# Neg V. Liberty LS

## 1NC

### 1st Off

#### [A.] Interpretation: production of natural gas is distinct from exploration

Energy Information Agency, no date (Glossary, Energy Information Agency, http://www.eia.gov/tools/glossary/index.cfm, acsd 5-12)

Preproduction costs: Costs of prospecting for, acquiring, exploring, and developing mineral reserves incurred prior to the point when production of commercially recoverable quantities of minerals commences.

#### [B.] Violation: affirmative removes restrictions on exploration of natural gas

#### [C.] Reason to prefer:

#### Ground: Components of the supply chain outside of production are key to negative capacity to challenge the necessity of adding more supply. - -Exploration ground allows affs to not actually defend an increase of production if the area of interest doesn’t have capacity for being commercially viable.-Production centered ground is sufficient because it has structural market effects that allow the affirmative to implicate the other sectors.

#### Limits: Components of the supply chain outside of production unlimits affirmative potential and predictable constraints for the negative-There are a ton of areas that could possibly be explored – it would be impossible to predict all of them.-Allowing preproduction opens the affirmative to directly promoting other upstream sections of the chain as well - includes transportation affs, refinery affs, and marketing affs.

#### [D.] Voting Issue: competitive equity and education.

### 2nd Off

#### Text: The United States President should enter into prior and binding consultation with the United States Congress over the substantial reduction of leasing restrictions on natural gas drilling in the Outer Continental Shelf. The President should offer to support the substantial reduction of leasing restrictions on natural gas drilling in the Outer Continental Shelf, if Congress agrees to invest 90 percent of federal revenues from the resulting production into clean energy research and development.

#### Observation One: Theory – The Counterplan is legitimate. It is grounded in the topic literature making it predictable and educational. Net benefits prove it is a germane policy making consideration.

#### Observation Two: Net Benefits

#### [1.] Politics and solvency – leveraging the removal of restrictions effectively builds bipartisan support for investing in clean energy research and development and congress would say yes.

[Jenkins](http://thebreakthrough.org/people/profile/Jesse-Jenkins) [and Borofsky](http://thebreakthrough.org/people/profile/Yael-Borofsky)-Breakthrough Institute-4/10

After "Drill, Baby, Drill," Obama Should Embrace Another GOP Energy Plan

http://thebreakthrough.org/archive/after\_drill\_baby\_drill\_obama\_s

So while the expansion of offshore drilling may seem like we're taking a step back from a future free from oil, investing the royalty revenues in clean tech RD&D could amount to a big leap forward in the transition to a clean energy economy by securing a revenue source for clean tech that is not tied to embattled efforts to establish a carbon price -- all while beginning the urgent work of securing America's clean tech competitiveness and ensuring our energy security. Nearly the entire Republican caucus, not to mention a handful of Democrats, are already on record voting for this concept in the August 2008 vote on the New Energy Reform Act, introduced by the so-called Gang of 10 during the height of the oil price spikes in 2008. If offshore drilling is to move forward over the next few years, the Obama Administration and Congressional Democrats should waste no time in embracing this clean energy investment plan.

#### [2.] Energy Security Trust –

#### [a.] Counterplan is key to energy diversification and security

[Jenkins](http://thebreakthrough.org/people/profile/Jesse-Jenkins) [and Borofsky](http://thebreakthrough.org/people/profile/Yael-Borofsky)-Breakthrough Institute-4/10

After "Drill, Baby, Drill," Obama Should Embrace Another GOP Energy Plan

http://thebreakthrough.org/archive/after\_drill\_baby\_drill\_obama\_s

After all, we simply cannot drill our way to energy security. The New York Times reports that at current rates of consumption, estimates show that there could be as much as a three-year supply of oil and around a two-year supply of natural gas in the OCS areas. That's not exactly a long-term 'fix' for an oil-addicted nation, which is why Obama noted Wednesday in his speech at Andrews Air Force Base that offshore drilling is meant merely to aid in the "transition to cleaner energy sources;" drilling is no alternative. We can, however, invest and invent our way to freedom from oil. That's where (somewhat ironically!) the Republicans 'all of the above' energy plan, AKA the "American Energy Act," has a leg up on the President -- at least for now. Under the GOP proposal, put forth by House Republicans in June 2009, 90% of the federal share "of the revenues created by OCS exploration would go to a renewable energy trust fund to pay for a variety of renewable, alternative and advanced energy programs." This "American Renewable and Alternative Energy Trust Fund" would be dedicated to efforts accelerating the development of clean energy technologies that can truly help end America's oil addiction. If the federal government retained 75% of the royalty revenues from new OCS and Alaskan Coastal Plain production, this formula could represent an infusion of over $110 billion for critical clean energy investments over the next twenty years.

#### [b.] Renewable transition solves extinction from climate change and great power war

Klarevas 09

[Louis Klarevas, Professor for Center for Global Affairs at New York University, “Securing American Primacy While Tackling Climate Change: Toward a National Strategy of Greengemony,” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/louis-klarevas/securing-american-primacy\_b\_393223.html]

As national leaders from around the world are gathering in Copenhagen, Denmark, to attend the United Nations Climate Change Conference, the time is ripe to re-assess America's current energy policies - but within the larger framework of how a new approach on the environment will stave off global warming and shore up American primacy. By not addressing climate change more aggressively and creatively, the United States is squandering an opportunity to secure its global primacy for the next few generations to come. To do this, though, the U.S. must rely on innovation to help the world escape the coming environmental meltdown. Developing the key technologies that will save the planet from global warming will allow the U.S. to outmaneuver potential great power rivals seeking to replace it as the international system's hegemon. But the greening of American strategy must occur soon. The U.S., however, seems to be stuck in time, unable to move beyond oil-centric geo-politics in any meaningful way. Often, the gridlock is portrayed as a partisan difference, with Republicans resisting action and Democrats pleading for action. This, though, is an unfair characterization as there are numerous proactive Republicans and quite a few reticent Democrats. The real divide is instead one between realists and liberals. Students of realpolitik, which still heavily guides American foreign policy, largely discount environmental issues as they are not seen as advancing national interests in a way that generates relative power advantages vis-à-vis the other major powers in the system: Russia, China, Japan, India, and the European Union. Liberals, on the other hand, have recognized that global warming might very well become the greatest challenge ever faced by mankind. As such, their thinking often eschews narrowly defined national interests for the greater global good. This, though, ruffles elected officials whose sworn obligation is, above all, to protect and promote American national interests. What both sides need to understand is that by becoming a lean, mean, green fighting machine, the U.S. can actually bring together liberals and realists to advance a collective interest which benefits every nation, while at the same time, secur[e]ing America's global primacy well into the future. To do so, the U.S. must re-invent itself as not just your traditional hegemon, but as history's first ever green hegemon. Hegemons are countries that dominate the international system - bailing out other countries in times of global crisis, establishing and maintaining the most important international institutions, and covering the costs that result from free-riding and cheating global obligations. Since 1945, that role has been the purview of the United States. Immediately after World War II, Europe and Asia laid in ruin, the global economy required resuscitation, the countries of the free world needed security guarantees, and the entire system longed for a multilateral forum where global concerns could be addressed. The U.S., emerging the least scathed by the systemic crisis of fascism's rise, stepped up to the challenge and established the postwar (and current) liberal order. But don't let the world "liberal" fool you. While many nations benefited from America's new-found hegemony, the U.S. was driven largely by "realist" selfish national interests. The liberal order first and foremost benefited the U.S. With the U.S. becoming bogged down in places like Afghanistan and Iraq, running a record national debt, and failing to shore up the dollar, the future of American hegemony now seems to be facing a serious contest: potential rivals - acting like sharks smelling blood in the water - wish to challenge the U.S. on a variety of fronts. This has led numerous commentators to forecast the U.S.'s imminent fall from grace. Not all hope is lost however. With the impending systemic crisis of global warming on the horizon, the U.S. again finds itself in a position to address a transnational problem in a way that will benefit both the international community collectively and the U.S. selfishly. The current problem is two-fold. First, the competition for oil is fueling animosities between the major powers. The geopolitics of oil has already emboldened Russia in its 'near abroad' and China in far-off places like Africa and Latin America. As oil is a limited natural resource, a nasty zero-sum contest could be looming on the horizon for the U.S. and its major power rivals - a contest which threatens American primacy and global stability. Second, converting fossil fuels like oil to run national economies is producing irreversible harm in the form of carbon dioxide emissions. So long as the global economy remains oil-dependent, greenhouse gases will continue to rise. Experts are predicting as much as a 60% increase in carbon dioxide emissions in the next twenty-five years. That likely means more devastating water shortages, droughts, forest fires, floods, and storms. In other words, if global competition for access to energy resources does not undermine international security, global warming will. And in either case, oil will be a culprit for the instability. Oil arguably has been the most precious energy resource of the last half-century. But "black gold" is so 20th century. The key resource for this century will be green gold - clean, environmentally-friendly energy like wind, solar, and hydrogen power. Climate change leaves no alternative. And the sooner we realize this, the better off we will be. What Washington must do in order to avoid the traps of petropolitics is to convert the U.S. into the world's first-ever green hegemon. For starters, the federal government must drastically increase investment in energy and environmental research and development (E&E R&D). This will require a serious sacrifice, committing upwards of $40 billion annually to E&E R&D - a far cry from the few billion dollars currently being spent. By promoting a new national project, the U.S. could develop new technologies that will assure it does not drown in a pool of oil. Some solutions are already well known, such as raising fuel standards for automobiles; improving public transportation networks; and expanding nuclear and wind power sources. Others, however, have not progressed much beyond the drawing board: batteries that can store massive amounts of solar (and possibly even wind) power; efficient and cost-effective photovoltaic cells, crop-fuels, and hydrogen-based fuels; and even fusion. Such innovations will not only provide alternatives to oil, they will also give the U.S. an edge in the global competition for hegemony. If the U.S. is able to produce technologies that allow modern, globalized societies to escape the oil trap, those nations will eventually have no choice but to adopt such technologies. And this will give the U.S. a tremendous economic boom, while simultaneously providing it with means of leverage that can be employed to keep potential foes in check. The bottom-line is that the U.S. needs to become green energy dominant as opposed to black energy independent - and the best approach for achieving this is to promote a national strategy of greengemony.

### 3rd Off

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

#### Massively boosts domestic production

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

### 4th Off

#### Drilling will destroy numerous biological hotspots

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

3. When deciding whether to approve seismic testing or exploration and production off the east coast, your department needs to balance the safety of those special areas against the potential for damage from oil drilling. The only way to adequately assess the balance would be for your department (with the participation of NOAA and possibly the National Academy of Science) to do a comprehensive census of those special places and analyze possible impacts on them from drilling. 1. The Ocean: More Like A Diverse Forest Than A Desert Many people look at the ocean and see it as a pretty, shiny surface. They may imagine a few fish swimming below the surface and a plain featureless bottom. This is not an accurate picture of the ocean in most places. Unless the bottom is sandy and continually disturbed by wind, wave or current the bottom of the ocean is filled with communities of diverse creatures. Depending on depth, penetration of light, type of bottom (i.e., muddy, sandy, pebbles, boulders) and other factors, the ocean’s floor is teaming with diverse communities of plants, invertebrates, shellfish, crustaceans and fish. Numerous kinds of fish live on the bottom. Other fish swim above the bottom in the water column at different levels. Thousands of types of phytoplankton, zooplankton and larvae at the base of most food chains ‘float’ around. Marine mammals, sea turtles and sea birds spend most of their time at or near the surface of the ocean. All of these creatures are sensitive to the impacts of oil and pollution from oil and gas drilling; some are more sensitive than others. But none are immune to the short or long term effects of oil. With this as background, it is important to recognize the special places in the ocean that are unique, especially sensitive to pollution or those that are especially productive. These include: submarine canyons cutting across the continental shelf; deep water coral gardens; plateaus where the floor of the ocean rises and becomes unusually productive because deeper nutrient rich waters come closer to the warmer temperatures and light of the surface; migratory pathways for marine mammals and sea turtles; and areas where fish aggregate to spawn or where larval stages of animals are concentrated. Finally, the margins of the ocean: beaches, bays and marshes are often unusually sensitive to oil pollution. 2. Special Places in the Atlantic Ocean Deserving of Protection Based on the Environmental Sensitivity Index (ESI) and a crude measure of marine productivity that your own department uses, the New England, Mid Atlantic and South Atlantic planning areas are all very environmentally sensitive and highly productive. The South Atlantic planning area and Mid Atlantic have the first and third most environmentally sensitive coastlines, respectively, of all 22 MMS planning areas. New England comes in at #11. The South Atlantic and Mid Atlantic are ranked first and second respectively in terms of primary productivity among all the planning areas with North Atlantic being #12. There are 14 submarine canyons between Massachusetts and Virginia that slice through the continental shelf (See attached list). Submarine canyons, some with a mouth as wide as eight to ten miles and 30-40 miles long, are important because they shelter unusual species, provide hard bottoms and sidewalls for creatures to attach to or burrow in, provide nursery areas for many commercially important fish and bring nutrients from the deep ocean up to more shallow waters. Sea life in these canyons is unusually diverse which is why drilling in or near submarine canyons with their risk from spills and chronic pollution from production would be a very bad idea. There are a number of important underwater plateaus and reefs off the eastern seaboard which serve as fish baskets, places of unusual marine productivity where very high populations of fish reproduce and grow. Often these are called ‘banks’ or ‘reefs’ with names like Georges Bank, Stellwagen Bank, Gray’s Reef or Occulina Bank. Some of these areas of the ocean are shallow enough to allow sunlight to penetrate to the seafloor and nutrients from the deeper ocean feed a richer abundance of life. These banks and reefs sometimes offer the only hard substrate for creatures to attach in a wide area. . Drilling in biological hot spots like these and jeopardizing productive commercial and recreational fisheries would make no sense. Like on land, certain areas of the ocean support migration corridors for fish, marine mammals, sea turtles and sea birds. For much of the Mid Atlantic there is a coastal corridor extending out 20 miles from shore in which endangered marine mammals like the northern right whale, various sea turtles and migratory fish travel. For example, the last 350 northern right whales on earth travel each year from the Georgia-Florida border where they give birth and nurse their calves to an area off Cape Cod where they spend the summer feeding. Loggerheads, leatherback and Kemp’s ridley turtles all use this corridor at various times of the year. Another corridor, farther offshore at the edge of the continental shelf break and slope provides food for various endangered sea turtles and other kinds of whales and dolphins. Whales and dolphins are typically migratory and each is only seasonally present but taken together the area is important year round to these marine mammals. There are four more hotspots of marine diversity and unusual productivity off the Mid Atlantic caused by ocean currents, type of bottom, [and] submarine canyons and other special characteristics. These include: the coastal waters off North Carolina near and south of Cape Hatteras, the mouth of the Chesapeake and Delaware Bays and off New York harbor. Coastal waters and sandy bottoms off New Jersey support a large and economically important clam and scallop industry.

#### Human survival is at risk

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

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

### 5th Off

#### TPA will pass

Fatka 3/20

[Jacqui Fatka, 3/20/2013, USTR voices support for Trade Promotion Authority, <http://feedstuffs.com/story-ustr-voices-support-trade-promotion-authority-45-96288>, uwyo//amp]

Committee chairman Sen. Max Baucus (D., Mont.) said given the ambitious trade agenda including the TPP and Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership in Europe the need for TPA is clear. "TPA is a key negotiating tool and will help bring these trade agreements to a successful conclusion," he said, adding that it's been more than a decade since the last TPA was renewed. Since then exports have more than doubled, which means a new TPA should reflect new realities that come with economic priorities and challenges. "I’m pleased that the Administration has indicated its interest in working with Congress to get TPA done. Working together, we will pass this important trade legislation," Baucus said.

#### OCS drilling drains capital

Orth 11 (Derek Orth, J.D. expected May 2012, Rutgers School of Law (Newark, N.J.); Managing Articles Editor for the Rutgers Computer and Technology Law Journal, 2011 University of Oregon, Journal of Environmental Law and Litigation, 26 J. Envtl. L. & Litig. 509, Lexis, 2011)

NAME: DEREK ORTH\*

The Deepwater Horizon was constructed in 2001 and was "capable of operating in water up to 8,000 feet deep and able to drill down to 30,000 feet." n6 The disaster occurred while Halliburton Energy Services, Inc. (Halliburton) was mounting production casing and [\*512] cement on a 5,000 feet deep exploratory well in the Macondo Prospect. Ironically, integrity tests were due to be performed on the Macondo well at the time the explosion occurred, after which the well would have been capped until BP was prepared to begin extraction operations. n7¶ Tragically, the fiery explosion that occurred onboard the Deepwater Horizon threw BP's plans into disarray, resulting in eleven deaths, n8 millions of barrels of spewing oil, n9 and immense damage to the Gulf Coast. n10 The subsequent proliferation of monetary claims, lawsuits, and legislation n11 has raised numerous issues that stand to forever alter the regulatory structure of the offshore oil industry n12 as well as the liability schemes of international oil companies operating in the United States' coastal waters. n13¶ A bill's passage through Congress is fraught with danger at every turn. In general, most bills are submitted by individual members of Congress, examined and voted upon by specialized committees, presented to both the House and Senate for approval, and, finally, submitted to the President for his signature. Thus, a well-meaning and complex bill can often only gain approval through an expenditure of serious political capital by at least one party or the occurrence of an event that exerts public pressure on both political parties to react expediently and deal with the crisis. n14

#### Trade promotion authority is key to the EU FTA- sensitive compromises necessary

Abrams 03/10

[Jim Abrams, 03/10/13, Obama Trade Agenda: Congress Wants Role In Aggressive White House Push, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/03/10/obama-trade-agenda_n_2849878.html>, uwyo//amp]

The last TPA law expired in 2007, and up to now, the Obama White House hasn't pushed for its renewal. Without TPA on the books, trade partners are reluctant to sign off on deals that could later be amended. That could be fatal to some complex trade deals, such as the future talks with the EU where success hinges on reaching delicate compromises on such issues as European agriculture subsidies and Europe's restrictions on genetically engineered crops.

#### Collapses the global economy-US exposure and worldwide credit crunch

Recknagel 2011

[Charles Recknagel, Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty, December 01, 2011, What If The Eurozone Collapses?, http://www.rferl.org/content/what\_if\_the\_eurozone\_collapses/24409489.html, uwyo//amp]

Across Europe and the much larger financial world, the shock waves of any breakup of the eurozone would be almost certain to bring a new global recession. Banks, brokers, and exchanges are already in the front line of the euro crisis and would take huge losses as governments that owe them money default or make payments with devalued currencies. Even banks that never loaned directly to those governments would be vulnerable, as the cost for buying insurance for loans would soar generally. All banks would have less money to lend, likely creating another worldwide credit crunch and slowing economies everywhere. "It would certainly hurt the United States because U.S. banks are fairly heavily exposed to Germany and France and the core banks. They are not exposed to the periphery," says Boone of the London School of Economics. "But there would be lot of concern about whether or not they would be able to make it through, so there would be another big shift towards less risky assets around the world, you would have trouble in stock markets and in some of the emerging market bonds and so I would expect we would end up with another [global] recession and it would take one or two years to get out of that."

**There is a strong historical correlation between economic decline and war.**

**Mead 9** — Henry Kissinger Senior Fellow at the CFR, Professor at Yale (Walter Russel, "What Doesn't Kill You Makes You Stronger," The New Republic)

So far, such half-hearted experiments not only have failed to work; they have left the societies that have tried them in a progressively worse position, farther behind the front-runners as time goes by. Argentina has lost ground to Chile; Russian development has fallen farther behind that of the Baltic states and Central Europe. Frequently, the crisis has weakened the power of the merchants, industrialists, financiers, and professionals who want to develop a liberal capitalist society integrated into the world. **Crisis can also strengthen the hand of religious extremists, populist radicals, or authoritarian traditionalists** who are determined to resist liberal capitalist society for a variety of reasons. Meanwhile, **the companies and banks based in these societies are often less established and more vulnerable to the consequences of a financial crisis than more established firms in wealthier societies.** As a result, **developing countries** and countries where capitalism has relatively recent and shallow roots **tend to suffer greater economic and political damage when crisis strikes**--as, inevitably, it does. And, consequently, **financial crises often reinforce rather than challenge the global distribution of power and wealth.** This may be happening yet again. **None of which means that we can just sit back and enjoy the recession.** History may suggest that financial crises actually help capitalist great powers maintain their leads--but it has other, less reassuring messages as well. **If financial crises have been a normal part of life** during the 300-year rise of the liberal capitalist system under the Anglophone powers, **so has war**. The wars of the League of Augsburg and the Spanish Succession; the Seven Years War; the American Revolution; the Napoleonic Wars; the two World Wars; the cold war: **The list of wars is almost as long as the list of financial crises. Bad economic times can breed wars.** Europe was a pretty peaceful place in 1928, but **the Depression poisoned German public opinion and helped bring** Adolf **Hitler to power. If the current crisis turns into a depression, what rough beasts might** start slouching toward Moscow, Karachi, Beijing, or New Delhi to **be born**? The United States may not, yet, decline, but, **if we can't get the world economy back on track, we may still have to fight.**

## Solvency

### 1NC Yes Supply Glut

#### Natural gas is abundant – 100 years supply and to say otherwise is ludicrous

Rob Reuteman, CNBC.com, “The math behind the 100-year, Natural-Gas Supply Debate”, CNBC, June 20, 2012.

Estimates of recoverable natural gas have exploded in recent years because technology has made it possible to extract huge amounts from areas previously judged infeasible, mostly gas embedded in tight formations of shale rock. The new drilling process known as hydraulic fracturing, or fracking, has become widespread, raising supplies and driving down prices so it’s no longer profitable for many companies to drill for the commodity. A 2009 study by the [IHS](http://www.ihs.com/products/global-insight/industry-economic-report.aspx?id=106595407)Global Insight energy research firm concluded, “Shale gas production has more than doubled the size of the discovered natural gas resource in North America —enough to satisfy more than 100 years of consumption at current rates.” On top of that, a just-released [IHS study](http://www.ihs.com/info/ecc/a/unconventional-gas-report-2012.aspx?ocid=pr:consulting:print:0001) estimates the industry boom will wind up creating 2.4 million jobs by 2035. Pete Stark, IHS vice president of industry relations, says: “Getting all uptight about the 100-year number is ludicrous. There’s all sorts of gas being identified everywhere as potentially recoverable. Since 2009 we’ve known the ‘shale gale’ breakthrough was real. Now it looks as if there will be more than a 100-year supply. It was huge then, it’s huge now.” A 2011 report by the [National Petroleum Council](http://www.npc.org/reports/NARD-ExecSummVol.pdf) for the U.S. Department of Energy concluded in part, “North America has a large, economically accessible natural gas resource base that includes significant sources of unconventional gas, such as shale gas. This resource base could supply over 100 years of demand at today’s consumption rates.”

#### Low prices kill offshore NG

Santos 11/4 (Paulo, independent trader, analyst and algorithmic trading expert, having worked for both sell side (brokerage) and buy side (fund management) institutions, Paulo has been trading professionally for about 16 years, “Potential Issue With Offshore Drilling”, http://seekingalpha.com/article/976851-potential-issue-with-offshore-drilling)

However, there might be trouble brewing in the distance; the same kind of trouble which hit natural gas (UNG) and land-locked WTI crude (USO). The thesis is simple Drilling for oil onshore is a lot cheaper than drilling for it offshore. Up until recently inshore exploration was seen as somewhat exhausted with U.S. crude production falling steadily since the 70s and thus exploration had to move offshore. But with the shale boom - using horizontal drilling and fracking techniques - onshore exploration and production of natural gas boomed with well-known consequences for natural gas prices. What is new here, is that now those consequences are flowing over to the natural gas liquids and crude markets. WTI crude production is increasing, reversing a 4 decade trend towards lower production in the U.S. (source: EIA) The trouble for offshore drilling contractors is that this revolution is happening onshore - that place where drilling is cheaper. Already we have seen a collapse of offshore natural gas production, as we can observe in the production chart below (SOURCE: EIA) How long until the same effect happens to the offshore drilling rigs looking for crude? Were such a thing to happen, the companies servicing the industry would naturally suffer tremendously. Conclusion In yet another consequence of the shale boom, the increased productivity and lower cost of inshore crude wells might drive a temporary stake through the offshore drilling business. This would probably require that the shale boom turn international to have an effect, but given the healthy valuations on the offshore drilling services sector the possible impact cannot be ignored.

### 1NC Squo Solves – OCS Leases Now

#### Status quo solves – Leasing on the OCS is increasing now and into the future

Fetcher 12

(Adam Fetcher, Deputy Press Secretary for Obama. “Next Five-Year Strategy Includes Frontier Areas in the Alaska Arctic” June 28, 2012. http://www.doi.gov/news/pressreleases/Interior-Finalizes-Plan-to-Make-All-Highest-Resource-Areas-in-the-US-Offshore-Available-for-Oil-and-Gas-Leasing.cfm//wyoccd)

WASHINGTON – As part of the Obama administration’s all-of-the-above energy strategy to expand safe and responsible domestic energy production, Secretary of the Interior Ken Salazar and Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) Director Tommy Beaudreau today announced the release of a proposed final offshore oil and gas leasing program for 2012-2017 that makes all areas with the highest-known resource potential – including frontier areas in the Alaska Arctic – available for oil and gas leasing in order to further reduce America’s dependence on foreign oil. Consistent with the President’s direction, the Obama administration’s Proposed Final U.S. Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Program makes available areas focused on the most likely recoverable oil and gas resources that the U.S. Outer Continental Shelf is estimated to hold. It schedules 15 potential lease sales for the five-year period, including 12 in the Gulf of Mexico and three off the coast of Alaska. “Put simply, this program opens the vast majority of known offshore oil and gas resources for development over the next five years and includes a cautious but forward-looking leasing strategy for the Alaska Arctic,” said Secretary Salazar. “President Obama has made clear his commitment to expanding responsible domestic oil and gas production in America as part of this all-of-the-above energy strategy, and with comprehensive safety standards in place, this plan will help us to continue to grow America’s energy economy and further reduce our dependence on foreign oil, while protecting marine, costal and human health.” Today’s announcement builds on a series of actions taken by the Obama administration to meet President Obama’s directive to continue to expand safe and responsible production of America’s important domestic resources. Successful offshore lease sales held by the Department of the Interior in the Western and Central Gulf of Mexico in recent months have made available approximately 60 million acres of resource-rich areas for industry leasing that will bring additional domestic resources to market. The Proposed Final Program is designed to account for the distinct needs of the regions across the OCS, and considers a range of factors, including current and developing information about resource potential, the status of resource development and emergency response infrastructure, recognition of regional interest and concerns, and the need for a balanced approach to the use of the Nation’s shared natural resources. “Offshore oil and gas leasing should not be ‘one size fits all,’” said Director Beaudreau.

### 1NC

#### No solvency – Decades until production

Murawski 12 [John, "Opening Atlantic Ocean to offshore drilling likely," 10-2, http://www.newsobserver.com/2012/10/02/2384560/opening-atlantic-ocean-to-offshore.html#storylink=cpy]

But even if the Atlantic Ocean is opened to energy companies, oil and gas production would likely not get underway for at least a decade. The energy exploration cycle is heavily regulated and requires seismic testing, environmental assessments, oceanographic mapping, military reviews and other regulatory hurdles before any oil and gas can start flowing. “There’s no way to speed this up,” said Athan Manuel, director of the Sierra Club’s lands protection program. The latest federal estimates from the U.S. Bureau of Ocean Energy Management for the entire Atlantic coast is between 11 trillion cubic feet and 54 trillion cubic feet of natural gas – well below the 84.2 trillion cubic feet found in the Marcellus Shale that spans New York and Pennsylvania. The amount of oil is likely between 1.3 billion barrels and 5.58 billion barrels, less than a year’s supply. With the market price of gas hovering near all-time lows, the Energy Information Administration, a division within the U.S. Department of Energy, has estimated that no oil or gas will be produced in the Atlantic or outer continental shelf before 2035. Drilling offshore could begin 3 miles beyond the coast, the point at which federal waters begin, extending as far as 200 miles in the ocean. Each mile away from land increases the cost of pipelines, land-to-rig travel and drilling in ever-deeper waters. $66M to $400M a year Beyond the engineering and technical challenges, offshore drilling would mobilize state governments to press Congress to change federal law to allow states to collect royalties on the lease fees, as is done for Gulf Coast states. North Carolina could collect $66 million to $400 million a year for the life of the reserves, according to a 145-page report issued September 2011 by a scientific advisory panel created by Gov. Perdue. The revenue amount, at the top end, could approach 2 percent of the state’s $20.2 billion annual budget. “You could scatter that money around all over state government,” said Weatherspoon of the N.C. Petroleum Council. He said the money could bolster programs such as environmental regulation, mental health services, community colleges and others that have been hard-hit by budget cuts. Weatherspoon said that offshore exploration would pit neighboring states against each other to host shore bases that would supply and support the offshore rigs. Such bases could involve hundreds of jobs in metallurgy, food preparation, transportation and related work. A 2009 report from the Southeast Energy Alliance, an industry trade group, estimated that offshore drilling could create 6,700 new jobs in North Carolina. Bill Holman, director of the State Policy Program at Duke University’s Nicholas Institute for Environmental Policy Solutions, said chances are slim that North Carolina could compete with larger ports in South Carolina and Virginia. Holman based his assessment on his tenure as a member of another offshore study panel, the Legislative Research Commission’s Advisory Subcommittee on Offshore Energy Exploration, which prepared a report in 2010. He said little research has been done on offshore resources, and noted that projected natural gas prices suggest that little will change in this regard in the near future. “We’re at the same state of knowledge on these issues as we were 20 years ago,” Holman said. “Until the price of natural gas goes way up, I’d be surprised if there would be very much interest, given the cost of developing those offshore resources versus the cost of developing the known resources.”

### Exports

#### US Exports cripple Russia’s economy

Mead 12

Walter Russell Mead, April 25, 2012 (Professor of Foreign Affairs and Humanities at Bard College, Henry A. Kissinger senior fellow for U.S. foreign policy at the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), and Editor-at-Large of The American Interest magazine), , The American Interest, North American Shale Gas Gives Russia Serious Headache, <http://blogs.the-american-interest.com/wrm/2012/04/25/north-american-shale-gas-gives-russia-serious-headache/>

North America’s shale gas boom is chipping away at the market for gas producers like Russia. What’s more, if the United States becomes a gas exporter, Russia’s customers (especially in Europe) could decide to cancel expensive contracts with Gazprom in favor of cheaper American natural gas. “If the US starts exporting LNG to Europe and Asia, it gives [customers there] an argument to renegotiate their prices with Gazprom and Qatar, and they will do it,” says Jean Abiteboul, head of Cheniere supply & marketing. Gazprom supplied 27 percent of Europe’s natural gas in 2011. While American gas is trading below $2 per MMBTU (million British thermal units), Gazprom’s prices are tied to crude oil markets, and its long-term contracts charge customers roughly $13 per MMBTU, says the *FT*. European customers would love to reduce their dependence on Gazprom and start to import American gas. Already Gazprom has had to make concessions to its three biggest customers, and others are increasingly dissatisfied with their contracts. Worse, from Russia’s point of view: evidence that western and central Europe contain substantial shale gas reserves of their own. Fracking is unpopular in thickly populated, eco-friendly Europe, but so are high gas prices. All this ought to give Russia serious heartburn. Eroding Gazprom’s dominance of the European energy market would be a major check on Russian economic growth and political influence.

#### Goes nuclear

**Filger 9** (Sheldon, Columnist and Founder – Global EconomicCrisis.com, “Russian Economy Faces Disasterous Free Fall Contraction”, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/sheldon-filger/russian-economy-faces-dis_b_201147.html>)

In Russia, historically, economic health and political stability are intertwined to a degree that is rarely encountered in other major industrialized economies. It was the economic stagnation of the former Soviet Union that led to its political downfall. Similarly, Medvedev and Putin, both intimately acquainted with their nation's history, are unquestionably alarmed at the prospect that Russia's economic crisis will endanger the nation's political stability, achieved at great cost after years of chaos following the demise of the Soviet Union. Already, strikes and protests are occurring among rank and file workers facing unemployment or non-payment of their salaries. Recent polling demonstrates that the once supreme popularity ratings of Putin and Medvedev are eroding rapidly. Beyond the political elites are the financial oligarchs, who have been forced to deleverage, even unloading their yachts and executive jets in a desperate attempt to raise cash. Should the Russian economy deteriorate to the point where economic collapse is not out of the question, the impact will go far beyond the obvious accelerant such an outcome would be for the Global Economic Crisis. There is a geopolitical dimension that is even more relevant then the economic context. Despite its economic vulnerabilities and perceived decline from superpower status, Russia remains one of only two nations on earth with a nuclear arsenal of sufficient scope and capability to destroy the world as we know it. For that reason, it is not only President Medvedev and Prime Minister Putin who will be lying awake at nights over the prospect that a national economic crisis can transform itself into a virulent and destabilizing social and political upheaval. It just may be possible that U.S. President Barack Obama's national security team has already briefed him about the consequences of a major economic meltdown in Russia for the peace of the world. After all, the most recent national intelligence estimates put out by the U.S. intelligence community have already concluded that the Global Economic Crisis represents the greatest national security threat to the United States, due to its facilitating political instability in the world. During the years Boris Yeltsin ruled Russia, security forces responsible for guarding the nation's nuclear arsenal went without pay for months at a time, leading to fears that desperate personnel would illicitly sell nuclear weapons to terrorist organizations. If the current economic crisis in Russia were to deteriorate much further, how secure would the Russian nuclear arsenal remain? It may be that the financial impact of the Global Economic Crisis is its least dangerous consequence.

#### Russia can’t use natural gas as a political weapon in Europe-interdependence

Weiss 12

(Andrew Weiss is the director of the RAND Center for Russia and Eurasia and executive director of the RAND Business Leaders Forum. “Five Myths about Vladimir Putin” March 4, 2012. http://www.rand.org/blog/2012/03/five-myths-about-vladimir-putin.html//wyoccd)

Russia's oil and gas reserves have made the country fabulously wealthy and a crucial supplier for Europe and other energy markets. When a commercial dispute with Ukraine left hundreds of thousands shivering across Central and Eastern Europe in January 2006 after the Russian energy company Gazprom turned off the tap, many observers warned that energy had become Putin's latest weapon. But the Russian economy is the real hostage. In 2011, revenue from oil and gas accounted for about halfthe federal budget, and raw materials made up more than 85 percent of exports. Thanks to a huge trade surplus, enormous currency reserves and an overvalued ruble, Russia's domestic industries have become uncompetitive against imports — a textbook case of what economists call "Dutch disease." Adding to these challenges are changes in the European natural gas market. With European demand depressed and stiff competition from cheaper liquefied natural gas from the Middle East and North Africa, Russia's share of the E.U. gas market fell from 48 percent in 2001 to 34 percent in 2009. As government spending balloons because of a massive military buildup and Putin's campaign promises of more robust social programs, Russia's oil weapon will be increasingly pointed at itself.

#### No solvency—need to change both DOE and FERC restrictions.

Levi 12—Michael Levi, David M. Rubenstein senior fellow for energy and environment at the Council on Foreign Relations [June 2012, “A Strategy for U.S. Natural Gas Exports,” Brookings Institution, [www.brookings.edu/research/papers/2012/06/13-exports-levi](http://www.brookings.edu/research/papers/2012/06/13-exports-levi)]

In Chapter 4, I laid out a framework for consideration of the wisdom of allowing LNG exports. An examination of these components indicates that the benefits of allowing LNG exports outweigh the risks and costs, so long as downside risks to the local environment are mitigated, as discussed previously. Allowing exports would boost the U.S. economy, create jobs, reduce greenhouse-gas emissions, and create new geopolitical leverage for the United States. In particular, the likely benefits to the U.S. economy outweigh the benefits that would be realized by trapping natural gas in the United States in the hope that it will be used to replace oil. Barring exports would also weaken the U.S. hand in international trade diplomacy, including in the ongoing fight over Chinese restrictions on minerals exports. Strongly constraining U.S. gas exports would also require substantial interference in the currently integrated North American energy market, with the potential for economically and politically damaging fallout. The most acute risks associated with allowing natural gas exports are distributional and environmental; both could also spur a backlash against natural gas production more broadly. Both can and should be mitigated, however, with appropriate policies, as outlined earlier. The details are largely beyond the scope of this paper, but options include the many steps outlined in DOE (2011), severance taxes or impact fees that fund infrastructure and regulatory capacity, and bonding requirements for drillers that help communities recover damages from bankrupt operators (Davis 2012). I thus propose that, to facilitate potential natural gas exports, the DOE should approve applications for LNG exports to non-FTA countries that are pending before it, barring specific concerns about individual applications that are not related to the broader wisdom of allowing LNG exports. In doing so, the DOE is required to find that allowing exports is in the “public interest.” The framework outlined in this paper provides one way of presenting such an assessment. The FERC must also approve modifications to terminals in order for exports to be allowed (Ebinger et al. 2012). I propose that it approve any applications to operate export terminals that have been approved by the DOE, barring problems with individual applications that are unrelated to the broader wisdom of allowing LNG exports. Implementing these steps will not require any new staffing, funding, or action by Congress, which has already put in place the legislative framework needed to approve and monitor LNG exports. Congress need only refrain from placing new statutory restrictions on LNG exports.

#### Exports won’t be economical and the timeframe is super long

Pavel Molchanov (Political analyst for the Energy Tribune) and Alex Morris (writer for the Energy Tribune) 2012 “Will LNG Exports Rescue the North American Natural Gas Market?”, http://www.energytribune.com/articles.cfm/10703/Will-LNG-Exports-Rescue-the-North-American-Natural-Gas-Market

Thinking of building your own LNG plant? Read this first. From what we’ve already written, it should be clear that you shouldn’t hold your breath waiting for North American LNG export plants to come to fruition. Sabine Pass is a useful case study of just how difficult and time-consuming it is to develop these projects. Cheniere’s original plan to develop liquefaction capacity at Sabine Pass dates back to June 2010. Nearly two years later, construction has not yet started – even though this specific project has the big advantage of having a well-developed site with existing LNG infrastructure. Let’s look at some of the challenges faced by North American LNG developers. Slow permitting. Let’s face it: if this was China rather than the U.S., building LNG plants (and refineries, and nuclear reactors, and just about anything else) would be a lot easier. The undeniable reality is that the permitting process for domestic LNG developers is expensive, burdensome and excruciatingly slow. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) is the lead agency, though the Department of Energy (DOE) also plays a role. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Army Corps of Engineers can also be involved. In addition, state and local permits are required. For example, Cheniere’s follow-on liquefaction project, near Corpus Christi, Texas, was authorized by FERC to begin “pre-filing” in December 2011. The company aims to file the completed application in August 2012 and receive approval in September 2013. Assuming no delays, this would allow project startup in late 2017. For projects in Canada, permitting is also complex. The Kitimat project in British Columbia – a joint venture between Apache, EOG Resources and Encana – received a 20-year export license from the Canadian National Export Board in October 2011. This was nearly three years after the project received environmental approval (both federal and provincial). Industry opposition. While by no means the sole factor, one of the reasons for the slow permitting is the fact that these LNG projects face a considerable amount of public opposition. Protests from environmentalists – which helped sink the Keystone XL pipeline, and now seem particularly focused on Dominion’s Cove Point project – are not surprising. What may be more surprising is that some major industry groups are also opposed, though, of course, for different reasons. Specifically, large gas consumers do not want LNG exports for the exact same reason why large gas producers such as Chesapeake Energy applaud these projects: they would put upward pressure on gas prices. The American Public Gas Association, which represents gas utilities, testified in November 2011 before the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, stating: “APGA maintains that the export of LNG is not in the best interests of our country and most notably that it will increase natural gas prices at the expense of consumers while sacrificing a unique opportunity to reduce our dependence on foreign energy sources.” The Industrial Energy Consumers of America, which represents manufacturers, has also expressed its concerns, stating: “It would be irresponsible for the DOE to approve export applications without first doing an economic analysis of the impact.” Financing constraints. LNG plants are never cheap. Even in the best of circumstances, they are immensely capital-intensive projects, with price tags that range from a few billion to tens of billions of dollars, and almost invariably they tend to come in over budget (as well as behind schedule). This needs to be seen in the context of a highly competitive commodity market where global liquefaction capacity will rapidly increase between now and 2020. Australia alone, led by projects such as Chevron’s Gorgon and Inpex’s Ichthys, is expected to surpass Qatar as the world’s #1 LNG producer by the end of the decade. Combined with other projects in West Africa, Papua New Guinea and elsewhere, the jury is out as to whether global (especially Asia-Pacific) LNG pricing will remain as strong it is currently, i.e., whether the close linkage with crude oil can be maintained. Thus, not everyone is willing to invest in North American liquefaction plants. Among companies that are willing, some (e.g., Apache) are clearly better capitalized than others (e.g., Cheniere). For project loans to be secured, offtake agreements are essential, hence Cheniere’s recent deals with KOGAS, BG Group and others.

#### Terrorists aren’t pursuing nukes

**Wolfe 12 –** Alan Wolfe is Professor of Political Science at Boston College. He is also a Senior Fellow with the World Policy Institute at the New School University in New York. A contributing editor of The New Republic, The Wilson Quarterly, Commonwealth Magazine, and In Character, Professor Wolfe writes often for those publications as well as for Commonweal, The New York Times, Harper's, The Atlantic Monthly, The Washington Post, and other magazines and newspapers. March 27, 2012, "Fixated by “Nuclear Terror” or Just Paranoia?" [http://www.hlswatch.com/2012/03/27/fixated-by-“nuclear-terror”-or-just-paranoia-2/](http://www.hlswatch.com/2012/03/27/fixated-by-)

If one were to read the most recent unclassified report to Congress on the acquisition of technology relating to weapons of mass destruction and advanced conventional munitions, it does have a section on CBRN terrorism (note, not WMD terrorism). The intelligence community has a very toned down statement that says “several terrorist groups … probably remain interested in [CBRN] capabilities, but not necessarily in all four of those capabilities. … mostly focusing on low-level chemicals and toxins.” They’re talking about terrorists getting industrial chemicals and making ricin toxin, not nuclear weapons. And yes, Ms. Squassoni, it is primarily al Qaeda that the U.S. government worries about, no one else. The trend of worldwide terrorism continues to remain in the realm of conventional attacks. In 2010, there were more than 11,500 terrorist attacks, affecting about 50,000 victims including almost 13,200 deaths. None of them were caused by CBRN hazards. Of the 11,000 terrorist attacks in 2009, none were caused by CBRN hazards. Of the 11,800 terrorist attacks in 2008, none were caused by CBRN hazards.

#### Aggression won’t escalate

-red lines solve

-all actors are rational and wouldn’t fight

-if it’s true it would escalate now that’s a reason war wouldn’t happen

-their ev is premised on hawkish rhetoric from , experts unanimously conclude neg

-intervening actors prevent escalation through dialogue

**Sieg 9/23** (Linda, – writer for Reuters “Japan, China military conflict seen unlikely despite strain”, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/09/23/us-china-japan-confrontation-idUSBRE88M0F220120923>)

¶ (Reuters) - Hawkish Chinese commentators have urged Beijing to prepare for military conflict with Japan as tensions mount over disputed islands in the East China Sea, but most experts say chances the Asian rivals will decide to go to war are slim.¶ A bigger risk is the possibility that an unintended maritime clash results in deaths and boosts pressure for retaliation, but even then Tokyo and Beijing are expected to seek to manage the row before it becomes a full-blown military confrontation.¶ "That's the real risk - a maritime incident leading to a loss of life. If a Japanese or Chinese were killed, there would be a huge outpouring of nationalist sentiment," said Linda Jakobson, director of the East Asia Program at the Lowy Institute for International Policy in Sydney.¶ "But I still cannot seriously imagine it would lead to an attack on the other country. I do think rational minds would prevail," she said, adding economic retaliation was more likely.¶ A feud over the lonely islets in the East China Sea flared this month after Japan's government bought three of the islands from a private owner, triggering violent protests in China and threatening business between Asia's two biggest economies.¶ Adding to the tensions, China sent more than 10 government patrol vessels to waters near the islands, known as the Diaoyu in China and the Senkaku in Japan, while Japan beefed up its Coast Guard patrols. Chinese media said 1,000 fishing boats have set sail for the area, although none has been sighted close by.¶ Despite the diplomatic standoff and rising nationalist sentiment in China especially, experts agree neither Beijing nor Tokyo would intentionally escalate to a military confrontation what is already the worst crisis in bilateral ties in decades.¶ U.S. PRESSURE¶ "The chances of a military conflict are very, very slim because neither side wants to go down that path," said former People's Liberation Army officer, Xu Guangyu, now a senior consultant at a government-run think tank in Beijing.¶ Pressure from the United States, which repeated last week that the disputed isles were covered by a 1960 treaty obliging Washington to come to Japan's aid if it were attacked, is also working to restrain both sides, security experts said.¶ "I very seriously do not think any of the involved parties - Japan, China and including the United States because of its defense treaty (with Japan) - want to see a military conflict over this dispute," said the Lowy Institute's Jakobson.¶ "They don't want to risk it, they don't seek it and they do not intend to let it happen."¶ Still, the possibility of a clash at sea remains.¶ While the presence of the Chinese surveillance ships - none of which is a naval vessel - and Japan Coast Guard ships in the area might appear to set the stage for trouble, military experts said each side would try to steer clear of the other.¶ "The bad news is that China sent ships to the area. The good news is that they are official ships controlled by the government," said Narushige Michishita at the National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies in Tokyo.¶ "This is good news because they are not likely to engage in aggressive action because that would really exacerbate the situation and turn it into a major crisis," said Michishita.¶ The Chinese ships, he said, had another mission besides asserting China's claims to the islands and nearby waters.¶ "My guess is that some (Chinese) official patrol boats are there to watch out for fishing boats ... to stop them from making problems," Michishita said.¶ FISHING BOATS WILD CARD¶ Military specialists say the Chinese patrol vessels are well disciplined as are the Japan Coast Guard ships, while the two sides have grown accustomed to communicating.¶ "Both sides are ready, but both sides are very well under control," said a former senior Japanese military official.¶ What worries observers most is the risk that a boat carrying Chinese fishermen slips through or activists try to land, sparking clashes with Japan's Coast Guard that result in deaths - news of which would spread like wildfire on the Internet.¶ In 1996, a Hong Kong activist drowned in the nearby waters. ¶ Diplomatic and economic relations chilled sharply in 2010 after Japan arrested a Chinese trawler captain whose boat collided with a Japan Coast Guard vessel. This time, tensions are already high and China is contending with a tricky once-in-a-decade leadership change while Japan's ruling party faces a probable drubbing in an election expected in months.¶ "Two rational governments of major countries would not intentionally decide to enter into a major war with each other over a few uninhabited rocks," said Denny Roy, an Asia security expert at the East-West Center in Hawaii.¶ "But unfortunately, you can arrive at war in ways other than that - through unintended escalation, in which both countries start out at a much lower level, but each of them think that they must respond to perceived provocation by the other side, both very strongly pushed into it by domestic pressure. That seems to be where we are now and it is difficult to see how countries can get out of that negative spiral."¶ Others, however, were more confident that an unplanned clash could be kept from escalating into military conflict.¶ "That's not really a major possibility, because there are still broad channels of communication between the two sides, and they would help prevent that happening. Both sides could still talk to each other," said former senior PLA officer Xu.¶ "Even before anything happened, you would also have the U.N Secretary General and others stepping in to ensure that the situation does not get out of control."

**No aggression -- the Russian military is in terrible shape.**

**Goure**, Vice President of the Lexington Institute and analyst on national security and military issues for NBC, **‘11**

[Daniel, “Russian Military’s Decline Continues”, Lexington Institute, July 12, 2011, http://www.lexingtoninstitute.org/russian-militarys-decline-continues?a=1&c=1171, Callahan]

The past 20 years has been a tale of near-continuous decline for the ex-Soviet military. Once it was the largest military force on the planet. Of late it has fallen to a mere shadow of its former self. So low have the fortunes of Russia’s conventional military fallen that it was barely able to defeat Georgia in their short conflict in 2008. The Soviet Union was once known for its massive nuclear arsenal. Now it is barely able to maintain a viable force; most of its systems are obsolescent and aging badly. Even in the absence of new arms control agreements with the United States, Russia would be forced to significantly cut back its nuclear arsenal. According to a senior Russian government official, the situation continues to deteriorate. In a recent interview for a Russian newspaper, reported on by Leon Aron in Foreign Policy, Yuri Solomonov, that country’s chief missile designer, took on his country’s President Dimitry Medvedev. This move is significant for Russian politics, since Medvedev is seeking to extend his tenure against the wishes of current prime minister and former President Vladimir Putin who wants his old job back. Medvedev is associated with a military reform program that was intended to transform the Russian military. But in his critique Solomonov revealed that Russia’s military is heading for the ash heap. According to Solomonov, Russia is now dependent on the West for critical technologies to keep its nuclear forces in operation. The military reform program, which required a massive increase in the production of modern aircraft, ground combat systems and ships, has essentially collapsed because of weaknesses in the Russian defense industrial base. Equally interesting, Solomonov criticizes President Medvedev for his efforts to threaten Europe and the United States over its current plans to deploy a theater missile defense system. The Kremlin leader had suggested that Russia could respond to the deployment of the Aegis Ashore theater missile defense system with countervailing deployments of theater nuclear missiles. Solomonov says that Medvedev is threatening the West with a military deployment that "does not exist, did not exist, and will not exist." In addition, the Russian missile designer pointed out something which Western advocates of limited missile defenses have said for years: the Russian ICBM force could overwhelm such a defense. The Obama Administration’s effort to reset this nation’s strategic relations with Russia is based in large part on the belief that our counterpart in the decades old strategic pas de deux is still a player. In fact, it is clear that Russia continues to decline as a military and economic power even as its politics become more Byzantine. No effort at arms control will be able to mask Russia’s military decline.

### Navy

#### 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]

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 criticalfor 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

#### Empirical studies prove the navy is not capable of deterring threats

**Daniel 2** [Donald C.F. “The Future of American Naval Power: Propositions and Recommendations,” Globalization and American Power. Chapter 27. Institute for National Strategic Studies National Defense University, http://www.ndu.edu/inss/Books/Books\_2002/Globalization\_and\_Maritime\_Power\_Dec\_02/0 1\_toc.htm]

In sum, there would seem to be a special role for the U.S. Navy in contingency response along littorals, but, outside the context of a specific crisis, constant day-to-day presence does not do much to deter unwanted behavior. Thus, it would seem a raising of false expectations to argue, for example, that the “gapping of aircraft carriers in areas of potential crisis is an invitation to disaster—and therefore represents culpable negligence on the part of America’s defense decision-makers.”33 In the early 1960s, the United States maintained three aircraft carrier battlegroups in the Mediterranean Sea but later gradually found that it needed to scale back. Currently, a single battlegroup operates there for less than 9 months of the year on average. This is a significant reduction, but no one can prove that the Mediterranean region became less stable. Conversely, the Navy began to maintain a regular presence in the Arabian Gulf in 1979, but this did not prevent Iran or Iraq from attacking ships during their war. In the 1980s, attacks generally increased in number over the 8 years of the war. As for deterring the initiation of a crisis in the first place, it is essentially impossible for an outsider to prove that such deterrence was successful except in the rare case in which a deterred party admits that he was deterred and states the reasons. Adam Siegel, John Arquilla, Paul Huth, Paul Davis, and a Rutgers Center for Global Security and Democracy team led by Edward Rhodes have each attempted to study the effects of forward presence and general deterrence. The deficiency of such study is always in making the definitive link between them. The majority of these studies suggest that “[h]istorically seapower has not done well as a deterrent” in preventing the outbreak of conflicts, principally because land-based powers not dependent on overseas trade are relatively “insensitive” to the operations of naval forces.

#### Squo solves—shale gas now

Ross 27 Mar

[ What They’re Saying: “Shale Gas is Transforming America’s Energy Future”” Accessed 29 Mar 2013. http://www.northcentralpa.com/feeditem/2013-03-27\_what-they%E2%80%99re-saying-%E2%80%9Cshale-gas-transforming-america%E2%80%99s-energy-future%E2%80%9D]

#### Wilbur Ross: Shale Gas Bringing Manufacturing Back to U.S., Helping Consumers: “These shale reserves…could revolutionize the chemical industry, the plastics industry, the fertilizer industry, even the steel industry. And it bring things back to the U.S. because it gives us a huge competitive advantage from an energy cost point of view. … Shale gas is much cheaper. So one of the reasons there hasn’t been a shock in electric bills and one of the reasons that the one percent withholding increase that when in January hasn’t destroyed consumers is that shale gas has been bringing down electric bills.”

#### And, the United States navy cannot prevent inevitable conflict through deterrence

**Daniel 2** [Donald C.F. “The Future of American Naval Power: Propositions and Recommendations,” Globalization and American Power. Chapter 27. Institute for National Strategic Studies National Defense University, http://www.ndu.edu/inss/Books/Books\_2002/Globalization\_and\_Maritime\_Power\_Dec\_02/0 1\_toc.htm]

force should be employed to ensure that its comparative advantages are maximized with full recognition of where limits exist. The point of the above recommendations is to emphasis that naval forces possess unique flexibility as politico-military instruments, but there are also limitations to what they can achieve as elements of conventional deterrence to regional crises. Naval forces can be effective instruments in training toward interoperability with friends, allies, and potential coalition members and do appear to have a reassuring effect on treaty allies. But this does not necessarily require the current rigorous force deployment schedule. In the globalizing world, naval forces will be critical elements in responding to crises and will have a modest role in shaping the environment, but it is not certain that they can have considerable direct effect in deterring the inevitable politico-military crises that will occur in less stable regions buffeted by the effects of globalization. U.S. Navy force structure should be optimized for what it can do, not for tasks that cannot be proven effective.
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### EU/Exports

### Turns Cartels/Back-stopping

#### Plan spurs Russian back-stopping and cartels- turns case

Hulbert, 12 – Johns Hopkins University energy policy professor

(Matthew, Central European University Public Policy department head (American graduate school based in Hungary), "Why America Can Make or Break A New Global Gas World," Forbes, 8-5-12, www.forbes.com/sites/matthewhulbert/2012/08/05/why-america-can-make-or-break-a-new-global-gas-world/print/, accessed 9-22-12, mss)

But it’s not all bad news for Russia. The first point is that most consumers (especially continental Europeans) are labouring under the illusion that spot markets mean cheap prices. What they miss, is that setting gas prices based on gas fundamentals has got nothing to do with being cheap – it’s purely about achieving a cost reflective price for whatever the markets (and fundamentals) suggest gas should be. Gas on gas competition might well have positive medium term effects on price given marginal costs of production are generally cheaper than oil. But there are never any guarantees. If anything, prices could initially be far more volatile than those associated with piped gas given the cyclical nature of the beast, not to mention adapting to new upstream investment regimes unable to fall back on the oil ‘certainties’ of old. But assuming these initial hurdles are jumped and gas markets are politically allowed to bed in, that’s where the real fun and games start. As much as consumers think they’ve taken the political sting out of gas producers tails, spot markets could actually give producers **far more leverage** to manipulate prices, either on a collective or bilateral basis. When you take a quick look at the map, it’s clear to see supply side dynamics are essentially oligopolistic in Europe, a position that Russia might decide to capitalise on. **The question is whether Russia would have the nerve** to go for it, or be able to take the ideological leap of faith needed to explore and exploit a potentially lucrative new world of gas benchmarks? **Much would depend on** pricing pressures involved and **how far convergence** has **got,** but **the lower prices go, the more compelling** prospect **supply side collusion would become**. Warning shots along such lines have been repeatedly fired by the GECF (even if often behind closed doors) with Russia, Algeria, Iran and Venezuela all wanting to recalibrate markets back towards producer interests. Obviously someone would have to shoulder initial opportunity costs and absorb likely free riding, enforce quotas and restrict new market entry at the fringe. They would also need to find a swing producer, that many have long thought would be Qatar, but actually, flags up a huge opportunity for Russia here. Instead of issuing empty threats to flood markets or decimate upstream investments, independent gas benchmarks might just provide Moscow with sufficient incentive to do what it should always have done: get to grips with the fact that US shale has made Russia a price taker in Europe (and Asia), **and start developing LNG** prospects **to reclaim control of global gas fundamentals**. Despite sitting on over **30% of global gas supplies**, Russian LNG production accounts for less than 5% of global share. Moscow has **let itself** become a fringe player in a global gas world. A ridiculous statement when you consider **Russia is the gas equivalent to Saudi Arabia** for oil. Developing Shtokman, Sakhalin and indeed Bazhenov and Achimov fields will undoubtedly put some people’s nose out of joint, but given Russia’s own unconventional reserves are estimated to be **ten times larger** than the whole of Europe, it still has the time (and potential) to **break anybody in the field** on volume to dictate long term prices. If global gas benchmarks are the way of the future, then we should at least be aware that Russia has the potential to play a pivotal role as the swing LNG producer of the world. The initial 62 million tonnes of LNG Shtokman and Sakhalin should hold, tells us as much.

### Turns Russia Aggression

#### Cartel causes Russian resurgence – turns case

Fang et al 12 (Songying Fang - Ph.D. Assistant Professor of Political Science Rice University. Amy Myers Jaffe - Fellow in Energy Studies JamesA. Baker III Institute for Public Policy Rice University. TedTemzelides, Ph.D., Prof of Economics. “New Alignments? The Geopolitics of Gas and Oil Cartels and the Changing Middle East,” January 2012, <http://www.bakerinstitute.org/publications/EF-pub-GasOilCartels-012312.pdf>)

Ill this study, we investigate three related questions raised by the above observations. First, what is the likelihood that Russia will be successful in creating new coalitions in energy markets in the near future? Russia’s aggressive use of its own energy exports as a tool of statecraft and diplomatic leverage in recent years has reintroduced fears of an “energy weapon” that could be wielded in international discourse. It has been argued that tightening energy markets could raise the benefits and possible chances of success for an energy exporting country that, alone or in combination with others, is trying to wrest political concessions by threatening to cut off energy supplies. Such an event would present a challenge for the international economy, and it could even lead to military conflict.2

#### Russian resurgence causes global nuclear war

Blank 9 – Dr. Stephen Blank , Research Professor of National Security Affairs at the Strategic Studies Institute of the U.S. Army War College, March 2009, “Russia And Arms Control: Are There Opportunities For The Obama Administration?,” online: http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/pub908.pdf

Proliferators or nuclear states like China and Russia can then deter regional or intercontinental attacks either by denial or by threat of retaliation.168 Given a multipolar world structure with little ideological rivalry among major powers, it is unlikely that they will go to war with each other. Rather, like Russia, they will strive for exclusive hegemony in their own “sphere of influence” and use nuclear instruments towards that end. However, wars may well break out between major powers and weaker “peripheral” states or between peripheral and semiperipheral states given their lack of domestic legitimacy, the absence of the means of crisis prevention, the visible absence of crisis management mechanisms, and their strategic calculation that asymmetric wars might give them the victory or respite they need.169 Simultaneously, The states of periphery and semiperiphery have far more opportunities for political maneuvering. Since war remains a political option, these states may find it convenient to exercise their military power as a means for achieving political objectives. Thus international crises may increase in number. This has two important implications for the use of WMD. First, they may be used deliberately to offer a decisive victory (or in Russia’s case, to achieve “intra-war escalation control”—author170) to the striker, or for defensive purposes when imbalances in military capabilities are significant; and second, crises increase the possibilities of inadvertent or accidental wars involving WMD.171 Obviously nuclear proliferators or states that are expanding their nuclear arsenals like Russia can exercise a great influence upon world politics if they chose to defy the prevailing consensus and use their weapons not as defensive weapons, as has been commonly thought, but as offensive weapons to threaten other states and deter nuclear powers. Their decision to go either for cooperative security and strengthened international military-political norms of action, or for individual national “egotism” will critically affect world politics. For, as Roberts observes, But if they drift away from those efforts [to bring about more cooperative security], the consequences could be profound. At the very least, the effective functioning of inherited mechanisms of world order, such as the special responsibility of the “great powers” in the management of the interstate system, especially problems of armed aggression, under the aegis of collective security, could be significantly impaired. Armed with the ability to defeat an intervention, or impose substantial costs in blood or money on an intervening force or the populaces of the nations marshaling that force, the newly empowered tier could bring an end to collective security operations, undermine the credibility of alliance commitments by the great powers, [undermine guarantees of extended deterrence by them to threatened nations and states] extend alliances of their own, and perhaps make wars of aggression on their neighbors or their own people.172

### Turns Democracy

#### Cartel kills global democracy

Cohen, 7 -- Heritage Russian and Eurasian studies senior research fellows (Ariel, "Gas OPEC: A Stealthy Cartel Emerges," 4-12-7, l/n, accessed 9-23-12, mss)

By 2010, LNG's share of the world's total gas consumption will double. Thus, price gouging through production quota manipulation may come faster than many experts expect if the GECF becomes a new OPEC and if consumer nations do not unite and flex their muscle. Moreover, Russia and Iran are interested in increasing their geopolitical leverage against the EU in areas which often have little to do with energy. Major gas producers share another characteristic. Qatar, Turkmenistan, Brunei, and Venezuela, to name just a few, have one feature in common: a **democracy deficit**. Just like OPEC, the gas cartel will be a **formidable global force** that can be used to **oppose**, challenge, **and** possibly **weaken** market-based democracies through high prices and wealth transfer. Such a cartel may cut deals with similarly undemocratic large-scale consumers, while forcing the West to pay full price.

#### Democracy solves extinction

Diamond 95

Larry Diamond, Hoover Institution, Stanford University, December, PROMOTING DEMOCRACY IN THE 1990S, 1995, p. http://www.carnegie.org//sub/pubs/deadly/diam\_rpt.html

Nuclear, chemical and biological weapons continue to proliferate. The very source of life on Earth, the global ecosystem, appears increasingly endangered. Most of these new and unconventional threats to security are associated with or aggravated by the weakness or absence of democracy, with its provisions for legality, accountability, popular sovereignty and openness. The experience of this century offers important lessons. Countries that govern themselves in a truly democratic fashion do not go to war with one another. They do not aggress against their neighbors to aggrandize themselves or glorify their leaders. Democratic governments do not ethnically "cleanse" their own populations, and they are much less likely to face ethnic insurgency. Democracies do not sponsor terrorism against one another. They do not build weapons of mass destruction to use on or to threaten one another. Democratic countries form more reliable, open, and enduring trading partnerships. In the long run they offer better and more stable climates for investment. They are more environmentally responsible because they must answer to their own citizens, who organize to protest the destruction of their environments.

### Solvency

#### Regulations low and don’t prevent production

Peter Kelly-Dewiler, Contributor who writes about energy technologies and policy for Forbes, “In Obama’s Second Term, Shale Gas Production No Likely to SlowDown”, Forbes, 11/7/2012

 Now that the election numbers are in, it’s time to take a brief look at a key element of both the Romney and Obama energy platforms: increased domestic natural gas production.  It is generally expected that the Obama administration will continue to push for more oversight and regulation of shale fracking.  The April 2012 EPA decision to reduce air emissions from fracking could well be followed by an effort to end exemptions from certain elements of the Safe Drinking Water Act.  In the case of the EPA air emissions oversight, the rules were relaxed somewhat, and industry was given two years to bring activities into compliance.  In the case of water regulation, the conversation may well continue to drag along slowly for some time to come.  In the end, there is only so much regulation that is likely to occur at the national level.  The 2005 [Energy](http://www.forbes.com/energy/) [Policy](http://www.forbes.com/policy/) Act essentially gave most regulatory responsibility to individual states, and it will probably remain there. Regardless of the final regulatory outcome, gas production is likely to soar, especially as gas use grows in transportation, industry, and electric generation. And don’t forget the significant potential for LNG exports, as numerous license requests have already been tendered. The Marcellus area, and Pennsylvania in particular, should continue to see rapid growth. A [new study](http://www.asdreports.com/mnews.asp?pr_id=900) from ASDReports announced today suggests that production could increase more than seven-fold from 2011 levels, from just over 1,000 billion cubic feet equivalent (bcfe) in 2011 to almost 5,000 bcfe in 2015, before finally leveling off at over 7,600 bcfe in 2020. Just in the eastern US, the shale gas reserves are enormous. The US Geological Survey has pegged Marcellus at an estimated recoverable total of 84 trillion cubic feet (TCF). In October, it released its [first estimates](http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3419&from=rss_home#.UJpqhGt5mSM) for the neighboring (in Ohio) or underlying (in Pennsylvania and [New York](http://www.forbes.com/places/ny/new-york/)) [Utica](http://www.forbes.com/places/ny/utica/)shales of 38 TCF, plus 940 million barrels of unconventional oil resources and 208 million barrels of unconventional liquids.  The current dominant players, such as Chesapeake, Range Resources, [Talisman Energy](http://www.forbes.com/companies/talisman-energy/), and Cabot Oil and Gas have locked up a good deal of the acreage, but they may be joined by others.  The drilling will continue, and the conversation will go on as to how to produce domestic shale gas in the most efficiently, clean, and safe manner.  The stuff is there, and it’s not going away.

#### [b.] Wont cost more or duplicate – EPA authority at worst means approving ongoing state oversight

Abrahm Lustgarten, “FRAC Act – Congress Introduces Twin Bills to Control Drilling and Protect Drinking Water”, Pro Publica, June 9, 2009

It is unclear exactly how federal oversight would lead to mounting costs. EPA officials in Washington say the section of the Safe Drinking Water Act that governs the oil and gas industry allows for flexibility and already defers oversight of drilling to the states. According to the industry and a recent industry-affiliated study, most state programs already have regulations in place. In such cases, restoring the EPA's authority could mean that the EPA approves ongoing state oversight and that little else would change.

### Navy

### Frontline

#### Resource scarcity leads to cooperation, not war – empirically proven

Dalby 6 (Simon, Dept. Of Geography, Carleton University, "Security and environment linkages revisited" in Globalisation and Environmental Challenges: Reconceptualising Security in the 21st Century, www.ntu.edu.sg/idss/publications/SSIS/SSIS001.pdf)

In parallel with the focus on human security as a necessity in the face of both natural and artificial forms of vulnerability, recent literature has emphasised the opportunities that environmental management presents for political cooperation between states and other political actors, on both largescale infrastructure projects as well as more traditional matters of wildlife and new concerns with biodiversity preservation (Matthew/Halle/Switzer 2002). Simultaneously, the discussion on water wars, and in particular the key finding the shared resources frequently stimulate cooperation rather than conflict, shifted focus from conflict to the possibilities of environmental action as a mode of peacemaking. Both at the international level in terms of environmental diplomacy and institution building, there is considerable evidence of cooperative action on the part of many states (Conca/Dabelko 2002). Case studies from many parts of the world suggest that cooperation and diplomatic arrangements can facilitate peaceful responses to the environmental difficulties in contrast to the pessimism of the 1990’s where the focus was on the potential for conflicts. One recent example of the attempts to resolve difficulties in the case of Lake Victoria suggests a dramatic alternative to the resource war scenarios. The need to curtail over-fishing in the lake and the importance of remediation has encouraged cooperation; scarcities leading to conflict arguments have not been common in the region, and they have not influenced policy prescriptions (Canter/Ndegwa 2002). Many conflicts over the allocations of water use rights continue around the world but most of them are within states and international disputes simply do not have a history of leading to wars.

**Biotech is inevitable**

**D'Haeze, ‘7**

[Wim, Bio-Engineer in Chemistry and received his Ph.D. in Biotechnology at Ghent University, Senior Technical Writer in the pharmaceutical, "Blooming Biotech and Pharmaceutical Industries," 10-15, The Science Advisory Board, <http://www.scienceboard.net/community/perspectives.193.html>]

Whoever regularly follows the news will recognize that the Biotech and Pharmaceutical Industry is still expanding – booming – in the United States and Europe, but also in major Asian countries such as India, China, and Japan. A pattern that is often observed for pharmaceutical companies is headquartering in a major location in the United States or Europe while branching elsewhere in the United States, Europe, and/or Asia. Those processes are highly dependent on how successfully drug candidates move through the drug development pipelines and on how the drug development process is organized, planned, and executed. Research and Development hubs are located at the East coast (e.g., New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Atlanta, and Northern and Central New Jersey) and West coast (e.g., San Francisco, Los Angeles, San Diego, and Seattle) of the United States and throughout major cities in Europe, but multinational companies have been or are stepping on land in countries throughout Asia as well. Reasons for the latter development may include substantial cheaper labor as compared to that in developed countries and the ability to produce medicines close to the market place. During recent years, India, for example, has become the home of a few hundred registered biotech and pharmaceutical companies and is now positioned within the top-5 producers of pharmaceuticals. Interestingly, the majority of its export (e.g., production of diphtheria, tetanus, pertussis (DTP) vaccine) goes to developing countries. Companies such as Biocon, Novo Nordisk, Aventis Pharma, Chiron Behring Vaccines, GlaxoSmithKline, Novozymes, Eli Lilly & Company, and Advanced Biochemicals are all represented in major Indian cities, including Bangalore, Calcutta, Hyderabad, Mumbai, Pune, and New Delhi. In 2005, Indian biotech and pharmaceutical companies represented a revenue of more than US$1 billion and the governmental goal articulated by the Indian Department of Biotechnology is to create a biotechnology and pharmaceutical industry generating US$5 billion in revenues annually and representing one million jobs by roughly three years from now. The government tries to achieve this goal in part by facilitating foreign-owned companies to establish in India, making it easier for investors by centralizing the process, creating at least ten new science parks by 2010, financially supporting new drug discovery proposals and research, and by supporting small biotech and pharmaceutical businesses and start-up companies.
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#### Key to US economy- largest trading partner

Root 12

[Wayne Allyn Root, writer for Town hall, May 22, 2012, Why The EU Economic Disaster Is "The Black Box" For America, <http://townhall.com/columnists/wayneallynroot/2012/05/22/why_the_eu_economic_disaster_is_the_black_box_for_america/page/full/>, uwyo//amp]

Well, the EU is America’s biggest trading partner. Any crisis or depression in the EU will badly hurt U.S. businesses. Jobs will be lost. Businesses will fail. Budgets will be slashed. Tax revenues will plummet. We’re staring at a huge economic haircut and headache. At best, the EU’s collapse will damper the U.S. economy. At worst, it could plunge us into another Great Depression.

#### Trade directly influences terrorist activity: economic growth and income effects.

Krieger and Meierrieks 10

(Tim and Daniel, Department of Economics, University of Paderborn, Journal of Conflict Resolution, “Terrorism in the Worlds of Welfare Capitalism,” 2010, Sage Publications//wyo-mm)

Trade openness may influence terrorist activity by its effects on economic growth, inequality, and income levels (Li and Schaub 2004). Blomberg and Hess (2008) find that higher levels of trade openness reduce the likelihood of transnational and domestic terrorism. Economic integration may reduce grievances associated with poor economic conditions, consequently reducing terrorism building on such grievances. At the same time, open economies face external risks from world market fluctuations. This increases demand for more universal social protection provided by the government (Rodrik 1998).

#### Free trade solves disease: makes medicines affordable and increases accessibility of medicine- Africa proves

Jason 10

(Gary, teaches in the Department of Philosophy, California State University, Liberty, “The Case for Free Trade,” December 2010, accessed via ProQuest//wyo-mm)

Consider another argument for free trade, one recently given by the presidents of Uganda and Tanzania (see Yoweri Museveni and Jakaya Mrisho Kikwete, "Free Trade and the Fight Against Malaria," Wall Street Journal, July 26, 2010). Malaria is a vicious disease that is common in Africa. Over 200 million people suffer from it, and it kills 800,000 a year, disproportionately children. During the past decade, new diagnostic tests, drugs, and mosquitoproof netting have been developed. But as Kikwete and Museveni note, a lot of African nations still have high tariff and tax barriers to protect their domestic industries. When some of them eliminated trade barriers on antimalarial products, the cost of those products dropped, and usage correspondingly increased. So did the number of local entrepreneurs who create homegrown medical businesses producing antimalarial products.

#### Stopping disease key to prevent extinction

Steinbruner 98

(John D., Senior Fellow, Brookings Institution, “Biological Weapons: A Plague Upon All Houses,” FOREIGN POLICY n. 109, Winter 1997/1998, pp. 85-96, ASP.)

It is a considerable comfort and undoubtedly a key to our survival that, so far, the main lines of defense against this threat have not depended on explicit policies or organized efforts. In the long course of evolution, the human body has developed physical barriers and a biochemical immune system whose sophistication and effectiveness exceed anything we could design or as yet even fully understand. But evolution is a sword that cuts both ways: New diseases emerge, while old diseases mutate and adapt. Throughout history, there have been epidemics during which human immunity has broken down on an epic scale. An infectious agent believed to have been the plague bacterium killed an estimated 20 million people over a four-year period in the fourteenth century, including nearly one-quarter of Western Europe's population at the time. Since its recognized appearance in 1981, some 20 variations of the HIV virus have infected an estimated 29.4 million worldwide, with 1.5 million people currently dying of AIDS each year. Malaria, tuberculosis, and cholera - once thought to be under control - are now making a comeback. As we enter the twenty-first century, changing conditions have enhanced the potential for widespread contagion. The rapid growth rate of the total world population, the unprecedented freedom of movement across international borders, and scientific advances that expand the capability for the deliberate manipulation of pathogens are all cause for worry that the problem might be greater in the future than it has ever been in the past. The threat of infectious pathogens is not just an issue of public health, but a fundamental security problem for the species as a whole.

#### TPA will be reality this year

ICTSD, “US Trade Policy to Focus on TPP, EU Talks in 2013,” International Centre for Trade and Development, 3/6/2013. http://ictsd.org/i/news/bridgesweekly/156978/

 Fast track authority key to unlocking pacts

Political analysts, however, say garnering support from Democrats for both the trans-Atlantic and trans-Pacific deals could potentially be an uphill battle. Thus, those following the trade talks are scrutinising the small passage supporting the renewal of Trade Promotion Authority - better known as “fast track” - which some say is an initial requirement for ushering the deals through the US Congress.¶ “To facilitate the conclusion, approval, and implementation of market-opening negotiating efforts, we will also work with Congress on Trade Promotion Authority,” the report reads. “Such authority will guide current and future negotiations, and will thus support a jobs-focused trade agenda moving forward.”¶ Under “fast track authority,” trade deals negotiated by the executive branch are then presented to the US Congress for a straight up-or-down vote, without any amendments. The provision expired in 2007, though it still applied to the Colombia, Panama, and South Korea trade deals, which were underway at the time, but not ratified until 2011.¶ Some analysts have interpreted the statement as a positive sign that the provision could become a reality this year, but some key Republicans and the US business community say the Obama Administration needs to quicken the pace of the fast track initiative and make concrete progress. In 2012, US Trade Representative Ron Kirk had similarly called for the renewal of fast track authority; however, the initiative was not pursued further by the White House in the then-difficult election year climate.

#### Obama’s trade agenda will be successful – bipartisan support, recent history of trade deals, and good reason for hope

Orrin Hatch, U.S. Senator from Utah, “Hatch Statement At Finance Committee Hearing Examiningthe Obama Administration’s Trade Agenda Washington,” 3/19/2013. http://www.finance.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/03%2019%2013%20Hatch%20Statement%20at%20Hearing%20Obama's%20Trade%20Agenda.pdf.

March 19, 2013 (202) 224-4515– U.S. Senator Orrin Hatch (R-Utah), Ranking Member of the Senate FinanceCommittee, today delivered the following opening statement at a committee hearing examining the Obama Administration’s trade agenda for 2013:Mr. Chairman, thank you for holding today’s hearing. As I’m sure you’d agree, congressional oversight is critical to ensuring transparency and accountability in the ExecutiveBranch. So, I appreciate this opportunity to talk with the Administration in a public forum about their trade agenda. International trade is critical to our economy. Trade supports more than 38 million jobs in the United States. But we can do better. Ninety-five percent of the world’s customers live outside the United States and theyaccount for 92 percent of global economic growth and 80 percent of the world’s purchasing power. If we are going to access these customers, we need an aggressive trade policy and the tools to help put that policy in place. Our record of bipartisan cooperation on trade is strong. During the last Congress we worked together to pass seven trade bills, including our long-stalled free trade agreements with Colombia, Panama and South Korea. We also worked closely together to develop legislation to grant permanent normal trade relations for Russia while holding Russia accountable for its actions. I am hopeful we will be able to look back on a similar record of success at the end of the 113th Congress. There certainly is reason for hope.

#### OCS oil unpopular – democrats and environmentalists

Drennen 10 Kyle is a writer at NewsBuster. “CBS 'Early Show' Hits Obama From Left on Offshore Drilling,” April 1, http://newsbusters.org/?q=blogs/kyle-drennen/2010/04/01/cbs-early-show-hits-obama-left-offshore-drilling

Introducing a segment on Thursday's CBS Early Show about President Obama's decision to open up some new areas to offshore oil drilling, fill-in co-host Jeff Glor warned that some of Obama's "closest allies are especially unhappy." In a report that followed, White House correspondent Bill Plante noted "Environmental groups are disappointed." ¶ However, Plante also touted the idea that the move could help pass unpopular cap and trade legislation, a long-held liberal goal: "Many in Washington see this as a strategy to win Republican support for a climate bill aimed at slowing global warming." He later concluded: "The conventional political wisdom is that this is not the time to have another rancorous nasty debate, like the one over health care, on a climate change bill. But the betting here is that the President's energy policy may make it easier to have that debate." ¶ At the top of the show, co-host Maggie Rodriguez proclaimed: "President Obama's controversial offshore drilling proposal is making big waves. Critics say the risks are obvious, but not the rewards." In a discussion with CBS political analyst John Dickerson after Plante's report, she did little to hide her displeasure with the proposal: "Let's establish right off the bat that this will not---not even remotely free us from our dependence on foreign oil." Dickerson agreed: "You're exactly right." ¶ At the same time, Rodriguez wondered why Republicans were not on board with the decision: "You would think that Republicans, the 'Drill, Baby, Drill' crowd, would be ecstatic over this. This is something they want. Why didn't they seem too overwhelmed?" Dickerson explained: "this is not a drill everywhere plan, it's quite limited, and that's why their support for him has been limited." Rodriguez replied: "Still, it's still a step in their direction, a step to the Right." ¶ Rodriguez then fretted if that supposed "step to the Right" would hurt Obama with the Left: "Is he doing that at the risk of alienating his Democratic base?" Dickerson shared her concern: "You're right, it is a step to the Right and the Democratic base and progressives are angry with him. Some of the Democratic senators were quite fulsome in their denunciation of this plan."

#### Coal lobby fights natural gas

Krauss 9—NYT Energy Staff [Clifford Krauss, Natural Gas Hits a Roadblock in New Energy Bill, http://www.nytimes.com/2009/09/07/business/07gas.html]

 The natural gas industry has enjoyed something of a winning streak in recent years. It found gigantic new reserves, low prices are encouraging utilities to substitute gas for coal, and cities are switching to buses fueled by natural gas.

But its luck has run out in Washington, where the industry is having trouble making its case to Congress as it writes an energy bill to tackle global warming.

For all its pronouncements that gas could be used to replace aging, inefficient coal-fired power plants — and reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the process — lawmakers from coal-producing states appear committed to keeping coal as the nation’s primary producer of power.

Those influential lawmakers, from both parties, say that new technologies under development to capture and bury emissions of coal are a better bet than gas for long-term solutions to climate change.

The difference of opinion is about more than what is best for the environment, of course. Industry profits are riding on the outcome of the discussion — a rich mix of politics, environment, science and business.

A climate-change bill that passed the House in June, intended to cap greenhouse gas emissions, delivered benefits to renewable fuels like wind and solar and strengthened building codes to conserve energy.

But the cost of emitting carbon dioxide emissions under the terms of the bill remained at levels that would continue to provide a price advantage for coal in many regions of the country.

The Senate is planning to begin writing its own bill later this month.

“The Senate is more open to natural gas as a transition fuel than the House was,” said Senator Charles E. Schumer, Democrat of New York, “but the senators from the coal states who are crucial votes are going to want first consideration for coal.”

The gas industry’s leaders say they will descend on Capitol Hill in coming weeks to press their case about the advantage of gas, including that it emits about half the greenhouse gases as coal.

The industry has formed a new lobbying group, and it is planning a national campaign that includes television advertising. Executives want fewer allowances for coal. They also want legislation that gives incentives for companies to convert truck fleets from diesel to natural gas.

“Never in my life have I been confronted with something so obviously easy and good to do and have such Congressional apathy,” said Aubrey McClendon, chief executive of Chesapeake Energy and a leading voice in the industry. He added that he was still hopeful the Senate can improve the House bill.

But the coal industry will also be active. Vic Svec, a senior vice president at Peabody Energy, a large coal company, said coal was still a better fuel because its price is more stable than gas.

#### Coal lobby is powerful—will fight energy fights to keep it strong—insures a fight in congress

Choma 12—money-in-politics reporter for the Center for Responsive Politics [Russ Choma, Two Years After Mine Disaster, Coal Lobby Is Still Growing, https://www.commondreams.org/view/2012/04/06-0]

Two years ago today, the Upper Big Branch mine exploded, killing 29 miners and injuring two others. In the months after the tragedy, it became clear that the mine's owner, Massey Energy, had flouted safety requirements and tried to game the system. Led by CEO Don Blankenship, the company unapologetically pursued politicians at both the state and federal levels, dumping cash into campaigns and lobbying hard for less oversight.

Investigations into the disaster found that the company had successfully skirted orders to improve the safety of the mine, despite fines and warnings from regulators. In 2010, Blankenship resigned, and a few months later the company was sold to Alpha Natural Resources.

But the departure of the pugnacious coal executive, eager to use his money to influence power, hasn't lessened the industry's investment in Washington. In fact, OpenSecrets.org data shows that the amount of money spent by the coal industry on politicians and lobbying has only grown since the disaster.

In 2011, the industry spent at least $18.1 million lobbying on the federal level - millions more than the $14.9 million in 2009. That figure includes all types of companies with interests in coal, but the mining companies spend far and away the most money on lobbying -- companies like Peabody Energy, which spent $4.9 million last year, and CONSOL Energy, which spent $3.2 million. Massey's corporate successor, Alpha Natural Resources spent just over $1 million. Safety issues and mine oversight was an issue of concern listed on lobbying disclosure forms for all three companies.

To put that in perspective, the United Mine Workers, the largest miner's union, spent just $404,419 lobbying last year.

The industry's figures overall are slightly down compared to 2010, but are significantly higher than before the accident. Although there is evidence that mine safety has improved since the explosion, Congress has failed to pass any legislation addressing it. The correlation between lobbying expenditures and legislation, or lack thereof, is never clear -- but it's clear where campaign contributions go and who's pushing or resisting new legislation.

As a recent hearing on efforts by the Mine Health and Safety Administration (the agency responsible for overseeing mine safety) showed, Democrats are the ones pushing for new laws. And the industry has given far more money to Republicans -- about $3 million to Republicans and just $385,486 to Democrats.

The OpenSecrets.org analysis of contributions by the industry also shows that overall giving to candidates is on the rise. In the 2010 campaign cycle, individuals and PACs affiliated with the industry gave far more than ever before -- $8.1 million. That is more than double than the previous high-water mark in the 2002 cycle, when when individuals and PACs affiliated with the industry gave $3.7 million. And so far this cycle, with much of this year including the general election still to come, the industry has given $4.8 million, putting it on pace to possibly surpass last cycle.

Mine safety and the aftermath of Upper Big Branch is hardly the only major issue confronting the mining industry and causing them to spend money in Washington, to be fair: climate change and the role of coal-fired power plants in the nation's energy future are huge fights in Washington. Just yesterday, the American Coalition for Clean Coal Electricity launched a major new ad campaign to push coal-fired plants back to prominence in the discussion over domestic power sources.

#### Prefer positive view percentage- reflects smaller decline since January

Holyk 3/27

[Greg Holyk, 3/27/2013, Congress Improves Among Hispanics; Obama, SCOTUS Hold Majority Popularity, <http://abcnews.go.com/blogs/politics/2013/03/congress-improves-among-hispanics-obama-scotus-hold-majority-popularity/>, uwyo//amp]

Popularity of the U.S. Congress, while weak overall, has gained sharply among Hispanics, likely reflecting its current efforts on immigration reform, a new ABC News/Washington Post poll has found. More than half of Americans, meanwhile, favorably rate the U.S. Supreme Court and the president alike. Congress by far is the least popular of the three, with just 30 percent of Americans viewing it favorably. But that jumps to 56 percent among Hispanics, up by a steep 21 percentage points from November 2011 – the only group in which it reaches majority popularity. See PDF with full results, charts and tables here. Separately, 55 percent of Americans overall hold a favorable opinion of the Supreme Court, which is hearing arguments on gay marriage, a major civil rights issue, this week. That’s despite some less-than-popular recent opinions; the public divided on the court’s ruling on health care reform in 2012 and broadly opposed its 2010 decision on political campaign financing. Obama, for his part, is seen positively by 57 percent of Americans, near his more than three-year high, 60 percent, in January. That’s despite the fact that his job approval slipped from a three-year peak of 55 percent in January to 50 percent earlier this month. The two assessments can differ; the first measures basic goodwill while the latter is more performance-based.

#### Polls break for Obama-Republicans may strongly dislike him but liberals, independents, and moderates view him positively

Holyk 3/27

[Greg Holyk, 3/27/2013, Congress Improves Among Hispanics; Obama, SCOTUS Hold Majority Popularity, <http://abcnews.go.com/blogs/politics/2013/03/congress-improves-among-hispanics-obama-scotus-hold-majority-popularity/>, uwyo//amp]

PARTY – Not surprisingly, partisan and ideological loyalties play their biggest roles in views of Obama, though differences on the court and Congress are apparent as well. The president is popular with nine in 10 Democrats and 86 percent of liberals, but unpopular among eight in 10 Republicans, two-thirds of conservatives overall and seven in 10 “strong” conservatives. Feelings are intense on both sides: Two-thirds of Democrats and 55 percent of liberals rate Obama strongly favorably, while about two-thirds of Republicans and very conservatives view him strongly negatively. Helping to tip the balance in the president’s favor, majorities of political independents and ideological moderates see him favorably.

#### Coming down after post-election high-still has PC

Nate Cohn, Obama's Plunge in Popularity is No Big Deal (Yet), New Republic, 3/15/2013.

http://www.newrepublic.com/article/112662/obama-approval-ratings-march-2013-unsurprising-decline#

After a decisive victory in November and attendant surge in popularity, President Barack Obama’s post-election honeymoon appears to be coming to an end. A wave of recent polls show that his job approval ratings have dropped from their post-election peak, leading some to blame the sequester and others to speculate that the president has lost his “political capital,” presumably endangering his agenda. That's probably overstating things. While the decline certainly isn't good news for the White House, it's not entirely surprising, either. Presidents receive a post-election bounce, and it usually comes back down.¶ But if it continues to fall, especially as the 2014 midterms approach? That's a different story.¶

#### Second, Political capital is finite – a win on one issue doesn’t spill over

Gangale, San Francisco State political science lecturer, 5

(Thomas, poli sci lecturer @ SF State, 1/23/5, “To Amend or Not to Amend”, http://pweb.jps.net/~gangale/opsa/ps2/ToAmendOrNotToAmend.htm) JPG

Abolishing the Electoral College is somewhat of a progressive issue in that it is based on the principle of "one person, one vote." However, more than anything it is a "large states vs. small states" issue, and that is why it is a perennial loser. The reality is that there are many more Idahos and Nebraskas than there are Californias and New Yorks, and since a small state has as many votes in the US Senate as a large state, any proposal to do away with the Electoral College cannot hope to win the required two-thirds majority. It is destined to defeat. Even worse, the issue pits progressive states large and small against each other, weakening progressive solidarity. If you fight someone tooth-and-nail on one issue, it’s hard to muster any more than lukewarm support on another issue on which you agree. Political capital is like ammunition: use too much of it up in an unwise action, and you have to wait to be resupplied. Meanwhile, your forces may be in disarray and vulnerable to a counterstrike. Abolishing the Electoral College isn’t the only constitutional amendment that’s being bandied about this year. There’s also talk of an amendment to ban gay marriage.

#### Third, Winners win is wrong -- Obama votes neg

Calmes 2012

[Jackie Calmes, NYTimes, 11/12/12, In Debt Talks, Obama Is Ready to Go Beyond Beltway, mobile.nytimes.com/2012/11/12/us/politics/legacy-at-stake-obama-plans-broader-push-for-budget-deal.xml]

That story line, stoked by Republicans but shared by some Democrats, holds that Mr. Obama is too passive and deferential to Congress, a legislative naïf who does little to nurture personal relationships with potential allies - in short, not a particularly strong leader. Even as voters re-elected Mr. Obama, those who said in surveys afterward that strong leadership was the most important quality for a president overwhelmingly chose Mr. Romney. George C. Edwards III, a leading scholar of the presidency at Texas A & M University who is currently teaching at Oxford University, dismissed such criticisms as shallow and generally wrong. Yet Mr. Edwards, whose book on Mr. Obama's presidency is titled "Overreach," said, "He didn't understand the limits of what he could do." "They thought they could continuously create opportunities and they would succeed, and then there would be more success and more success, and we'd build this advancing-tide theory of legislation," Mr. Edwards said. "And that was very naïve, very silly. Well, they've learned a lot, I think." "Effective leaders," he added, "exploit opportunities rather than create them." The budget showdown is an opportunity. But like many, it holds risks as well as potential rewards. "This election is the second chance to be what he promised in 2008, and that is to break the gridlock in Washington," said Kenneth M. Duberstein, a Reagan White House chief of staff, who voted for Mr. Obama in 2008 and later expressed disappointment. "But it seems like this is a replay of 2009 and 2010, when he had huge majorities in the House and Senate, rather than recognizing that 'we've got to figure out ways to work together and it's not just what I want.' " For now, at least, Republican lawmakers say they may be open to raising the tax bill for some earners. "We can increase revenue without increasing the tax rates on anybody in this country," said Representative Tom Price, Republican of Georgia and a leader of House conservatives, on "Fox News Sunday." "We can lower the rates, broaden the base, close the loopholes." The challenge for Mr. Obama is to use his postelection leverage to persuade Republicans - or to help Speaker John A. Boehner persuade Republicans - that a tax compromise is in their party's political interest since most Americans favor compromise and higher taxes on the wealthy to reduce annual deficits. Some of the business leaders the president will meet with on Wednesday are members of the new Fix the Debt coalition, which has raised about $40 million to urge lawmakers and their constituents to support a plan that combines spending cuts with new revenue. That session will follow Mr. Obama's meeting with labor leaders on Tuesday. His first trip outside Washington to engage the public will come after Thanksgiving, since Mr. Obama is scheduled to leave next weekend on a diplomatic trip to Asia. Travel plans are still sketchy, partly because his December calendar is full of the traditional holiday parties. Democrats said the White House's strategy of focusing both inside and outside of Washington was smart. "You want to avoid getting sucked into the Beltway inside-baseball games," said Joel Johnson, a former adviser in the Clinton White House and the Senate. "You can still work toward solutions, but make sure you get out of Washington while you are doing that." The president must use his leverage soon, some Democrats added, because it could quickly wane as Republicans look to the 2014 midterm elections, when the opposition typically takes seats from the president's party in