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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)
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#### Expanded offshore oil production collapse critical ocean resources

SELC, 12

[Southern Environmental Law Center, "Offshore Drilling: Defending the Atlantic and Eastern Gulf," 6-20-12, www.southernenvironment.org/cases/drilling\_in\_the\_atlantic\_huge\_risk\_little\_reward, accessed 1-31-13, mss]

For more than 25 years, the Atlantic coast has been off-limits to offshore oil and gas drilling. During that time, SELC has protected our coastal resources from a variety of harms. Today, our beaches and marshlands remain largely **unspoiled**, and our fisheries are among the most productive in the world. The Push to Drill In 2008, the freeze on offshore drilling in new areas of the U.S. was lifted, and two years later, President Obama announced plans to allow drilling in the Atlantic, from Maryland to northern Florida, and in the eastern Gulf, near Alabama. Virginia, which had a potential lease sale in the works, was suddenly in the crosshairs. Shortly after, the blowout of BP’s deepwater well in the Gulf of Mexico and the oil spill that lasted several months brought into stark focus the threats posed by offshore drilling to coastal communities and ecosystems. SELC and our partners, including Defenders of Wildlife, are taking legal action to stop the lax federal oversight that led to the Gulf disaster, and we continue leading the opposition to plans to open more of the Southeast’s coast to oil and gas development. Coastal Riches for Wildlife and People The beautiful and **biologically rich** coastal areas off Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama feature some of the **most productive estuaries** in the country, including the Chesapeake Bay, the Pamlico Sound, the ACE Basin, and Mobile Bay. Our shores attract millions of tourists, anglers, and other visitors each year and provide **important** breeding and feeding **habitat** for migratory birds, turtles, and whales, many of which are globally rare. Tourism and fishing—both commercial and recreational—are the economic backbone of hundreds of towns and cities along our coasts. In 2008 alone, our four Atlantic states yielded $262.8 million in commercial fish landings. Potential for Disaster The environmental impacts of offshore drilling were well known even before Gulf disaster. Ocean rigs routinely spill and leak oil—and sometimes blow out. Chemicals used to operate oil and gas wells also pollute the marine environment. Moreover, oil spills and other contamination from onshore refineries, pipelines, and associated infrastructure would spoil wetland and marsh ecosystems that provide untold benefits for Southern communities, including flood control, clean drinking water, and **essential habitat** for fisheries that sustain their economies. Hurricanes occur frequently in the Atlantic and add to the risk. In the Gulf, the devastation and loss of life caused by hurricanes Katrina and Rita overshadowed the fact that roughly 8 million gallons of petroleum products spilled from various sources. Too Little, Too Late The relatively low amounts of oil and gas in the Atlantic are not worth the tremendous risk to the South’s exceptional coastal resources. According to only available government estimates, the Mid- and South Atlantic hold less than a two-month supply of oil (at current rates of national consumption) and just a six-month supply of natural gas. The Virginia lease area holds just six days of oil and 18 days of natural gas. . (Read more about the Virginia lease sale.) The South has too much to lose and too little to gain by opening up the Mid- and South Atlantic coast and eastern Gulf to offshore drilling. SELC strongly opposes any moves to do so.

#### Extinction

Craig, 3 -- Indiana University School of Law professor

[Robin, "Taking Steps Toward Marine Wilderness Protection?" McGeorge Law Review, 34 McGeorge L. Rev. 155, Winter 2003, l/n, accessed 2-2-13, mss]

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

#### Only a massive expansion of drilling will trigger the impacts, slow releases in the status quo will not trigger the impact

**Morningstar, Huntington News, 2011**

(Cory, “Destination—Hell. Are we there yet?”, 3-27, <http://www.huntingtonnews.net/2768>)

US Department of Energy meeting summary: "Alternatively, an undersea earthquake today, say off the Blake Ridge or the coast of Japan or California might loosen and cause some of the sediment to slide down the ridge or slump, exposing the hydrate layer to the warmer water. That in turn could cause a chain reaction of events, leading to the release of massive quantities of methane. Another possibility is drilling and other activities related to exploration and recovery of methane hydrates as an energy resource. The hydrates tend to occur in the pores of sediment and help to bind it together. Attempting to remove the hydrates may cause the sediment to collapse and release the hydrates. So, it may not take thousands of years to warm the ocean and the sediments enough to cause massive releases, only lots of drilling rigs. Returning to the 4 GtC release scenario, assume such a release occurs over a one-year period sometime in the next 50 years as result of slope failure. According to the Report of the Methane Hydrate Advisory Committee, “Catastrophic slope failure appears to be necessary to release a sufficiently large quantity of methane rapidly enough to be transported to the atmosphere without significant oxidation or dissolution.” In this event, methane will enter the atmosphere as methane gas. It will have a residence time of several decades and a global warming potential of 62 times that of carbon dioxide over a 20-year period. This would be the equivalent of 248 GtC as carbon dioxide or 31 times the annual man-made GHG emissions of today. Put another way, this would have the impact of nearly 30 years worth of GHG warming all at once. The result would almost certainly be a rapid rise in the average air temperature, perhaps as much as 3°F immediately. This might be tolerable if that’s as far as things go. But, just like 15,000 years ago, if the feedback mechanisms kick in, we can expect rapid melting of Greenland and Antarctic ice and an overall temperature increase of 30°F."

#### Methane release causes extinction

**Ryskin, Northwestern chemical engineering professor, 2003**

(Gregory, “Methane-driven oceanic eruptions and mass extinctions”, Geology, 31.9, <https://pangea.stanford.edu/research/Oceans/GES205/methaneGeology.pdf>)

The consequences of a methane-driven oceanic eruption for marine and terrestrial life are likely to be catastrophic. Figuratively speaking, the erupting region ‘‘boils over,’’ ejecting a large amount of methane and other gases (e.g., CO2, H2S) into the atmosphere, and flooding large areas of land. Whereas pure methane is lighter than air, methane loaded with water droplets is much heavier, and thus spreads over the land, mixing with air in the process (and losing water as rain). The air-methane mixture is explosive at methane concentrations between 5% and 15%; as such mixtures form in different locations near the ground and are ignited by lightning, explosions 2 and conflagrations destroy most of the terrestrial life, and also produce great amounts of smoke and of carbon dioxide. Firestorms carry smoke and dust into the upper atmosphere, where they may remain for several years (Turco et al., 1991); the resulting darkness and global cooling may provide an additional kill mechanism. Conversely, carbon dioxide and the remaining methane create the greenhouse effect, which may lead to global warming. The outcome of the competition between the cooling and the warming tendencies is difficult to predict (Turco et al., 1991; Pierrehumbert, 2002).
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#### Obama will green-light Keystone now- green backlash on energy policy destroys his environmental cover

Restuccia, 2-8 – Politico energy reporter, former energy and environmental reporter for The Hill

[Andrew, "Can Obama pair Keystone, climate action?" Politico, 2-8-13, www.politico.com/story/2013/02/can-obama-pair-keystone-climate-action-87350.html?hp=l12, accessed 2-8-13, mss]

President Barack Obama is approaching two of the most crucial energy decisions of his presidency: **Should he disappoint climate activists by approving** the **Keystone** XL pipeline? And should he anger industry groups by imposing tough greenhouse gas limits on existing power plants? But the president may have a third option: trying to placate both sides. Greenlighting Keystone **while he moves forward with** the **power plant regulations** could limit the political fallout from either move, handing Republicans a win on the pipeline and Democrats a victory on climate change. The White House isn’t tipping its hand, but environmental advocates **who have closely followed the administration’s handling** of both issues say Obama could roll out the two moves at or around the same time. And some climate-minded Democrats, such as Sen. Barbara Boxer, chairwoman of the Committee on Environment and Public Works, have signaled that they may not raise hell over Obama approving Keystone **if it’s accompanied by aggressive action on other** environmental **fronts**. “**It depends on what else he does**,” the California Democrat said last month when asked whether OKing the pipeline would diminish Obama’s climate legacy. “If he did that but did 17 things that, you know, clean it up … I’d have a different opinion.” One of the world’s leading scientific journals, Nature, has also advocated a package deal, writing in a late-January editorial that going ahead with both the pipeline and tough greenhouse gas rules would “give Obama an early opportunity to build some goodwill across the political spectrum.”

#### Massive environmental backlash to the plan- OCS is a key bargaining chip

Wojick, 10 – People’s World editor

[John, "Environmentalists hail Obama curb on offshore drilling," People's World, 12-2-10, www.peoplesworld.org/environmentalists-hail-obama-curb-on-offshore-drilling/, accessed 2-10-13, mss]

The Obama administration announced yesterday that it was withdrawing plans for expanding oil drilling in the Gulf and Atlantic Ocean. **The news was met with cheers of approval by environmentalists** who had condemned the administration's move in March to back additional drilling. "This decision is a wise and sensible step to protect Florida, the Atlantic Coast and the Pacific Coast from an inevitable disaster from expanded drilling," said Oceana Executive Director Andrew Sharpless. In March, a month before the BP oil spill, the Interior Department decided that it would support ending the longstanding drilling ban in the Atlantic Ocean and eastern Gulf of Mexico around Florida. However, on Dec. 1, citing too much risk of another disaster, the department reversed that decision, ensuring there will be no drilling in these areas until at least 2017. The BP spill prompted **massive campaigns** asking the president to do everything from cracking down on oil companies with **tougher regulations and penalties** to slowing down and even ending offshore drilling altogether. The reversal by the administration does not include deepwater drilling in the western Gulf, the area of the spill, which will continue under new safety regulations. Also not included in the ban is oil drilling by companies in the Arctic's fragile Beaufort and Chukchi seas. In Alaska, the administration is suspending new oil lease sales through 2012 but has left open the possibility of future oil and gas development in the Arctic after completion of studies of possible environmental impacts and oil response capabilities. Longstanding prohibitions on new drilling along the Pacific Coast remain in effect. Not surprisingly, GOP leaders have already attacked the president for the move. "We shouldn't allow this single event [referring to the BP spill, the worst environmental disaster in U.S. history] to disrupt our long-term need for an all-of-the-above energy plan that includes the responsible development of our nation's oil and gas resources," declared Rep. Doc Hastings, R-Wash. Hastings is the likely incoming chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee. Republican Gov. Robert McDonnell of Virginia called the administration's move "an irresponsible and shortsighted decision." Virginia's Democratic Sen. Mark Warner also said he was unhappy with Obama's decision. A spokesman for Warner said, "While it is appropriate to take time to incorporate lessons learned from the Gulf disaster, Sen. Warner sees no reason to delay this process for what realistically could be another seven years or more." Most observers, however, saw many reasons for the administration's action. Some believe **the administration may want to use it as a bargaining chip on environmental issues**, as Republicans exercise their increased clout on Capitol Hill.

#### Keystone key to prevent Canada-China deal- collapses US-China relations

Tu, 12 – Carnegie Energy program senior associate

[Kevin, "China Should be Cautious about the Canadian Oil Sands," Carnegie Endowment, 2-10-12, carnegieendowment.org/2012/02/10/china-should-be-cautious-about-canadian-oil-sands, accessed 2-10-13, mss]

On February 7, the Canadian prime minister, Stephen Harper, arrived in Beijing for a five-day visit that focused on expanding trade links between Canada and China. Before Harper’s trip, the Obama administration rejected TransCanada’s initial Keystone XL pipeline application, saying that the "rushed and arbitrary deadline" set by congressional Republicans would prevent a full review of the pipeline’s environmental impacts. The pipeline would eventually have moved about 700 thousand barrels per day of carbon-intensive synthetic crude and diluted bitumen from Alberta’s oil sands deposits to oil refineries along the U.S. Gulf Coast. Given that 99 percent of Canadian oil exports are destined for the U.S. market, the Obama administration’s decision is a big blow to the ambitious oil-sands-development agenda set by the conservative Canadian government. To diversify its oil exports away from the U.S. market, Harper promptly turned to Enbridge's plan for the construction of the Northern Gateway pipeline. That pipeline would move synthetic crude and bitumen from Edmonton in Alberta to the west coast of Canada—and then it could be shipped directly to China. The export of Canadian oil sands output was thus a key issue underlying Harper’s visit to China. Oil sands consist of a naturally occurring mixture of bitumen, sand, clay, or other minerals and water. Alberta's total oil sands reserves amount to the equivalent of 169.3 billion barrels of crude, which means Canada has the third-largest proven oil reserves worldwide, ranking only behind Saudi Arabia and Venezuela. Compared to conventional oil extraction, oil sands development is not only technologically more sophisticated but also more energy intensive. Nevertheless, recent spikes in global crude oil prices and technological breakthroughs in oil sands extraction and processing have led to an increase in Canada’s oil sands output from 0.61 million barrels per day in 2000 to 1.47 million barrels per day in 2010. According to the most recent forecast by the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers, Canada’s oil sands output could be as high as 3.73 million barrels per day by 2025. Since China first became a net oil importer in 1993, its national oil consumption has grown rapidly at an average of 6.5 percent annually, making the country the world’s second-largest oil consumer after the United States. In comparison, China’s oil output has increased at an average annual rate of only 2 percent during the same period. As a result, China has become increasingly reliant on imported oil, currently depending on imported oil to meet more than half of its oil demand. Furthermore, as China sources most of its oil imports from politically unstable countries in the Middle East and Africa, energy security has become an increasingly imperative policy challenge for Chinese decisionmakers. Considering the complementary nature of the two country’s energy sectors, at first glance Harper’s exporting proposal seems like a win-win initiative for both China and Canada. The Northern Gateway pipeline is designed to provide a crude oil export capacity of 525 thousand barrels per day, which could ultimately be expanded to 850 thousand barrels per day. The completion of the pipeline could not only reduce Canada’s overreliance on the U.S. market, but also help China diversify its oil supply. An additional advantage for China is Canada’s stable political and transparent regulatory environment, which makes large-scale imports from Canadian oil sands attractive to Chinese decisionmakers. However, looking beyond the energy-security perspective, Canadian oil sands exports to China are actually politically troublesome, largely due to three factors: the strain such a move would put on the Sino-U.S. relationship, the detrimental impact the deal would have on China’s international climate change negotiations, and the strong opposition from environmental groups and indigenous communities in Canada. First, Canadian oil sands exports to China could further strain the already turbulent Sino-U.S. relationship. In 2012, a presidential election year, the Obama administration rejected TransCanada’s application to build the Keystone XL pipeline. The move stemmed from strong Democratic and environmentalist opposition to the deal—Obama would have risked losing the pro-environment electorate if he approved the plan. Yet, the Democratic Party has been unable to reach a consensus on this contentious issue, and the U.S. State Department has agreed to allow TransCanada to reapply for a Keystone XL permit once an alternative route that avoids particularly environmentally sensitive sites is selected. By comparison, almost all congressional Republicans strongly support the Keystone XL pipeline. Arguing that turning down the pipeline will harm U.S. energy security, kill U.S. jobs, and unnecessarily benefit China, they have vigorously attacked Obama’s decision. Any renewed support for the Northern Gateway pipeline by Chinese national oil companies would shift the focus of the Keystone XL debate within the United States from the environment to national security—a prevailing fear, especially among congressional Republicans, is that without Keystone, China will beat the United States to Canada’s rich oil reserves. A desire to shift the debate to national security in the United States may even be driving the Canadian government’s public support of the Northern Gateway pipeline. Second, large-scale Chinese imports of output from Canadian oil sands would come with a high price tag for China’s future international climate negotiations. According to the revised national Energy Balance Table, China surpassed the United States to become the world’s largest carbon emitter as early as 2006. In 2009, emissions from Chinese coal combustion alone exceeded total U.S. carbon dioxide emissions. According to the International Energy Agency, China is expected to account for 42 percent of global incremental carbon emissions by 2035. Nevertheless, under the 2011 Durban Platform for Enhanced Action, China has already said it will join a legally binding international climate treaty that will be agreed upon by 2015 and will come into force by 2020. As a result, during future international climate negotiations, China is expected to face increasingly higher pressure from the international community to retard its spiking carbon emissions. According to the Canadian Industrial Energy End-Use Data and Analysis Center, carbon-emission intensities of upstream oil sands production are generally one to four times higher than conventional oil extraction. Although recent “well-to-wheels” studies have found that the life-cycle emissions of oil-sands-based products are only 5 to 15 percent higher than those of conventional oil products, such analyses likely overlook the substantial carbon-emissions potential that is embedded in the large amount of carbon-intensive oil sands byproducts, such as petroleum coke. According to Environment Canada, oil sands development and the transportation sector are the primary drivers underlying the growth of Canada’s greenhouse gas emissions. In order to allow room for the emissions that would result from oil sands development, and to save $14 billion in penalties for not achieving its Kyoto targets, the Canadian government withdrew from the Kyoto Protocol right after the Durban climate conference, without adequate consideration of the criticism it would receive from the international community. Large-scale Chinese imports of Canadian oil sands output would correspond to de facto support of Canada’s environmentally irresponsible climate policy. Not surprisingly, Chinese imports from Canada’s oil sands would not only be criticized by the international environmental community but would also make the work of China’s climate negotiation delegation much more difficult in the future. Finally, strong opposition to the Northern Gateway pipeline from environmental organizations and Canada’s indigenous community is another important issue that China should not ignore. As early as 2005, PetroChina, the listed arm of China’s largest national oil company, signed a cooperation agreement with Enbridge to support the Northern Gateway pipeline. However, after Stephen Harper came into power in 2006, Sino-Canadian relations soon deteriorated. Citing a lack of support from the Canadian federal government, PetroChina withdrew from the pipeline project in 2007 but forgot to mention the other serious impediment to the deal—strong opposition from both environmental organizations and indigenous communities along the pipeline route. Although the Canadian government now seems to be supportive of the pipeline, it will still be unable to address environmental concerns and the indigenous community’s opposition to pipeline construction in the near future. Consequently, Enbridge’s application for the pipeline is expected to be a prolonged process, which will inevitably increase the financial risks of the project. To enhance China’s energy security, Chinese national oil companies have significantly expanded their overseas presence in recent years. But, due to the monopoly status they have long enjoyed domestically, these companies often evaluate overseas projects primarily on the basis of energy security and corporate bottom line. However, many other factors are at play, and such practices have made securing a return on some Chinese overseas investments problematic at most. Importing output from Canadian oil sands is likewise complicated. Chinese leaders should prohibit national oil companies’ involvement in the Northern Gateway pipeline, at least during a U.S. presidential election year, or they risk **stirring up a national security debate** in the United States and inflaming Sino-U.S. relations. After the conclusion of the Chinese political power transition by the end of 2012, the new Chinese leadership should not only fundamentally reform China’s energy-oversight mechanism, which has so far failed to adequately regulate Chinese national oil companies, but also significantly improve intergovernmental coordination. This would lead Chinese national oil companies to, in addition to focusing on national energy security and their corporate bottom line, take other important factors such as Sino-U.S. relations, environmental governance, and the host country’s internal politics into consideration when they make future overseas investment decisions.

#### Extinction

Wittner, 11 -- State University of New York history professor

[Lawrence, "Is a Nuclear War with China Possible," 11-28-11, www.huntingtonnews.net/14446, accessed 2-10-13, mss]

While nuclear weapons exist, there remains a danger that they will be used. After all, for centuries national conflicts have led to wars, with nations employing their deadliest weapons. The current deterioration of U.S. relations with China might end up providing us with yet another example of this phenomenon. The gathering tension between the United States and China is clear enough. Disturbed by China’s growing economic and military strength, the U.S. government recently challenged China’s claims in the South China Sea, increased the U.S. military presence in Australia, and deepened U.S. military ties with other nations in the Pacific region. According to Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, the United States was “asserting our own position as a Pacific power.” But need this lead to nuclear war? Not necessarily. And yet, there are signs that it could. After all, both the United States and China possess large numbers of nuclear weapons. The U.S. government threatened to attack China with nuclear weapons during the Korean War and, later, during the conflict over the future of China’s offshore islands, Quemoy and Matsu. In the midst of the latter confrontation, President Dwight Eisenhower declared publicly, and chillingly, that U.S. nuclear weapons would “be used just exactly as you would use a bullet or anything else.” Of course, China didn’t have nuclear weapons then. Now that it does, perhaps the behavior of national leaders will be more temperate. But the loose nuclear threats of U.S. and Soviet government officials during the Cold War, when both nations had vast nuclear arsenals, should convince us that, even as the military ante is raised, nuclear saber-rattling persists. Some pundits argue that nuclear weapons prevent wars between nuclear-armed nations; and, admittedly, there haven’t been very many—at least not yet. But the Kargil War of 1999, between nuclear-armed India and nuclear-armed Pakistan, should convince us that such wars can occur. Indeed, in that case, the conflict almost slipped into a nuclear war. Pakistan’s foreign secretary threatened that, if the war escalated, his country felt free to use “any weapon” in its arsenal. During the conflict, Pakistan did move nuclear weapons toward its border, while India, it is claimed, readied its own nuclear missiles for an attack on Pakistan. At the least, though, don’t nuclear weapons deter a nuclear attack? Do they? Obviously, NATO leaders didn’t feel deterred, for, throughout the Cold War, NATO’s strategy was to respond to a Soviet conventional military attack on Western Europe by launching a Western nuclear attack on the nuclear-armed Soviet Union. Furthermore, if U.S. government officials really believed that nuclear deterrence worked, they would not have resorted to championing “Star Wars” and its modern variant, national missile defense. Why are these vastly expensive—and probably unworkable—military defense systems needed if other nuclear powers are deterred from attacking by U.S. nuclear might? Of course, the bottom line for those Americans convinced that nuclear weapons safeguard them from a Chinese nuclear attack might be that the U.S. nuclear arsenal is far greater than its Chinese counterpart. Today, it is estimated that the U.S. government possesses over five thousand nuclear warheads, while the Chinese government has a total inventory of roughly three hundred. Moreover, only about forty of these Chinese nuclear weapons can reach the United States. Surely the United States would “win” any nuclear war with China. But what would that “victory” entail? A nuclear attack by China would immediately slaughter at least 10 million Americans in a great storm of blast and fire, while leaving many more dying horribly of sickness and radiation poisoning. The Chinese death toll in a nuclear war would be far higher. Both nations would be reduced to smoldering, radioactive wastelands. Also, radioactive debris sent aloft by the nuclear explosions would blot out the sun and bring on a “nuclear winter” around the globe—destroying agriculture, creating worldwide famine, and generating chaos and destruction. Moreover, in another decade the extent of this catastrophe would be far worse. The Chinese government is currently expanding its nuclear arsenal, and by the year 2020 it is expected to more than double its number of nuclear weapons that can hit the United States. The U.S. government, in turn, has plans to spend hundreds of billions of dollars “modernizing” its nuclear weapons and nuclear production facilities over the next decade. To avert the enormous disaster of a U.S.-China nuclear war, there are two obvious actions that can be taken. The first is to get rid of nuclear weapons, as the nuclear powers have agreed to do but thus far have resisted doing. The second, conducted while the nuclear disarmament process is occurring, is to improve U.S.-China relations. If the American and Chinese people are interested in ensuring their survival and that of the world, they should be working to encourage these policies.

### 1NC

#### Naval readiness is strong- now is key to deter conflict

Katz, 13 -- retired vice admiral, former commander of the Fifth Fleet

[Doublas, "A Strong Navy," The Hill, 1-3-13, thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/economy-a-budget/275395-a-strong-navy, accessed 1-24-13, mss]

On the other hand, even with the increasingly austere fiscal climate unfolding, the nation seems to be entering **a new naval era** that emphasizes the renewed importance of U.S. sea power. Add to that the ever turbulent Middle East and Southeast Asian regions demanding rapid response capabilities, **it is now more imperative than ever** that civilian decision makers wisely plan for an adequate future size and composition of the our Fleet. In times of conflict, our Navy is called upon to control the seas, deny their use to the enemy, and to protect and sustain power ashore, indispensible in successful military operations. A strong Navy is a recognized United States commitment to the world. Our Navy is unique among all others in that the Fleet is not garrisoned in U.S. home ports but is spread across the globe. In fact, we presently have approximately 110 of those 287 ships deployed at any one time **with every expectation** that **that number will rise** as our naval commitments increase. Such recognized presence is a key element of the U.S. global defense posture. That presence is there to cooperate and defend partners and allies. It signals our national intent, prevents and **deters aggression**, promotes regional security and responds quickly to crises, to include humanitarian, no matter where they flare up.

#### Expanded oil drilling destroys naval readiness- current leases don’t trigger

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]

There have been recent proposals to open areas off the Atlantic coast for oil and gas production. Such proposals, however, could impair national security because a large portion part of **this area is critical for a wide array of military training**, including explosives, submarine exercises and Navy SEAL training. The Department of Defense wants to prohibit offshore drilling in a vast majority of the 2.9 million acre zone under consideration for oil production off Virginia. n65 About 20 percent, or 630,000 acres, would be open to drilling. n66 Secretary of the Interior Ken Salazar reiterated that Defense Department needs will take precedence over the energy industry. n67 Similarly, proposals to open the Gulf coast of Florida to expanded oil and gas production would also **interfere** **with D**epartment **o**f **D**efense **training**. Tom Neubauer, president of the Bay Defense Alliance, raised concerns about conflict with the Navy during an April 2012 public hearing on the expansion of drilling. He warned: The Gulf test range, which is essentially everything east of the military mission line, which comes down from Pensacola into the Gulf of Mexico, is really **essential to nine bases** in Northwest Florida. Most of those bases do testing and training, research and development in the Gulf of Mexico. ... Drilling in those areas would impair those missions. n68 One of the benefits of energy independence would be enhanced national security. It makes little sense to strive for that goal by drilling in places that would interfere with our security. Drilling in these two places important to our military is even less sensible because "about 70 percent of undiscovered oil and gas resources are on federal lands that are available for leasing under current laws and administrative policies" according to recent analysis by the Congressional Budget Office. n69

#### Strong navy de-escalates all conflict and deters great power war

Roughead, 7 -- Admiral, US Navy, Chief of Naval Operations

[Gary, James Conway, General, US Marine Corps, and Thad Allen, Admiral, US Coast Guard, "A Cooperative Strategy for 21st Century Seapower," Oct 2007, www.navy.mil/maritime/Maritimestrategy.pdf, accessed 1-24-13, mss]

This strategy reaffirms the use of seapower to influence actions and activities at sea and ashore. The expeditionary character and versatility of maritime forces provide the U.S. the **asymmetric advantage** of enlarging or contracting its military footprint in areas where access is denied or limited. Permanent or prolonged basing of our military forces overseas often has unintended economic, social or political repercussions. The sea is a vast maneuver space, where the presence of maritime forces can be adjusted as conditions dictate to enable **flexible approaches** to escalation, **de-escalation** **and deterrence of conflicts**. The speed, flexibility, agility and scalability of maritime forces provide joint or combined force commanders a range of options for responding to crises. Additionally, integrated maritime operations, either within formal alliance structures (such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization) or more informal arrangements (such as the Global Maritime Partnership initiative), send powerful messages to would-be aggressors that we will act with others to ensure collective security and prosperity. United States seapower will be globally postured to secure our homeland and citizens from direct attack and to advance our interests around the world. As our security and prosperity are inextricably linked with those of others, U.S. maritime forces will be deployed to protect and sustain the peaceful global system comprised of interdependent networks of trade, finance, information, law, people and governance. We will employ the global reach, persistent presence, and operational flexibility inherent in U.S. seapower to accomplish six key tasks, or strategic imperatives. Where tensions are high or where we wish to demonstrate to our friends and allies our commitment to security and stability, U.S. maritime forces will be characterized by regionally concentrated, forward-deployed task forces with the combat power to limit regional conflict, deter major power war, and should deterrence fail, win our Nation’s wars as part of a joint or combined campaign. In addition, persistent, mission-tailored maritime forces will be globally distributed in order to contribute to homeland defense-in-depth, foster and sustain cooperative relationships with an expanding set of international partners, and prevent or mitigate disruptions and crises. Credible combat power will be continuously postured in the Western Pacific and the Arabian Gulf/Indian Ocean to protect our vital interests, assure our friends and allies of our continuing commitment to regional security, and deter and dissuade potential adversaries and peer competitors. This combat power can be selectively and **rapidly repositioned to meet contingencies** that may arise elsewhere. These forces will be sized and postured to fulfill the following strategic imperatives: Limit regional conflict with forward deployed, decisive maritime power. Today regional conflict has ramifications far beyond the area of conflict. Humanitarian crises, violence spreading across borders, pandemics, and the interruption of vital resources are all possible when regional crises erupt. While this strategy advocates a wide dispersal of networked maritime forces, we cannot be everywhere, and we cannot act to mitigate all regional conflict. Where conflict threatens the global system and our national interests, maritime forces will be ready to respond alongside other elements of national and multi-national power, to give political leaders a range of options for deterrence, escalation and de-escalation. Maritime forces that are persistently present and combat-ready provide the Nation’s primary forcible entry option in an era of declining access, even as they provide the means for this Nation to respond quickly to other crises. Whether over the horizon or powerfully arrayed in plain sight, maritime forces can deter the ambitions of regional aggressors, assure friends and allies, gain and maintain access, and protect our citizens while working to sustain the global order. **Critical to this** notion **is the maintenance of a powerful fleet**—ships, aircraft, Marine forces, and shore-based fleet activities—capable of selectively controlling the seas, projecting power ashore, and protecting friendly forces and civilian populations from attack. Deter major power war. No other disruption is as potentially disastrous to global stability as war among major powers. Maintenance and extension of this Nation’s comparative seapower advantage is a **key component** of **deterring** major power war. While war with another great power strikes many as improbable, the near-certainty of its ruinous effects demands that it be actively deterred using all elements of national power. The expeditionary character of maritime forces—our lethality, global reach, speed, endurance, ability to overcome barriers to access, and operational agility—provide the joint commander with a range of deterrent options. We will pursue an approach to deterrence that includes a credible and scalable ability to retaliate against aggressors conventionally, unconventionally, and with nuclear forces.

### CP

#### The United States federal government should impose escalating surcharges on land in the United States that oil companies are leasing but not using and prohibit companies from obtaining additional leases unless they demonstrate that they are producing or diligently developing leases they already hold.

#### Idle leases contain a vast amount of oil- solves the aff without endangering fragile environments

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

[Daniel, “The American Energy Initiative,” congressional testimony, 9-13-12, www.americanprogressaction.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/WeissTestimony.pdf, accessed 1-31-13, mss]

Despite their demand to open **fragile**, previously protected places for oil and gas production, oil and gas companies are not developing many of the leases that they already hold. A **huge portion** of leases held for public lands and waters lack exploration or development plans according to Department of Interior data. The department found that 56 percent of the leased acres onshore in the lower 48 states are not in production or exploration. The percentage is even larger offshore, where **72 percent** of leased acres are dormant. 87 This simply means that big oil companies currently hold the keys to **vast amounts** of publicly owned resources but have chosen not to develop them right now. As of the end of fiscal year 2011, there were more than 38 million onshore acres under lease, but the industry was only actively producing on just more than 12 million acres. 88 The story holds true down the line, given that as of the end of fiscal year 2011, the industry was holding more than 7,000 authorized permits to drill with parcels that were unexplored or undeveloped. 89 Idle leases in the Gulf of Mexico contain large amounts of oil. The tracts that are not producing oil or subject to pending or approved exploration and development plans are estimated to contain 17.9 billion barrels of “undiscovered technically recoverable resources” oil and 49.7 trillion cubic feet of UTRR natural gas. 90 According to the same report from the Department of Interior, “More than 70 percent of the tens of millions of offshore acres under lease are inactive.” This includes almost 24 million acres that do not have “approved exploration or development plans” in the Gulf of Mexico. This area has an estimated **11.6 billion** barrels of oil and 50 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. 91

**Counterplan solves and avoids politics**

**Mufson, 12** – Washington Post chief economic policy writer

[Steven, staff writer covering energy and other financial news, "Study: 20 million acres of federal oil, gas leases in Gulf of Mexico idle," Washington Post, 10-22-12, articles.washingtonpost.com/2012-10-22/business/35501614\_1\_gas-leases-oil-companies-massive-oil-spill, accessed 1-18-13, mss]

Oil and natural gas companies are not exploring, developing or producing on more than **20 million acres** of federal leases in the Gulf of Mexico, 40 percent of them owned by the five biggest private oil giants, according to a study by the office of Rep. Edward J. Markey (D-Mass.), the ranking member of the House Natural Resources Committee. The study is the latest salvo in a politicized election year battle over whether the Obama administration should be blamed for what Republican presidential nominee Mitt Romney has called a slow pace of leasing or whether the oil industry owns more drilling leases than it can handle. The study found that 131 oil and gas companies hold about 3,700 leases in the Gulf of Mexico that are not undergoing exploration, development or production. BP has 2.5 million acres of idle leases in the Gulf of Mexico, the report said. BP is followed by Chevron, Exxon Mobil and Shell, each of which own 1.4 million to 1.5 million acres of idle leases. Markey’s study added that about half of the leases have been idle for at least five years and that 80 percent of the idle leases were purchased for less than $300 an acre. Many Democratic lawmakers have pressed in recent years for “use it or lose it” legislation to compel oil companies to exploit their federal leases. But major oil companies have argued that the current system, which already uses a “use it or lose it” structure, works fine. Oil companies bid for federal leases and generally have 10 years to explore a lease or let the acreage revert to the federal government, which can then put the leases up for auction again. The companies, especially those exploring deep-water offshore leases, say they need time to carry out surveys and contract for a rig. Recently, BP has been the company most actively drilling in the Gulf of Mexico. It would not comment on the study. Some members of Congress, including Markey, want to push companies harder to develop their leases by imposing a system of escalating surcharges as idle leases get older.

### Solvency

#### They can't solve lease certainty-can’t undo past actions.

**Bluey, Heritage Foundation, 2012**

(Rob, “Production of Oil, Gas and Coal on Federal Lands Sinks to Nine-Year Low”, 3-19, <http://blog.heritage.org/2012/03/19/production-of-oil-gas-and-coal-on-federal-lands-sinks-to-nine-year-low/>)

The administration, meanwhile, has also taken several steps to limit production. Heritage’s Nick Loris noted these four steps taken by the Obama administration: [Withdrew](http://naturalresources.house.gov/News/DocumentSingle.aspx?DocumentID=134670) areas offered for 77 oil and gas leases in Utah that could cost American taxpayers millions in lost lease bids, production royalties, new jobs and the energy needed to offset rising imports of oil and natural gas. [Cancelled](http://abcnews.go.com/blogs/politics/2010/05/president-obama-to-cancel-offshore-drilling-projects/) lease sales in the Western Gulf of Mexico, the Atlantic coast and delayed exploration off the coast of Alaska and kept other [resource-rich areas off-limits](http://naturalresources.house.gov/News/DocumentSingle.aspx?DocumentID=179299). [Finalized](http://naturalresources.house.gov/News/DocumentSingle.aspx?DocumentID=186056) rules, first announced by Secretary Salazar on January 6, 2010, to establish more government hurdles to onshore oil and natural gas production on federal lands. [Withdrew](http://billingsgazette.com/news/opinion/editorial/gazette-opinion/article_bb25685e-33df-11df-ae5a-001cc4c002e0.html) 61 oil and natural gas leases in Montana as part of a lawsuit settlement over climate change. “The big picture is clear that government policies undertaken by the Obama administration have produced a significant decline in offshore oil production on federal lands in fiscal year 2011,” the [Institute for Energy Research](http://www.instituteforenergyresearch.org/2012/03/15/fossil-fuel-production-on-federal-lands-at-9-year-low/) said in response to last week’s updated EIA analysis. “That is certainly not a way to increase domestic production of oil and keep oil and thus gasoline prices in check.”

#### No solvency—OCS has no oil and takes decades

**Colagiovanni, Detroit Examiner consultant, 2012**

(Lou, “CBO report finds 'drill baby drill' in practice produces little revenue or oil”, 8-18, <http://www.examiner.com/article/cbo-report-finds-drill-baby-drill-pratice-produces-little-revenue-or-oil>,)

It has been confirmed in a new report by the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office that the benefits of opening up and leasing protected federal lands for the development of oil and natural gas are next to nothing. The estimated profit would be as little as $500 million a year which is only 0.7% of the total gross take of revenue of $150 billion that is expected to be generated over the next decade from leases already in place. A favorite cheer of the Republican party has been "drill baby drill." Some would now say that talking point has been proven impotent. The analyzed issue was the opening of ANWR, The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, and off-shore drilling sites between 5 and 200 miles away from both coasts. Certain parts of the Outer Continental Shelf were also included in the analysis. The United States allows individual corporations and private businesses to bid on leases for resource development already, with 70% of these areas already in use. Once operational, which in some areas may take as long as 25 years, the report finds a revenue of $2 billion a year may be possible but not sustainable. For those who say that any revenue generated is acceptable and desired, they should know that up to 90% of the profits will be paid to Alaskan residents. The remaining 10% would have nearly no bearing on the federal debt or deficit. This figure is based on the speculation that if new contracts were to be signed, they would be similar to those already approved, which do pay up to 90% of generated revenue to Alaskans. Finally the CBO report summarizes the situation succinctly: Production from newly opened areas over the 2023–2035 period would be far less than the amounts produced by current operations in the Gulf of Mexico. Therefore, American citizens are left with a decision. Do they wish to proceed allow the destruction of protected lands for a measly $500 million a year, or will they see the costs far outweigh the benefits. The United States uses between 6.8 - 8.3 billion barrels of oil per year. Today's current oil price is $96.21 per barrel. Therefore, The United States annually spends $798 billion a year for oil. In other words it would take 1,596 years for these new drilling operations to generate enough oil or revenue to cover the US for a single year.

#### 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.

### Heg

#### Drilling doesn’t fix it ---

CAP ‘8

Center for American Progress- Independent nonpartisan educational institute - Ten Reasons Not to Expand Offshore Drilling September 15, 2008

This week, the House of Representatives will consider the Comprehensive American Energy Security and Consumer Protection Act. The bill would protect our coasts up to 50 miles off shore, but then give states the option of allowing offshore drilling 50 miles off the coastline. The compromise bill does include some positive measures, such as a renewable electricity standard that would require all utilities to generate 15 percent of their electricity from wind, solar, geothermal, or other renewable energy sources. It would also extend tax incentives for renewable energy and efficiency, paid for by closing tax loopholes for big oil, and sell oil from the nearly full government petroleum reserves to lower gas prices. The nearly 30-year moratorium on oil drilling in the Outer Continental Shelf will expire on September 30th, and President Bush opposes its extension. Nonetheless, offshore oil drilling in areas that have been off-limits since 1982 is not the way to solve our energy crisis. There are many reasons that offshore drilling in sensitive coastal areas is a bad idea. These 10 are only the beginning: 1. We can’t drill our way out of the energy crisis. According to a report by the House Committee on Natural Resources Majority Staff: “Between 1999 and 2007, the number of drilling permits issued for development of public lands increased by more than 361 percent, yet gasoline prices have also risen dramatically, contradicting the argument that more drilling means lower gasoline prices. There is simply no correlation between the two.” 2. We don’t have enough oil to meet our demand. The U.S. oil supply-demand balance is insurmountable. We have less than 2 percent of the world’s known reserves, yet use 25 percent of its oil. Even if we drilled off of every beach, and inside every national park, refuge, and forest, we could not produce enough oil to offset our growing demand. 3. Oil companies have not utilized the leases they have now. Why open up new areas to drilling when oil companies hold over 4,000 undeveloped leases in the western Gulf of Mexico? What’s more, the government already leases 44 million acres offshore, of which only 10.5 million—or one quarter—are producing oil or gas. 4. Offshore drilling would have an “insignificant” effect on long-term prices. Offshore drilling in sensitive areas would increase domestic oil production by 3 percent by 2030 compared to a reference case, according to the Energy Information Administration. But “because oil prices are determined on the international market…any impact on average wellhead prices is expected to be insignificant.” 5. Drilling could lock us in to a future of expensive gasoline. By committing to costly recovery, oil companies are betting that oil prices (and gas prices) will stay high enough to justify their investments. Opening the Outer Continental Shelf could never bring us back to $2-a-gallon gas, but would ensure that companies that develop the newly available oil have an interest in keeping gas prices high enough to justify their investments. 6. Production would be expensive, would not start for a long time, and would have no short-term effect on oil prices. The average oil field size in the OCS is smaller than the average in the Gulf of Mexico, which is already being developed. As a result, much of the oil in the OCS would be expensive to extract, and is only becoming attractive now as a result of high oil prices. According the Energy Information Administration, it would take at least five years for oil production to begin. EIA predicted that there would be no significant effect on oil production or price until nearly 20 years after leasing begins. 7. There isn’t enough drilling equipment. Due to the high price of oil, existing drilling ships are “booked solid for the next five years,” and demand for deepwater rigs has driven up the price of such ships. Oil companies just don’t have the resources to explore oil fields in the OCS. 8. We can’t refine the oil we would extract. In a June speech, President George W. Bush noted that, “Refineries are the critical link between crude oil and the gasoline and diesel fuel that drivers put in their tanks.” Yet refineries are already so stretched that last year, the United States had to import almost 150 million barrels of gasoline. The Wall Street Journal reported oil companies are not building new refineries because it would be bad for their bottom line: “Building a new refinery from scratch, Exxon believes, would be bad for long-term business.”

#### Domestic consumption prevents solvency

Menenburg 9-6

Aaron  graduate student in international relations at The Maxwell School of Syracuse University. "Let’s Get Real: Energy Independence is an Unrealistic and Misleading Myth" <http://www.economonitor.com/policiesofscale/2012/09/06/lets-get-real-energy-independence-is-a-unrealistic-and-misleading-myth/>

Thus far, when energy has been discussed, the foci are “energy independence” and “alternative energy.” Although far from dominating energy markets, the latter is quickly becoming a significant source of US energy consumption and will likely to continue to gain market share. The concept of energy independence, however, is unrealistic, largely undesirable, and misleading. I am going to tackle the façade of the energy independence argument in this piece and in doing so will try to explain the issues actually affecting national energy policy. This piece will focus on oil because (1) it is our most used source of energy and (2) it is our major energy import. At the heart of the energy independence idea is the rationale that achieving energy independence will unhook us from world energy prices and disengage us from the geopolitical consequences Americans find unpalatable, namely massive engagement in the Middle East. Neither is true, and in fact they’re not even remotely plausible outcomes. If there is one take-away I want the reader to remember, it is this: the goal of self-sufficiency in energy supplies – especially in oil – misdiagnoses the problem as one characterized largely by importation of oil. Rather, energy security, the implications of energy on the economy, and America’s reliance on imported oil is a function of the importance of oil consumption in the domestic economy regardless of its source. The only way to reduce the cost of gasoline is by consuming significantly less of it, while the only way to ensure minimal political and security insulation from oil is to stop using it.

#### No risk of US oil war

**GLASER 2011** (Professor of Political Science and International Relations Elliot School of International Affairs The George Washington University, “ Reframing Energy Security: How Oil Dependence Influences U.S. National Security,” August 2011, http://depts.washington.edu/polsadvc/Blog%20Links/Glaser\_-\_EnergySecurity-AUGUST-2011.docx, )

Oil dependence could reduce a state’s security if its access to oil is vulnerable to disruption and if oil is necessary for operating the state’s military forces. Vulnerable energy supplies can leave a state open to coercion—recognizing that it is more likely to lose a war, the state has a weaker bargaining position and is more likely to make concessions.[[1]](#footnote-1) Closely related, if war occurs the state is more likely to lose. Conflict that is influenced by this mechanism is not fundamentally over the oil;[[2]](#footnote-2) rather, when states already have incentives for conflict, the oil vulnerability influences their assessment of military capabilities and in turn the path to war. Recognizing this type of danger during the Cold War, U.S. planning to protect its sea lanes of communication with the Persian Gulf was motivated partly by the importance of insuring the steady flow of oil that was necessary to enable the United States to fight a long war against the Soviet Union in Europe. During the Second World War, Japan’s vulnerability to a U.S. oil embargo played an important role in destroying Japan’s ability to fight.[[3]](#footnote-3) **This type of threat to the U.S. military capabilities is not a serious danger today because the U**nited **S**tates **does not face a major power capable of severely interrupting its access to key supplies of oil.** In contrast, China does face this type of danger because its oil imports are vulnerable to disruption by the U.S. Navy.

#### Can’t access oil volatility – companies won’t keep spare capacity --- means we’ll always be behind

LEVI ’12 - David M. Rubenstein senior fellow for energy and the environment at the Council on Foreign Relations and director of its Program on Energy Security and Climate Change (Levi, Michael. “Think Again: The American Energy Boom”. August, 2012. http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/06/18/think\_again\_the\_american\_energy\_boom)

But what makes Saudi Arabia such a dominant global player isn't merely the scale of its energy production. It's that it actively attempts to influence the price of oil and often does so for explicitly political reasons, whether currying favor with Washington or trying to hurt Tehran. By **restraining** long-term investment in oil production capacity -- **manufacturing scarcity** -- the desert kingdom is able to prop up the average price of crude. What's more, by keeping some of its production capacity in reserve, to be swung on and off the market at will, Saudi Arabia is able to moderate short-term price swings. It's not because they love the Saudi royal family that world leaders are so solicitous when they visit Riyadh. Nothing about the U.S. oil and gas boom suggests that Washington **can or will** step into this role. No U.S. government would -- or could -- attempt to prop up world prices by restraining U.S. supplies. Besides, America's oil boom is being driven by supplies that cost huge sums of money to develop. Once new wells are drilled (at a cost of about $100 million each for offshore development), owners will produce flat out to **recoup** their **investments**; there's no way they'll leave untapped production capacity just waiting for a political crisis or global market swing.

#### Too integrated into the oil market

LEVI ’12 - David M. Rubenstein senior fellow for energy and the environment at the Council on Foreign Relations and director of its Program on Energy Security and Climate Change (Levi, Michael. “Think Again: The American Energy Boom”. August, 2012. <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/06/18/think_again_the_american_energy_boom>)

In any case, energy independence requires more than impressive arithmetic. As long as the United States is ***fully* *integrated* into the world oil market**, U.S. fuel prices will rise and fall along with events on the other side of the globe -- say, a war with Iran. Greater domestic production will blunt the economic shock of rapidly rising prices -- better to suddenly be sending massive sums to North Dakota than to Saudi Arabia -- but because oil **producers *everywhere* are** relatively **slow to spend their windfalls**, skyrocketing prices could still knock the economy on its back.

#### Drilling can’t solve the trade deficit

Rusnak ‘12

Karl, writer for Economyincrisis.org non-profit corporation dedicated to educating legislators and the American public and publish critical but overlooked facts and figures, keeping our readers up-to-date with daily articles regarding the U.S. economy. B.A., Economics and Political Science, The Ohio State University. May 9. Drilling Won’t Fix Our Trade Deficit

In a recent post on Forbes.com, contributor Tim Worstall put forth the dubious idea that we may be able to turn our trade deficit into a trade surplus through the exploitation of America’s fossil fuels. Drilling our way out of high gas prices and dependence on OPEC is popular in right wing circles, but **the idea that we can restore our balance of trade with oil and gas takes the delusion to a new level**. Worstall claims that “[i]t’s not inconceivable that the U.S. will start to run a sustained trade surplus for the first time in [his] adult lifetime.” There are certainly ways to make this happen, but short-sighted thinking and reliance on fossil fuels will not make this prediction a reality. Oil imports currently account for approximately half of our nation’s $560 billion trade deficit. U.S. oil and gas production has increased recently with advances in drilling technology that have allowed us to access new sources of energy, but we are still net importers of both oil and natural gas. We are closing the gap between production and consumption in natural gas, but the disparity in oil is still much larger. The United States consumes 19,150,000 barrels of oil a day while currently producing only about 5.5 million barrels per day. Even with the new sources of oil, the U.S. Energy Information Administration estimates that we will only be producing 6.7 million barrels per day by 2020, while consumption is expected to rise. It is clear that fossil fuel production will not save us in the short term, and depending on fossil fuels for our economic well-being in the future would be foolhardy. While we are learning to harness more of our available reserves, the world will inevitably move away from oil and gas. Many countries have set specific goals for the move away from fossil fuels. For instance, the European Union has set a target of obtaining 20 percent of its energy from renewable sources by 2020, up from the 9 percent it achieved in 2009. With power grids shifting to alternative energy sources and increasingly efficient cars and buses hitting the market regularly, the idea that oil and gas will be the area of energy production that is most profitable in the future is questionable. Drilling our way to energy independence is partisan rhetoric, not a real solution to either our energy or economic problems. If we want to think about energy independence and the trade deficit, we should be concerned with things such as the fact that China is subsidizing its solar industry to undercut the pricing of our domestic manufacturers. Domestic fossil fuel production may make a dent in our trade deficit, but it will not eliminate it and a focus on drilling over innovation in renewable sources may hurt the United States long term. There are much better ways to fix our economy than pretending that we can drill our way to prosperity.

#### It’s impossible to build leverage heg with soft power in the short term

Gray 11 Colin S. Gray, Professor of International Politicsand Strategic Studies at the University of Reading, England; worked at the International Institute for Strategic Studies (London), and at Hudson Institute before founding the National Institute for Public Policy, April 2011, “Hard Power and Soft Power: The Utility of Military Force as an Instrument of Policy in the 21st Century,” online: <http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/display.cfm?pubID=1059>

It bears repeating because it passes unnoticed that culture, and indeed civilization itself, are dynamic, not static phenomena. They are what they are for good and sufficient local geographical and historical reasons, and cannot easily be adapted to fit changing political and strategic needs. For an obvious example, the dominant American strategic culture, though allowing exceptions, still retains its principal features, the exploitation of technology and mass.45 These features can be pathological when circumstances are not narrowly conducive to their exploitation. Much as it was feared only a very few years ago that, in reaction to the neglect of culture for decades previously, the cultural turn in strategic studies was too sharp, so today there is a danger that the critique of strategic culturalism is proceeding too far.46 The error lies in the search for, and inevitable finding of, “golden keys” and “silver bullets” to resolve current versions of enduring problems. Soft-power salesmen have a potent product-mix to sell, but they fail to appreciate the reality that American soft power is a product essentially unalterable over a short span of years. As a country with a cultural or civilizational brand that is unique and mainly rooted in deep historical, geographical, and ideational roots, America is not at liberty to emulate a major car manufacturer and advertise an extensive and varied model range of persuasive soft-power profiles. Of course, some elements of soft power can be emphasized purposefully in tailored word and deed. However, foreign perceptions of the United States are no more developed from a blank page than the American past can be retooled and fine-tuned for contemporary advantage. Frustrating though it may be, a country cannot easily escape legacies from its past.

#### And it will fail

Holmes ’10 [Kim Holmes, VP, foreign policy and defense studies, Heritage. Frmr Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs. While at the State Department, Holmes was responsible for developing policy and coordinating U.S. engagement at the United Nations and 46 other international organizations. Member of the CFR. Frmr adjunct prof of history, Georgetown. PhD in history, Georgetown, Smart Multilateralism and the United Nations, 21 Sept. 2010, <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2010/09/smart-multilateralism-when-and-when-not-to-rely-on-the-united-nations>]

The need for multilateralism is obvious. Nations share concerns about many problems and issues for which coordinated efforts could be mutually beneficial. Yet only rarely do all governments agree on the nature of a problem and the means to address it. At times, negotiations result in a less-than-perfect, but still acceptable, course of action. Disagreements can also lead to no action or the use of force or other confrontational measures. One of the purposes of multilateralism is to minimize the number and intensity of such confrontations. The process itself, however, is fraught with political challenges that can undermine potential solutions and even lead to other problems. For the United States, multilateralism faces its greatest challenge at the United Nations, where U.S. diplomats seek cooperative action among member nations on serious international problems. Therein lies the tension. The United Nations is first and foremost a political body made up of 192 states that rarely agree on any one issue. Even fundamental issues, such as protecting and observing human rights, a key purpose of the U.N. that all member states pledge to uphold when they join it, have become matters of intense debate. A key reason for this difficulty is the fact that the voices and votes of totalitarian and authoritarian regimes have equal weight to those of free nations at the U.N. The all-too-frequent clash of worldviews between liberty and authoritarian socialism has stymied multilateralism more than facilitated it, frequently leading to institutional paralysis when a unified response to grave threats to peace and security or human rights and fundamental freedoms was needed. U.S. secretary of state John Foster Dulles, who attended the San Francisco meetings that established the U.N., acknowledged this Achilles’ heel in 1954, when he told reporters: “The United Nations was not set up to be a reformatory. It was assumed that you would be good before you got in and not that being in would make you good.”[1] Fifty-five years later, the ideological fray at the U.N. has turned the terms “democracy” and “freedom” on their heads. Autocracies that deny democratic liberties at home are all too keen to call the Security Council “undemocratic” because in their view not every region, country, or bloc is sufficiently represented. During my time at the State Department, I was told repeatedly by other diplomats at the U.N. that the very concept of “freedom” is taboo because the term is “too ideologically charged.” In this environment, how can the United States or any freedom-loving country advance the purposes set forth in the U.N. Charter, including “encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all,”[2] when the word “freedom” itself is considered too controversial? More money will not do it. No other nation contributes more to the U.N.’s regular budget, its peacekeeping budget, or the budgets of its myriad affiliated organizations and activities than the United States. America has continued its generous support even though Americans increasingly view the U.N. as inefficient and ineffective at best and fraudulent, wasteful, anti-American, and beyond reform at worst.[3] If the United States is to advance its many interests in the world, it needs to pursue multilateral diplomacy in a smarter, more pragmatic manner. This is especially true when Washington is considering actions taken through the United Nations. A decision to engage multilaterally should meet two criteria: First, it should be in America’s interests, and second, it will serve to advance liberty. Unless the United States can achieve both these ends acting within the U.N. system, it should find ways to work around it. Such “smart multilateralism” is not easy, particularly in multilateral settings. It requires politically savvy leaders who can overcome decades-old bureaucratic inertia at the State Department and in international organizations. It requires the political will and diplomatic skill of people who are dedicated to advancing U.S. interests in difficult environments, especially where progress will likely be slow and incremental. It requires a belief in the cause of liberty, gleaned from a thorough study of our nation’s history and the U.S. Constitution, and a deep appreciation for the values and principles that have made America great. Smart multilateralism requires a fundamental awareness of the strengths and weaknesses, capabilities and failings, of the U.N. and other multilateral negotiating forums, so that the United States does not overreach. Perhaps the most critical decision is whether or not to take a matter to the U.N. in the first place. It would be better to restrict U.S. engagement at the U.N. to situations in which success is possible or engagement will strengthen America’s influence and reputation. Selective engagement increases the potential for success, and success breeds success. When America is perceived to be a skillful and judicious multilateral player, it finds it easier to press its case. Smart multilateralism thus requires well-formulated and clear policy positions and a willingness to hold countries accountable when their votes do not align with our interests. Finally, smart multilateralism is not the same thing as “smart power,” a term that Secretary of State Hillary Clinton has used. Suzanne Nossell, a former diplomat at the U.S. Mission to the U.N. in New York, coined that term in 2004 and described it in an article in Foreign Affairs.[4] Smart power is seen as a takeoff of “soft power,” which suggests that America’s leaders downplay the nation’s military might as well as its historic role in establishing an international system based on the values of liberty and democracy, and de-emphasize its immense economic and military (“hard”) power. Smart power seeks to persuade other countries from a position of assumed equality among nations. This assumption has become the Achilles’ heel of the U.N. system and other Cold War–era organizations. Smart multilateralism does not make that same mistake. Challenges to Effective U.S. Multilateralism The United States belongs to dozens of multilateral organizations, from large and well-known organizations such as NATO, the World Trade Organization (WTO), and the International Monetary Fund to relatively small niche organizations such as the Universal Postal Union and the International Bureau of Weights and Measures. The 2009 congressional budget justification[5] for the U.S. Department of State included line items for U.S. contributions to some fifty distinct international organizations and budgets.[6] The United Nations and its affiliated bodies receive the lion’s share of these contributions. While the World Bank and International Monetary Fund weight voting based on contributions, most of these organizations subscribe to the notion of the equality of nations’ votes. With a few exceptions such as Taiwan,[7] all nations—no matter how small or large, free or repressed, rich or poor—have a seat at the U.N. table. Every nation’s vote is equal, despite great differences in geographic size, population, military or economic power, and financial contributions. This one-country, one-vote principle makes the U.N. an extremely difficult venue in which to wage successful multilateral diplomacy. In this environment, multilateralism becomes a double-edged sword. It can sometimes speed up global responses to global problems, as with the avian flu outbreak and the Asian tsunami. At other times, it can slow or prevent timely responses, as with halting Iran’s nuclear weapons program and stopping genocide in Darfur. Too often, multilateralism at the U.N. is the political means by which other countries and regional blocs constrain or block action. Groups of small nations can join together to outvote the great powers on key issues, and this situation can often lead to bizarre outcomes and compromises. Even seemingly noncontroversial issues, such as improving auditing of U.N. expenditures, require days of skillful, almost nonstop negotiations. The U.N. is simply too poorly primed for American multilateralism. It is a vast labyrinth of agencies, offices, committees, commissions, programs, and funds, often with overlapping and duplicative missions.[8] Lines of accountability and responsibility for specific issues or efforts are complex, confused, and often indecipherable. For example, dozens of U.N. bodies focus on development, the environment, and children’s and women’s issues. Coordination is minimal. Reliable means to assess the effectiveness of the bodies’ independent activities is practically nonexistent. Although institutional fiefdoms and bureaucratic interests strongly influence the formulation of U.N. policy, programs, and resolutions, the most powerful actors remain the member states. Each tries to persuade the U.N. as an institution to advocate and adopt its positions on the matters most important to it. The chaos of conflicting priorities rarely results in consensus for decisive action. The most common result is inaction or a lowest-common-denominator outcome. Too often, the United States also finds that other countries’ positions on an issue have been predetermined in their regional or political groupings.

### Econ

#### The U.S. will already get 150 billion from oil without the plan

CBO 8-9

Congressional Budget Office – “Potential Budgetary Effects of Immediately Opening Most Federal Lands to Oil and Gas Leasing”

The federal government offers private businesses the opportunity to bid on leases for the development of onshore and offshore oil and natural gas resources on federal lands—although not all federally controlled lands are open to leasing now. CBO estimates that, under current laws and policies, the government’s gross proceeds from all federal oil and gas leases on public lands will total about $150 billion over the next decade.

#### Growth now and the economy is resilient

Godhwani 8-15

Gautam  2012; CEO, SimplyHired.com "Signs Of Resilience In Our Economy" http://www.huffingtonpost.com/gautam-godhwani/us-economy-jobs\_b\_1778664.html

These days, it's rare to see a day pass without hearing some sort of negative commentary or sentiment towards today's economy. But, there's one characteristic about our nation's economy that folks tend to overlook -- resiliency. By definition, resiliency is "an ability to recover from or adjust easily to misfortune or change." Today's economy is proving to be rather resilient - the growth is slow, but we continue to head in the right direction, even at a time when economies across the globe continue to struggle. With the prospect of a modest, steady recovery in our future, employer confidence continues to rise. In Simply Hired's monthly U.S. Employment Outlook, we've seen job openings increase in each of the last three months. Nationwide job openings increased 4.5 percent in July, while June saw a 9.2 percent jump and May had a 3.3 percent increase. In addition, every one of the top 50 metropolitan areas experienced growth in job openings for the second month in a row. Nationwide, we're looking at a total of 4.3 million job openings right now. That's nearly a 10 percent increase from last year. Sounds promising, right?

#### Drilling won’t create jobs – global market checks

Jones ‘12

Forrest, writing about Pau Krugmanl, Nobel economist,: More Oil Drilling Won't Help Economy by Creating Jobs

Drilling for more oil in the United States won't lower prices at the pump and won't create jobs, says Nobel economist Paul Krugman. Demand for oil is growing worldwide, and drilling in U.S. territories won't produce enough oil in a global market to lower prices at the pump, Krugman writes in his New York Times column. "Oil prices are up because of rising demand from China and other emerging economies, and more recently because of war scares in the Middle East; these forces easily outweigh any downward pressure on prices from rising U.S. production," Krugman writes. Meanwhile, the oil industry wouldn't create more jobs. Take North Dakota, where an energy boom is playing out. Proponents of more drilling argue low unemployment in North Dakota should serve as model for overall U.S. energy policy. "Yes, the oil boom there has pushed unemployment down to 3.2 percent, but that’s only possible because the whole state has fewer residents than metropolitan Albany — so few residents that adding a few thousand jobs in the state’s extractive sector is a really big deal," Krugman says.

#### 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.

#### Speculators make volatility inevitable

Hayes ‘11

Christopher is Editor at Large of The Nation and host of Up w/ Chris Hayes on MSNBC. fellow at Harvard University’s Edmond J Safra Foundation Center for Ethics. Bernard Schwartz fellow at the New America Foundation. Schumann Center Writing Fellow at In These Times. “Will Federal Regulators Crack Down on Oil Speculation?”

In the wake of the price explosion in the summer of 2008, a bubble that extended to all kinds of commodities, including copper and wheat, a number of observers from George Soros to Hedge Fund manager Michael Masters to former Commodities Future Trading Commission staffer and derivatives expert Michael Greenberg concluded that the underlying supply-and-demand fundamentals couldn’t account for the sharp rise in prices. In the first six months of 2008, US economic output was declining while global supply was increasing. And even if supply and demand were, over the long run, pushing the price of oil up, that alone couldn’t explain the massive volatility in the market. Oil cost $65 per barrel in June 2007, $147 a year later, down to $30 in December 2008 and back up to $72 in June 2009. The culprits, they concluded, were Wall Street speculators. Commodities markets involve essentially two kinds of participants: there are so-called “end users” like farmers and airlines that use commodities markets as a form of insurance against future price fluctuations, and then there are speculators—hedge funds, investors, big banks that try to make money by correctly betting on those same price fluctuations. The presence of these speculators isn’t in and of itself a bad thing; in fact, they bring liquidity that should, in theory, make the market more efficient. According to an analysis by the House Energy Committee’s Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, in 2000, physical hedgers, trucking companies, farmers, bakers, made up 63 percent of the crude oil futures markets, with speculators accounting for the rest. By 2008, those proportions had basically flipped. Of course, the Wall Street banks say there’s nothing to see here, but that’s hard to believe. It’s almost impossible to make sense of 2008’s massive commodity price spike without concluding that the speculators played an outsized role. When enough money floods into a booming market, Greenberger says it can “unmoor” the prices of commodities from their underlying supply-and-demand fundamentals. The basic mechanism by which this might happen should be familiar; it’s the same principle that drove the housing market bubble or the tech stock boom. When a bunch of people think the price of a stock is going to go up, they rush to buy it so they can realize the imminent gains. Of course, a surge of demand itself pushes the price up and the price cycles upwards until it pops. The difference being, no one puts Pets.com in their cars, trucks and airplanes. “The most conservative thing that can be said right now [is that] this would be no time to dismiss the role that speculation plays,” says Greenberger. ” A moderate statement is that speculation is creating volatility that is aggravating the uncertainty in the market. If you start talking to industry people, they’re pulling their hair out. American Bakers Association is going bananas. They all believe that the markets are going screwy because of Wall Street.” A host of businesses and organizations from Virgin’s Richard Branson to Oxfam all make the same case.

#### empirics disprove war

Pickering 7 – Assistant Professor of Political Science at Kansas State University (Jeffrey, Emizet F. Kisangani, “Diverting with Benevolent Military Force: Reducing Risks and Rising above Strategic Behavior,” International Studies Quarterly 51, 277–299, JSTOR)

Our results underscore the utility of broadening the conception of diversionary force and using the agenda setting framework to understand leaders’ decisions to divert. As the agenda setting approach anticipates, we find that leaders in democracies and mixed regimes tend to prefer a comparatively low-risk, low-profile type of military force when they attempt diversion. They use what we term SEI in their attempt to clear the domestic policy agenda. They presumably hope that the use of such seemingly controllable, low-scale force will provide a brief reprieve from the public and the media’s focus on issues that have damaged their political reputations and threatened their terms in office. If low politics force succeeds in providing leaders with the window they seek, they can be expected to do all they can to reshape the policy agenda in the hope of saving their political careers. Autocratic leaders, in contrast, do not appear to use any form of external armed force to bolster their domestic standing when they encounter domestic unrest or economic difficulty. Our results also highlight the need for further theoretical development of the SCA framework. In our cross-national sample of democracies, SCA does not seem to constrain democratic leaders to the extent that is implied in the literature. For example, we find no evidence that SCA prevents democratic leaders from using PSI, and democratic leaders often used SEI even when SCA was present (see especially Table 5). The only time SCA seems to obstruct democratic leaders is when they attempt SEI in the face of rising levels of inflation or mass unrest. We did not expect target states to be able to employ SCA to inhibit SEI, but this result at least provides some evidence for the theoretically compelling and logical influence of SCA on democracies. This outcome and the unanticipated influence of SCA on autocracies suggest that the SCA framework requires greater precision. As noted previously, adding measures that capture extant relations or affinity levels among potential actors and targets may enhance the explanatory power of SCA. Another possibility is that we are trying to generalize a phenomenon that has limited scope. It may be that target states only worry about diversion from extremely powerful states and perhaps some unstable, unpredictable autocracies, which might explain why David Clark (2003) and Benjamin Fordham’s (2005) results diverge from those found in this paper and by Christopher Sprecher and Karl DeRouen (2005). Careful empirical study will have to determine if this is the case, and if it is not why SCA appears to constrain certain types of actors experiencing certain types of domestic troubles but not others. Different methods will have to be used to pinpoint the prevalence and the impact of SCA. While powerful and suggestive, the ZIP method is based on a theoretical assumption: that SCA is the exogenous influence that prevents leaders from using military force. Although this is plausible and the evidence presented by David Clark (2003) and Benjamin Fordham (2005) is extremely compelling for the United States case, there could be other exogenous influences that have similar effects on leaders in other countries. Powerful opposition parties (Schultz 1998) or increasing tensions or instability within the government itself could, for example, tie leaders’ hands in a way that prevents the use of military force. Given the significant institutional variation that characterizes democracies and mixed regimes across the globe, both detailed qualitative and country-specific quantitative analyses will be necessary to trace the empirical boundaries of SCA and to refine the theory. In sum, this paper adds to the growing body of literature that suggests that leaders in democracies and mixed regimes use armed forces overseas for diversionary purposes. It just may not be the type of high profile, confrontational military force we typically envision. It is often armed force deployed over low politics issues like humanitarian suffering. Making this simple distinction between the types of armed force states use abroad may go some way toward uniting extant empirical research on diversion and perhaps even producing more cumulative research in the future.

#### High food prices increase agricultural investment - holistically solves for hunger better. Err negative - historically low food prices haven’t decreased hunger or poverty

Kharas 8 (Homi, The Economist Debate: Rising food prices, The Proposition’s closing statement, <http://www.economist.com/debate/index.cfm?action=article&debate_id=10&story_id=11829068>)

Images of food riots and hungry people stir deep emotions. But we must debate trade-offs: will the rise in food prices generate more food for the world and less poverty for poor people in the future? Are today’s food prices fair to producers and consumers? Yes, **because higher food prices will bring about new investments in agriculture and higher** global production. This is already happening in Asia and other parts of the world, **and will accelerate over time**. Yes, because without higher **food prices, land use would shift towards** corn-for-**ethanol** and other biofuel crops **and we would have less food available**. Yes, because **a system with food prices in free fall for 30 years did not produce any measurable decline in hunger and poverty.** But the last time food prices were as high as they are today we witnessed the Green Revolution and a rapid reduction of rural poverty in one of the largest population centres of the world, South Asia.

#### No famine – the poorest are insulated from global markets

Paarlberg 8 (Robert, Professor of Political Science – Wellesley College, “It's Not the Price that Causes Hunger”, The International Herald Tribune, 4-23, Lexis)

International prices of rice, wheat and corn have risen sharply, setting off violent urban protests in roughly a dozen countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America. But is this a ''world food crisis?'' It is certainly a troubling instance of price instability in international commodity markets, leading to social unrest among urban food-buyers. But we must be careful not to equate high crop prices with hunger around the world. Most of the world's hungry people do not use international food markets, and most of those who use these markets are not hungry. International food markets, like international markets for everything else, are used primarily by the prosperous and secure, not the poor and vulnerable. In world corn markets, the biggest importer by far is Japan. Next comes the European Union. Next comes South Korea. Citizens in these countries are not underfed. In the poor countries of Asia, rice is the most important staple , yet most Asian countries import very little rice. As recently as March , India was keeping imported rice out of the country by imposing a 70 percent duty. Data on the actual incidence of malnutrition reveal that the regions of the world where people are most hungry, in South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa, are those that depend least on imports from the world market. Hunger is caused in these countries not by high international food prices, but by local conditions, especially rural poverty linked to low productivity in farming. When international prices are go up, the disposable income of some import-dependent urban dwellers is squeezed. But most of the actual hunger takes place in the villages and in the countryside , and it persists even when international prices are low. When hunger is measured as a balanced index of calorie deficiency, prevalence of underweight children and mortality rates for children under five, we find that South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa in 2007 had hunger levels two times as high as in the developing countries of East Asia, four times as high as in Latin America, North Africa or the Middle East, and five times as high as in Eastern Europe and Central Asia. The poor in South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa are hungry even though their connections to high-priced international food markets are quite weak. In the poorest developing countries of Asia, where nearly 400 million people are hungry, international grain prices are hardly a factor, since imports supply only 4 percent of total consumption - even when world prices are low. Similarly in sub-Saharan Africa, only about 16 percent of grain supplies have recently been imported, going mostly into the more prosperous cities rather than the impoverished countryside, with part arriving in the form of donated food aid rather than commercial purchases at world prices. The region in Africa that depends on world markets most heavily is North Africa, where 50 percent of grain supplies are imported. Yet food consumption in North Africa is so high (average per capita energy consumption there is about 3,000 calories per day, comparable to most rich countries) that increased import prices may cause economic stress for urban consumers (and perhaps even street demonstrations) but little real hunger. Import dependence is also high in Latin America (50 percent for some countries) but again high world prices will not mean large numbers of hungry people, because per capita GDP in this region is five times higher than in sub-Saharan Africa. There is a severe food crisis among the poor in South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa, but it does not come from high world prices. Even in 2005 in sub-Saharan Africa, a year of low international crop prices, 23 out of 37 countries in the region consumed less than their nutritional requirements. Africa's food crisis grows primarily out of the low productivity, year in and year out, of the 60 percent of all Africans who plant crops and graze animals for a living. The average African smallholder farmer is a woman who has no improved seeds, no nitrogen fertilizers, no irrigation and no veterinary medicine for her animals. Her crop yields are only one third as high as in the developing countries of Asia, and her average income is only $1 a day.

#### Food wars are a myth – there’s zero empirical evidence

Salehyan 7 (Idean, Professor of Political Science – University of North Texas, “The New Myth About Climate Change”, Foreign Policy, Summer, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/story/cms.php?story\_id=3922)

First, aside from a few anecdotes, there is little systematic empirical evidence that resource scarcity and changing environmental conditions lead to conflict. In fact, several studies have shown that an abundance of natural resources is more likely to contribute to conflict. Moreover, even as the planet has warmed, the number of civil wars and insurgencies has decreased dramatically. Data collected by researchers at Uppsala University and the International Peace Research Institute, Oslo shows a steep decline in the number of armed conflicts around the world. Between 1989 and 2002, some 100 armed conflicts came to an end, including the wars in Mozambique, Nicaragua, and Cambodia. If global warming causes conflict, we should not be witnessing this downward trend. Furthermore, if famine and drought led to the crisis in Darfur, why have scores of environmental catastrophes failed to set off armed conflict elsewhere? For instance, the U.N. World Food Programme warns that 5 million people in Malawi have been experiencing chronic food shortages for several years. But famine-wracked Malawi has yet to experience a major civil war. Similarly, the Asian tsunami in 2004 killed hundreds of thousands of people, generated millions of environmental refugees, and led to severe shortages of shelter, food, clean water, and electricity. Yet the tsunami, one of the most extreme catastrophes in recent history, did not lead to an outbreak of resource wars. Clearly then, there is much more to armed conflict than resource scarcity and natural disasters.

#### No Russia war

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 US-Sino war

Rosecrance et al 10 (Richard, Political Science Professor @ Cal and Senior Fellow @ Harvard’s Belfer Center and Former Director @ Burkle Center of IR @ UCLA, and Jia Qingguo, PhD Cornell, Professor and Associate Dean of School of International Studies @ Peking University, “Delicately Poised: Are China and the US Heading for Conflict?” Global Asia 4.4, <http://www.globalasia.org/l.php?c=e251>)

Will China and the US Go to War? If one accepts the previous analysis, the answer is “no,” or at least not likely. Why? First, despite its revolutionary past, China has gradually accepted the US-led world order and become a status quo power. It has joined most of the important inter-governmental international organizations. It has subscribed to most of the important international laws and regimes. It has not only accepted the current world order, it has become a strong supporter and defender of it. China has repeatedly argued that the authority of the United Nations and international law should be respected in the handling of international security crises. China has become an ardent advocate of multilateralism in managing international problems. And China has repeatedly defended the principle of free trade in the global effort to fight the current economic crisis, despite efforts by some countries, including the US, to resort to protectionism. To be sure, there are some aspects of the US world order that China does not like and wants to reform. However, it wishes to improve that world order rather than to destroy it. Second, China has clearly rejected the option of territorial expansion. It argues that territorial expansion is both immoral and counterproductive: immoral because it is imperialistic and counterproductive because it does not advance one’s interests. China’s behavior shows that instead of trying to expand its territories, it has been trying to settle its border disputes through negotiation. Through persistent efforts, China has concluded quite a number of border agreements in recent years. As a result, most of its land borders are now clearly drawn and marked under agreements with its neighbors. In addition, China is engaging in negotiations to resolve its remaining border disputes and making arrangements for peaceful settlement of disputed islands and territorial waters. Finally, even on the question of Taiwan, which China believes is an indisputable part of its territory, it has adopted a policy of peaceful reunification. A country that handles territorial issues in such a manner is by no means expansionist. Third, China has relied on trade and investment for national welfare and prestige, instead of military conquest. And like the US, Japan and Germany, China has been very successful in this regard. In fact, so successful that it really sees no other option than to continue on this path to prosperity. Finally, after years of reforms, China increasingly finds itself sharing certain basic values with the US, such as a commitment to the free market, rule of law, human rights and democracy. Of course, there are still significant differences in terms of how China understands and practices these values. However, at a conceptual level, Beijing agrees that these are good values that it should strive to realize in practice. A Different World It is also important to note that certain changes in international relations since the end of World War II have made the peaceful rise of a great power more likely. To begin with, the emergence of nuclear weapons has drastically reduced the usefulness of war as a way to settle great power rivalry. By now, all great powers either have nuclear weapons or are under a nuclear umbrella. If the objective of great power rivalry is to enhance one’s interests or prestige, the sheer destructiveness of nuclear weapons means that these goals can no longer be achieved through military confrontation. Under these circumstances, countries have to find other ways to accommodate each other — something that China and the US have been doing and are likely to continue to do. Also, globalization has made it easier for great powers to increase their national welfare and prestige through international trade and investment rather than territorial expansion. In conducting its foreign relations, the US relied more on trade and investment than territorial expansion during its rise, while Japan and Germany relied almost exclusively on international trade and investment. China, too, has found that its interests are best served by adopting the same approach. Finally, the development of relative pacifism in the industrialized world, and indeed throughout the world since World War II, has discouraged any country from engaging in territorial expansion. There is less and less popular support for using force to address even legitimate concerns on the part of nation states. Against this background, efforts to engage in territorial expansion are likely to rally international resistance and condemnation. Given all this, is the rise of China likely to lead to territorial expansion and war with the US? The answer is no.

# 2NC

## Keystone

### Turns

#### Cooperation with China is key to continued U.S. leadership in Asia

Pollack 1.(Jonathon A., US Naval War College, American Perceptions of Chinese Military Power, 1-11 http://www.nwc.navy.mil/apsg/papers/Chinese%20Military%20Power2.htm)

Slowly but inexorably, the Chinese are acquiring the requisite military capabilities that will enable Beijing to assume a more pivotal role in shaping the future security contours of East Asia. These capabilities are not fully realized at present, nor would they automatically translate into a more assertive state intent on intimidating its neighbors. But the emergence of China as a more capable military power is a core component of East Asia’s ineluctable strategic realignment. China seems determined to assume what it sees as its rightful place in the regional political and security order. Its position will be rooted both in its future military capabilities and in the political-economic role it has already begun to assume throughout the region, including with important U.S. allies and security partners. These developments underscore the centrality of future U.S.-Chinese relations to the regional order as a whole. The United States has substantial incentives to seek larger security understandings with Beijing, given that China will ultimately have the capability to challenge or to complicate American strategic primacy in East Asia. American policymakers have yet to achieve closure on how best to ensure long term U.S. interests in a region of genuine strategic import to the United States, but where U.S. strategy cannot reflexively assume (as in Europe) a coalition of the like minded. Nor is there a clear consensus on what the United States deems within the legitimate scope of China’s future military capabilities, or whether both countries will prove able to reconcile their respective security interests over the longer run. The United States hopes to preserve its current strategic advantage, which presumes the absence of a major power adversary (or adversaries) who by intention, action, or capability could put U.S. vital interests at risk. The pivotal policy question, therefore, is how to retain America’s existing advantage without incurring strategy and resource commitments that are neither warranted nor sustainable. This will require a prudent hedging option, but without this option proving self-fulfilling. In essence, the United States seeks fallback without lock in. A benign outcome with China, though clearly preferable, cannot be assumed. But an insurance strategy in relation to China must not render meaningful security collaboration with Beijing impossible. Squaring this circle will remain among the preeminent international challenges the United States will face in the decades to come.

**China cooperation on North Korea key to prevent regional prolif and war**

**Mead 5.** [Walter Russell, Senior Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, “Should Nukes bloom in Asia? Rapid Change in the Region has Washington Engaged in a Dizzying Display of Diplomacy” Los Angeles Times -- June 19 -- lexis]

The idea -- not yet a threat -- is that unless North Korea dismantles its nuclear program, Japan, South Korea and even Taiwan might go nuclear in the not-so-distant future. The United States has intimated that although it would not aid or support any nuclear proliferation, it would be unable to control its allies' ambitions, just as China can't restrain North Korea's program. Bush officials have repeated this message. China is the only country that can pressure North Korea to give up its nukes. Only China has the carrots and sticks that the North Koreans respect. Without China, no progress is possible. If North Korea stays nuclear, the region will respond in ways that China will hate. With China's and India's power growing, North Korea rattling its nukes, Japan becoming more nationalistic and South Korea reconsidering its relations with the U.S., this once-stable part of the world is in flux. A nuclear arms race across East Asia would be hugely dangerous and destabilizing. Far better that the Bush administration convince China that the wiser course is to prevent a nuke race by telling Pyongyang the time has come for a deal.

#### Strong relations key to the global economy

Summers, 99 -- Treasury secretary

[Lawrence, "The United States and China at the Dawn of a New Century," FDCH Federal Department and Agency Documents, l/n, accessed 2-10-13, mss]

**There is little doubt** that **a constructive** bilateral **relationship** **between the U**nited **S**tates **and China will be critical to the** shape and prosperity of the 21st century **global economy**. China will choose its own destiny. But by working with China as it reforms, by expanding our areas of cooperation and by dealing forthrightly with our differences - in all of these ways we can advance fundamental American interests and values. Principled and successful United States engagement with China in the years ahead will involve a wide range of concerns that are not strictly economic: from combating global warming and nuclear proliferation, to global aviation regulation, to expanding our people-to-people ties. For our part the Treasury Department will be working, at the upcoming JEC and in other fora to strengthen our cooperation on international law enforcement issues such as money laundering, and we will also be continuing to call on China to observe the terms of the Memorandum of Understanding and Statement of Cooperation on prison labor. Beyond these issues, what will be most important for China's economic future will be the approach we adopt toward the closer integration of China with the global trading system. Many see a rising economy with millions of poor people within its borders as a threat to American economic interests. And starting from this perspective, they worry about the implications of such a country becoming more integrated with our own markets. This Administration - and all of those who have supported, on a bipartisan basis, China's closer integration with the world trading system for well over a decade - perceive it rather differently. Of course, it is important to ensure in our relations with China that our commercial interests are protected. But to seek to contain China economically - to keep it poor and to isolate it from our markets - is to see our long-term core interests precisely backwards. The truth is that an open and prosperous China will best promote our national commercial interests - and it will best promote our broader national economic and security interests: It will open an enormous export market to our producers and our farmers. Even the limited opening that has already occurred has quadrupled our exports to China in the past decade, to the point where an estimated 400,000 American jobs now depend on them. It will support faster growth in productivity and wages in China - and thus faster real living standards and higher demand for our products in the future. And, as I have described, it will provide a catalyst for broad economic and institutional change that could help China in the 21st century become the open, stable and prosperous observer of global norms that we would all like to see.

### Uq/IL

#### Obama will approve Keystone now, but the environmental politics matter to him

Simpson, 2-9 -- Globe and Mail staff

[Jeffrey, "Is Keystone XL Obama’s line in the sand?" Globe and Mail, 2-9-13, www.theglobeandmail.com/commentary/is-keystone-xl-obamas-line-in-the-sand/article8410518/, accessed 2-9-13, mss]

Once re-elected, Canadian governments presumed Mr. Obama would approve Keystone – and, on balance, he probably still will. **But** his speech sent a frisson of apprehension through Canada and the private companies backing the project. Mr. Obama had delayed a decision on Keystone before the election, despite Prime Minister Stephen Harper’s saying U.S. approval should be a “no-brainer.” Mr. Obama actually has a brain and, like Mr. Harper, he has political antennae. Just as Mr. Harper nixed a foreign takeover of Potash Corp. of Saskatchewan for largely political reasons, Mr. Obama delayed Keystone **to please environmentalists** who’d supported him. Now, as then, **the President’s decision will swirl around politics**. TransCanada Pipelines, Keystone’s proponent, has changed the route in Nebraska, thereby bringing the Republican governor onside. Trade unions, a key part of the Democrats’ constituency, want the jobs and economic spinoffs Keystone would bring. Fifty-five senators, including nine Democrats, signed a letter urging Mr. Obama to approve the project. Oil from Canada, bitumen or otherwise, is deemed by foreign-policy analysts to be more “secure” than that from elsewhere. If Alberta oil didn’t make it to the Gulf of Mexico refineries, oil from somewhere else would arrive. Canada is safe, reliable and friendly. Who could ask for anything more? So foreign-policy considerations plus parts of the Democratic Party coalition would suggest that Keystone will get the nod, if not soon then perhaps by midyear. And yet, what about those inaugural sentences? The largest U.S. environmental groups overwhelmingly oppose Keystone, although the journal Nature recently said bitumen oil isn’t as dirty as critics say and thus the pipeline should go ahead. **These groups**, who hailed Mr. Obama’s pre-election delay, supported him on voting day and still do. They **expect payback**. And what about the new Secretary of State, John Kerry? He spent years in the Senate railing against greenhouse-gas emissions, sponsoring bills and urging action. His department has to make a recommendation to the President, who is free to ignore or accept it. In one ear, he will hear the national security arguments for Keystone and the negative impact its rejection would have on relations with the Harper government; in the other, he will hear echoes of his own words as a senator. (He was non-committal on Friday after meeting Foreign Affairs Minister John Baird in Washington.)

#### Obama will green-light Keystone now- environmental cover key

Cattaneo, 2-9 -- Financial Post staff, citing an Obama policy advisor

[Claudia, "Why Obama will okay XL," 2-9-13, National Post, l/n, accessed 2-9-13, mss]

The first step is his State of the Union Address on Tuesday, when he is expected to talk about how he plans to address climate change. After introducing the subject in his Inaugural Speech, the president is expected to be more specific about tough new regulation to curb carbon emissions in the power sector, a move that is opposed by the coal industry. While some may interpret the tough talk on carbon as bad news for Keystone, **his game plan** could be the opposite. Being tough on coal-fired power plants "is going to be the build-up to making a positive decision on Keystone," the policy advisor said. The unrecognized silver lining in the recent appointment of climate change hawk John Kerry as Secretary of State is that he has enough environmental movement legitimacy that he can defend a Keystone XL approval, the advisor said.

### Link UNQ – Frontline

#### Enviros on board with Obama now- inaugural

Sheppard, 1-23 -- staff reporter Mother Jones' Washington bureau

[Kate, "Does Obama Mean It This Time on Climate?" Mother Jones, 1-23-13, www.motherjones.com/environment/2013/01/does-obama-mean-it-time-climate, accessed 2-10-13, mss]

President Obama **pleased**—and surprised—many environmentalists with his remarks on climate change in his second inaugural speech on Monday. "We will respond to the threat of climate change, knowing that the failure to do so would betray our children and future generations," Obama said. "Some may still deny the overwhelming judgment of science, but none can avoid the devastating impact of raging fires, and crippling drought, and more powerful storms." It wasn't just a fleeting mention, an obligatory nod to climate change alongside a host of other base-pleasing agenda items. In a short, 2000-word, 15-minute speech, Obama used nine separate sentences to lay out his belief that dealing with climate and finding sustainable energy sources are an obligation to posterity. "I was pleasantly surprised," says Felice Stadler, senior director of the climate and energy program at the National Wildlife Federation. "It was the first time that we heard a **clear signal** from him that he believes in the science."

### Resilient

#### Relations improving but still vulnerable

Laurson, 13 -- International Affairs Forum editor-at-large

[Jens, and George Pieler, attorney, "U.S. And China: Perfect Together In 2013?" Forbes, 1-16-13, www.forbes.com/sites/laursonpieler/2013/01/16/u-s-and-china-perfect-together-in-2013/, accessed 2-10-13, mss]

China is easing its restrictions on foreign investment and the grip on its currency. The minimum threshold for foreign investment has dropped to $500 million, the minimum holding period reduced to two years, and Hong Kong banks are allowed to lend renminbi at market rates to companies set up in a special economic zone. These are small steps, but prudent ones, in the right direction of freer markets. Together with noises from the Chinese Politiburo about relaxing political vetoes on investment abroad, they allow the dim perception of a day when China might be open to foreign investment. It fits this picture that Chinese investment in the U.S. (foreign direct investment, not purchases of U.S. debt) rose 12% in 2012 and may hit a new record in 2013… albeit from the low base of one percent of all FDI into the US. It goes both ways: in 2012 the U.S. announced $3.4 billion of bilateral cross-border investment. Some Chinese investments in the U.S. come from state-owned companies; some of the U.S. investments go to Chinese political jurisdictions—not surprising given the Chinese government’s determination to carefully manage all foreign investment and international commerce. U.S.-China economic relations aren’t all rosy, though. Aside from the perennial U.S. complaints about China manipulating the value of the renminbi to promote exports (the same might be said of the U.S. and its Quantitative Easing), China and the U.S. accuse each other of unfair export subsidies: China calls the whole GM bailout one massive subsidy, and they have a point. The U.S. in turn accuses China of slapping improper duties on American auto imports. Chinese holdings of Treasury debt (of which there is always a lot to buy) are ever-present in debates on budget and trade. China’s sidestepping of Western rules on intellectual property are a permanent source of friction. But the real concern is the risk that the U.S. and China might meet-in-the-middle on the matter of foreign direct investment: China allowing more of it, but the U.S. discouraging it from China. Security concerns in the U.S. have slowed Chinese investment, as witness the Treasury review of the planned sale of A123, the American battery maker that got a big Obama stimulus grant. Treasury regulations implementing the Foreign Account Tax Compliance Act (FATCA) will scare off some foreign investors because of a 30% penalty(effective in 2014) on firms that don’t wish to lay open their books completely to the IRS (to fish for U.S.-based account holders). The U.S.’s high corporate tax rate (35%,creeping toward 40%) remains uncompetitive when the OECD average is around 25% (China’s is 25%). Though, because the U.S. is still seen safe for investment, one might think worries about tax and regulatory moves that discourage investment at the margin are distinctly non-urgent. But that can change quickly, as the 2007-2008 real estate bust showed. Right now the U.S. is a safe-haven from economic and political turbulence in Europe and the Middle East, and for both political and economic reasons a more secure bet than China, especially now that China’s economy is slowing. Brazil and Russia, meanwhile, depend heavily on high energy prices to drive growth. There is a compelling logic to politically motivated cream-skimming aimed at foreign investment. But a more prudent course for both the U.S. and China is to encourage as much outside investment as possible, with as little state interference as possible. China should accelerate and expand its liberal-ish economic experiments by encouraging foreign capital investment. The People’s Republic should let the Hong Kong exchanges trade freely in a wide range of investment vehicles without regard to investor nationality. The U.S., for its part, should relax its FATCA regulations and might think about cutting its corporate tax rate. A little less demagoguery about exporting jobs and currency manipulations wouldn’t hurt, either. One hopeful sign: The Obama administration has promulgated a new model Bilateral Investment Treaty that, despite extraneous regulatory baggage it comes with, could well **help guide U.S.-China efforts** in the direct of more, not less, open investment across borders. Launching treaty talks with Beijing based on that model would be a smart move for the U.S. in 2013.

## Cp

### Solvency Frontline

#### There’s no quantifiable solvency deficit- only comparative evidence

Markey, 12 -- Rep., House Committee on Natural Resources ranking member

[Edward, "Hearing on Offshore Drilling," CQ Transcriptions, 5-9-12, l/n, accessed 1-31-13, mss]

The majority has also opposed Democratic efforts to get oil companies to start drilling on the leases they already have. Oil companies already hold the offshore drilling rights to **an area the size of Kentucky** on which they are not producing a single barrel of oil. Last year, the Interior Department found that there was **nearly as much** oil and more natural gas under these nonproducing leases -- nonproducing because the oil companies refuse to drill on them, **than we could ever get** from drilling up and down the East and West Coasts of the United States.

#### Idled wells contain a massive amount of natural gas

Barkoff, 11 -- DOI press secretary, citing DOI reports

[Kendra, "DOI Releases Report on Unused Oil and Gas Leases," Department of the Interior, 3-29-11, www.doi.gov/news/pressreleases/DOI-Releases-Report-on-Unused-Oil-and-Gas-Leases.cfm, accessed 1-31-13, mss]

A report requested by President Obama and released today by the Department of the Interior shows that more than two-thirds of offshore leases in the Gulf of Mexico and more than half of onshore leases on federal lands remain idle, neither producing nor under active exploration and development by companies who hold those leases. “We continue to support safe and responsible domestic energy production, and as this report shows millions of acres that have already been leased to industry for oil and gas productions sit idle,” Department of Interior Secretary Ken Salazar said. “These are resources that belong to the American people, and they expect those supplies to be developed in a timely and responsible manner and with a fair return to taxpayers. As we continue to offer new areas onshore and offshore for leasing, as we have done over the last two years, we will also be exploring ways to provide incentives to companies to bring production online quickly and safely.” According to the report, more than 70 percent of the tens of millions of offshore acres under lease are inactive, neither producing nor currently subject to approved or pending exploration or development plans. This includes almost 24 million inactive leased acres in the Gulf of Mexico, which potentially could hold more than 11 billion barrels of oil and **50 trillion cubic feet of natural gas.**

#### Speeding production on idle well solves certainty and signal

McKillip, 11 -- Heritage staff

[Matthew, "Drilling Delays Inspire New Proposal to Reform Permitting Process," 3-17-11, blog.heritage.org/2011/03/17/drilling-delays-inspire-new-proposal-to-reform-permitting-process/, accessed 1-31-13, mss]

“It’s time we put the Gulf of Mexico back to work and **restore stability and certainty** from unlocking access and tapping into the **vast amounts** of taxpayer-owned resources **that currently sit idle,**” Flores said. “By establishing more stringent deadlines and other requirements for the offshore drilling permitting process, we may work to **restore certainty** in offshore oil and gas development.”

### A2 Not Idle – Exploration/Development

#### AND- this is just an industry lie- DOI data proves

Weiss, 12 -- Center for American Progress Action Fund climate strategy director

[Daniel, "Dept. Of Interior Finds 72 Percent Of Offshore Acreage Leased By The Oil Industry Is ‘Idle’," Climate Progress, 5-15-12, thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/05/15/484558/dept-of-interior-finds-nearly-two-thirds-of-acreage-leased-by-the-oil-industry-lies-idle/, accessed 1-31-13, mss]

The Department of Interior released an updated analysis of fossil fuel leases today, finding that more than two thirds of offshore leases and half of onshore leases are sitting idle — “neither producing **nor under active exploration.”** The report, “Oil and Gas Lease Utilization, Onshore and Offshore Updated Report to the President,” explained that oil and gas companies hold thousands of undeveloped leases. Despite holding these inactive leases, the oil industry continues to demand the opening of new, previously protected federal lands and waters areas to drilling. The report found that: More than 70 percent of the tens of millions of offshore acres currently under lease are inactive, neither producing nor currently subject to approved or pending exploration or development plans. Out of nearly 36 million acres leased offshore, only about 10 million acres are active – leaving nearly 72 percent of the offshore leased area idle. In the lower 48 states, an additional 20.8 million acres, or 56 percent of onshore leased acres, remain idle. Furthermore, there are approximately 7,000 approved permits for drilling on federal and Indian lands that have not yet been drilled by companies. According to the Energy Information Administration, total federal oil production (offshore and onshore) has increased by 13 percent during the first three years of the Obama administration combined, compared with the last three years of the previous administration. According to independent analysis, the total number of active rigs operating on the U.S. outer continental shelf was higher in January 2012 than any time since May 2010. The American Petroleum Institute – Big Oil’s lobbying arm — claims that the Department of Interior ignores exploratory work on leases; **however, that is clearly included in DOI’s assessment** above.

## Solvency

### EXTN: Misinformation

#### Fossil fuel lobby pays millions for fake research- makes it impossible to assign truth value to the aff

Safina, 12 -- Stony Brook University‘s School of Marine and Atmospheric Sciences professor

[Carl, SBU Center for Communicating Science professor, PhD in ecology from Rutgers University, honorary doctorates from Long Island University and the State University of New York, MacArthur Fellow, n elected member of The Explorers Club, World Wildlife Fund Senior Fellow, a recipient of the Pew Scholar’s Award in Conservation and the Environment, and a recipient of Chicago’s Brookfield Zoo’s Rabb Medal, "Opposition to Clean Energy," Blue Ocean Institute, 6-30-12, blueocean.org/issues/opposition-to-clean-energy/, accessed 2-6-13, mss]

Given the negative impact of fossil fuels on so many aspects of modern life, who resists a clean energy future? To paraphrase Upton Sinclair: It is difficult to get a man to support something, when his salary depends upon his not supporting it. Big industries stand to lose business if clean energy succeeds. These are stalwart, multinational, trillion dollar businesses, some over a hundred years in the making. Their desire to maintain the dirty fossil fuel status quo at the expense of the health of people everywhere is **never to be underestimated**. Electric utilities, oil, gas, and mining industries spent over $500 million on lobbying between 2009 and 2010. That is big money but it pales in comparison to the trillions of dollars out there to be made in these industries. Exxon Mobil alone made over $40 billion in 2010. With this much at stake these industries will not stop telling us that we must accept their pollution if we want jobs, prosperity, and energy security. The fossil fuel industry uses any number of methods to keep their world intact including **untruths**, savvy PR and spin campaigns, **paid scientists,** generous contributions to elected officials — **all intended to** cast doubt, raise fear, and when in doubt, **obfuscate**. It is an ongoing war with numerous skirmishes and battles. The oil and gas industry spent $179 million in 2011 to ensure that legislation designed to fight climate change failed. Koch Industries, one of the largest fossil fuel conglomerates in the world, owned and operated by the Koch brothers, also paid scientists and others $24.9 million from 2005 to 2008 to deny climate change. Fossil fuel lobbyists and politicians from states with much vested in fossil fuels and who have accepted campaign contributions from the fossil fuel industry would have us believe that climate change is some grand conspiracy or that cleaning the dirty smoke from say, a coal plant, costs too much, or that solar power is infeasible. Front groups, think thanks, and non-profits like the American Legislature Exchange Council and the Americans for Prosperity receive money and support from the Koch brothers and others to spread doubt, fear, and denial in direct opposition to innovation and progress toward a clean energy future. Many elected officials who receive contributions and support from the fossil fuel industry consistently attempt to dismantle landmark anti-pollution legislation such as the Clean Air Act and undermine the Environmental Protection Agency from doing its job. Everything is in play, too. The American Coal Foundation likes to start them young. The foundation was recently ordered to remove books that it had given to elementary schools across the country. The books were supposed to tell the story of the coal industry but the story was too good to be true: negative details of the coal industry such as pollution and destructive mining were omitted. It is tiresome, sometimes, to engage in this kind of nonsense. It is exasperating. The tendency is to just leave it be. That is exactly what the opposition hopes. Vigilance, awareness, and **skepticism** with a good dose of determination **is** unfortunately sometimes **necessary**. The stakes are too high. Healthy oceans and healthy people depend on it.

#### Offshore drilling is a part of that hoax- empirical exploration proves there’s no gas

Berry, 8 -- Bloomberg News columnist

[John, "Offshore Drilling Claims Are a Political Hoax," Bloomberg, 8-1-8, www.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=newsarchive&sid=air.\_Othgtuc, accessed 2-6-13, mss]

**Offshore Drilling Claims Are a Political Hoax**

It's absurd to argue that ending the moratorium on drilling off parts of the U.S. coasts would quickly bring down the high price of gasoline. This chimera is being touted by President George W. Bush and other Republican politicians, including the party's presumptive presidential nominee, Senator John McCain of Arizona, to deflect blame for what it's costing for a fill-up. To get around the fact that it would be a decade or more before any oil would be likely to flow, a few partisan analysts have said that the cost of gasoline would fall right away. They argue that the prospect of additional oil supply in the future would lead oil companies to produce more oil immediately because they would expect prices for crude to be lower later on. Well, wouldn't that depend on whether a producer had the capacity to pump more oil today, and whether it thought lifting the moratorium would add a significant amount of oil to future supply relative to future demand? There are good reasons to question whether another 1 million or 2 million barrels of crude a day would make much difference in prices when world consumption is running at 85 million barrels a day. About a fourth of all U.S. oil production is already coming from offshore wells, primarily in the central and western portions of the Gulf of Mexico that aren't covered by the moratorium. In a May 2007 forecast, the Interior Department's Minerals Management Service, which oversees exploration and drilling on the outer continental shelf, said that oil production in the Gulf was likely to increase from 1.3 million barrels a day last year to about 2 million barrels by 2010. Ignored Forecast In other words, production was expected to rise by about 700,000 barrels a day over a three-year period. That would be a gain of about 14 percent over the 5.1 million barrels produced daily last year in the U.S. Yet somehow that sort of forecast based on industry projections and announced discoveries had no discernable impact on world crude oil prices. Why would anyone assume that opening other coastal areas -- which may or may not harbor large quantities of oil that might or might not be economic to produce sometime in the future -- will have an immediate impact on today's oil prices? Nevertheless, the assertions continue: lift the moratorium and gasoline prices will fall. And since McCain's Democratic opponent, Senator Barack Obama of Illinois, is opposed to ending the moratorium, he therefore is responsible for high gasoline prices. Drilling proponents point to an estimate from the Minerals Management Service that there are probably about 76 billion barrels of oil waiting to be discovered offshore. The problem is that little of that oil -- perhaps about 18 billion barrels -- lies in areas subject to the moratorium. A third of the total is off the coast of Alaska, where drilling is extraordinarily difficult and expensive, and most of the rest is in the Gulf of Mexico where drilling is permitted. Some 3.5 billion barrels in the Minerals Management Service estimate are off the Atlantic coast in the Baltimore Canyon, an ideal geologic formation in which to find oil. It runs from east of Cape Cod all the way to North Carolina. Beginning in the late 1970s, huge tracts were opened for exploration and oil companies jumped at the chance to drill. About 35 wells were sunk off Cape Cod, New York and New Jersey at a cost, including purchases of the leases, of almost $3 billion. **The result? Nothing.** Neither oil nor gas was found. Giving Up Another ideal formation, the Destin Dome, in the eastern Gulf Coast area off Pensacola, Florida, was another major disappointment. Exxon Mobil Corp. spent heavily to acquire leases and found no commercial quantities of oil or gas in what became known as ``Dusty Dome.''

### EXTN: Worker Shortages

#### No workers now- demand alone can’t solve

Block and Brady, 12 -- NPR staff

[Melissa, and Jeff, "Booming Oil Industry Struggles To Fill Jobs," 5-9-12, www.npr.org/2012/05/09/152366886/booming-oil-industry-struggles-to-fill-jobs, accessed 2-6-13, mss]

The oil industry **can't find enough** new **workers** to replace an aging workforce. Recruiters are busy finding a new generation of workers and training programs have sprung up to prepare them. Some young people are signing on for jobs that promise good pay — but there are still a lot of positions to fill. It's ALL THINGS CONSIDERED from NPR News. I'm Audie Cornish. MELISSA BLOCK, HOST: And I'm Melissa Block. The unemployment rate here in the U.S. is high, above eight percent. But at least one industry insists it can't find and hire experienced workers fast enough. Thousands of older employees are beginning to retire from the oil and gas industry. And as NPR's Jeff Brady reports, the shortage comes at the very moment high oil prices have companies hoping to drill more. JEFF BRADY, BYLINE: Look across the oil fields in the U.S. and offshore and you'll see a lot more gray hair than just a few decades back. A hiring lull during the 1980s oil bust has left a **generation gap**. JIM NOE: We've struggled, as an industry, to attract young workers and I think there's a lot of reasons for that. BRADY: Jim Noe is senior vice president at Hercules Offshore in Houston. He suspects one reason is job security. The oil business is cyclical and companies tend to layoff workers when prices decline. But Noe says there are big pluses that come with an oil industry job; there's travel and, given the current worker shortage, good pay. NOE: Straight out of high school, no skills, we pay you $55,000 a year with full benefits, 401k, health care coverage, et cetera. And we're still struggling to attract workers here at Hercules. BRADY: Fifty-five thousand dollars a year would be attractive even to college students facing a difficult job market after they graduate. (SOUNDBITE OF MACHINERY) BRADY: But talk to Temple University students on the street in Philadelphia and you'll learn the oil industry's recruiting problems **run deeper** than just job security and pay. Nick Nothaft is a freshman studying linguistics. She says environmental concerns and high gas prices have given the industry a bad reputation. NICK NOTHAFT: I just don't imagine myself working for that industry. I don't have a good impression of it, I would say. And it just doesn't seem like something that would be attractive to me. BRADY: Down the street, junior Dashiell Sears is studying political science and would like to work for a politician in the future. He thinks having big oil on his resume could jeopardize that. DASHIELL SEARS: If I was going to out for this very, I'll say, liberal office I want to work for them and I have ExxonMobil on there and I worked on their PR and they're taking all these subsidies that they're totally against, it doesn't work toward me.

#### Crushes solvency

IMCA, 7

[International Marine Contractors Association, "Tackling the Skills Shortage," Oil and Gas, Issue 7, www.cisoilgas.com/article/Tackling-the-skills-shortage/, accessed 2-6-13, mss]

Getting to grips with the lack of highly skilled oil and gas workers is a matter of urgency for the industry. Hugh Williams, Chief Executive of the International Marine Contractors Association (IMCA), explains how his organization is taking a proactive approach to the problem. Economic growth is the aim of every country eager to improve its general well being. It ensures the future, is the lifeblood of the market sector, boosts the expansion of companies and thus encourages their employees. Fortunately, the marine contracting industry is currently thriving and can look forward to its workload remaining at a very high level for some time to come. On the face of it, this is good news for our industry but, as everyone is fully aware, success rarely happens without causing some problems. The **major challenge** facing our industry at this time is a serious skills shortage. In other words, we are perilously short of the **most important commodity** of all– **people**. The industry is extremely busy and expects to remain so for a number of years. Many companies are experiencing challenges in recruiting sufficiently trained and skilled personnel for their projects all over the world. **This is placing** **significant pressure on their** growth and **ability to deliver services**. As the international trade association representing over 350 offshore, marine and underwater engineering companies in 45 countries, the IMCA is eager to help its members address this skills shortage. Our members are involved in many aspects of offshore marine contracting, including pipe-laying, heavy lifting, diving, remotely operated vehicles (ROV) operations and offshore surveying – largely carried out from dynamically positioned (DP) vessels, as well as other marine operations, offshore supply and support of many other kinds. At the start of this year, we focused attention on the skills shortage by highlighting the projected numbers of trained personnel required by the expanding marine contracting industry over the next 2-3 years. Our members have provided some practical estimates of the possible growth of their businesses – for example, orders for new build construction vessels, drilling rigs, saturation diving spreads and remotely operated vehicles. From these estimates we are able to extrapolate some of the marine contracting industry’s recruitment needs over the next few years; the new tonnage needs to be manned and supported by highly skilled professionals in order to meet the stringent requirements of the market with regard to both execution and safety. The figures thrown up by the industry certainly make for interesting and compelling reading (see boxout: Big numbers), and these numbers do not include the large numbers of additional air diving personnel and the many other deck, catering and ancillary crew, or onshore and engineering support personnel required to operate the vessels. Just looking ahead a couple of years, the figures pose a serious challenge to an industry already finding it difficult to recruit, train and retain skilled personnel. For example, the worldwide diving schools can perhaps train about 100 new saturation divers a year. That there is a ‘skills shortage’ is widely acknowledged. By providing firm, verifiable estimates of anticipated growth, we are highlighting the seriousness and complexity of the challenge faced, not only by IMCA members worldwide, but also by all stakeholders in the offshore oil industry. Indeed, the future **health and** **growth** of a number of industries, not just the oil and gas industry, may be **directly affected** by a shortage of trained personnel in the coming years.

#### Takes decades to solve

Brady, 12 -- NPR National Desk Correspondent covering energy issues

[Jeff, "As Workers Age, Oil Industry Braces For Skills Gap," NPR, 4-20-12, www.npr.org/2012/04/20/150871935/as-workers-age-oil-industry-braces-for-skills-gap, accessed 2-6-13, mss]

Konrad says such staffing reorganizations are becoming more common. Around the globe, as more huge drill ships like the Deepwater Horizon are built to take advantage of high oil prices, companies have had difficulty finding enough experienced workers. "It only takes a year to build a billion-dollar ship," Konrad says. "But it takes **10**, **20**, **30** **years** to build a billion-dollar captain who's going to navigate and command the ship." And just as demand for more experienced workers is rising, their numbers are declining. A survey by Schlumberger Business Consulting finds that **22,000** experienced geoscientists and engineers will leave the field by 2015.

**EXTN: Timeframe**

#### Takes 10 years in areas with existing infrastructure- aff takes even longer [reverse-biased evidence]

API, 12

[American Petroleum Institute, "Why are oil companies sitting on idle leases?" www.energyanswered.org/questions/why-are-oil-companies-sitting-on-idle-leases, accessed 1-31-13, mss]

Finally, these arguments simply **ignore the basics** of the oil and natural gas industry. Production with both onshore and offshore leases is a **time-consuming process**. In general, from lease purchase to first production can take anywhere from seven to 10 years **in areas that have existing infrastructure**.

## HEg

#### Trade deficit has no impact

Fisher Investments ‘11

 9-15-20**11**; Trade Gap Irrelevant for U.S. Economic Growth [http://www.thestreet.com/story/11250198/1/trade-gap-irrelevant-for-us-economic-growth.html-http://www.thestreet.com/story/11250198/1/trade-gap-irrelevant-for-us-economic-growth.html](http://www.thestreet.com/story/11250198/1/trade-gap-irrelevant-for-us-economic-growth.html-http%3A/www.thestreet.com/story/11250198/1/trade-gap-irrelevant-for-us-economic-growth.html)

NEW YORK (TheStreet) -- International trade is an important and volatile component of global economic growth, one that's commonly misunderstood. For example, last Thursday's U.S. Commerce Department report on trade led off with a discussion of a $6.8 billion reduction in our trade deficit, to a minus $44.8 billion. And, as is customary, the trade gap is what led off most coverage of the report. Some argue an expanding trade gap is bad. And counterintuitively, last week some argued the shrinking trade gap was also bad -- supposedly as a sign of a slowing economy. But in reality, the trade gap simply doesn't describe U.S. economic conditions. (Although the trade deficit does affect GDP, it's mostly a statistical anomaly. As discussed in our recent article, "What GDP Doesn't Say ," it's a reason why GDP isn't completely synonymous with economic health.) The more telling metric is total trade. Calculating total trade calls for adding exports and imports but it is rarely done. However, in our view, this is the most correct way to view trade. Imports can detract from a nation's GDP calculation, but rising imports can be sign of strong demand. Imports can also create massive economic value for consumers and businesses -- by helping firms stay competitive and even resulting in lower prices. Moreover, over half of U.S. imports aren't children's toys, cars or food, but equipment and components U.S. businesses use to produce or reassemble goods for final sale or re-export. For example, in the first seven months of this year (the latest data available), one category -- industrial supplies -- outweighed foodstuffs, vehicles and consumer goods combined, according to the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis. Since imports have a positive economic value and can be indicative of healthy demand, it makes little sense to us to statistically account for them as a negative. And it reinforces the point that total trade can be more instructive regarding overall economic health than the trade deficit.

#### Drilling won’t solve oil dependence - no new wells needed and it doesn’t affect world markets

Barnes ‘11

A. James, professor of law and public and environmental affairs at Indiana University, Atlanta journal constitution, April 4 Pro & Con: Should the U.S. accelerate development of oil resources?

We have been talking about having a national energy strategy for 50 years. But each crisis has represented a missed opportunity — and has left our economic well-being more and more vulnerable. How long will we continue to act like Charlie Brown trying to kick the football while hoping things will be different and not always ending up the same way? How many more muggings will we endure at the hands of unfriendly countries before we have had enough? In February alone we sent more than $30 billion overseas to pay for oil. Think of what that money could do for our economy. It is time finally to face the fact that we cannot drill ourselves to energy independence and isolate ourselves from the worldwide demand for oil. America consumes 20.8 percent of the oil produced in the world each year and 20.9 percent of the natural gas production. But we only have about 1.6 percent of the proven oil reserves and only about 3.8 percent of the proven gas reserves. We could tap all our reserves and we would still be importing oil. And, at our current rate of consumption and importation, our reserves are estimated to last less than six years. America ranks No. 1 in natural gas production and No. 3 in oil production. Since 1950, we have drilled 2.6 million oil and natural gas wells, and at the beginning of 2010, we had 824,847 producing wells. We are drilling; 40,000 wells were drilled last year alone. As of the first week in February, there were 1,739 rotary drilling rigs operating in the United States, more than in any other country in the world. Millions of acres of federal lands are already under lease — with no exploratory or production activity under way on a majority of those lands. Despite the claims that the government is thwarting oil and gas development, thousands of federal drilling permits held by oil and gas companies go unused. While we are importing oil, we are exporting about 1.6 million barrels a week of U.S. refined petroleum products. Increasing our domestic production, limited as it will be, does not guarantee lower prices at home. Oil is an international commodity, it goes where it can command the best price, and we pay the world price, whether it comes from Texas or Libya. Increased production in the United States may simply flow into the world market rather than increasing the supply available to us.

## Econ

#### No impact to shocks – reserves

WEISS ’12 – Senior Fellow and Director of Climate Strategy at the Center for American Progress (Weiss, Daniel J.. “Preparing for the Next Oil Price Shock” May 18, 2012. http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2012/05/spr\_g8.html)

Some argue there should be no sale of reserve oil unless there is actually a severe supply disruption, rather than selling in response to high oil prices driven up by Wall Street speculators in anticipation that there might be a Persian Gulf supply interruption. But the United States and its allies have ample oil reserves that could be used in the event of another huge price spike or a supply disruption so as to pop the speculative bubble and provide economic relief. The United States has significant oil reserves. The Strategic Petroleum **Reserve is 96 percent full** with nearly 700 million barrels of oil. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development nations had more than 800 million barrels of oil reserves at the end of 2011. Selling 30 million barrels from each reserve would reduce total reserves by less than 4 percent. In addition, U.S. reserve oil has been sold **under every president** beginning **with** George **H.W. Bush**. He sold 17.2 million barrels of reserve oil in advance of the 1991 Gulf War in anticipation of supply disruption that did not occur. In 1996 the Republican Congress led by Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich (R-GA) sold 23 million barrels of oil to reduce the federal budget deficit at a time when it was less than 80 percent full. In other words, the oil in the U.S. Strategic Petroleum Reserve is not **some sacred oil supply** only to be used during an oil embargo or pipeline destruction.

#### Russian security solves—no risk of theft

Birch 2007 (Douglas, “Russian Nuclear Security on Display,” Washington Post, Aug 29, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/08/29/AR2007082901817.html>, Kel)

Fifteen years ago, a worker at the Russian nuclear research center in Podolsk smuggled more than three pounds of weapons-grade uranium out the doors over a period of weeks, determined to sell the material on the black market. Police arrested the thief with the uranium on a railway platform in the city, about 35 miles south of the Russian capital, as he waited for a train to Moscow. But the incident was one of several in the former Soviet Union that set off alarm bells across the globe, warning that a new era in the annals of terrorism might soon begin. On Wednesday, Sen. Richard Lugar and former Sen. Sam Nunn came to Podolsk to inspect $25 million worth of security measures at what is now Podolsk's Luch Scientific and Industrial Association, paid for by the United States \_ improvements that one institute official said had made any future theft "impossible." Also with the help of the U.S., the nuclear processing facility has installed a new perimeter fence, metal and radiation detectors, a network of surveillance cameras, special locks, doors and other systems at the facility, all intended to track the location of every ounce of highly enriched uranium kept here. "It is very difficult work" keeping track of the material, said Valentin Deniskin, deputy general director of scientific work at the facility. But, he added, the security measures would prevent any repeat of the 1992 theft. "It is physically impossible to remove these materials from this territory," he said.
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### Overview

#### Strong navy key to allied response- creates a super-deterrent

Lyons, 13 -- retired Navy admiral

[James, commander in chief of the U.S. Pacific Fleet and senior U.S. military representative to the United Nations, "Where are the carriers?" Washington Times, 1-15-13, l/n, accessed 1-22-13, mss]

To keep pressure on and **raise** **the level of deterrence**, movement of naval forces, particularly carrier strike groups, must remain unpredictable. In a deteriorating crisis situation, our Navy gains maximum impact by moving the carrier strike group into the crisis area. That sends a **special signal** of our intent to respond to our potential enemies and to our allies as well. Such a signal has a telling effect on our regional allies and encourages them to **employ their** air force and naval **assets in a coordinated manner**, which certainly should **raise the deterrent equation**.

#### Strong now specifically key now to deter Mid-east and Asia war- that’s Katz.

#### Middle East wars cause extinction

Russell, 9 (James A. Russell, Senior Lecturer, National Security Affairs, Naval Postgraduate School, ‘9 (Spring)
“Strategic Stability Reconsidered: Prospects for Escalation and Nuclear War in the Middle East” IFRI, Proliferation Papers//, #26, \_\_http://www.ifri.org/downloads/PP26\_Russell\_2009.pdf\_\_)

Strategic stability in the region is thus undermined by various factors: (1) asymmetric interests in the bargaining framework that can introduce unpredictable behavior from actors; (2) the presence of non-state actors that introduce unpredictability into relationships between the antagonists; (3) incompatible assumptions about the structure of the deterrent relationship that makes the bargaining framework strategically unstable; (4) perceptions by Israel and the United States that its window of opportunity for military action is closing, which could prompt a preventive attack; (5) the prospect that Iran’s response to pre-emptive attacks could involve unconventional weapons, which could prompt escalation by Israel and/or the United States; (6) the lack of a communications framework to build trust and cooperation among framework participants. These systemic weaknesses in the coercive bargaining framework all suggest that escalation by any the parties could happen either on purpose or as a result of **miscalculation or the pressures** of wartime circumstance. Given these factors, it is disturbingly easy to imagine scenarios under which a conflict could quickly escalate in which the regional antagonists would consider the use of chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons. It would be a mistake to believe the nuclear taboo can somehow magically keep nuclear weapons from being used in the context of an unstable strategic framework. Systemic asymmetries between actors in fact suggest a certain increase in the probability of war – a war in which escalation could happen quickly and from a variety of participants. Once such a war starts, events would likely develop a momentum all their own and decision-making would consequently be shaped in unpredictable ways. The international community must take this possibility seriously, and muster every tool at its disposal to prevent such an outcome, which would be an unprecedented disaster for the peoples of the region, with substantial risk for the entire world.

#### Asia wars go nuclear

Jonathan S. Landay, National Security and Intelligence Correspondent, -2K [“Top Administration Officials Warn Stakes for U.S. Are High in Asian Conflicts”, Knight Ridder/Tribune News Service, March 10, p. Lexis]

Few if any experts think China and Taiwan, North Korea and South Korea, or India and Pakistan are spoiling to fight. But even a minor miscalculation by any of them could destabilize Asia, jolt the global economy and even start a nuclear war. India, Pakistan and China all have nuclear weapons, and North Korea may have a few, too. Asia lacks the kinds of organizations, negotiations and diplomatic relationships that helped keep an uneasy peace for five decades in Cold War Europe. “Nowhere else on Earth are the stakes as high and relationships so fragile,” said Bates Gill, director of northeast Asian policy studies at the Brookings Institution, a Washington think tank. “We see the convergence of great power interest overlaid with lingering confrontations with no institutionalized security mechanism in place. There are elements for potential disaster.” In an effort to cool the region’s tempers, President Clinton, Defense Secretary William S. Cohen and National Security Adviser Samuel R. Berger all will hopscotch Asia’s capitals this month. For America, the stakes could hardly be higher. There are 100,000 U.S. troops in Asia committed to defending Taiwan, Japan and South Korea, and the United States would instantly become embroiled if Beijing moved against Taiwan or North Korea attacked South Korea. While Washington has no defense commitments to either India or Pakistan, a conflict between the two could end the global taboo against using nuclear weapons and demolish the already shaky international nonproliferation regime. In addition, globalization has made a stable Asia \_ with its massive markets, cheap labor, exports and resources \_ indispensable to the U.S. economy. Numerous U.S. firms and millions of American jobs depend on trade with Asia that totaled $600 billion last year, according to the Commerce Department.

### T/ Case – Economy

#### Seapower key to protect sealanes- key to the economy

Roughead, 7 -- Admiral, US Navy, Chief of Naval Operations

[Gary, James Conway, General, US Marine Corps, and Thad Allen, Admiral, US Coast Guard, "A Cooperative Strategy for 21st Century Seapower," Oct 2007, www.navy.mil/maritime/Maritimestrategy.pdf, accessed 1-24-13, mss]

The security, prosperity, and vital interests of the United States are increasingly coupled to those of other nations. Our Nation’s interests are best served by fostering a peaceful global system comprised of interdependent networks of trade, finance, information, law, people and governance. We prosper because of this system of exchange among nations, yet recognize it is vulnerable to a range of disruptions that can produce cascading and harmful effects far from their sources. Major power war, regional conflict, terrorism, lawlessness and natural disasters—all have the potential to threaten U.S. national security and world prosperity. The oceans connect the nations of the world, even those countries that are landlocked. **Because the maritime domain**—the world’s oceans, seas, bays, estuaries, islands, coastal areas, littorals, and the airspace above them—**supports 90% of the world’s trade, it carries the lifeblood of a global system** that links every country on earth. Covering three-quarters of the planet, the oceans make neighbors of people around the world. They enable us to help friends in need and to confront and defeat aggression far from our shores. Today, the United States and its partners find themselves competing for global influence in an era in which they are unlikely to be fully at war or fully at peace. Our challenge is to apply seapower in a manner that protects U.S. vital interests even as it promotes greater collective security, stability, and trust. While defending our homeland and defeating adversaries in war remain the indisputable ends of seapower, it must be applied more broadly if it is to serve the national interest. We believe that preventing wars is as important as winning wars. There is a tension, however, between the requirements for continued peacetime engagement and maintaining proficiency in the critical skills necessary to fighting and winning in combat. Maritime forces must contribute to winning wars decisively while enhancing our ability to prevent war, win the long struggle against terrorist networks, positively influence events, and ease the impact of disasters. As it has always been, these critical tasks will be carried out by our people—the key to success in any military strategy. Accordingly, we will provide our people—our Sailors, Marines, and Coast Guardsmen—with the training, education and tools necessary to promote peace and prevail in conflict. Guided by the objectives articulated in the National Security Strategy, National Defense Strategy, National Military Strategy and the National Strategy for Maritime Security, the United States Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard will act across the full range of military operations to secure the United States from direct attack; secure strategic access and retain global freedom of action; strengthen existing and emerging alliances and partnerships and establish favorable security conditions. Additionally, maritime forces will be employed to build confidence and trust among nations through collective security efforts that focus on common threats and mutual interests in an open, multi-polar world. To do so will require an unprecedented level of integration among our maritime forces and enhanced cooperation with the other instruments of national power, as well as the capabilities of our international partners. Seapower will be a unifying force for building a better tomorrow. Challenges of a New Era The world economy is tightly interconnected. Over the past four decades, total sea borne trade has more than quadrupled: 90% of world trade and two-thirds of its petroleum are transported by sea. **The sea-lanes** and supporting shore infrastructure **are the lifelines of the modern global economy,** visible and vulnerable symbols of **the modern distribution system** that **relies on free transit** through increasingly urbanized littoral regions. Expansion of the global system has increased the prosperity of many nations. Yet their continued growth may create increasing competition for resources and capital with other economic powers, transnational corporations and international organizations. Heightened popular expectations and increased competition for resources, coupled with scarcity, may encourage nations to exert wider claims of sovereignty over greater expanses of ocean, waterways, and natural resources—potentially resulting in conflict.

#### Readiness buys economic resiliency and prevents decline- checks their internal links

Norrlof, 10 -- political science professor at Toronto

(Carla, America’s Global Advantage: US Hegemony and International Cooperation, pg 185-6)

The United States owes at least some of its ability to process debt to allies' dependence on American security provision. As a counterpart to foreigners' economic claims, the United States is sitting on a pile of security claims. The United States' self-proclaimed role as global policeman is a wildcard in a hand full of economic IOUs. Armed interventions have been routine throughout the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, and have had both a private and public good dimension. The security lever lurks in the background of economic relations and explains why allies are **prepared to intervene to adjust economic imbalances**, as they did at Plaza and at Louvre in the 1980s (see chapter 5). Under a **shield of firepower**, the United States can buy time and take economic risks that no other county can afford. Europe is indebted to the United States for putting an end to two world wars. But we need not go all the way back to the First and Second World Wars. There have been plenty of reminders in our own time of Europe's military subordination. The turmoil on the continent in the 1990s over-determined Europe's continued reliance on American military assistance. As a result, Europe's feeble attempt to create a credible and autonomous military force in the late 1990s and early millenia was quickly cannibalized by NATO (see chapter 7). The formal defense commitments that go out to Japan and South Korea also give two of the five largest reserve holders a **powerful incentive to prevent American decline**. Even China can be counted among those who have an interest in preserving American military might. As long as the relationship between China and Japan is marred by distrust, China prefers an American security guarantee to a militarized Japan. While allies' dependence on the US military for defensive purposes and global interventions will hardly make global imbalances disappear, it **can buy financial assistance if external liabilities become a problem**. Since the world's leading economies are inextricably bound up with the American economy, coordinating a soft landing of the US economy has always had a clear economic rational. But central bankers also know that political stability is at the source of economic growth. The United States gets good mileage out of its willingness to protect allies and stabilize hotspots. Both economically and militarily, the United States is "too big to fail." A weakening of the economy, the fountain of the United States' military might, would be dangerous for western Europe and East Asia.

#### Readiness is a pre-req to investment

Norrlof, 10 -- political science professor at Toronto

(Carla, America’s Global Advantage: US Hegemony and International Cooperation, pg 172-3)

One of the reasons investors are attracted to the American market is that they consider investing in it is safe. The United States has collected a huge security premium by capitalizing on the ability to secure its home base both militarily and legally through property rights protection. The United States' investment pull is not only explained by the need for dollars in the international system. The government's commitment to secure investments has also been important. The combined effect of an advanced capital market and a strong military machine to defend that market, and other safety measures such as a strong tradition of property rights protection and a reputation for honoring dues, has made it possible to attract capital with great ease. In chapter 5, we saw that three other countries - Britain, Switzerland, and Canada - have enjoyed substantial gains from the discrepancy between the value of the net foreign asset position and the cumulative current account. In common, they all have a liberal orientation grounded in property rights protection and are able to extract a substantial security premium as a result - Canada by free-riding on the United States, Switzerland by adhering to secrecy laws and unbending neutrality, and the United Kingdom (like the United States) by boasting a commitment to honoring dues and its own imperial legacy. Out of these, only the United States and Switzerland saw their currency strengthen in the wake of the financial crisis. Battered by the United States, France, and Germany, it is not clear how bruised Switzerland will emerge from suggested changes in secrecy rules and taxation agreements. Given the size of American trade deficits and external liabilities, one would expect a lot more headwind against American-based assets and therefore the dollar. As we saw in chapter 5, however, central banks only sold more American assets than they bought in three of the thirty-six years between 1971 and 2006.13 And only on one occasion, in 1971, did sales by private investors exceed private purchases of American assets.14 The steady capital inflow, through good times and bad, is due to the widely held belief that the American market is safe and will rebound after a downturn. In what follows, I substantiate my claim that the United States has received a security premium by linking increased financial flows to the United States with military successes and reduced financial flows with military defeats.

#### Investment is key to the economy- including manufacturing

Payne, 11 -- Department of Commerce economists

[David, and Fenwick Yu, “Foreign Direct Investment in the United States,” June 2011, www.esa.doc.gov/sites/default/files/reports/documents/fdiesaissuebriefno2061411final.pdf, accessed 2-1-13, mss]

Employment by majority-owned U.S. affiliates of foreign companies has generally held steady over the last decade (see Figure 2), with these companies employing more than 5 million workers in the United States since 2000. Given the relative size of foreign investment in the manufacturing sector, a large portion of FDI-supported jobs – close to 2 million – are in manufacturing. FDI supported manufacturing jobs tend to be more stable than domestic manufacturing jobs. From 1998 to 2008, total manufacturing employment fell 24 percent, while FDIsupported manufacturing jobs declined only 11 percent. In fact, manufacturing employment of 1.8 million in 2008 accounted for 32.5 percent of total employment at majority-owned U.S. affiliates of foreign companies. In contrast, retail trade – the largest industry outside of manufacturing for employment by U.S. affiliates of foreign companies – employed 489,000 workers in 2008, followed by the administration, support, and waste management industry at 453,000. (See Figure 3.) Compensation per employee at U.S. affiliates of foreign firms has consistently been higher than at other U.S. firms, as illustrated in Figure 1 on the front page. 1,2 The compensation differential between FDI jobs and jobs as a whole has also been widening over time; growing from 28.4% in 1998 to 37.0% in 2007 before falling slightly to 33.3% in 2008. Foreign Direct Investment is Important to the U.S. Economy Foreign Direct Investment into the United States has been an important factor in the U.S. economy for a number of years, with FDI totaling $1.7 trillion over the last ten years. 3 Figure 4 shows FDI has fluctuated with the U.S. business cycle. Investment surged to an historical peak of $328 billion in 2008 and reached a similarly high level in 2000, though it hit a low of $64 billion in 2003. FDI rebounded to $194 billion in 2010. A significant portion of FDI goes to the U.S. manufacturing sector. (See Figure 5.) In 2010, $78 billion of FDI, or 41 percent of total FDI, was spent on the manufacturing sector. 4 Over the past 14 years, manufacturing’s share of FDI has varied from a low of 15 percent in 2004 to a high of 81 percent in 1998, averaging 39 percent. Other sectors that have received significant FDI over time include the wholesale and retail sector (21 percent in 2010) and financialrelated industries (14 percent in 2010). 5 Since 1997, about two-thirds of the remaining investment has been in information, mining, utilities, and non-bank holding companies. 6 Very little FDI goes to construction, transportation services and other service industries.

### 1NR – Turns Case – Russia/China

#### Naval power solves wars with Russia and China

Green 97 (Kevin, Rear Admiral, Commander – United States Navy, NTC, Great Lakes, "What the Best Damn Navy in the World Is For", Vital Speeches of the Day, 7-15, Ebsco)

And the list of troubles wouldn't be complete without mentioning that by the year 2000, nine developing countries could have nuclear or biological weapons, thirty countries might have chemical weapons; these are "weapons of mass destruction," capable of killing millions of people. Border disputes have often led to armed conflict between nations. Professor Aaron Friedberg of Princeton University recently just listed the ones in the Pacific Rim, border disputes alone. I'll have to take a breath here. "Japan against Russia, Russia against China, China against India, Japan against South Korea, Laos against China, China against Burma, India against Pakistan, Cambodia against Vietnam, China against Vietnam, China against Taiwan, Indonesia against Timor, Malaysia against the Philippines, and in the case of the Spratly Islands in the South China Sea, which may hold a bonanza of oil, we have seen war before over oil, China against Vietnam, against the Philippines, against Malaysia, against Taiwan." Those are just the border disputes. But they are between some of the most advanced and fastest growing economies in the world. And most of these disputes are in countries that border the most heavily-traveled sea lanes in the world, the western Pacific rim. Nobody knows if any will lead to armed conflict. Or even, if they do, that the United States will take a role. But we certainly have to be prepared to do so, if we have to. Bottom line, we have to maintain our readiness. Because when the call comes, if it comes and it always comes, eventually, we' 11 have to move quickly. Some Americans, though, would like to make further, deeper cuts in national security. One of them quoted former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Colin Powell, who said, "I would be very surprised if another Iraq occurred." The writer forgot to mention that we were all, including General Powell, very surprised the first time. "This, too, shall pass." Other surprises, perhaps quite unpleasant surprises, are virtually certain. America has to be ready for them, the Navy-Marine corps team has to be ready for them.

#### Naval power prevents us-china war over taiwan

Hultin and Blair 6. (Jerry MacArthur Hultin, Undersecretary for the Navy, Dennis Blair, former President for the Institute of Defense Analysis and Admiral, US Navy, “Naval Power and Globalization,” September, 2006 http://www.poly.edu/president/\_doc/hultin%20naval%20power.pdf)

Even if the interaction of US and Chinese decisions in future avoids a global naval arms race centered in the Pacific, China will still have a capable regional navy. World events may put China and the United States on opposite sides of an issue or crisis, leading to a maritime confrontation. The most likely location for this scenario is Taiwan. Successful deterrence depends on the United States **having strong naval capability** on station or quickly deployable so that there is no incentive to China or other adversaries to initiate hostilities.   The second Pacific area in which the United States must maintain a deterrent capability based on naval power is around the Korean Peninsula. North Korea is a failing state, but so long as Kim Jong II and his successors maintain their position of power, they will need to be deterred from military aggression.   To maintain deterrence, American naval strategy in the Pacific must preserve its alliance base, its forward deployed posture and its ability to reinforce quickly to assert maritime superiority throughout any crisis situation.

### Turns North Korea

#### Turns North Korea war and escalation

Carpenter ’12

(Ted, Pyongyang Is Still Deterred, National Interest, 12-22-2012, http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/pyongyang-still-deterred-7873)

The reaction in some U.S. circles to the North Korean satellite launch, though, is merely the latest example of a fading confidence in the efficacy of deterrence. There was similar alarmism when China deployed its first aircraft carrier, as though that modest achievement somehow diluted America’s naval superiority. Yet the U.S. Navy has 11 far more capable carriers—not to mention a fleet of deadly submarines, any one of which carries a sufficient quantity of nuclear missiles to devastate China’s cities.¶ Unwarranted alarmism is even more evident about the prospect that Iran might someday build a small nuclear arsenal. But as in the cases of North Korea’s missile capability and China’s sole aircraft carrier, that development does not significantly increase the danger to the American homeland. The United States would retain a vast military superiority by every relevant measure, and any attack on this country would provoke an obliterating retaliatory strike. And, contrary to the hysteria in some quarters, there is no credible evidence that the Iranian leadership is suicidal.¶ Developments such as North Korea’s progress on missile technology or Iran’s embryonic nuclear program do not fundamentally alter the bilateral strategic relationship between the United States and either country. Primary deterrence, deterring an attack on the United States itself, remains as effective and credible as ever.

### Turns Terrorism

#### Drilling interferes with vital SEAL training- that’s the 1NC Weiss evidence.

#### SEAL training key to prevent terrorism – solves the nuke and bioterror scenarios

Peterson, 9 – Lieutenant Commander, United States Navy

[Erick, "The Strategic Utility of U.S. Navy Seals," Naval Postgraduate School, June 2009, www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA501950, accessed 2-6-13, mss]

Terror is likely to remain a threat in the foreseeable future. It may become, like Dick Couch proclaims in Sherriff of Ramadi, that terror will be similar to illegal drugs, something we never eradicate, but requires constant attention. For this reason, SEALs will always have a mission of removing terrorist leaders and tenaciously chasing terrorists across the globe. This constant vigilance will **systematically erode** the **terrorists’ ability to operate** (Couch 2008). This task is often seen as the domain of special mission units (SMUs), but SMUs are extremely limited. The “vanilla” or “white” SOF assets, specifically SEALs, can provide a responsive means of dealing with this threat. Terrorism is akin to cancer. Like cancer there are multiple measures that must be taken to eliminate the disease. Some of the measures are non-invasive. For cancer these measures are nutrition, rest and pharmacological. For terrorism these are the activities surrounding civil affairs, psychological operations, and “nation building.” But invasive measures must also be taken and the deadly tumor removed. For cancer this is the work of the skilled surgeon, armed with the scalpel he uses with precision. For the military, the highly trained SEALs are the surgeon and the scalpel. In order to ensure this capability remains a precision tool, SEAL mission focus should remain direct action in nature with a very good understanding of how the "kinetic scalpel of a surgical operation" should be used (Smith, 2009). And just as important, they must understand when a not-so-sharp scalpel can adversely affect the indirect effort. Therefore, **this skill must remain as sharp as possible to ensure success** (Smith, 2009).

### AT: Shipbuilding

#### Can’t finance shipbuilding – bad credit ratings

**Rubin, Dow Jones Newswires, 2012**

(“S&P: As Maritime Shipping Fleets Age, US Companies Will Face Greater Challenges”, <http://gcaptain.com/sp-maritime-shipping-fleets/>)

Already burdened with eroding credit quality, many U.S. shipping companies will face greater challenges in the near future as their older fleets continue to age, Standard & Poor’s said. “The U.S. domestic fleet likely will contract over the next three to five years as vessels retire faster than owners can replace them,” said S&P analyst Funmi Afonja. “Companies that cannot find sufficient financing to refresh their fleet may not survive.” For those operators that can stay afloat, she said, reduced capacity should cut back on industry oversupply, leading to better charter rates. The inland river system and the coastwise trade benefit from government protections that exclude competition from foreign-flagged vessels. But, S&P said, U.S.-built ships are expensive, and shipping companies’ access to financing depend heavily on their credit quality. Weak credit quality, challenging capital market conditions, and reduced access to government-guaranteed loans likely will increase the cost of funding new vessels and retrofitting old ones to meet upcoming environmental regulations, S&P said. Companies at the lower end of the speculative-grade ratings spectrum are both the most likely to face steep financing costs and the least equipped to deal with those costs, S&P continued.

#### Over capacity on ships now

**CNA 2012**

(“Shipping industry highlights challenges of overcapacity, rising oil prices”, 3-14, <http://www.channelnewsasia.com/stories/singaporebusinessnews/view/1189016/1/.html>)

Oversupply of vessels, rising oil prices and falling freight rates are among the woes that are hotly discussed by shipping companies at a maritime conference in Singapore. Plagued by overcapacity and low freight rates, the shipping industry has been in a slump for more than a year, and industry players say it will take another two years for shipping liners to regain profitability. Shipping consultancy Alphaliner forecast that growth in the Europe to Far East container traffic would slow to 1.5 percent in 2012, in contrast to an 8.3 percent growth in container vessel fleet in the same period.

#### 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.

#### Mine-warfare key to readiness and deterrence

**US Navy 8**

**(**<http://www.public.navy.mil/surfor/comomag/Pages/conceptofoperations.aspx#.UQ_YCh19Iw8>, “U.S. Navy Mine Familiarizer”,  [COMOMAG CORPUS CHRISTI TX](http://www.public.navy.mil/surfor/comomag))

The Navy is seriously committed to maintaining a potent sea mining capability. **Mining can be** used as **a** **strategic deterrent and**/or as a **force multiplier** in this era during which the Navy faces a continued reduction in platform numbers. The unique attributes of naval mines make them one of the most effective forms of naval warfare across the spectrum of conflict. Even the suggestion of the presence of mines in the water has deterred or delayed waterborne movement until the threat could be effectively assessed and neutralized. In the early stages of future crises, mines positioned either overtly or clandestinely, not necessarily in large numbers, could be a strategic tool in convincing an adversary to reassess its intentions, contributing to the establishment of **battlespace dominance**. Therefore, mining can be effective across many different levels of conflict, either as a stand‑alone option or as one element in a broader response. Our allies and adversaries recognize that mines are relatively low-cost weapons that can level the playing field between otherwise unequal opponents. To guarantee the effectiveness of our future forces, we must develop and maintain an inventory of modern weapons, integrate mining into the overall planning to shape the battlespace, and ensure the availability of a variety of delivery platforms in sufficient numbers to execute approved plans. Maintenance of a robust mining capability also provides a basic understanding of state-of-the-art sea mine technology that allows us to optimize development of an effective countermeasures force. Our Mining Concept of Operations (CONOPS) describes the top-level operational roles of mining as a key component of our overall naval operational structure. There are three stages of mining operations within which all aspects of mining are grouped. They are the planning, delivery, and campaign stages. Planning The planning stage of the mining CONOPS includes the following basic activities: · Determining mission requirements and maintaining mine assets · Identifying and planning priority minefields · Developing, acquiring, and prepositioning mining assets · Exercising and training in the mining area · Implementation of global mining alliances Requisite to the determination of mission requirements is threat assessment, collection of environmental and target data, and the development of algorithms for mine sensors. Effective minefield modeling is particularly important in this regard. The development and acquisition of mines is an extremely important component of the planning phase, as is maintenance of a modern mine stockpile. Rigorous training and mining exercises are essential to ensure our readiness to conduct mining operations.

### AT: Doesn’t Hurt Readiness

#### That overwhelms naval readiness- sea lanes, subs, and other missions

Weinstein, 10 -- Mother Jones' national security reporter

[Adam, "DOD: We Hate Offshore Drilling, Too," Mother Jones, 5-21-10, www.motherjones.com/mojo/2010/05/military-we-hate-offshore-drilling-too-navy-norfolk-bp-virginia, accessed 1-31-13, mss]

How about if it's discovered that outer continental shelf drilling is also anti-national-security? That's exactly what the Department of Defense appears to have done in a leaked portion of its new report (PDF), appropriately titled "Outer Continental Shelf (OCS): Military Activities and Future Oil & Gas Development." You see, the new conservative Virginia governor and shadow commander in chief, Bob McDonnell, longs to penetrate Virginia's sea plain with hard probes for profit. His plan was to make 4,500 square miles of ocean available to oil drillers by 2010. But! According to the Washington Post: The Defense Department report, concluded in March but released in part Tuesday by Rep. James P. Moran Jr. (D-Va.), a drilling opponent, indicates that drilling would interfere with military activities...in 72 percent of the 3 million acres covered by the lease sale and that it could be allowed only with restrictions in 6 percent of the area. As a former sailor who's operated out of Norfolk, Virginia—the world's largest naval installation—I can attest that its **sea lanes are** rather **critical to effective military activities**. Ships need to **move** through **quickly** and safely when deploying, and that process gets harder when additional surface contacts and navigational hazards are thrown into the brew. (Submarines, **which** also **operate extensively in the area,** face a special three-dimensional, **life-or-death challenge** with undersea drilling infrastructures.) Fleet training exercises, tactical readiness exams, sea trials of new ships, and many other classified but important endeavors begin off the Tidewater coast.

#### Sub effectiveness key to naval readiness

Padgett, 11 -- Rear Admiral (retired)

[John, "Projecting power," Armed Forced Journal, Sept 2011, www.armedforcesjournal.com/2011/09/7558135/, accessed 1-22-13, mss]

One thing SSK and SSN advocates can agree on is the need for submarines. That need is growing and stems from the proliferation of threats to nonstealthy surface ships and aircraft — the mainstays of Navy power projection. Those platforms, along with forward bases, are becoming increasingly vulnerable to precision-guided weapons ranging from man-portable missiles and guided mortars to the most sophisticated surface-to-air missiles and anti-ship ballistic-missile threats. The submarine’s immunity to these threats and the nonprovocative nature of its presence provides commanders with much-needed intelligence preparation of the battle space, as well as strike, anti-submarine warfare, anti-surface warfare, special operations support and other missions.

#### OCS gas expansion disrupts irreplaceable testing and training ranges- key to air power, mine warfare, and spectrum

Jackson, 12 -- Emerald Coast Magazine writer

[Scott, "Is Offshore Drilling Affecting National Security?" Exploring Emerald Coast, 11-17-2012, atd.agranite.com/emerald-coast/living/national-security-affected-by-offshore-platforms/, accessed 1-31-13, mss]

Beyond the wondrous vista of the shimmering and pristine coastal waters of the Gulf of Mexico reside two of our nation’s most precious resources – the oil and gas reserves below and the airspace above. While the value of further oil and gas exploration to the nation’s security is commonly known, the value of the airspace is not. The traditional pillars of economic growth normally incorporate land, labor and capital. But in Northwest Florida, there is another pillar that is equally valuable – airspace. It allows not only the flow of commercial aviation for business and tourism but military training and testing. Supersonic dogfights, training missions and weapons testing are conducted by F-15 Eagle and F-22 Raptor fighter jets, as well as other military aircraft, in specified blocks of airspace. Such exercises occur at carefully scheduled times to allow pilots unfettered concentration to scream through the air and hone their combat skills in a deliriously swirling amalgamation of blue skies, white clouds and emerald waters. Without undue interference, their mindset is rechanneled to the challenge – kill or be killed. But the waters below this airspace are also coveted for their rich oil and gas reserves by a country seeking energy independence. Eglin Air Force Base’s Air Armament Center conducts test and evaluation missions of new weapons involving full-size target drone aircraft in the skies over the 130,000-square-mile test and training range in the eastern Gulf – an area larger than the state of New Mexico. Between Oct. 1, 2007, and Sept. 30, 2008, more than 3,400 test missions were flown in this airspace. **Any civilian encroachment** on this training area could reduce the military value of Eglin’s mission to test and evaluate new weapon systems. **It isn’t the type of testing that can be** efficiently **performed anywhere else** in the continental United States. “**The Eglin Water Test Range has more airspace available** for testing new and legacy weapons **than the combined airspace of all U.S. land ranges,**” said Bob Arnold, chief of Eglin’s Mission Enhancement Committee. “This is important due to the increasing safety footprint size of our new fighter aircraft conducting air-to-air missile tests and training missions. The increased speed of these aircraft, coupled with the added range of the missiles, requires larger ‘clear areas’ for target debris resulting from our testing.” This range provides training areas for military pilots sharpening their combat skills from Air Force runways at Eglin, Tyndall Air Force Base and Hurlburt Field. And the future addition of the new F-35 Lightning II, a state-of-the-art supersonic fighter scheduled to arrive at Eglin in 2010, will demand even more use of the airspace. The Naval Surface Warfare Center at Panama City also uses the Gulf waters for testing and evaluation in the areas of mine warfare, special warfare, diving and life support. The combined economic impact of these four installations is $8.9 billion for Okaloosa and Bay counties, according to the Florida Defense Fact Book published by the University of West Florida’s Haas Business Center. Oil and gas drilling operations in the waters of the range cannot co-exist with ongoing Air Force testing without coordination and a firm understanding between them. These behemoth rigs cost upwards of $1 billion and incorporate a logistics lifeline to the mainland. “Our concern over oil/gas activity is related to the possible damage to oil/gas platforms associated with permanent production activity,” Arnold said. Moreover, the additional boat and helicopter support activity would require safe passage, and the radio emissions from the oil and gas platforms could interfere with military missions. As part of Eglin’s test and evaluation mission, a fleet of 50 Vietnam-era QF-4 fighter jets are used as remotely piloted, full-sized target drones, along with smaller drones for missile training and evaluation by the 82nd Aerial Targets Group operating from Tyndall Air Force Base. “Above-surface oil/gas platforms are **incompatible** with our military operations in areas of the Gulf of Mexico where we shoot down things like unmanned drone aircraft,” Arnold said. “Debris from these types of operations pose a serious safety hazard for the platforms and personnel who operate them, so obviously, this is not a situation we can allow to occur.” According to Arnold, the downing of a 25-ton QF-4 can produce tens of thousands of pieces of debris, with the wreckage hitting the water with the force of a minivan collision at 45 mph.

#### Range space key to readiness and air power

DOD, 3

[Department of Defense, "Military Readiness: The Training and Testing Connection," 8-28-3, aec.army.mil/usaec/newsroom/rrpi05.pdf, accessed 1-31-13, mss]

**Readiness Requires Preparation**

The U. S. Armed Services fight as they train. Analysis of WWI and WWII combat data reveal that the probability of battlefield survival increases almost exponentially if one survived the first five engagements where shots were fired. The purpose of training is to replicate those first five engagements in safe training areas, not in combat. The United States Armed Forces train to conduct military operations in all terrain and weather conditions to defend our interests. They are the best at what they do. They are the best because they "train as they will fight" and their equipment is rigorously tested under realistic conditions. High quality training and testing **requires access to appropriate** land, air and water **ranges**. For many years the Department of Defense (DoD) enjoyed ample access to ranges; however, as our nation has grown, so has urban development around our ranges. External factors stemming from urban development can prohibit, limit, or constrain testing and training activities on military installations and ranges. DoD seeks to maintain readiness while remaining environmentally responsible. But the defense of our nation is an imperative; other national goals cannot be achieved without it. This brief overview discusses the training and testing side of the balance between readiness and stewardship. Training Modem warfare requires specialized ranges where military personnel can leam, through practical hands-on experience, the skills necessary to assure victory and to survive in combat. The use of live ammunition and the ability to train in complex and realistic scenarios are fundamental requirements. DoD ranges support such training, from basic warfare skills to highly advanced integrated operational maneuver training. The Army’s National Training Center at Fort Irwin, California is a 1,000 square mile range in the Mojave Desert. The success of the Army in Desert Storm has been attributed to the specialized prior training armored, mechanized and air units received at Fort Irwin. Navy battle groups, with their onboard Marine Expeditionary Units (MEU), use water ranges and operating areas to sharpen offensive and defensive skills, including anti-submarine and carrier air operations. The Marines' projection of power from the sea to take control of airstrips in the vicinity of Kandahar during the war in Afghanistan exemplifies the results of such training. All services conduct military aviation training **requiring large areas of airspace** to prepare fighter, bomber and transport aircrews for combat. Airspace is also required over artillery ranges. Testing The testing of military weapons and equipment requires similar ranges. In order to ensure that our forces are armed with weapons systems that operate under all conditions on the battlefield, they must be rigorously tested. Some testing is done in laboratories, while some require ranges. Several of these ranges are very large, such as the 1,700 square mile Naval Air Warfare Center in China Lake, California, which is used to test aircraft, guided missiles and precision guided munitions (PGMS). The readiness of our Armed Forces **depends on** the continued availability of realistic testing and training. We owe our men and women in uniform nothing less.

#### Air power readiness deters war

Donnelly, 2k -- AEI fellow

(Thomas, American Enterprise Institute, “Rebuilding America’s Defenses: Strategy, Forces and Resources for a New Century,” Sept 2000, page 37, Project for New American Century, http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/pdf/RebuildingAmericasDefenses.pdf)

The reconstitution of the stateside Air Force as a large-scale, warfighting force will complicate the service’s plans to reconfigure itself for the purposes of expeditionary operations. But the proliferation of overseas bases should reduce many, if not all, of the burdens of rotational contingency operations. Because of its inherent mobility and flexibility, the Air Force will be the first U.S. military force to arrive in a theater during times of crisis; as such, the Air Force must retain its ability to deploy and sustain sufficient numbers of aircraft to **deter wars** and **shape** any **conflict in its earliest stages**. Indeed, it is the Air Force, along with the Army, that remains the core of America’s ability to apply decisive military power when its pleases. To dissipate this ability to deliver a rapid hammer blow is to lose the key component of American military preeminence.

#### Mine-warfare key to readiness and deterrence

**US Navy 8**

**(**<http://www.public.navy.mil/surfor/comomag/Pages/conceptofoperations.aspx#.UQ_YCh19Iw8>, “U.S. Navy Mine Familiarizer”,  [COMOMAG CORPUS CHRISTI TX](http://www.public.navy.mil/surfor/comomag))

The Navy is seriously committed to maintaining a potent sea mining capability. **Mining can be** used as **a** **strategic deterrent and**/or as a **force multiplier** in this era during which the Navy faces a continued reduction in platform numbers. The unique attributes of naval mines make them one of the most effective forms of naval warfare across the spectrum of conflict. Even the suggestion of the presence of mines in the water has deterred or delayed waterborne movement until the threat could be effectively assessed and neutralized. In the early stages of future crises, mines positioned either overtly or clandestinely, not necessarily in large numbers, could be a strategic tool in convincing an adversary to reassess its intentions, contributing to the establishment of **battlespace dominance**. Therefore, mining can be effective across many different levels of conflict, either as a stand‑alone option or as one element in a broader response. Our allies and adversaries recognize that mines are relatively low-cost weapons that can level the playing field between otherwise unequal opponents. To guarantee the effectiveness of our future forces, we must develop and maintain an inventory of modern weapons, integrate mining into the overall planning to shape the battlespace, and ensure the availability of a variety of delivery platforms in sufficient numbers to execute approved plans. Maintenance of a robust mining capability also provides a basic understanding of state-of-the-art sea mine technology that allows us to optimize development of an effective countermeasures force. Our Mining Concept of Operations (CONOPS) describes the top-level operational roles of mining as a key component of our overall naval operational structure. There are three stages of mining operations within which all aspects of mining are grouped. They are the planning, delivery, and campaign stages. Planning The planning stage of the mining CONOPS includes the following basic activities: · Determining mission requirements and maintaining mine assets · Identifying and planning priority minefields · Developing, acquiring, and prepositioning mining assets · Exercising and training in the mining area · Implementation of global mining alliances Requisite to the determination of mission requirements is threat assessment, collection of environmental and target data, and the development of algorithms for mine sensors. Effective minefield modeling is particularly important in this regard. The development and acquisition of mines is an extremely important component of the planning phase, as is maintenance of a modern mine stockpile. Rigorous training and mining exercises are essential to ensure our readiness to conduct mining operations.

#### Radio spectrum encroachment destroys training and readiness

Kidd, 11 -- Department of the Navy director for strategic spectrum policy

[Thomas, and Mark Rossow, provides strategic spectrum policy support for the DON spectrum team, “DON Manages Increasing Spectrum Encroachment,” 7-25-11, <http://www.doncio.navy.mil/ContentView.aspx?ID=2515>, accessed 2-6-13, mss]

The Department of the Navy's electromagnetic spectrum, or radio frequency, use is similarly affected by encroachment. During the past decades naval spectrum use grew proportionally to public and commercial use. For most of the 20th century, the Navy and Marine Corps had ample spectrum to support communications, radar and other spectrum-enabled capabilities. Spectrum use, though always regulated, was relatively unimpeded. But near the end of the 20th century, the emergence of a plethora of wireless capabilities, made possible by the use of radio frequencies, began to affect the amount of spectrum available to naval forces. While public and commercial spectrum use, as well as federal government use, increased dramatically in recent decades, so too has the **military's reliance** on spectrum. To help ensure harmony with public and commercial spectrum requirements, restrictions limiting naval spectrum use, such as time, location, altitude and propagation, are often placed on DON installations just as training and operational restrictions are imposed. Some spectrum restrictions intend to prevent radio frequency interference to public and commercial spectrum use; while others are self-imposed to prevent interference between Navy, Marine Corps, Army and Air Force equipment. As spectrum use increases, spectrum encroachment will continue to challenge the Navy and Marine Corps when conducting **realistic training** and day-to-day operations. The DON maintains a unique and diverse cadre of spectrum professionals who understand the department's spectrum requirements, ensure they are met and comply with international, federal, Department of Defense and DON regulations. The department's globally dispersed spectrum team of civilian and military personnel are located at installations, training ranges, major commands and operational organizations throughout the nation and the world. This team coordinates and negotiates the department's usage of spectrum with host nation governments and non-government entities. Access to and use of spectrum continues to be **vital to the nation's naval services**. The DON, in its continuing efforts to ensure spectrum is available, will also continue to ensure that its use is in concert with commercial and public spectrum use — as a good neighbor should.

### AT: Budgets

#### Military already shielded itself- locked-in contracts

Burnett, 1-6 -- Orlando Sentinel staff

[Richard, "Fiscal-cliff fears trigger potential bonanza for Lockheed, region's military contractors," 1-6-13, Orlando Sentinel, articles.orlandosentinel.com/2013-01-06/business/os-cfb-defense-contract-rush-0107-20130106\_1\_fiscal-cliff-fears-f-35-lockheed-s-orlando, accessed 1-11-12, mss]

In the weeks leading up to the dreaded "fiscal cliff," the U.S. military **flung open its coffers** and awarded a slew of defense **contracts** before Jan. 1, when automatic spending cuts had been scheduled to take effect. Agencies within the Department of Defense committed billions of dollars to the contract pipeline in December — for everything from fighter jets and missiles to training simulators and construction projects — to protect them from across-the-board cuts mandated by the 2011 deficit-reduction law. And while last week's fiscal-cliff compromise between the White House and Republicans in Congress delayed the defense-budget controversy until March, it is clear Central Florida was one of the big beneficiaries of the Pentagon's last-minute rush of contracts. In December alone, the military doled out contracts worth nearly $6.6 billion for work to be performed partly or totally in Central Florida, according to the latest Department of Defense figures. And nearly all of it involves Lockheed Martin Corp., the region's biggest defense contractor. The $6.6 billion was three times the total size of Central Florida-related contracts awarded back in September, which is typically the busiest month for military spending because the federal government's fiscal year ends Sept. 30. "The last-minute rush usually comes at the end of the fiscal year, because military agencies want to get that money **obligated** so it won't get cut," said Michael Blades, senior defense analyst for the global consulting firm Frost & Sullivan. "So it is not surprising to also see this big spike of contracts as we approached the so-called fiscal cliff. Once that money is out there, it's generally insulated from budgetcuts."

### Korea

The entire past 50 years disproves escalation

White 10 – Master’s in journalism from Columbia and IR degree from the London School of Economics, editor for Business Insider and formerly wrote for MSNBC (3/26, Gregory, Business Insider, “The Long, Long History Of False Starts Of War Between South And North Korea”, http://www.businessinsider.com/were-calling-it-this-is-not-the-start-the-restart-of-the-korean-war-2010-3, WEA)

History suggests that this sinking of a South Korean naval vessel off the coast of the country will not be the restart of the Korean conflict. Since the end of open conflict between North and South Korea, the North has consistently acted in an aggressive manner towards its neighbor. During the 1960s, North Korea conducted military operations into the south, culminating in 1968 when 600 of these raids were reported. In the 1970s, North Korea tried to assassinate key members of the South Korean government, in an attempt to push the crisis forward. In 1999, two North Korean naval ships were blown up killing 30. In 2002, a sea battle killed and unspecified amount of North Koreans and 5 South Koreans. In November 2009, two military vessels exchanged fire (via HuffPo). In January 2010, North Korea launched 30 shells into the country's no sail zone. This time won't be different. Little will happen.

No risk of Korean war

Meyer 3 (Carlton, Editor – G2 Military, The Mythical North Korean Threat, http://www.g2mil.com/korea.htm)

**The chance of a Korean war is** extremely unlikely**. North Korean** **leaders realize they have no hope of success without major backing** from China or Russia.  The previous South Korean President, Kim Dae Jung, encouraged peace and visited North Korea.  **The two countries are reconnecting rail lines and sent a combined team to the Olympics.  Even the** United States **is providing $500 million dollars** a year in food **to the starving North Koreans.  The new South Korean President**, Roh-Moo-hyun was elected on a peace platform and **suggested** **US troops may be gone within ten years**.

Tension in the region is subsiding and multilateral talks solve

Barnett 9 (Thomas, Professor – US Naval War College, “Threat of Great Power War Recedes”, Korea Times, 3-23, http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/opinon/2009/03/137\_41779.html)

Here's where it gets tricky for President Obama: the three conflict scenarios that currently justify our military's big-war focus are China-Taiwan; North Korea, and Iran. All three scenarios will effectively disappear over the next half-decade. With the Kuomintang's return to power in Taipei last year, tranquility broke out between island and mainland, triggering a concerted effort at brokering a peace treaty that matches Taiwan's already profound economic integration with China. If only Nixon could go to China, then only Chiang Kai-shek's party could do the same for Taiwan. Setting aside political integration, Taipei's leaders follow Hong Kong's example: separate systems integrating with one another in an expanding economic commonwealth. We're witnessing the first steps toward an Asian economic union with China as its natural anchor. No, it will not be a linear journey, as the current economic crisis demonstrates, but where else can small Asian states turn? As for Kim Jong-il's North Korea, that fake state won't long survive the Dear Leader's death, made all the more imminent by a recent stroke that Pyongyang strenuously denied. Whatever the timetable, the key point here is that none of the concerned great powers expects North Korea's collapse will trigger war among them. Their long-standing multilateral talks have demystified that dire scenario.

Your evidence is massively exaggerated

Leitenberg 5 (Milton, Senior Research Scholar @ University of Maryland, “ASSESSING THE BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS AND BIOTERRORISM THREAT,” December, EMM)

Framing “the threat” and setting the agenda of public perceptions and policy prescriptions. For the past decade the risk and immanence of the use of biological agents by nonstate actors/terrorist organizations—“bioterrorism”—has been systematically and deliberately exaggerated. It became more so after the combination of the 9/11 events and the October- November 2001 anthrax distribution in the United States that followed immediately afterwards. U.S. Government officials worked hard to spread their view to other countries. An edifice of institutes, programs, conferences, and publicists has grown up which continue the exaggeration and scare-mongering. In the last year or two, the drumbeat had picked up. It may however become moderated by the more realistic assessment of the likelihood of the onset of a natural flu pandemic, and the accompanying realization that the U.S. Government has been using the overwhelming proportion of its relevant resources to prepare for the wrong contingency.

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.

Terrorists won’t use bioweapons

Stern 99 (Jessica, Member of the Council on Foreign Relations, “The Prospect of Domestic Bioterrorism,” http://www.cdc.gov/ncidod/EID/vol5no4/stern.htm CDC Emerging Infectious Diseases--Vol 5 # 4 July)

Would domestic terrorists use biological weapons?1 The conventional wisdom among experts has been that terrorists "want a lot of people watching, not a lot of people dead" and are unlikely to turn to weapons of mass destruction.2 A new school of thought proposes that improved technology has made biological attacks resulting in hundreds of thousands or millions of deaths all but inevitable. While terrorists are increasingly interested in weapons of mass destruction, proponents of the latter view exaggerate the threat. Using biological weapons to create mass casualties would require more than having biological agents in hand. The terrorists would need to disseminate the agent, which presents technical and organizational obstacles that few domestic groups could surmount. In addition, relatively few terrorists would want to kill millions of people, even if they could. For most terrorists, the costs of escalation to biological weapons would seem to outweigh the benefits. Most modern terrorists have had substantively rational goals, such as attaining national autonomy or establishing a government purportedly more representative of the people's will. Escalating to such frightening weapons would result in a massive government crackdown and could alienate the group'ssupporters. Biological weapons are also dangerous to produce. A number of Aum Shinrikyo members reportedly damaged their own health while working on biological agents. Additionally, some terrorists may perceive moral constraints.3

No extinction - history proves

Easterbrook 3 (Gregg, Senior Fellow – New Republic, “We’re All Gonna Die!”, Wired Magazine, July, http://www.wired.com/wired/archive/11.07/doomsday.html?pg=1&topic=&topic\_set=)

3. Germ warfare!Like chemical agents, **bio**logical **weapons have never lived up to their billing in pop**ular **culture.** Consider the 1995 medical thriller Outbreak, in which a highly contagious virus takes out entire towns. The reality is quite different. **Weaponized smallpox escaped from a Soviet laboratory** in Aralsk, Kazakhstan, in 1971; **three** people **died, no epidemic followed. In** 19**79, weapons-grade anthrax got out** of a Soviet facility in Sverdlovsk (now called Ekaterinburg); **68 died, no epidemic. The loss of life was** tragic, but **no greater than** could have been caused by **a single conventional bomb. In** 19**89, workers at a US government facility** near Washington **were** accidentally **exposed to Ebola** virus. **They walked around** the community **and hung out with family and friends for** several **days** before the mistake was discovered. **No one died.** The fact is, **evolution has spent millions of years conditioning mammals to resist germs. Consider the Black Plague. It was the worst known pathogen in history**, loose in a Middle Ages society of poor public health, awful sanitation, and no antibiotics. **Yet it didn’t kill off humanity. Most people** who were caught in the epidemic **survived. Any superbug introduced into today’s Western world would encounter top-notch public health, excellent sanitation, and an array of medicines specifically engineered to kill bioagents.** Perhaps one day some aspiring Dr. Evil will invent a bug that bypasses the immune system. Because it is possible some novel superdisease could be invented, or that existing pathogens like smallpox could be genetically altered to make them more virulent (two-thirds of those who contract natural smallpox survive), biological agents are a legitimate concern. They may turn increasingly troublesome as time passes and knowledge of biotechnology becomes harder to control, allowing individuals or small groups to cook up nasty germs as readily as they can buy guns today. But no superplague has ever come close to wiping out humanity before, and it seems unlikely to happen in the future.

Tech hurdles check

Mueller 6 (John, Chair of National Security Studies – Mershon Center and Professor of Political Science – Ohio State University, Overblown, p. 24)

Not only has the science about chemical and biological weapons been quite sophisticated for more than a century, but that science has become massively more developed over that period. Moreover, **govern­ments** (not just small terrorist groups) **have spent a great deal of money** over decades in an effort to make the weapons more effective. **Yet**, although there have been great improvements in the lethality, effective­ness, and deployment of conventional and nuclear weapons during that time, **the difficulties of controlling and dispersing c**hemical andbiological substances **seem to have persisted.** Perhaps dedicated terrorists will, in time, figure it out. However, the experience in the 1990s of the Japanese cult **Aum Shinrikyo** suggests there are great difficulties. The group **had** some **300 scientists** in its employ **and** an estimated budget of **$1 billion, and** it reportedly **tried** at least **nine times** over five years **to set off bio**logical **weapons** by spray­ing pathogens from trucks and wafting them from rooftops, hoping fancifully to ignite an apocalyptic war**. These efforts failed to create a single fatality**; in fact, nobody even noticed that the attacks had taken place. It was at that point that the group abandoned its biological efforts in frustration and instead turned to the infamous sarin chemical attack.29 As two analysts stress, there have been so few **bio**logical (and **chem**­ical) **terrorist attacks** because they **would require overcoming** several **major technological hurdles**. Among them: **gaining access to special**ized **ingredients, acquiring equipment and know-how** to produce and dis­perse the agents, **and creating an organization that can resist** infiltration or early **detection** by law enforcement."In the meantime, the science with respect to detecting and ably responding to such attacks is likely to grow. Although acknowledging that things could change in the future, the Gilmore Commission has concluded, "As easy as some argue that it may be for terrorists to culture anthrax spores or brew up a concoction of deadly nerve gas, the **effective dissemination** or dispersal of these viruses and poisons **still presents seri­ous technological hurdles** that greatly inhibit their effective use.
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