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**It’ll pass – bipart support – Obama pushing.**

Binshteyn 3-5. [Nataliya, lawyer @ Greenberg Traurig LLP, "Immigration compromise makes bipartisan headway as Congress, business and labor converge on solutions" Lexology -- www.lexology.com/library/detail.aspx?g=3427c20d-1f81-47ae-8e3f-7401e728de06]

The movement to craft a bipartisan plan for comprehensive immigration reform appears to be making genuine headway despite the Capitol’s reputation for gridlock. The tide toward progress has been helped by an unlikely compromise between U.S. business and labor groups, represented by the Chamber of Commerce and the AFL-CIO, who recently reached a breakthrough agreement to support a series of principles that will make it easier for employers to hire foreign employees when American workers cannot fill needed jobs. The new scheme would include a new worker visa program that may obviate the two camps’ long-standing disagreement about the prospect of a temporary worker program. Moreover, a joint statement released by the groups cites the need for a new federal agency bureau that will inform Congress and the public about labor market needs and worker shortages. ¶ In addition, House Republicans are debating a closed-door proposal that includes eventual citizenship for the 11 million undocumented immigrants currently living in the United States. Under the House version, undocumented immigrants would first be allowed to live and work in the country on a provisional basis and subsequently qualify for “green cards” through employer or family-based sponsorship. For its part, the Senate is also involved in active talks about comprehensive immigration reform and prominent senators from both parties have recently held high-level meetings with President Obama about this issue, prompting Senator Lindsey Graham (Republican – South Carolina) to state that it was “one of the best meetings” he had “ever had with the [P]resident.”

**Plan saps capital**

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

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

**Pc’s key**

Shifter 12/27/12 (Michael, President of the Inter-American Dialogue, “Will Obama Kick the Can Down the Road?”)

Not surprisingly, Obama has been explicit that reforming the US’s shameful and broken immigration system will be a top priority in his second term. There is every indication that he intends to use some of his precious political capital – especially in the first year – to push for serious change. The biggest lesson of the last election was that the “Latino vote” was decisive. No one doubts that it will be even more so in future elections. During the campaign, many Republicans -- inexplicably -- frightened immigrants with offensive rhetoric. But the day after the election, there was talk, in both parties, of comprehensive immigration reform. Despite the sudden optimism about immigration reform, there is, of course, no guarantee that it will happen. It will require a lot of negotiation and deal-making. Obama will have to invest a lot of his time and political capital -- twisting some arms, even in his own party. Resistance will not disappear. There is also a chance that something unexpected could happen that would put off consideration of immigration reform. Following the horrific massacre at a Connecticut elementary school on December 14, for example, public pressure understandably mounted for gun control, at least the ban of assault weapons. But a decision to pursue that measure -- though desperately needed -- would take away energy and time from other priorities like immigration.

**Key to the economy**

De Los Santos 2-9. [Michael, political writer, contributor @ Policy Mic, "3 Ways Immigration Reform Will Lead to a Stronger American Economy" Policy Mic -- www.policymic.com/articles/25301/3-ways-immigration-reform-will-lead-to-a-stronger-american-economy]

Immigration, immigration, immigration: it seems that reform has become the hot topic of the day now that the debt ceiling debate is temporarily over. PolicyMic has published at least 16 articles over the last week that dealt with the topic. We have had a bipartisan panel and President Obama release ideas for immigration reform, and you can expect it to play a significant role in his upcoming State of the Union address. With the economy still the biggest driver of dissatisfaction in this country, how will passing immigration reform impact the economic recovery? Passing a comprehensive package will positively impact the economy in three key areas: consumption, tax revenue and job creation.¶ 1. Consumption:¶ Consumption is driven by wages, and so to understand how consumption will improve, we have to look at wage increases. Immigration reform does not just impact the immigrant community, but U.S.-born workers as well. Our first glimpses are the effects of President Reagan's Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986. While immigrants still made less than their U.S. born-comrades, they still saw their incomes increase by 15% years following their legalization. While anti-immigration reform groups will dispute the effectiveness of the reforms of 1986, they can’t refute the increase in wages.¶ These wage increases also extended to U.S.-born workers. The Economic Policy Institute looked at the impact immigration had on wages of the non-immigrant community. What they found was that between 1994 and 2007, wages increased by 0.4% over foreign-born workers. This also extended to those with less than a high school education, who still saw a 0.3% increase during that same time as a result of immigration. These aren't huge gains, but the size of the gains wasn't as important as what they indicated: more workers mean a bigger economy. The influx of immigrant workers meant more people were earning wages, and therefore spending more and growing the economy, which in turn meant higher wages and more opportunities for everyone.¶ 2. Tax Revenue:¶ The increase in wage earners, wages, and spending leads to higher tax revenues. A 2010 study by the University of Southern California estimated that undocumented Latino workers missed out on $2.2 billion in income. As a result, the state of California missed out on $310 million in income taxes. They also determined that the federal government lost out on $1.4 billion in taxes.¶ Furthermore, the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation estimated that the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2006 would have generated $66 billion in new revenue between 2007 and 2016. This increase in revenue would have more than offset the estimated increase in entitlement spending of $54 billion.¶ 3. Job Creation:¶ The final area for consideration is job creation. Ezra Klein of The Washington Post examined this in a recent post. Small businesses are drivers of the economy, and as Klein points out, immigrants start business and file patents at a much higher rate than the non-immigrant community.¶ Our economy is struggling to create jobs and encourage consumer spending, and all levels of government are struggling to generate the necessary revenues and right spending cuts to tackle growing debt.¶ These factors make immigration reform a nobrainer. A comprehensive immigration plan addresses all three of these key areas to fixing our economy. In fact, immigration reform should be looked at as more than just immigration policy – it's economic policy. The economy and our country will be better because of it.

**Decline goes nuclear**

Green and Schrage ‘9 (Michael J Green is Senior Advisor and Japan Chair at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) and Associate Professor at Georgetown University. Steven P Schrage is the CSIS Scholl Chair in International Business and a former senior official with the US Trade Representative's Office, State Department and Ways & Means Committee, Asia Times, 2009 <http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Asian_Economy/KC26Dk01.html>)

Facing the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression, analysts at the World Bank and the US Central Intelligence Agency are just beginning to contemplate the ramifications for international stability if there is not a recovery in the next year. For the most part, the focus has been on fragile states such as some in Eastern Europe. However, the Great Depression taught us that a downward global economic spiral can even have jarring impacts on great powers. It is no mere coincidence that the last great global economic downturn was followed by the most destructive war in human history. In the 1930s, economic desperation helped fuel autocratic regimes and protectionism in a downward economic-security death spiral that engulfed the world in conflict. This spiral was aided by the preoccupation of the United States and other leading nations with economic troubles at home and insufficient attention to working with other powers to maintain stability abroad. Today's challenges are different, yet 1933's London Economic Conference, which failed to stop the drift toward deeper depression and world war, should be a cautionary tale for leaders heading to next month's London Group of 20 (G-20) meeting. There is no question the US must urgently act to address banking issues and to restart its economy. But the lessons of the past suggest that we will also have to keep an eye on those fragile threads in the international system that could begin to unravel if the financial crisis is not reversed early in the Barack Obama administration and realize that economics and security are intertwined in most of the critical challenges we face. A disillusioned rising power? Four areas in Asia merit particular attention, although so far the current financial crisis has not changed Asia's fundamental strategic picture. China is not replacing the US as regional hegemon, since the leadership in Beijing is too nervous about the political implications of the financial crisis at home to actually play a leading role in solving it internationally. Predictions that the US will be brought to its knees because China is the leading holder of US debt often miss key points. China's currency controls and full employment/export-oriented growth strategy give Beijing few choices other than buying US Treasury bills or harming its own economy. Rather than creating new rules or institutions in international finance, or reorienting the Chinese economy to generate greater long-term consumer demand at home, Chinese leaders are desperately clinging to the status quo (though Beijing deserves credit for short-term efforts to stimulate economic growth). The greater danger with China is not an eclipsing of US leadership, but instead the kind of shift in strategic orientation that happened to Japan after the Great Depression. Japan was arguably not a revisionist power before 1932 and sought instead to converge with the global economy through open trade and adoption of the gold standard. The worldwide depression and protectionism of the 1930s devastated the newly exposed Japanese economy and contributed directly to militaristic and autarkic policies in Asia as the Japanese people reacted against what counted for globalization at the time. China today is similarly converging with the global economy, and many experts believe China needs at least 8% annual growth to sustain social stability. Realistic growth predictions for 2009 are closer to 5%. Veteran China hands were watching closely when millions of migrant workers returned to work after the Lunar New Year holiday last month to find factories closed and jobs gone. There were pockets of protests, but nationwide unrest seems unlikely this year, and Chinese leaders are working around the clock to ensure that it does not happen next year either. However, the economic slowdown has only just begun and nobody is certain how it will impact the social contract in China between the ruling communist party and the 1.3 billion Chinese who have come to see President Hu Jintao's call for "harmonious society" as inextricably linked to his promise of "peaceful development". If the Japanese example is any precedent, a sustained economic slowdown has the potential to open a dangerous path from economic nationalism to strategic revisionism in China too. Dangerous states It is noteworthy that North Korea, Myanmar and Iran have all intensified their defiance in the wake of the financial crisis, which has distracted the world's leading nations, limited their moral authority and sown potential discord. With Beijing worried about the potential impact of North Korean belligerence or instability on Chinese internal stability, and leaders in Japan and South Korea under siege in parliament because of the collapse of their stock markets, leaders in the North Korean capital of Pyongyang have grown increasingly boisterous about their country's claims to great power status as a nuclear weapons state. The junta in Myanmar has chosen this moment to arrest hundreds of political dissidents and thumb its nose at fellow members of the 10-country Association of Southeast Asian Nations. Iran continues its nuclear program while exploiting differences between the US, UK and France (or the P-3 group) and China and Russia - differences that could become more pronounced if economic friction with Beijing or Russia crowds out cooperation or if Western European governments grow nervous about sanctions as a tool of policy. It is possible that the economic downturn will make these dangerous states more pliable because of falling fuel prices (Iran) and greater need for foreign aid (North Korea and Myanmar), but that may depend on the extent that authoritarian leaders care about the well-being of their people or face internal political pressures linked to the economy. So far, there is little evidence to suggest either and much evidence to suggest these dangerous states see an opportunity to advance their asymmetrical advantages against the international system. Challenges to the democratic model The trend in East Asia has been for developing economies to steadily embrace democracy and the rule of law in order to sustain their national success. But to thrive, new democracies also have to deliver basic economic growth. The economic crisis has hit democracies hard, with Japanese Prime Minister Aso Taro's approval collapsing to single digits in the polls and South Korea's Lee Myung-bak and Taiwan's Ma Ying Jeou doing only a little better (and the collapse in Taiwan's exports - particularly to China - is sure to undermine Ma's argument that a more accommodating stance toward Beijing will bring economic benefits to Taiwan). Thailand's new coalition government has an uncertain future after two years of post-coup drift and now economic crisis. The string of old and new democracies in East Asia has helped to anchor US relations with China and to maintain what former secretary of state Condoleezza Rice once called a "balance of power that favors freedom". A reversal of the democratic expansion of the past two decades would not only impact the global balance of power but also increase the potential number of failed states, with all the attendant risk they bring from harboring terrorists to incubating pandemic diseases and trafficking in persons. It would also undermine the demonstration effect of liberal norms we are urging China to embrace at home. Protectionism The collapse of financial markets in 1929 was compounded by protectionist measures such as the Smoot-Hawley tariff act in 1932. Suddenly, the economic collapse became a zero-sum race for autarkic trading blocs that became a key cause of war. Today, the globalization of finance, services and manufacturing networks and the World Trade Organization (WTO) make such a rapid move to trading blocs unlikely. However, protectionism could still unravel the international system through other guises. Already, new spending packages around the world are providing support for certain industries that might be perceived by foreign competitors as unfair trade measures, potentially creating a "Smoot-Hawley 2.0" stimulus effect as governments race to prop up industries. "Buy American" conditionality in the US economic stimulus package earlier this year was watered down somewhat by the Obama administration, but it set a tempting precedent for other countries to put up barriers to close markets.
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#### The United States federal government should impose escalating surcharges on land in the United States that gas 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 natural gas- 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.

**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 gas 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.
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#### Expanded offshore gas 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
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#### US-Russia cooperation is strong over Arctic energy, which is key to smooth overall relations- the plan derails it

**Weitz 1-29**-13 [Richard Weitz is a senior fellow at the Hudson Institute and a World Politics Review senior editor, “Global Insights: Oil Sector a Challenge for Russia, Opportunity for U.S.,” http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/12672/global-insights-oil-sector-a-challenge-for-russia-opportunity-for-u-s]

U.S.-based multinationals have the capital and technologies to help Russia exploit its Arctic riches. Meanwhile, the small and medium-sized American companies that revolutionized and revitalized U.S. oil production could bring the same technologies and management skills to Russia. ¶ To attract these companies, which could conceivably invest in other regions in Russia as well, the Russian government needs to create a more attractive investment climate. This would include legal, fiscal and regulatory reforms that establish a more competitive and transparent domestic market. In particular, the reforms must give tax breaks for energy companies that invest in new fields and technologies; encourage restructuring of the Russian oil industry to make it more innovative; reduce corruption and bureaucracy; and insure that property rights are better protected.¶ The United States would also benefit from a newly cooperative energy arrangement. In a recent paper, Rawi Abdelal of Harvard Business School and Tatiana Mitrova of the Moscow School of Management highlighted the fact that, despite their comprehensive bilateral relationship and the large role Russia and the United States play in global energy issues, the two countries cooperate very little in the hydrocarbon sector. ¶ In the view of Russians interviewed by the authors, this paucity of cooperation results from perceived impediments erected by the U.S. government. Similarly, Russian officials see the shale gas revolution as a conspiracy on the part of the United States to undermine Russia’s role in energy markets.¶ Absent forward momentum, the Russia-U.S. energy relationship might even deteriorate. The United States could soon become a major energy exporter again, which would lead to direct energy sales competition between Russia and the United States for the first time in history. One major opportunity for enhanced partnership, as opposed to competition, is the deal reached last August between Exxon Mobil and Rosneft. The project has only recently begun the preliminary seismic surveys, technical assessments and environmental studies that would allow any substantial drilling to start. ¶ Bringing the project to fruition, and augmenting it with near-term cooperation on tight oil and other energy projects, is important for both sides. Concrete Russia-U.S. energy collaboration could help dispel mutual misconceptions and perhaps spur U.S. and Russian economic cooperation in other areas. That in turn could help to increase the number of stakeholders in both countries that share an interest in maintaining good relations. These kinds of private-sector ties, as much as political will in Washington and Moscow, will contribute to the health of bilateral ties moving forward.

#### The plan disrupts the cooperative framework- destroys relations

**Sergunin and Konyshev ‘12** [Alexander Sergunin¶ Doctor of Political Science, Professor, St. Petersburg State University¶ Valery Konyshev¶ Doctor of Political Science, Professor, St. Petersburg State University, “US Arctic Strategy,” July 6, http://russiancouncil.ru/en/inner/?id\_4=584#top]

However, relations between the United States and Russia have significant potential for cooperation in the Arctic. According to experts, such relations are based on the Ilulissat Declaration signed by the “Arctic five” in May 2008, which states that the Convention on the Law of the Sea of 1982 was recognized as the legal basis for drawing borders, and that the parties intended to resolve problems through negotiations. In keeping with the general aspirations of Barack Obama to restart relations with Russia, there were statements including that of the U.S. President himself and Secretary of State on U.S. intentions to cooperate with Russia in the Arctic. However, it is likely that cooperation will only be in those areas where the USA. cannot do without Russian participation.¶ In particular, this concerns measures on ensuring the safety of water and air transportation in the Arctic, on which Member States of the Arctic Council signed an Agreement in May 2011. Each of the signatories undertook to build forces and resources to ensure safety in its segment and rapid exchange of information.¶ There is plan for a large-scale cooperation in the development of the resources of the Arctic zone of Russia. Rosneft and Exxon-Mobil – Russian and American companies, respectively – in April 2012 signed an agreement on cooperation in the exploration and development of oil and gas deposits in the Kara Sea.¶ Russia benefits from attracting the needed financial resources (Exxon-Mobil has capitalization of $400 billion) and modern technologies for exploration and drilling in the northern latitudes. Rosneft and ConocoPhillips, an American multinational energy corporation, are implementing another joint project at Nenets Autonomous District where they are developing the promising Ardalinskoye field. The American party is expected to increase investments.¶ Another direction of bilateral cooperation is the development of transantarctic routes for flights, involving development of communications infrastructure and maintenance, upgrade and construction of new airports in Russia. This airline market segment is the fastest growing.¶ Cooperation between the United States and Russia in the scientific study and nature conservation activities in the Arctic was and remains mutually beneficial. It is obvious that any decisions relating to the economic development of the Far North should be based on scientific analysis of the vulnerability of the northern nature and difficult weather, social, domestic and other conditions. In this respect, Russia can offer icebreaking fleet and its rich experience in Arctic expeditions.¶ At present, it is difficult to predict how relations between the United States and Russia in the Arctic will develop. This will depend, first, on the general mood in Russian-American relations, which may change if Republicans come to power in the USA. Secondly, it will depend on the effectiveness of Russia’s economic policy in the Arctic on attracting foreign investments and technology. Some positive steps have already been taken in this regard. Thirdly, it will depend on whether the US will maintain its present course of predominantly unilateral action in the region, or whether it will opt for multilateral cooperation.

#### Relations solve multiple extinction scenarios

**Tayler ’08** [Jeffrey, Russia correspondent for the Atlantic Monthly and a contributor to several other magazines as well as to NPR's All Things Considered, “Medvedev Spoils the Party,” <http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2008/11/medvedev-spoils-the-party/7130/>]

Like it or not, the United States cannot solve crucial global problems without Russian participation. Russia commands the largest landmass on earth; possesses vast reserves of oil, natural gas, and other natural resources; owns huge stockpiles of weapons and plutonium; and still wields a potent brain trust. Given its influence in Iran and North Korea, to say nothing of its potential as a spoiler of international equilibrium elsewhere, Russia is one country with which the United States would do well to reestablish a strong working relationship—a strategic partnership, even—regardless of its feelings about the current Kremlin government. The need to do so trumps expanding NATO or pursuing “full-spectrum dominance.” Once the world financial crisis passes, we will find ourselves returning to worries about resource depletion, environmental degradation, and global warming – the greatest challenges facing humanity. No country can confront these problems alone. For the United States, Russia may just prove the “indispensable nation” with which to face a volatile future arm in arm.

### Solvency

**Restrictions irrelevant- prices too low to incentivize drilling**

**Harder, 12** -- National Journal energy correspondent

(Amy, "The Price Isn't Right," National Journal Daily AM, 1-31-12, l/n, accessed 9-5-12, mss)

For the United States to really capitalize on all the natural gas President Obama is boasting about, the price of it has to go up so that companies have an incentive to drill. Calling for high energy prices doesn't make political sense. But Obama is implicitly trying to do that by pushing incentives for natural-gas-powered trucks and cars that could boost demand for the energy sourceand therefore prices. Obama traveled to the battleground states of Nevada and Colorado last week to tout such a proposal in the wake of his State of the Union address. Legislation incentivizing natural-gas-powered trucks is politically popular and has Republican support in Congress. Such a measure would have the potential to create jobs, bolster energy independenceand raise natural-gas prices. The administration is quietly taking two other politically controversial steps that could also boost natural-gas demand: implementing environmental regulations that are prompting utilities to shift from coal to the relatively cleaner-burning natural gas, and processing applications from companies to export natural gas. With the nation's natural-gas prices under $3 per million British thermal units (a worldwide low, and down from nearly $14 per million Btu in 2008), oil and gas companies are shifting investments from America's recently discovered vast shale gas reserves to resources that fetch higher prices such as oil. Energy analysts say that this trend will continue for at least the next few years until prices reach a level where it becomes more profitable to produce gas.

#### 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.

### Helium

#### No one will retrieve helium- flawed pricing and the Federal Reserve has no money

**Plumer ’12** [Brad, reporter at the Washington Post writing about domestic policy, particularly energy and environmental issues, “Congress turns its attention to... America’s helium crisis,” 5-13-12, http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/post/congress-turns-its-attention-to-americas-helium-crisis/2012/05/12/gIQA4fIbKU\_blog.html]

There was just one small hitch. According to a 2010 report by the National Research Council, the formula that Congress used to set the price for the helium was flawed. Bingaman has dubbed it a “fire sale.” The federally owned helium now sells for about half of what it would on the open market (see chart on the right).¶ And, since the Federal Helium Reserve provides about one-third of the world’s helium each year, this has upended the entire market. There’s little incentive to conserve, recycle or find new sources of helium. Instead, we’ve been frittering it away. And once helium escapes into the air, it can’t be recovered. That’s partly why, since 2011, the world has been running into shortages, as demand has outstripped supply.¶ Worse, under existing law, the Federal Helium Reserve could run out of money to operate as early as mid-2013. When that happens, it will still have a large chunk of the world’s helium supply locked in the reservoir — but no one will be able to access it.¶ “If Congress does not act,” Bingaman said, “the helium program will disappear altogether in less than three years, leaving our hospitals, national labs, domestic manufacturers and helium producers without an adequate supply.”

#### Not a supply and demand problem- long term supplies solve

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

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

**Alt cause- Balloons**

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

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

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

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

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

#### No impact to science diplomacy

**Dickson ‘09** [David, Direction Science & Development Network. June 2, 2009, “Science diplomacy: the case for caution”,[http://scidevnet.wordpress.com/category/new- frontiers-in-science-diplomacy-2009](http://scidevnet.wordpress.com/category/new-%20frontiers-in-science-diplomacy-2009%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank), SM]

One of the frustrations of meetings at which scientists gather to discuss policy-related issues is the speed with which **the requirements for evidence-based discussion they would expect in a professional context can go out of the window.**Such has been the issue over the past two days in the meeting jointly organised in London by the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) and the Royal Society on the topic “New Frontiers in Science Diplomacy“. There has been much livelydiscussion on the value of international collaboration in achieving scientific goals, on the need for researchers to work together on the scientific aspects of global challenges such as climate change and food security, and on the importance of science capacity building in developing countries in order to make this possible. But there remained little evidence at the end of the meeting on how useful it was to lump all these activities together under the umbrella term of “science diplomacy”. More significantly, although numerous claims were made during the conference about the broader social and political value of scientific collaboration – for example, in establishing a framework for collaboration in other areas, and in particular reducing tensions between rival countries – **little was produced to demonstrate whether this hypothesis is true.**If it is not,then **some of the arguments made on behalf of “science diplomacy”, and in particular its value as a mechanism for exercising “soft power” in foreign policy, do not stand up to close scrutiny**. Indeed, a case can be made thatwhere scientific projects have successfully involved substantial international collaboration, such success is often **heavily dependent on a prior political commitment to cooperation, rather than a mechanism for securing cooperation where the political will is lacking**. Three messages appeared to emerge from the two days of discussion. Firstly, where the political will to collaborate does exist, a joint scientific project can be a useful expression of that will. Furthermore, it can be an enlightening experience for all those directly involved. But it is **seldom a magic wand that can secure broader cooperation** where none existed before. Secondly, “science diplomacy” will only become recognised as a useful activity if it is closely defined to cover specific situations (such as the negotiation of major international scientific projects or collaborative research enterprises). As an umbrella term embracing the many ways in which science interacts with foreign policy, it loses much of its impact, and thus its value. Finally, when it comes to promoting the use of science in developing countries, a terminology based historically on maximising self-interest – the ultimate goal of the diplomat – and on practices through which the rich have almost invariably ended up exploiting the poor, is likely to be counterproductive. In other words, the discussion seemed to confirm that “science diplomacy” has a legitimate place inthe formulation and implementation of policies for science (just as there is a time and place for exercising “soft power” in international relations). But the dangers of going beyond this – including the danger of distorting the integrity of science itself, and even alienating potential partners in collaborative projects, particularly in the developing world – were also clearly exposed.

Air power not key to overall power or deterrence – their evidence is biased
Axe 09 – (David, military correspondent, regular contributor to The Washington Times, C-SPAN, and Wired, 3/30/9, http://www.warisboring.com/2009/03/30/f-22s-versus-russias-rusting-ramshackle-air-force/)

Analyst Gregory Martin, a retired Air Force general, said the erosion of world influence is largely the result of weak public support for the F-22 and F-35 stealth fighters, which are built by Lockheed Martin, Boeing and Northrop Grumman. “If you can’t afford that [mix], then your national objectives have to be scaled back,” Martin said. In other words, stealth fighters equal national power. And the absence of stealth fighters equals weakness. Hogwash. The economic crisis is having an effect on every country, unevenly. Arguably, the U.S. is faring better than most as investors flee to the comparative safety of the dollar. Power in the world is a relative thing: if everyone else gets much weaker, and we stay the same or only grow a little weak, then we are, in fact, more powerful than we were before. Get it? The global recession, alone, does not mean we are losing influence. In fact, the recession might even boost our influence, by underscoring just how much the world depends on America as a consumer market. But more importantly, American national power does not hinge on fighter jets. We could retire every single fighter in the U.S. Air Force, tomorrow, and still remain the most powerful nation in the world, by far. National power is a complex and shifting thing, comprising military force, financial and cultural influence, leadership in international coalitions and organizations and even language. Every country in the world teaches American English to its business students, aviators and sea captains. Does that have anything to do with the F-22? Do some of our biggest exports — music, movies and television — depend on a squadron of F-35s flying orbits over North Dakota? Ignore the noise coming out of Washington’s punditocracy as the Obama Administration shapes its first defense budget. And when that budget is published, and it (inevitably) includes cuts to Air Force fighter programs, take a deep breath before panicking and consider: Nearly everyone telling you we must buy a given quantity of stealth fighters, or lose global influence, has a financial stake in advocating such purchases. Of the speakers at the Wednesday confab: \* Loren Thompson, from the Lexington Institute, runs a private consultancy for the defense industry, with clients including Lockheed Martin \* Thompson’s colleague, Rebecca Grant, also runs her own consultancy for the defense industry \* Gregory Martin has been a Northrop Grumman consultant The U.S. Air Force is in deep trouble, but it’s trouble of its own making. And it’s testimony to just how overwhelming, and sustainable, is America’s military, cultural, linguistic and financial dominance in the world that our primary military air service can commit slow, institutional suicide without alarming too many people, aside from a few hardware nerds like me and the consultants who get rich gabbing about certain pointy airplanes on behalf of wealthy corporate clients.

### Cooperative Federalism

#### Turn 1- Weaver concludes negative- federal intervention over OCS key to cooperative federalism, environment, and solvency

Weaver 2 (Sierra B., Senior Staff Attorney with Expertise in Climate Change, Forests and Public Lands, and Marine Conservation – Defenders of Wildlife (Litigation Group in Washington, DC), “NOTE: Local Management of Natural Resources: Should Local Governments be Able to Keep Oil Out?,” The Harvard Environmental Law Review, 26 Harv. Envtl. L. Rev. 231, Lexis)

 D. Making Sense of the Seaweed Rebellion While local control of land use planning has long been a key tenet of federalism, with local governments acting as a kind of public/private hybrid that is enabled by state law, n110 it is undeniable that coastal communities' local energy development policies can directly and indirectly affect the rest of the nation and the world. At its most basic level, the OCS is a national resource that should be subject to national control. Although Congress has to some degree allowed for state and local input in federal decision-making, it could, if it so desired, preempt the entire field. As a [\*254] political matter, this would likely be unfeasible due to strong public commitment to local participation in resource management decisions. n111 In today's world of diminishing resources, local environments and ecosystems have become major national concerns. Protection of the California coast, or any other location, cannot remain simply a matter of local land use preferences. While the nation's energy resources are important, society has also recognized other equally important values in preserving wilderness areas, endangered species, areas of cultural and historic significance, and marine areas of significant productivity, just to name a few. Ignoring these values when oil extraction is at issue both undervalues and undermines national environmental commitments. Because support for these environmental values is deeply rooted in society, it is not surprising that individuals and organizations continue to discover and develop new legal tools to use for environmental protection. Nevertheless, encouraging a system in which state and local governments are forced to work outside the federal framework simply exacerbates the tensions and inconsistencies inherent in OCS management. Throughout the different phases of the Seaweed Rebellion, state and local interests have reacted to what they experience as the federal government's lack of respect for competing values and competing voices in the debate over offshore energy development. With little regard for local priorities, the federal government has pushed ahead with oil and gas extraction as its primary goal for the OCS. This shortsighted and narrow view, however, has in fact prevented the federal government from achieving the extraction it desires. The executive and judicial branches have failed to recognize the public will as it was originally expressed by Congress in OCSLA and the CZMA. Consequently, the federal government has also failed to balance effectively national environmental concerns against its energy interests. As a result, those expressing the public will at the state and local levels have been forced to find other ways to incorporate local control into the federal OCS oil and gas development scheme. The following discussion presents a proposal for a more integrated approach to federal management of OCS energy development. This proposed integrated oil development scheme incorporates concerns regarding energy needs, environmental protection, and local participation, which have been highlighted throughout this Note. It also restores the [\*255] original intent of current laws and policies and reconciles their conflicting purposes in a new way. Although this proposal is specifically aimed at giving greater weight to environmental concerns and the non-oil resources of the OCS, its underlying purpose is to better respect both national energy priorities and local participation concerns.

#### Weaver thinks Congress should forbid leasing- opposite of the intent of the affirmative

Weaver 2 (Sierra B., Senior Staff Attorney with Expertise in Climate Change, Forests and Public Lands, and Marine Conservation – Defenders of Wildlife (Litigation Group in Washington, DC), “NOTE: Local Management of Natural Resources: Should Local Governments be Able to Keep Oil Out?,” The Harvard Environmental Law Review, 26 Harv. Envtl. L. Rev. 231, Lexis)

In particular, Interior must prepare five-year leasing programs that comply with the statutory mandate to best meet national energy needs, consider environmental sensitivity and marine productivity, and equitably share the benefits and environmental risks of OCS development. n112 In taking the competing values of the OCS seriously, Congress should simply forbid leasing in areas that meet a certain level of environmental sensitivity or purity. This baseline determination would equalize the priorities of OCS management, allowing respect for the different purposes of different areas of the ocean, rather than presuming extraction wherever resources exist. Beyond the leasing decision, federal agencies and courts must enforce existing environmental laws without compromise, respecting the full intent of the laws and resolving that oil development must not be given special privileges. Only by making environmental concerns a top priority can the federal government implement a national energy policy that truly considers all relevant factors. Moreover, the federal government would then be able to regain control of a system that must be run at the federal level in order to best deal with the nation's energy and environmental needs.

#### Turn 2- Their Comer evidence is about national parks- doesn’t say OCS- and they are the opposite of their Comer evidence- they decrease federal government involvement

Comer 4 (Robert, D., Regional Solicitor in the Rocky Mountain Region – Department of the Interior, “Constitutional Conflicts on Public Lands: Cooperative Conservation: The Federalism Underpinnings to Public Involvement in the Management of Public Lands,” University of Colorado Law Review, Fall, 75 U. Colo. L. Rev. 1133, Lexis,

In contrast, individuals actively involved with on-the-ground public land management issues in the West are calling for more local involvement in the federal land management decision process. Even those who might be characterized as being on opposite sides of the philosophical spectrum have argued forcefully for approaches to conservation that recognize and incorporate local cooperative conservation processes. n133 Advocates of cooperative conservation are hopeful that these decision processes will break through the paralysis and litigation borne of the current conflicts in federal land and water resource management to yield improved resource decisions informed by local knowledge. In essence, they see value in local involvement and seem not to share the fear that the local interests will dominate the process, make unlawful decisions, or [\*1155] unduly influence federal land managers. n134 Cooperative conservation group involvement in federal land management is considered to be "an experiment in new governance, a revival in Jeffersonian democracy." n135 Thus, cooperative conservation should not be viewed as a political effort when advanced administratively. n136 Some may view these broad grants of authority to invoke cooperative federalism as diminishing the authority of the Secretary and abdicating federal management responsibilities. n137 However, these grants provide more latitude in the exercise of discretion and create potentially important options in public land management and decision processes. Congress and the courts have provided guidance on permissible delegations of authority, the contours of which may be more limited when undertaken through executive discretion rather than through legislation. But, the underlying concept remains the same. Cooperative conservation is one of many tools available to federal land managers, a tool that should be used when it will serve the essential purpose of better conserving our land, water, and wildlife resources.

#### Turn 3- the Court

#### Their Aroney evidence is a reason the Supreme Court actor is *bad*- defers to the federal government in disputes- turns federalism

Aroney 6 (Nicholas – Senior Lecturer in Law, T.C. Beirne School of Law and Fellow, Centre for Public, International and Comparative Law, The University of Queensland, Australia, “Formation, Representation and Amendment in Federal Constitutions”, 2006, lexis)

A further complicating factor is that the powers allocated by the four constitutions under consideration are in some instances "exclusive" to the recipient polity, while in other cases the powers are "concurrently" exercised by both the federation and the States, with federal laws prevailing in the event of inconsistency. n84 Thus, in Australia and the United States, federal legislative powers are mostly concurrent with the States, and inconsistency between State and federal laws is resolved in favor of the federal legislature. n85 This principle of concurrency is qualified, particularly in the case of Australia, by a small but significant number of exclusive powers explicitly conferred upon the federal Parliament, n86 as well as a number of competences specifically removed from the States. n87 In both countries, there has also been judicial consideration of the possibility that certain formally concurrent powers are in effect exclusive to the federation, usually explained as a result of some inherent limitation in the capacity of the States to address a particular subject matter. n88 In Switzerland, a similar distinction between concurrent and exclusive competences applies, but is further complicated by the fact that some concurrent federal powers extend only to the enactment of "framework" laws (in the context of which the Cantons then legislate), n89 as [\*294] well as by the system of so-called "administrative federalism," typical of European federations, n90 under which the federal legislature enacts laws that are subsequently enforced by the executive authorities of the various Cantons, rather than solely by federal government agencies. n91 Swiss federalism thus places greater emphasis upon the formulation of consensus-based government policy through a unique combination of inter-governmental cooperation, federal representation and popular referendum. n92 While cooperative federalism is certainly not absent in the United States, Canada and Australia, the relatively greater emphasis given in these countries to the "division" of powers adjudicated through judicial review reinforces the tendency to resolve policy disagreements in legalistic terms by recourse to litigation. n93 The history of judicial interpretation of federal legislative power in the United States is a long and complex one. n94 At times, the Supreme Court has emphasised the fact that the Constitution in Article 1, 8 confers only "limited and expressly delegated powers" upon the United States Congress and, at the same time, in the Tenth Amendment "reserves" to the States all powers not "delegated" to the United States, with the result that the explicit legislative powers of Congress must be "construed strictly." n95 However, at other times - and indeed for much of the 20th century - the Supreme Court has been prepared to interpret federal legislative power in rather expansive terms, notwithstanding the impact on the so-called "residual" powers of the States. n96 The Supreme Court has also at times - under the conception of federal and State governments as each "sovereign" within their respective "spheres" n97 - adopted a relatively strict doctrine of [\*295] "intergovernmental immunities," under which the State legislatures are prohibited from interfering with the federal government and the federal Congress is prohibited from taxing the instrumentalities of the States. n98 Particularly over the course of the twentieth century, however, this doctrine has also progressively been narrowed. n99

#### No modeling – newest ev.

Law and Versteeg 12. [David, Prof. of Law and Prof of PoliSci @ Washington University, St Louis, PHD @ Stanford, JD @ Harvard Law, Mila, Assoc. Prof, U of Virginia Law, D.Phil @ Oxford, "The Declining Influence of the United States Constitution" New York University Law Review -- Vol 87:762 -- www.law.nyu.edu/ecm\_dlv2/groups/public/@nyu\_law\_website\_\_journals\_\_law\_review/documents/documents/ecm\_pro\_072892.pdf]

There are growing suspicions, however, that America’s days as a¶ constitutional hegemon are coming to an end. ¶ 12¶ It has been said that the United States is losing constitutional influence because it is¶ increasingly out of sync with an evolving global consensus on issues of¶ human rights.¶ 13¶ Indeed, to the extent that other countries still look to¶ the United States as an example, their goal may be less to imitate¶ American constitutionalism than to avoid its perceived flaws and mistakes.¶ 14¶ Scholarly and popular attention has focused in particular¶ upon the influence of American constitutional jurisprudence. The¶ reluctance of the U.S. Supreme Court to pay “decent respect to the¶ opinions of mankind” 15 by participating in an ongoing “global judicial¶ dialogue”¶ 16¶ is supposedly diminishing the global appeal and influence¶ of American constitutional jurisprudence.¶ 17¶ Studies conducted by scholars in other countries have begun to yield empirical evidence that¶ citation to U.S. Supreme Court decisions by foreign courts is in fact on the decline.¶ 18¶ By contrast, however, the extent to which the U.S.¶ Constitution itself continues to influence the adoption and revision of¶ constitutions in other countries remains a matter of speculation and¶ anecdotal impression.¶ With the help of an extensive data set of our own creation that¶ spans all national constitutions over the last six decades, this¶ Article explores the extent to which various prominent¶ constitutions—including the U.S. Constitution—epitomize generic¶ rights constitutionalism or are, instead, increasingly out of sync with¶ evolving global practice. A stark contrast can be drawn between the¶ declining attraction of the U.S. Constitution as a model for other¶ countries and the increasing attraction of the model provided by¶ America’s neighbor to the north, Canada. We also address the possibility that today’s constitution makers look for inspiration not only to¶ other national constitutions, but also to regional and international¶ human rights instruments such as the Universal Declaration of¶ Human Rights and the European Convention on Human Rights. Our findings do little to assuage American fears of diminished influence in¶ the constitutional sphere.

#### Now their impacts- Pakistan

#### Multiple alt causes to Pakistan federalism- 1AC Author

Rais 9 (Dr Rasul Bakhsh Rais – Professor of Political Science in the Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, LUMS, , “The Balochistan Package; Redefining Federalism in Pakistan”, 2009, <http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=2&cad=rja&ved=0CCMQFjAB&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.forumfed.org%2Fen%2Fpubs%2Fpakistan%2FBalochistan%2520Package%2520paper%2520DrBakhshRais%2520LUMSfinalDec09.doc&ei=hUuZUM3MOpTo9gTGzIDwBQ&usg=AFQjCNFVJVwbn1RXEJ6OUzQYnuYMMzt-4Q&sig2=X4rfcoAc_tWOuVQqUZFmPw>)

Introduction Federalism, the constitutional distribution of power between the centre and the provinces, remains largely an unsettled issue in Pakistan for number of reasons. But chief among them is a historic tendency on the part of the federal governments, both military as well civilians, to assume greater responsibilities, and thus, greater powers than especially the smaller units in the federation would be comfortable with. From the very beginning, the political design of state and national building strategy placed greater trust and powers with the federal structure than the provinces, even ignoring their genuine identity, economic and political concerns. Far from achieving any meaningful integration, centralization of powers only alienated the provinces and resulted into disputes that involved use of force. The failure of keeping East Pakistan, now Bangladesh in the union, was primarily a failure in structuring a federal system that would balance the requirements of an effective national government with the aspirations of autonomy and self-empowerment of the provinces.

#### Their Sokolski card says the US has to increase economic assistance to Pakistan- aff doesn’t solve- 1AC author

Sokolski 9 (Henry, Executive Director of the Nonproliferation Policy Education Center, “PAKISTAN’S NUCLEAR FUTURE: REINING IN THE RISK,” Strategic Studies Institute, December, http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/pub963.pdf)

What, then, should the United States do? With regard to Pakistan reformulating its federal model, the United States might help to focus and condition economic assistance and freer access to U.S. markets and encourage Islamabad to foster greater equality among Pakistan’s key regions and ethnic and religious groups. One suggestion that this book’s authors discussed was giving each of Pakistan’s provinces greater power to promote trade directly with India and focusing foreign investment to expand such commerce. The aim here is to moderate Indian-Pakistani relations by bolstering Pakistan’s growing middle class. Pakistan, however, must take the first steps: If Islamabad does not want to reformulate its federal model to accommodate its various regions and ethnic and religious groups, Washington is in no position to help.

No Pakistani collapse

AP 10 (“Pakistan's stability, leadership under spotlight after floods and double dealing accusations,” August 6th, <http://www.foxnews.com/world/2010/08/06/pakistans-stability-leadership-spotlight-floods-double-dealing-accusations/>)

Not for the first time, Pakistan appears to be teetering on the edge with a government unable to cope. Floods are ravaging a country at war with al-Qaida and the Taliban. Riots, slayings and arson are gripping the largest city. Suggestions are flying that the intelligence agency is aiding Afghan insurgents. The crises raise questions about a nation crucial to U.S. hopes of success in Afghanistan and to the global campaign against Islamist militancy. Despite the recent headlines, few here see Pakistan in danger of collapse or being overrun by militants — a fear that had been expressed before the army fought back against insurgents advancing from their base in the Swat Valley early last year. From its birth in 1947, Pakistan has been dogged by military coups, corrupt and inefficient leaders, natural disasters, assassinations and civil unrest. Through it all, Pakistan has not prospered — but it survives. “There is plenty to be worried about, but also indications that when push comes to shove the state is able to respond," said Mosharraf Zaidi, an analyst and writer who has advised foreign governments on aid missions to Pakistan. "The military has many weaknesses, but it has done a reasonable job in relief efforts. There have been gaps in the response. But this is a developing a country, right?" The recent flooding came at a sensitive time for Pakistan, with Western doubts over its loyalty heightened by the leaking of U.S. military documents that strengthened suspicions the security establishment was supporting Afghan insurgents while receiving billions in Western aid. With few easy choices, the United States has made it clear it intends to stick with Pakistan. Indeed, it has used the floods to demonstrate its commitment to the country, rushing emergency assistance and dispatching helicopters to ferry the goods. The Pakistani government's response to the floods has been sharply criticized at home, especially since President Asif Ali Zardari departed for a European tour. With so many Pakistanis suffering, the trip has left the already weak and unpopular leader even more vulnerable politically. The flooding was triggered by what meteorologists said were "once-in-a-century" rains. The worst affected area is the northwest, a stronghold for Islamist militants. Parts of the northwest have seen army offensives over the last two years. Unless the people are helped quickly and the region is rebuilt, anger at the government could translate into support for the militants. At least one charity with suspected links to a militant outfit has established relief camps there. The extremism threat was highlighted by a suicide bombing in the main northwestern town of Peshawar on Wednesday. The bomber killed the head of the Frontier Constabulary, a paramilitary force in the northwest at the forefront of the terror fight. With authorities concentrating on flood relief, some officials have expressed concern that militants could regroup. The city of Karachi has seen militant violence and is rumored to be a hiding place for top Taliban and al-Qaida fighters. It has also been plagued by regular bouts of political and ethnic bloodletting since the 1980s, though it has been calmer in recent years. The latest violence erupted after the assassination of a leading member of the city's ruling party. More than 70 people have been killed in revenge attacks since then, paralyzing parts of the city of 16 million people. While serious, the unrest does not yet pose an immediate threat to the stability of the country. Although the U.S. is unpopular, there is little public support for the hardline Islamist rule espoused by the Taliban and their allies. Their small movement has been unable to control any Pakistani territory beyond the northwest, home to only about 20 million of the country's 175 million people.

**Deterrence prevents India/Pakistan conflict.**

**Tepperman ‘9** ( 9/7/2009 (John - journalist based in New York Cuty, Why obama should learn to love the bomb, Newsweek, p.lexis)

The record since then shows the same pattern repeating: nuclear-armed enemies slide toward war, then pull back, always for the same reasons. The best recent example is India and Pakistan, which fought three bloody wars after independence before acquiring their own nukes in 1998. Getting their hands on weapons of mass destruction didn't do anything to lessen their animosity. But it did dramatically mellow their behavior. Since acquiring atomic weapons, the two sides have never fought another war, despite severe provocations (like Pakistani-based terrorist attacks on India in 2001 and 2008). They have skirmished once. But during that flare-up, in Kashmir in 1999, both countries were careful to keep the fighting limited and to avoid threatening the other's vital interests. Sumit Ganguly, an Indiana University professor and co-author of the forthcoming India, Pakistan, and the Bomb, has found that on both sides, officials' thinking was strikingly similar to that of the Russians and Americans in 1962. The prospect of war brought Delhi and Islamabad face to face with a nuclear holocaust, and leaders on each side did what they had to do to avoid it.

#### Wave energy use is inevitable- no reason why OCS is key to it

#### No terror

Mueller ’12 (John, Senior Research Scientist at the Mershon Center for International Security Studies and Adjunct Professor in the Department of Political Science, both at Ohio State University, and Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute. Mark G. Stewart is Australian Research Council Professorial Fellow and Professor and Director at the Centre for Infrastructure Performance and Reliability at the University of Newcastle in Australia, The Terrorism Delusion, International Security, Vol. 37, No. 1 (Summer 2012), pp. 81–110)

Over the course of time, such essentially delusionary thinking has been internalized and institutionalized in a great many ways. For example, an extrapolation of delusionary proportions is evident in the common observation that, because terrorists were able, mostly by thuggish means, to crash airplanes into buildings, they might therefore be able to construct a nuclear bomb. In 2005 an FBI report found that, despite years of well-funded sleuthing, the Bureau had yet to uncover a single true al-Qaida sleeper cell in the United States. The report was secret but managed to be leaked. Brian Ross, “Secret FBI Report Questions Al Qaeda Capabilities: No ‘True’ Al Qaeda Sleeper Agents Have Been Found in U.S.,” ABC News, March 9, 2005. Fox News reported that the FBI, however, observed that “just because there’s no concrete evidence of sleeper cells now, doesn’t mean they don’t exist.” “FBI Can’t Find Sleeper Cells,” Fox News, March 10, 2005. Jenkins has run an internet search to discover how often variants of the term “al-Qaida” appeared within ten words of “nuclear.” There were only seven hits in 1999 and eleven in 2000, but the number soared to 1,742 in 2001 and to 2,931 in 2002. 47 By 2008, Defense Secretary Robert Gates was assuring a congressional committee that what keeps every senior government leader awake at night is “the thought of a terrorist ending up with a weapon of mass destruction, especially nuclear.” 48 Few of the sleepless, it seems, found much solace in the fact that an al-Qaida computer seized in Afghanistan in 2001 indicated that the group’s budget for research on weapons of mass destruction (almost all of it focused on primitive chemical weapons work) was $2,000 to $4,000. 49 In the wake of the killing of Osama bin Laden, officials now have many more al-Qaida computers, and nothing in their content appears to suggest that the group had the time or inclination, let alone the money, to set up and staff a uranium-seizing operation, as well as a fancy, super-high-technology facility to fabricate a bomb. This is a process that requires trusting corrupted foreign collaborators and other criminals, obtaining and transporting highly guarded material, setting up a machine shop staffed with top scientists and technicians, and rolling the heavy, cumbersome, and untested finished product into position to be detonated by a skilled crew—all while attracting no attention from outsiders. 50 If the miscreants in the American cases have been unable to create and set off even the simplest conventional bombs, it stands to reason that none of them were very close to creating, or having anything to do with, nuclear weapons—or for that matter biological, radiological, or chemical ones. In fact, with perhaps one exception, none seems to have even dreamed of the prospect; and the exception is José Padilla (case 2), who apparently mused at one point about creating a dirty bomb—a device that would disperse radiation—or even possibly an atomic one. His idea about isotope separation was to put uranium into a pail and then to make himself into a human centrifuge by swinging the pail around in great arcs. Even if a weapon were made abroad and then brought into the United States, its detonation would require individuals in-country with the capacity to receive and handle the complicated weapons and then to set them off. Thus far, the talent pool appears, to put mildly, very thin. There is delusion, as well, in the legal expansion of the concept of “weapons of mass destruction.” The concept had once been taken as a synonym for nuclear weapons or was meant to include nuclear weapons as well as weapons yet to be developed that might have similar destructive capacity. After the Cold War, it was expanded to embrace chemical, biological, and radiological weapons even though those weapons for the most part are incapable of committing destruction that could reasonably be considered “massive,” particularly in comparison with nuclear ones. 52

No impact to trade—

MARTIN, MAYER, AND THOENIG 2008 (Phillipe, University of Paris 1 Pantheon—Sorbonne, Paris School of Economics, and Centre for Economic Policy Research; Thierry MAYER, University of Paris 1 Pantheon—Sorbonne, Paris School of Economics, CEPII, and Centre for Economic Policy Research, Mathias THOENIG, University of Geneva and Paris School of Economics, The Review of Economic Studies 75)

Does globalization pacify international relations? The “liberal” view in political science argues that increasing trade flows and the spread of free markets and democracy should limit the incentive to use military force in interstate relations. This vision, which can partly be traced back to Kant’s Essay on Perpetual Peace (1795), has been very influential: The main objective of the European trade integration process was to prevent the killing and destruction of the two World Wars from ever happening again.1 Figure 1 suggests2 however, that during the 1870–2001 period, the correlation between trade openness and military conflicts is not a clear cut one. The first era of globalization, at the end of the 19th century, was a period of rising trade openness and multiple military conflicts, culminating with World War I. Then, the interwar period was characterized by a simultaneous collapse of world trade and conflicts. After World War II, world trade increased rapidly, while the number of conflicts decreased (although the risk of a global conflict was obviously high). There is no clear evidence that the 1990s, during which trade flows increased dramatically, was a period of lower prevalence of military conflicts, even taking into account the increase in the number of sovereign states.