (cutting mercury, sulfurous, and nitrous oxide emissions) will add another 20 GW to the retirement agenda, once again coming almost exclusively from coal.¶ Each 10 GW transferred to natural gas will require an additional 1.2 billion cubic feet of gas per day. If only 50% of the expected transition from coal to gas occurs, the added demand will eliminate three times the current total gas in storage nationwide.¶

#### Low natural gas turn the aff- letting natural gas prices rise key

Nelder ‘12 [Chris, Smart Planet, February, Everything you know about shale gas is wrong, http://www.smartplanet.com/blog/energy-futurist/everything-you-know-about-shale-gas-is-wrong/341]

Another reason was that the spurt of production created a gas glut and drove prices far below the level of profitability. Data from a January, 2012 presentation by the CEO of gas operator Range Resources showed that gas needs to sell for at least $4 per million BTU in order for operators to turn a profit. Source: Jonathan Callahan, The Oil Drum. Data from Range Resources. Berman is certain that the $4 threshold applies to new drilling on existing plays only; after accounting for land leasing, overhead and debt service, the threshold would be much higher. In any case, we can see that production flattened out when prices fell below $4 at the beginning of 2009. Source: Arthur Berman. Data from Natural Gas Intelligence. A gas price below $3 spells real trouble for operators, and flagging production is but the first effect. The next is debt: According to analysis by ARC Financial Research, the 34 top U.S. publicly traded shale gas producers are currently carrying a combined $10 billion quarterly cash flow deficit. And finally, there will the destruction of forward supply, as new development grinds down. Financing further development with debt in this environment will be extremely difficult, and eventually even the joint-venture sugar daddies that have sustained operators over the past few months will get cold feet. Without a reversal in price, gas production is guaranteed to decline. The gas gold rush is over Indeed, Berman concludes that “the gold rush is over at least for now with the less commercial shale plays.” Within the major producing areas of the U.S., which account for 75 percent of production, all except Louisiana have been either flat or declining in recent years. Overall, he sees evidence that 80 percent of existing U.S. shale gas plays are already approaching peak production. Rig counts have been falling, and major operators such as Chesapeake Energy and ConocoPhilips have announced slowdowns in drilling in the last month. The two major plays that do not show evidence of peaking yet are the newer ones: the Marcellus Shale in Pennsylvania and the Haynesville Shale in Louisiana. To see the influence of these two plays on overall production, compare the first chart below, which shows production from all shale plays, to the second, which removes production from those two plays: Source: Arthur Berman Source: Chart by Chris Nelder, from Arthur Berman’s worksheets The Haynesville surpassed the Barnett Shale in Texas last year as the top-producing shale play in the U.S., but it may be reaching a production plateau now. Worse, Berman’s analysis finds that despite its impressive production, the Haynesville is among the least economic of the shale plays, requiring gas prices above $7.00 per thousand cubic feet to sustain new drilling profitably, and nearly $9.00 per thousand cubic feet after accounting for leasing and other costs. (One thousand cubic feet is roughly equivalent to one million BTU.) 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.

#### Card 1

New 12 (Bill, President – New Industires, \*Offers Steel Fabrication Services to Offshore Drilling Projects, “Letters: New Leasing Plan a Step Backward,” The Advocate, 6-30-12, http://theadvocate.com/news/opinion/3484480-123/letters-new-leasing-plan-a)

In late June, the U.S. Department of the Interior released its long-awaited outer continental shelf leasing plan, which effectively blocks offshore oil and natural gas exploration in any new areas for the next five years. Unfortunately, the proposal is a step backward in our effort to achieve energy independence. Under the plan, 85 percent of America’s OCS would be off-limits at a time when exploring every possible energy source is critical to boosting our nation’s economy and creating jobs. Instead of finding out what might be available to us in expansive unexplored areas off our coasts, we will be left to search for oil and natural gas in the same, relatively small portion of the OCS we’ve been exploring for four decades. Not only does this plan run counter to President Barack Obama’s “all of the above” strategy for energy independence, but it shows an outright disregard for the requests of the Gulf Coast states –— including Louisiana — to increase domestic oil production when the Interior Department released a draft of the plan late last year. Interestingly, the Interior Department chose to release this latest version of the OCS plan on the day the Supreme Court announced its health care decision — a thinly veiled attempt to bury it in news coverage of the ruling. But that didn’t keep right-thinking lawmakers from taking notice and working on ways to get America’s economy going using sound energy policies. U.S. Rep. Doc Hastings, R-Wash., chairman of the House Natural Resource Committee, has written legislation that sensibly revises the plan. While the Interior Department’s plan is to hold just 12 oil and gas lease sales in the Gulf of Mexico, and three in offshore Alaska from 2012 to 2017, the Hastings plan would schedule 28 lease sales total, dramatically increasing drilling opportunities off the Alaskan coast and including a sale of offshore leases in a potentially rich area off the coast of Virginia. The United States is producing more oil and natural gas than ever thanks to increased production on state-owned or private land. However, production on federal onshore land is down 14 percent in the last two years, and down 17 percent on federal offshore areas. Imagine what could happen if we enact legislation that allows us to open new offshore areas.
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### Shipbuilding

#### Their ev says it’s key to shipbuilding gas drilling products, but no ev articulates the internal link between that and the overall health of the ship industry

#### Shipbuilding is roaring now

Sun Herald 11/7/2012

(http://www.hispanicbusiness.com/2012/11/7/shipbuilding\_underscores\_confidence\_in\_economy.htm)

Last Friday the Sun Herald reported the results of a survey conducted by the Gulf Coast Business Council. Nearly half of the 155 executives who responded expect the economy to grow during the next six months.

**As if to validate that optimism**, Ingalls Shipbuilding President Irwin F. Edenzon announced Friday at the Ingalls career day the company will hire thousands of employees within the next two years.

"We're hiring," Edenzon said. "We're going to hire about 1,200 people here in the next few months and about 4,000 over the next two years. There are jobs here."

Ingalls expanded work force is especially good news for the Coast economy. Ingalls' payroll consists of highly-skilled and well-paid positions that can create an economic tide capable of **lifting many boats**.

The need for so many new employees at Ingalls, Edenzon said, comes from new shipbuilding contracts that Ingalls received. The company also has bid on a contract for **another five destroyers**. In addition to new contracts, Ingalls has a backlog of work that will keep workers busy for the next few years.

"**As long as the nation** believes we **need a strong Navy**, **we'll have a strong shipyard**," Edenzon said.

#### Naval primacy inevitable – US will adapt and is too far ahead

Harris 8 (Stuart, BEc (Sydney) and PhD (The Australian National University), is Professor in the Department of International Relations at the Australian National University, “China's "new" diplomacy: tactical or fundamental change?”, Google Books, pg 20)

The United States also keeps a close eye on Chinas military modernization. It believes that by 2020 "China will be, by any measure, a first rate military power."6 It will therefore take whatever steps it sees as necessary to maintain its military superiority, notably in the seas in and around the region. Nor is this superiority being challenged directly by China. That Chinas concept for sea-denial capability is limited to the seas around Taiwan and against Chinas eastern coast has been acknowledged by the United States.7 Outside of that, although President Hu Jintao has spoken of the need to develop Chinas naval capabilities, overwhelming U.S. naval superiority will remain for a long time.

### Overview

#### CIR outweighs, turns, and solves the aff

#### Food shortages are the most probable risk of world war three and extinction- calvin proves armies would invade for food- creates desperation that overwhelms normal constraints against war

#### Probability- History proves food shortages are the most likely cause of extinction

**Brown ’11** (from World on the Edge: How to Prevent Environmental and Economic Collapse, by Lester R. Brown © 2011 Earth Policy Institute

For the Mayans, it was deforestation and soil erosion. As more and more land was cleared for farming to support the expanding empire, soil erosion undermined the productivity of their tropical soils. A team of scientists from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has noted that the extensive land clearing by the Mayans likely also altered the regional climate, reducing rainfall. In effect, the scientists suggest, it was the convergence of several environmental trends, some reinforcing others, that led to the food shortages that brought down the Mayan civilization. 26 Although we live in a highly urbanized, technologically advanced society, we are as dependent on the earth’s natural support systems as the Sumerians and Mayans were. If we continue with business as usual, civilizational collapse is no longer a matter of whether but when. We now have an economy that is destroying its natural support systems, one that has put us on a decline and collapse path. We are dangerously close to the edge. Peter Goldmark, former Rockefeller Foundation president, puts it well: “**The death of our civilization is no longer a theory** or an academic possibility; it is the road we’re on.” 2 **Judging by the archeological records of earlier civilizations, more often than not food shortages appear to have precipitated their decline and collapse**. Given the advances of modern agriculture, I had long rejected the idea that food could be the weak link in our twenty-first century civilization. **Today I think not only that it could be the weak link but that it is the weak link.**

**Magnitude- food shortages mean extinction**

**Takacs ‘96** (David, The Idea Of Diversity: Philosophies Of Paradise, 1996, p. 200-1.)

So biodiversity keeps the world running. It has value and of itself, as well as for us. Raven, Erwin, and Wilson oblige us to think about the value of biodiversity for our own lives. The Ehrlichs’ rivet-popper trope makes this same point; by eliminating rivets, we play Russian roulette with global ecology and human futures: “It is likely that destruction of the rich complex of species in the Amazon basin could trigger rapid changes in global climate patterns. Agriculture remains heavily dependent on stable climate, and human beings remain heavily dependent on food. By the end of the century the extinction of perhaps a million species in the Amazon basin could have entrained famines in which a billion human beings perished. And if our species is very unlucky, the famines could lead to a thermonuclear war, which could extinguish civilization.” Elsewhere Ehrlich uses different particulars with no less drama: What then will happen if the current decimation of organic diversity continues? Crop yields will be more difficult to maintain in the face of climatic change, soil erosion , loss of dependable water supplies, decline of pollinators, and ever more serious assaults by pests. Conversion of productive land to wasteland will accelerate; deserts will continue their seemingly inexorable expansion. Air pollution will increase, and local climates will become harsher. Humanity will have to forgo many of the direct economic benefits it might have withdrawn from Earth's well­stocked genetic library. It might, for example, miss out on a cure for cancer; but that will make little difference. As ecosystem services falter, mortality from respiratory and epidemic disease, natural disasters, and especially famine will lower life expectancies to the point where can­cer (largely a disease of the elderly) will be unimportant. Humanity will bring upon itself consequences depressingly similar to those expected from a nuclear winter. Barring a nuclear conflict, it appears that civilization will disappear some time before the end of the next century - not with a bang but a whimper.

#### One failed harvest causes extinction – high threshold for any impact defense

**Zeitvogel ’11** (World is 'one poor harvest' from chaos, new book warns By Karin Zeitvogel (AFP) – Jan 16, 2011

What distinguishes "World on the Edge" from his dozens of other books is "the sense of urgency," Brown told AFP. "Things could start unraveling at any time now and it's likely to start on the food front. "We've got to get our act together quickly. We don't have generations or even decades -- **we're one poor harvest away from chaos**," he said. "We have been talking for decades about saving the planet, but **the question now is, can we save civilization?"** In "World on the Edge", Brown points to warning signs and lays out arguments for why he believes the cause of the chaos will be the unsustainable way that mankind is going about producing more and more food. Resources are already beginning to be depleted, and that could cause a global "food bubble" created by overusing land and water to meet the exponential growth in demand for food -- grain, in particular -- to burst. Two huge dustbowls have formed in the world, one in Africa and the other in China and Mongolia, because of soil erosion caused by overplowing. In Lesotho, the grain harvest has dropped by more than half over the last decade or two because of soil erosion, Brown said. In Saudi Arabia, grain supplies are shrinking as a fossil aquifer drilled in in the 1970s to sustain domestic grain production is running dry after years of "overpumping" to meet the needs of a population that wants to consume more meat and poultry. Global warming is also impacting the global supply of grain, which Brown calls the foundation of the world food economy. Every one-degree-Celsius rise above the normal temperature results in a 10 percent fall in grain yields, something that was painfully visible in Russia last year, where a seven-week heatwave killed tens of thousands and caused the grain harvest to shrink by 40 percent. Food prices soared in Russia as a result of the poor harvest, and Russia -- which is one of the top wheat exporters in the world -- cut off grain exports. Different grains are staple foods in most of the world, and foods like meat and dairy products are "grain-intensive." It takes seven pounds (3.2 kilograms) of grain fed to a cow to produce a pound of beef, and around four pounds (1.8 kilograms) of grain to produce a pound of cheese, Brown told AFP. In "World on the Edge", Brown paints a grim picture of how **a failed harvest could spark a grain shortage that would send food prices sky-rocketing, cause hunger to spread, governments to collapse and states to fail. Food riots would erupt in low-income countries and "with confidence in the world grain market shattered, the global economy could start to unravel**," Brown warned

#### Immigration reform expands skilled labor --- spurs relations and economic growth in China and India

Los Angeles **Times**, 11/9/**20**12 (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 averts South Asian nuclear war

Schaffer, Spring **200**2 (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.

### Will Pass

#### Immigration reform will pass now but capital key to ensure comprehensive bill.

Chazan 1-24. [Jackie, former news producer and editor, "Citizenship for undocumented immigrants gains favor" Examiner -- www.examiner.com/article/citizenship-for-undocumented-immigrants-gains-favor]

A new poll released Wednesday, shows an increase in support for a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants which, interestingly, has been fueled by Republicans.¶ The Associated Press-GfK poll released on Wednesday shows 62 percent Americans favor allowing undocumented immigrants to eventually gain citizenship, up from 50 percent in 2010. More than half of Republicans – 53 percent - now favor a path to citizenship, up 22 percentage points from 2010.¶ Congress is expected to take up an immigration reform package this year. A path to citizenship remains one of the most contentious issues of reform. Democrats support it and Republicans do not, although, Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.) proposal allows undocumented immigrants to apply for legal status but provides no special pathway to citizenship.¶ President Barack Obama made immigration reform a centerpiece of his re-election campaign, garnishing a plurality of votes in the November election from Latino voters.¶ Democrats have opened up a 41 percent to 34 percent lead over Republicans as the party most trusted to deal with immigration. That's a significant shift from October 2010, when Republicans led Democrats on that question by a margin of 46 percent to 41 percent.¶ Republican leaders have increasingly recognized the need for a shift in party stance on the issue, as Latino power grows in the United States. Whether Latino voters will convert electoral clout into meaningful, comprehensive immigration legislation has yet to be seen.¶ “I think the republicans are ready to do something on immigration,” former Republican presidential candidate, Rick Santurum said on ABC’s This Week. “You saw Marco Rubio’s plan which is pretty far down the road. It looks a lot like what President Bush put forward four years ago.”¶ But just because Republicans were prepared to talk about immigration policies doesn’t mean they are in complete agreement with Democrats on what policies to enact, Santorum cautioned. “They’re willing to do it but they’re not willing to give the President everything he wants.” Santorum said, “because I think they believe the rule of law still matters in this country and that we have to respect those who did it the right way who waited in line and did — and made sacrifices and that they shouldn’t be treated the same as people who broke the law and came here.”

#### Will pass but it’ll be a fight.

Lillis 1-29. [Mike, congressional reporter, "Despite momentum, tough fight looms for immigration-reform advocates" The Hill -- thehill.com/homenews/news/279761-despite-momentum-tough-fight-looms-over-immigration-reform]

Fueling the reform push, a bipartisan group of powerful senators unveiled a sweeping immigration-reform blueprint Monday that takes elements from both parties' legislative wish-lists. ¶ The package features efforts to strengthen border security and better track temporary visitors to ensure they leave the country when their visas expire — provisions favored by Republicans. The proposal would also create a path to citizenship for the roughly 12 million illegal immigrants estimated to be living in the United States — a change favored by Democrats.¶ The package has been endorsed by four Democrats — Sens. Charles Schumer (N.Y.), Dick Durbin (Ill.), Robert Menendez (N.J.) and Michael Bennet (Colo.) — and four Republicans, Sens. John McCain (Ariz.), Lindsey Graham (S.C.), Marco Rubio (Fla.) and Jeff Flake (Ariz.).¶ Obama is expected to outline a similarly broad approach on Tuesday in Las Vegas.¶ Rep. Luis Gutierrez (D-Ill.), Congress's most vocal immigrant-rights advocate, said Monday that Congress is "on track to pass a bipartisan bill" this year.¶ Still, few observers are predicting an easy fight, and major battles are sure to swirl around hot-button questions like how to register millions of immigrants while simultaneously protecting their civil liberties, and whether gay, bisexual, lesbian and transgender immigrants will benefit from the reforms.¶ Immigrant-rights advocates will also be watching closely to see what hoops illegal immigrants will have to jump through to remain in the country legally. Rubio, for instance, is urging that any immigrants granted legal status must "go to the back of the line" behind others who have officially applied — a process that can take many years, some warned this week.¶ "It takes 21 years, sometimes, to get to the front of the line," Longazel said.¶ The citizenship provision, however, will likely prove the thorniest; some conservatives on Capitol Hill are already hammering the Senate's bipartisan blueprint over it.¶ "When you legalize those who are in the country illegally, it costs taxpayers millions of dollars, costs American workers thousands of jobs and encourages more illegal immigration," Rep. Lamar Smith (R-Texas) said Monday in a brief statement. "By granting amnesty, the Senate proposal actually compounds the problem by encouraging more illegal immigration.”¶ NumbersUSA, a group that advocates for tougher immigration laws, also blasted the Senate proposal, vowing to mobilize its supporters against it. ¶ Rosemary Jenks, the group's director of government affairs, characterized the blueprint as " 'Amnesty 2.0' — meaningless enforcement measures, mass amnesty and increases in legal immigration, with taxpayers left to foot the bill.”¶ ¶ Such opposition will leave Boehner and other GOP leaders trying to perform the delicate dance of attracting Hispanic voters without alienating their conservative base.¶ Gutierrez, for one, was undeterred by the political complexities surrounding the issue this week, focusing instead on the rare case of Congress agreeing, at the very least, that immigration reform in some measure is a good idea. ¶ "The most important thing right now is to keep the various efforts moving forward," he said, "and not to draw lines in the sand."

#### Urgency and momentum now.

Seldin 2-6. [Jeff, journalist, "Battle for US immigration reform gathers steam" Voice of America -- www.voanews.com/content/battle-for-us-immigration-reform-moves-on-ahead-of-state-of-the-union/1598101.html]

U.S. President Barack Obama is expected to make immigration reform a priority in his State of the Union Address. But already, talk of tackling this controversial issue is gaining momentum.¶ There are an estimated 11-million illegal immigrants in the United States with more still hoping to cross the border.¶ Claudia Hernandez came here as a child, and like many in her situation, she feels she belongs in the U.S. ¶ "I have been here more than half of my life, and I respect the United States. This is my country," she said.¶ Only days into his second term, President Obama began the push for change.¶ "The time has come for common-sense, comprehensive immigration reform," he stated. "The time is now."¶ Already, Congress has begun to hold hearings.¶ And a bipartisan group of senators, including former Republican presidential candidate John McCain, is pushing ahead with a plan of its own.¶ "We have been too content for too long to allow individuals to mow our lawn, serve us food, clean our homes and even watch our children while not affording them any of the benefits that make our country so great," McCain said.¶ The bi-partisan plan calls for tighter border controls as well as a path to citizenship, something President Obama insists upon.¶ That worries Jim Gilchrist. He founded the Minuteman Project, a citizen's group that helps guard the border.¶ "If we are going to grant amnesty to 15 to 30-million people, who are here illegally now, we are going to be granting amnesty to 300 million," he added. "Who will follow them over the next several decades."¶ Other activists and lawmakers say proposals to secure the borders don't go far enough - even though the United States spends more money on immigration enforcement than on all other federal law enforcement activities combined.¶ In the meantime, the pressure is on - both President Obama and Congress.¶ Janet Murguia heads La Raza, the largest U.S. Hispanic civil rights and advocacy group. "The reality is that Hispanic and Latin voters went to the polls on election day with the economy on their minds, but with immigration reform in their hearts," she said.¶ With the State of the Union address as a platform, advocates on all sides of the issue are hoping something gets done, all too aware such hopes have been dashed before.

#### Obama has the upper hand now.

Reuters 2-4-13. www.reuters.com/article/2013/02/04/us-usa-immigration-idUSBRE9130V620130204

Obama is expected to use his February 12 State of the Union speech to Congress - a major annual address by the president in which he lays out his legislative priorities for the year - to keep the heat on Republicans, who appear more willing to accept an immigration overhaul after they were chastened by Latino voters' rejection in the November election.¶ But differences have emerged since Obama and a bipartisan Senate working "group of eight" rolled out their proposals last week aimed at the biggest U.S. immigration revamp in decades.¶ Obama wants to give America's 11 million illegal immigrants a clear process to achieve citizenship, including payment of fines, criminal background checks and going to the "back of the line" behind legal applicants. He has vowed to introduce his own bill if Congress fails to act in a timely fashion.¶ But top Republicans want to defer citizenship until the county's borders are deemed more secure - a linkage that Obama and most of his fellow Democrats would find hard to accept.¶ Obama's aides are confident the president has enough leverage to avoid giving ground - not least because they believe that if the reform effort fails in Congress, voters are more likely to blame the Republicans and they would suffer in the 2014 midterm congressional elections.

#### GOP coming on board now.

Merrills and Coffey 2-4. [Andrew, Justin, lawyers @ Ogletree Deakins, "Post-election immigration reform - What's at issue?" Lexology -- www.lexology.com/library/detail.aspx?g=fec318c5-d79a-4a70-8b8d-3ed17e59f65d]

The prospect of comprehensive immigration reform appears to be gaining momentum. On January 28, a bipartisan group of eight senators announced a broad proposal for immigration reform. Meanwhile, a similar bipartisan effort is underway in the House and, as this issue was going to press, it was expected that President Obama would announce his proposal for comprehensive immigration reform.¶ The Senate Proposal¶ The Senate proposal has four basic elements: (1) a path to legalization for illegal immigrants; (2) increased border security; (3) increased employer verification requirements; and (4) increased employment-based immigration. Illegal immigrants would pay monetary penalties to legalize but would not be eligible for permanent resident status until other enforcement-related measures are in place (such as increased border security).¶ The proposal would also increase certain types of employment-based immigration and allow individuals who have an advanced degree in science, technology, engineering, or mathematics from a U.S. university to obtain permanent resident status. The proposal includes increased fines and criminal penalties for employers that knowingly employ unauthorized workers.¶ Highlights of the proposal include:¶ Increased border security (additional unmanned drones, surveillance equipment, and border agents);¶ Entry-exit system to monitor visa overstays;¶ A commission to provide a recommendation as to whether increased border security measures have been completed;¶ A government registry for illegal immigrants who must pass background checks, pay fines, and back taxes in order to obtain temporary legal status (when increased border security measures are completed they can apply for permanent resident status behind others who have already applied);¶ A quicker path to legalization for foreign nationals that were brought to the United States as children;¶ A reduction in the immigrant visa backlogs for both family-based and employment-based immigration;¶ Permanent resident status for individuals who have an advanced degree in science, technology, engineering, or mathematics from U.S. universities;¶ Electronic verification of employment authorization and identity for new hires;¶ Increased fines and criminal penalties for employers that knowingly employ unauthorized workers;¶ Increased employment-based immigration where it can be demonstrated that employment of a foreign national would not displace U.S. workers;¶ Creation of an agricultural worker program;¶ Increased or decreased immigration for lower-skilled workers as needed depending on economic conditions; and¶ Permanent resident status for long-term employees who have contributed to the community and to the workplace.¶ Reaction from the White House¶ Initial reaction from the White House to the Senate’s proposal has been positive; and with a similar bipartisan effort underway in the House, the prospect of comprehensive immigration reform seems a possibility. President Obama has made comprehensive immigration reform a priority, referencing the idea in recent speeches including his inaugural address.¶ With approximately 70 percent of Latinos voting for Obama in the past election, Republicans appear to have become more receptive to a comprehensive overhaul of immigration laws. Latinos accounted for approximately 11 percent of the electorate in 2012 (up from eight percent in 2008) and this community has been especially important in key swing states, such as Florida, Colorado, Nevada, and New Mexico. More than two-thirds of exit polls were in favor of comprehensive immigration reform.¶ The perception is that Republicans have alienated the Latino community, the fastest-growing demographic group in the country, on the immigration issue. Immigration policy, largely overlooked during President Obama’s first term, has now re-emerged as a key issue as Republicans scurry to rebound from their election performance, motivated by the need to repair the electoral damage through comprehensive immigration reform.¶ The fact that Latinos cast significantly fewer votes for Mitt Romney than they had for previous Republican presidential candidates has led to an ostensible shift in the GOP’s position on immigration, forcing Republicans to reconsider their opposition to reform. In fact, following the election, many Republican Congressional Leaders (including House Speaker John Boehner), well aware of the election results, the polls, and demographic trends, have stepped forward to show support for comprehensive immigration reform.

#### Spending PC now.

Benen 2-6. [Steve, political writer, "Defining the 'extremes' in the immigration debate" MSNBC -- maddowblog.msnbc.com/\_news/2013/02/06/16868677-defining-the-extremes-in-the-immigration-debate]

At the surface, there's ample reason for optimism on comprehensive immigration reform. President Obama is investing considerable political capital into the issue; the public strongly supports the reform efforts; a bipartisan bill is already progressing in the Senate; and every Republican strategist and consultant is warning the party not to further alienate the fastest-growing voting constituency in the country.

#### Momentum.

Mali 2-3. [Meghashyam, web editor, "Reid: Immigration bill will pass Senate" The Hill -- thehill.com/video/senate/280739-reid-vows-immigration-reform-will-pass-senate]

Reid’s comments come as momentum is growing for immigration reform on Capitol Hill. Last week a bipartisan group of senators introduced a framework for reform, which includes a path to citizenship for illegals and calls for tighter border security. ¶ President Obama has also made immigration reform a “top priority” in his second term, unveiling his own principles during a speech in Las Vegas last week.¶ On the House side, another group of bipartisan lawmakers are also working on a proposal they hope to introduce soon.

#### Predictive ev.

Rusling 2-6. [Matthew, Special Correspondent at Xinhua, "Chances for US immigration reform good, but pitfalls remain" Philippines News Agency -- lexis]

The chances of passing U.S. immigration reform are high, but the devil is in the details, and those finer points could be a stumbling block for cooperation in a bitterly divided Congress. ¶ The long-simmering debate over fixing the nation's broken immigration system kicked off Tuesday with a House hearing after President Barack Obama vowed last week to take action in his second term.¶ While former President George W. Bush tried his hand at reform with a bill that ultimately failed, experts said conditions this time are ripe for Congress to hammer out a deal.¶ "For the first time in many years, members of both parties have political incentives to reform our broken immigration system," said Darrell M. West, director of governance studies at the Brookings Institution.¶ "With the poor showing of Republicans in the 2012 elections, they need to address the immigration issues that are at the top of the political agenda for most Latino voters," he said, referring to the Republican Party's loss of more than 70 percent of the Latino vote and that party's need, by its own admission, to cast off the image of a party of old, white males.¶ Citing polls showing 70 percent of Americans want immigration reform, Democratic Strategist Joe Trippi expressed hope Monday during a Fox News panel that Congress could come to an agreement.

### Thumper

#### No thumpers – Obama has priced in the rest of his agenda and will get immigration done – a new contentious topic ruins his strategy

Zeleny 1-24. [Jeff, NYT political correspondent, “For Obama, am ambitious agenda faces ticking clock” IHT -- lexis]

The State of the Union address that Mr. Obama will deliver to Congress on Feb. 12 will offer the most definitive road map yet for how the White House will set priorities in his second term as well as how it intends to **avoid becoming mired in a heated debate over one contentious topic** to the detriment of the full agenda. ''There's no doubt you want to get off to a strong start, and we've got a pretty big dance card,'' said David Plouffe, a senior adviser to Mr. Obama who is leaving the White House this week. He ticked through a list of agenda items that included guns, immigration and fiscal issues, but he disputed the suggestion that one item would overtake the others. **''We clearly have this moment where we can get immigration done**,'' Mr. **Plouffe added**. ''If we don't get it done, then shame on us. We've got to seize this opportunity.''

#### No fight over the budget

Kaletsky 1-23. [Anatole, journalist, financial economist, “Cooperation isn’t coming to Washington – it’s already arrived,” Reuters -- http://blogs.reuters.com/anatole-kaletsky/2013/01/23/cooperation-isnt-coming-to-washington-its-already-arrived/]

The House of Representatives decision to suspend the U.S. Treasury debt limit is the most important political event in America since President Barack Obama was first elected in 2008. As anticipated in this column immediately after the 2012 election, Washington seems to have broken its addiction to deadly games of economic chicken. That, in turn, should mean an orderly resolution of all U.S. fiscal problems and perhaps even an outbreak of bipartisan political cooperation, at least on economic issues, of a kind not seen in Washington since the early 1990s.¶ None of these favorable outcomes is yet acknowledged as true in Washington or Wall Street. Political analysts and market pundits have almost unanimously described the House decision as a diversionary tactic, simply designed to shift the high-noon confrontation with Obama to a new battleground more favorable to the Republican side: the March 1 date for automatic spending cuts under the sequestration procedure, or the March 27 expiration date of current government budgets.¶ This cynicism will almost certainly be proved wrong. The obvious reason is that an army in full retreat, as the Republicans have been since the election and fiscal cliff fiasco, finds it hard to regroup against an enemy enjoying strong momentum. And when such a battered force does attempt a last stand, this usually results in a rout. In this case, however, there are more specific reasons for the Republicans to seek peaceful coexistence instead of the fight-to-the-death over borrowing and spending that many pundits still predict. To see why House leaders decided to unilaterally disarm their nuclear weapons — first the fiscal cliff and now the debt ceiling — one has to understand the transformation in U.S. political dynamics that occurred the moment the votes were counted on Nov. 6.¶ Before the election, Republicans and their business backers had two overriding reasons to obstruct any deals with Obama on borrowing, spending or taxes. First, most Republicans genuinely expected to win the presidential election and therefore had every incentive to defer important decisions until their man was in power. Secondly, they calculated that any collateral damage inflicted on the economy through fiscal warfare would harm the incumbent president, whose Achilles’ heel was economic policy. Once the election was over, this calculus completely changed.¶ Having failed to unseat Obama, Republicans were suddenly in a situation where sabotaging the economy was no longer in their interests. As I argued immediately after the election, and again during the fiscal cliff negotiations, the GOP had few incentives after Nov. 7 to just thwart Obama. Republicans now had to persuade voters that their policies would promote jobs and growth — and would do so immediately, not in some distant future when budgets would have to balance or else the United States would turn into Greece.¶ The election also changed motivations for the Republicans’ business supporters. Instead of viewing Washington gridlock as a weapon for defeating Obama, American businesses after the election had to accept the inevitable. They would have to live with Obama and his policies, however much they disliked them. For most U.S. businesses, the primary political consideration was no longer the ideological debate over taxing and spending, but a purely economic issue: How would the economic policies negotiated between the White House and Congress affect business conditions in the four years leading to 2016?¶ This gestalt shift implies that **Republicans are unlikely to press very hard for large-scale spending cuts, government layoffs or fiscal tightening that could be seen as harming economic** recovery. Instead the focus should move to long-term budget reforms, designed to take effect only after the economy has largely recovered in 2015 or so – conveniently beyond the next congressional elections.¶ The president will have strong incentives to cooperate with such gradual fiscal consolidation, with major budget cuts backloaded to the last years of his administration and beyond. He would rather go down in history as the man who delivered universal healthcare, saved the U.S. economy from its worst crisis since the Great Depression, and put U.S. fiscal policy on a sustainable footing than waste his entire second term haggling over budgets – especially since achieving fiscal austerity does not require any major cuts or austerity, except in the very long term. ¶ In fact, the White House has already said it will offer some long-term entitlement reforms as part of the bipartisan budget deal that now looks eminently attainable. This may infuriate left-wing Democrats, but Obama is unlikely to care much, now that he has been reelected. In any case, grassroots Democratic voters will probably care more about presidential efforts on gun control, immigration and climate change than about wonkish arguments over Chained CPI and Medicare spending caps in the next decade.¶ Why then has there been little discussion of this change in political dynamics? Probably because **the media mostly see it as their role to magnify political drama rather than to analyze how they are likely to be resolved. The same applies to many professional politicians. Extreme statements from both parties will always attract the most media attention**. The congressional arithmetic, however, means that the views of radicals, highlighted by the media, are no longer very important.

#### Not spending pc on it.

Cain 2-5. [Michael, staff writer, "Gun Control Legislation is Another Victim of Our Short Attention Span" Policy Mic -- www.policymic.com/articles/24939/why-we-won-t-ever-see-a-real-gun-ban-in-america]

The president knows these things, and he isn’t about to spend valuable political capital trying to rise against the tide. Within 60 days, nobody in Washington will be talking about gun control. They will have moved on to more pressing matters, confident they have presented a brave attempt which will placate their constituents until the next time.

#### Public push for gun control irrelevant – Obama still pushing immigration reform.

Parsons 2-3. [Christi, White House correspondent for the Chicago Tribune, "Obama to keep up the pressure for immigration reform" LA Times -- articles.latimes.com/2013/feb/03/nation/la-na-pn-obama-immigration-napolitano-20130203]

President Obama’s public focus will be on gun violence this week, but behind the scenes he and key administration officials plan to keep pushing for immigration reform.

### Link Turn

#### Natural gas is politically explosive- plan spurs massive backlash over environment issues- that’s Mantius.

#### Their link turn – your evidence is citing the democratic senator for Alaska – they obviously have an incentive to say that the plan is overwhelmingly popular because Arctic drilling SERIOUSLY benefits Alaska…

#### Also, it’s not just the GOP – they have to win compromises between Dems and other coalitions, they’d get fractured as a result of the plan

#### Offshore drilling is controversial – Democrats hate it and it’ll cause a fight

Colman 1/3/13 (Zack, “Dems Raise Drilling Safety Concerns After Arctic Oil Rig Accident”)

Democrats and green groups are pushing the Obama administration to address offshore Arctic drilling concerns after a Shell oil rig ran aground earlier this week. Shell’s Kulluk rig grounded onto Sitkalidak Island in the Gulf of Alaska on Monday. The U.S. Coast Guard and Interior Department are investigating the incident. The accident arrives as Democratic lawmakers are already focusing on the safety of offshore oil-and-gas development, while Republicans are seeking to expand the practice. “The Coast Guard and Interior Department will be investigating the causes of this incident, so it's too soon to draw any firm conclusions. But as I've said before, I plan to look at drilling safety rules this year, to see if regulators are doing enough to make sure offshore drilling operations aren't putting lives or the environment at risk,” said Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee Chairman Ron Wyden (D-Ore.). The Kulluk episode is the latest in a string of Arctic mishaps for Shell. Its other Arctic drilling rig, the Noble Discoverer, also nearly grounded, and the firm’s blowout containment dome, the Arctic Challenger, failed safety tests. Shell in 2012 won federal permission to begin preliminary drilling in the Beaufort and Chukchi seas off Alaska’s coast. But a series of problems, such as failure to get final sign-offs on critical spill containment equipment, led regulators to withhold permission to drill into oil-bearing zones. Republicans, who say increasing offshore drilling would provide a boost for the economy, urged caution on indicting the oil company. “We need to find out exactly what happened and the extent of it,” House Natural Resources Chairman Doc Hastings (R-Wash.) told The Hill. But a group of liberal House Democrats who advocate energy efficiency and renewable energy said the Kulluk incident highlighted the risks of Arctic drilling. “The recent grounding of Shell’s Kulluk oil rig amplifies the risks of drilling in the Arctic. This is the latest in a series of alarming blunders,” the Sustainable Energy and Environment Coalition said in a Thursday statement. Green groups went a step further, calling on the Obama administration to withhold permits for offshore Arctic drilling. Environmental group Oceana sent a letter to Interior Secretary Ken Salazar on Thursday, calling on him to stop future drilling in the Arctic “to prevent the catastrophe that we have thus far avoided.” The Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) also plans to send a formal request to the White House asking for a halt to offshore Arctic permitting. “No matter how much Shell has poured into the Arctic drilling — and it has been a lot — it cannot make the effort anything but a terrifying gamble,” Chuck Clusen, director of national parks and Alaska projects with NRDC, said in a Thursday media call. Republicans resisted the idea of stopping Arctic drilling. Rep. John Fleming (R-La.) reflected on battling President Obama’s decision to impose a six-month freeze on new deepwater drilling permits in the Gulf of Mexico following the 2010 BP oil spill. The ban was formally lifted in October of 2010 but permits were not issued again until early 2011.

#### They would hate the plan

Cockerham 12 (Sean, McClatchy Newspapers, “Democratic Senators Want a Stop to Arctic Drilling”) http://www.mcclatchydc.com/2012/09/26/169792/democratic-senators-want-a-stop.html

A group of Democratic senators is calling for the Interior Department to halt future Alaska offshore drilling leases, saying the president hasn’t made the case that drilling in the environmentally sensitive region is safe. “Challenges with infrastructure and spill response are unprecedented in the Arctic’s remote, undeveloped region,” the senators wrote Interior Secretary Ken Salazar. Senators signing the letter this week were Richard Durbin of Illinois, Barbara Boxer of California, Frank Lautenberg of New Jersey, Patrick Leahy of Vermont, Jeff Merkley of Oregon and Sheldon Whitehouse of Rhode Island. They questioned the oil spill response capabilities in the Arctic and said there needs to be a better scientific monitoring plan. They also want more areas off limits. The senators urged the Interior Department to remove Arctic offshore drilling from its 2012-2017 leasing program. An Interior Department spokesman had no response to the letter on Wednesday. The Obama administration’s proposed offshore oil leasing program includes a pair of potential sales in the Alaska Arctic. That would be a 2016 sale in the Chukchi Sea and a 2017 sale in the Beaufort Sea. “We are committed to moving forward with leasing offshore Alaska, and scheduling those sales later in the program allows for further development of scientific information on the oil and gas resource potential in these areas and further study of potential impacts to the environment,” Deputy Interior Secretary David Hayes said when the plan was announced in July. There’s an intensifying global push to harvest the vast energy resources in Arctic waters, from Alaska to Russia to Greenland. It’s hugely controversial, and the French oil company Total on Wednesday became the first major driller to speak out against oil exploration in Arctic waters. The company’s chief executive told the London-based Financial Times that the risk of a spill in a sensitive offshore Arctic area such as Greenland was too great.

#### It’s a hot button- laundry list

Bauers, 10 -- Inquirer staff

(Sandy, "Philly academy study finds gas drilling threatens streams," The Philadelphia Inquirer, 10-12-10, l/n, accessed 9-2-12, mss)

Drilling for natural gas in the Marcellus Shale formation has become a **controversial issue** and a **political hot button** across the state. It is viewed as an economic boon and a potential solution to the nation's dependence on foreign oil. Since natural gas burns with fewer emissions than other fossil fuels, it also is considered an answer to climate change. However, critics cite the potential for environmental damage, the industrialization of urban areas, and the loss of a natural resource - owned, in some cases, by the public - to for-profit companies. The legislature is grappling with the issue of whether to levy a state tax on natural gas extracted from the Marcellus Shale. While rhetoric on drilling has been abundant, Velinsky said that independent scientific studies on the environmental effects have been scarce: "There are a lot of voices out there that are going from 'Oh, it's no problem' to the other side, 'It's doom and gloom.' "

#### Business interests are backing out of the Arctic – it’s too risk – means the plan gets no major lobbying push

Naidoo 10/3/12 (Kumi, “Drilling for Oil in the Arctic: The Risks Are Too Great for Companies to Take On”)

The floating ice cap of the Arctic has been shrinking at an alarming rate for several years, but [this year's melt was truly remarkable](http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2012/sep/19/arctic-ice-shrinks). The area of the Arctic Ocean covered in ice in the summer is now just half the size it was when satellite monitoring began three decades ago, with scientists now radically changing their predictions for when the entire ocean will be open water. It's refreshing to see that oil industry players, both current and former, have formed an unlikely chorus of collective opinion and are saying that drilling in the Arctic is a bad idea. An analysis of the combination of the cost and the risk of Arctic drilling is leading to the emergence of a new conventional wisdom. If corporate social responsibility (CSR) is to mean anything more than mere branding then there is a line beyond which the oil companies cannot go, and it is a line in the ice. When we launched the [Save the Arctic](http://www.savethearctic.org/) campaign at Rio+20, I shared the platform with Sir Richard Branson, who spoke eloquently on the urgent need to transition away from carbon fuels. Puma chairman, Jochen Zeitz, was one of the first to sign the [Greenpeace Arctic scroll](http://www.greenpeace.org.uk/blog/climate/together-we-can-save-arctic-20120621) that will next year be planted on the seabed 4km beneath the pole. Nick Butler, the former head of BP's expro division and Lord Browne's one-time right-hand man,[wrote in the Financial Times](http://blogs.ft.com/nick-butler/2012/09/19/shells-risky-play-in-the-arctic/?Authorised=false" \l "axzz28EacuFlY" \o ") that the setbacks Shell has suffered in the Arctic should cause it to pull out. "To abandon the Arctic project would not be an admission of technical failure, nor an act of submission to the environmentalists. It would be a statement of commercial common sense," Butler writes. Also [writing about Shell's Arctic venture](http://www.forbes.com/sites/matthewhulbert/2012/09/18/has-unconventional-production-peaked/), Forbes magazine commentator Matthew Hulbert, said: "There will be another 'Macondo moment' at some stage from unconventional plays. It's just a matter of where, when, and who." Macondo, of course, was the blowout that nearly crashed BP. Lloyd's of London warned companies not to "rush in [but instead to] step back and think carefully about the consequences of that action." The German bank WestLB announced it would not provide financing to any offshore oil or gas drilling in the region because the "risks and costs are simply too high." Then last week Christophe de Margerie, chief executive of oil giant Total, made an extraordinary intervention, warning the oil majors that Arctic drilling was bad business. "Oil on Greenland would be a disaster," he said. "A leak would do too much damage to the image of the company."

### AT: Obama Doesn’t Push

#### Their interpretation of the plan is a voting issue –

**It moots all agenda-based DA’s, which are key to research and education on current events and the political process – AND they are the reason most affs haven’t been done, which means the aff moots the most germane question in the literature**

**2ac clarifications about who does the plan could destroy every neg argument**

#### President has to push the plan – otherwise it never makes the agenda

**Cohen and Collier 99** – Jeffrey Cohen, professor of political science at Fordham University, and Ken Collier, assistant professor at the University of Kansas, 1999, Presidential Policymaking: An End of Century Assessment, ed. Shull, p. 45

Presidential influence over the congressional agenda aims not only to open the gates for some issues but to block other issues from progressing through the policymaking process. Presidents may try to block some issues by not addressing them, by being inattentive. Often presidential involvement is required for a policy to get onto the agenda. Lack of presidential attention may signal that the problem is not as important as others. Policy advocates seek to prove that their issue is worthy of national attention; getting the presidential “stamp of approval,” may be a necessary step in making an issue “national.”

#### And, normal means

**Pika & Maltese** **06** – Professor of poli sci & IR at U of Delaware & Prof of Poli Sci at University of Georgia

[Joseph A., & John Anthony, The Politics of the Presidency] 190

Individual members of Congress still introduce a multitude of bills independently of the president, but the chief executive is in a position to substantially influence, if not dominate, the congressional agenda. In a comprehensive review of how presidents helped set the congressional agenda from 1953-1996, George C. Edwards and Andrew Barrett drew important conclusions: (1) “The president can almost always place potentially significant legislation on the agenda of Congress”; (2) the president generates about one-third of “the total number of significant bills on the congressional agenda, “ ranging from a high of 68.8 percent under Kennedy in 1961-1963 to a low of 0 percent under Clinton in 1995-1996; (3) White House initiatives constitute a larger percentage of congressional agenda under unified government than under divided government; and (4) “presidential initiatives are more likely than congressional initiatives to become law, “ with the success rate nearly twice as high under unified, rather than divided, government.

#### And, the president has to take a position

**Fitts 96** – Professor of Law, University of Pennsylvania Law School [Michael A., “THE PARADOX OF POWER IN THE MODERN STATE,” University of Pennsylvania Law Review, January, 144 U. Pa. L. Rev. 827]

While the president's singularity may give him the formal ability to exercise agenda control, which public choice scholars see as an advantage of presidential power, his visibility and the influence of the media may also make it more difficult for him to exercise it. When public scrutiny is brought to bear on the White House, surrounding such issues as gays in the military or affirmative action, the president must often take a position and act. 128 This can deprive him of the ability to choose when or whether to address issues. Finally, the unitary president may be less able to rely on preexisting congressional or agency processes to resolve disputes. At least in theory, true unitariness means that he has the authority to reverse the decisions or non-decisions of others - the buck stops [\*866] with the president. 129 In this environment, "no politician can endure opposition from a wide range of opponents in numerous contests without alienating a significant proportion of voters." 130 Two types of tactics illustrate this phenomenon. First, presidents in recent years have often sought to deemphasize - at least politically - their unitariness by allocating responsibility for different agencies to different political constituencies. President Clinton, for example, reportedly "gave" the Department of Justice to the liberal wing of the Democratic party and the Department of the Treasury and the OMB to the conservatives. 131 Presidents Bush and Reagan tried a similar technique of giving control over different agencies to different political constituencies. 132Second, by invoking vague abstract principles or "talking out of both sides of their mouth," presidents have attempted to create the division within their person. Eisenhower is widely reported to be the best exemplar of this "bumbling" technique. 133 Reagan's widely publicized verbal "incoherence" and detachment from government affairs probably served a similar function. 134Unfortunately, the visibility and singularity of the modern presidency can undermine both informal techniques. To the extent that the modern president is subject to heightened visibility about what he says and does and is led to make increasingly specific statements about who should win and who should lose on an issue, his ability to mediate conflict and control the agenda can be undermined. The modern president is supposed to have a position [\*867] on such matters as affirmative action, the war in Bosnia, the baseballstrike, and the newest EPA regulations - the list is infinite. Perhapsin response to these pressures, each modern president has made more speeches and taken more positions than his predecessors, with Bill Clinton giving three times as many speeches as Reagan during the same period. 135 In such circumstances, the president is far less able to exercise agenda control, refuse to take symbolic stands, or take inconsistent positions. The well-documented tendency of the press to emphasize the strategic implications of politics exacerbates this process by turning issues into zero-sum games. 136

### Capital Key

#### Cap key – allows him to glue coalitions together – that’s Des Moines Register.

#### Capital key to keep pressure on the House – empirics.

Brownstein 2-4. [Ronald, Editorial Director, "Bush's immigration failure offers Obama a lesson" National Journal -- www.nationaljournal.com/thenextamerica/immigration/bush-s-immigration-failure-offers-obama-a-lesson-20130204]

Already many of the same dynamics are developing, with President Obama stamping immigration reform as a top priority, a bipartisan Senate coalition reassembling, a broad outside alliance of support groups coalescing—and most House Republicans rejecting anything that hints at “amnesty” for illegal immigrants. Yet the contrasts between now and 2006, particularly in the political climate, are also significant. Understanding both the similarities and the differences will be critical for reform advocates if they are to avoid replicating the disappointment they suffered under Bush.¶ Presidential interest was then, as it is now, critical in elevating immigration reform. Since his days as Texas governor, Bush had courted Hispanics, and—even during the 2000 GOP presidential primary campaign—he strikingly defended illegal immigrants as “moms and dads” trying to make a better life for their children. Together with his political “architect,” Karl Rove, Bush saw comprehensive reform that coupled a path to citizenship with tougher enforcement as an opportunity to consolidate the beachhead that allowed him to capture more than 40 percent of Hispanic voters in his 2004 reelection.¶ But Bush largely looked away when Republicans who controlled the House channeled that impulse in a very different direction. In December 2005, they passed an enforcement-only bill drafted by Judiciary Committee Chairman Jim Sensenbrenner of Wisconsin, that, for the first time, designated all undocumented immigrants as felons. (Previously, illegal presence in the U.S. had been a civil, not criminal, violation.)¶ Initially, debate in the GOP-controlled Senate drifted. Majority Leader Bill Frist, considering a 2008 presidential bid, pushed his own enforcement-only bill. But amid the backdrop of huge public rallies against Sensenbrenner’s proposal, Sen. Arlen Specter unexpectedly joined with three other Republicans and all eight Judiciary Committee Democrats in late March to approve a comprehensive plan, including a path to citizenship, that followed a blueprint negotiated by Sens. Edward Kennedy and John McCain.¶ When broader Senate agreement teetered over the terms of legalization, Republican Sens. Chuck Hagel and Mel Martinez devised a compromise that divided illegal immigrants into three categories, requiring those here less than two years to leave but allowing those with deeper roots to eventually earn citizenship by paying fines and learning English. After Bush finally delivered a national address on immigration, a bill embodying that plan cleared the Senate with 62 votes, including support from 23 Republicans.¶ House Republicans immediately signaled their disinterest by refusing to appoint a conference committee and instead scheduled hearings in border communities to highlight security lapses. “Border security reigned supreme,” recalls Ron Bonjean, the communications director for then-Speaker Dennis Hastert. “I remember being in a meeting with … the leadership where pollsters came in and said border security was the key to our reelection.”¶ Even in 2006, something like the Senate plan likely could have attracted 218 votes in the House—but not a majority of Republicans. Faced with a collision between his two political imperatives—courting Hispanics and mobilizing conservatives—Bush blinked, allowing House leaders to replace the Senate bill with enforcement-only legislation, which he signed that fall. These choices began the GOP’s slide among Hispanics that continues unabated: Hispanic support for Republican House candidates plummeted from 44 percent in 2004 to just 29 percent in 2006, presaging Mitt Romney’s disastrous 27 percent showing among those voters in 2012.¶ That slippage is one of the two most important differences in the political environment around immigration between 2006 and today. Back then, as Bonjean notes, hardly any House Republicans argued that the GOP needed to pass a plan attractive to minorities. But many GOP leaders now see that as self-preservation. “The political imperative has shifted the tectonic plates,” says Frank Sharry, a key player in the 2006 debate who remains central as executive director of America’s Voice, which backs full citizenship for immigrants. “Immigration was viewed as a wedge issue for Republicans in 2006. Now it’s viewed as a wedge issue for Democrats.”¶ The “Gang of Eight” proposal released this week makes it likely that, as in 2006, the Senate will eventually pass a bipartisan immigration bill. Once again, there are probably 218 House votes for such a plan, but not a majority of the majority Republicans. That raises another key difference from 2006: Hastert faced little pressure to consider the Senate bill, because Bush bit his tongue when the speaker buried it. If House Republicans shelve another bipartisan Senate plan in 2013, they should expect much more public heat, because Obama won’t be as deferential.

#### Capital key.

Kennedy 2-5. [Mark, leads George Washington University's Graduate School of Political Management and is Chairman of the Economic Club of Minnesota, "3 Lessons From Obama's Cliff Victories for Immigration Push" Huffington Post -- lexis]

1. Have a simple, effective pitch: After the knock down drag out fight over raising the debt ceiling in 2011, Obama's team realized they needed a more effective message for future fiscal fights. By characterizing the Republican reluctance to raise the debt limit as akin to refusing to pay for goods already placed on the credit card, Obama had a kitchen table explanation for a complex macroeconomic issue. A similar approach to a comprehensive immigration bill, which due to its size and scope will contain something unpalatable for both parties, will be essential to avoid a death by 1,000 cuts. 2. Seek the support of the opposition's traditional allies: Obama shrewdly courted corporate America, holding meetings with executives whose bottom lines would be adversely affected by another debt limit standoff. These traditional Republican supporters were able to convey the urgency of the issue to the GOP better than anyone else. It's always easier to take advice from a friend than a foe. The president should reach out to business leaders -- who would have much to gain from the certainty that an immigration deal could provide -- again to help sell a plan. Republicans should approach the immigration debate with as an opportunity to reach out to Asians and Hispanics that have trended heavily towards supporting Democrats. 3. Exploit unforced errors: Intransigent Republicans in the House derailed Speaker John Boehner's "Plan B" fiscal proposal, which substantially limited the leverage the party had in discussions over a final solution. That meant that the final deal went even further to the left and needed overwhelming Democratic support in the House to prevent an economic disaster. That served to weaken the strong fiscally responsible economic image Republicans had burnished in previous debates. Republicans need a deal[1], and Obama should try to work with them. While one side exploiting the other's fumble may again be decisive, a keen focus by both sides on minimizing mistakes and misstatements would allow each to bring their best to the effort of passing immigration reform.¶ Getting a deal on immigration will be tougher than the fiscal cliff (there is not a credit downgrade or economic meltdown at stake and thus less incentive to deal), but it is still possible if both President Obama and the Republicans learn from past successes, do not repeat missteps and seek to truly make this a win-win effort.

#### DICKINSON CONCLUDES NEG – prefer this evidence because its from a peer reviewed journal – their card assumes Supreme Court nominations which are inherently ideological.

Dickinson 9. (Matthew, professor of political science at Middlebury College. He taught previously at Harvard University, where he also received his Ph.D., working under the supervision of presidential scholar Richard Neustadt, We All Want a Revolution: Neustadt, New Institutionalism, and the Future of Presidency Research, Presidential Studies Quarterly 39 no4 736-70 D 2009)

Small wonder, then, that initial efforts to find evidence of presidential power centered on explaining legislative outcomes in Congress. Because scholars found it difficult to directly and systematically measure presidential influence or "skill," however, they often tried to estimate it indirectly, after first establishing a baseline model that explained these outcomes on other factors, including party strength in Congress, members of Congress's ideology, the president's electoral support and/or popular approval, and various control variables related to time in office and political and economic context. With the baseline established, one could then presumably see how much of the unexplained variance might be attributed to presidents, and whether individual presidents did better or worse than the model predicted. Despite differences in modeling assumptions and measurements, however, these studies came to remarkably similar conclusions: individual presidents did not seem to matter very much in explaining legislators' voting behavior or lawmaking outcomes (but see Lockerbie and Borrelli 1989, 97-106). As Richard Fleisher, Jon Bond, and B. Dan Wood summarized, "[S]tudies that compare presidential success to some baseline fail to find evidence that perceptions of skill have systematic effects" (2008, 197; see also Bond, Fleisher, and Krutz 1996, 127; Edwards 1989, 212). To some scholars, these results indicate that Neustadt's "president-centered" perspective is incorrect (Bond and Fleisher 1990, 221-23). In fact, the aggregate results reinforce Neustadt's recurring refrain that presidents are weak and that, when dealing with Congress, a president's power is "comparably limited" (Neustadt 1990, 184). The misinterpretation of the findings as they relate to PP stems in part from scholars' difficulty in defining and operationalizing presidential influence (Cameron 2000b; Dietz 2002, 105-6; Edwards 2000, 12; Shull and Shaw 1999). But it is also that case that scholars often misconstrue Neustadt's analytic perspective; his description of what presidents must do to influence policy making does not mean that he believes presidents are the dominant influence on that process. Neustadt writes from the president's perspective, but without adopting a president-centered explanation of power. Nonetheless, if Neustadt clearly recognizes that a president's influence in Congress is exercised mostly, as George Edwards (1989) puts it, "at the margins," his case studies in PP also suggest that, within this limited bound, presidents do strive to influence legislative outcomes. But how? Scholars often argue that a president's most direct means of influence is to directly lobby certain members of Congress, often through quid pro quo exchanges, at critical junctures during the lawmaking sequence. Spatial models of legislative voting suggest that these lobbying efforts are most effective when presidents target the median, veto, and filibuster "pivots" within Congress. This logic finds empirical support in vote-switching studies that indicate that presidents do direct lobbying efforts at these pivotal voters, and with positive legislative results.

<MARKED>

 Keith Krehbiel analyzes successive votes by legislators in the context of a presidential veto and finds "modest support for the sometimes doubted stylized fact of presidential power as persuasion" (1998,153-54). Similarly, David Brady and Craig Volden look at vote switching by members of Congress in successive Congresses on nearly identical legislation and also conclude that presidents do influence the votes of at least some legislators (1998, 125-36). In his study of presidential lobbying on key votes on important domestic legislation during the 83rd (1953-54) through 108th (2003-04) Congresses, Matthew Beckman shows that in addition to these pivotal voters, presidents also lobby leaders in both congressional parties in order to control what legislative alternatives make it onto the congressional agenda (more on this later). These lobbying efforts are correlated with a greater likelihood that a president's legislative preferences will come to a vote (Beck 2008, n.d.).