# Icebreakers Negative

## Funding Spec

#### You’ve got a lot of budget questions to answer about your plan

O’Rourke 6/14

(Specialist in Naval Affairs, Congressional Research Service, “Coast Guard Polar Icebreaker Modernization: Background and Issues for Congress,” <http://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc85474/>)

Potential issues for Congress regarding Coast Guard polar icebreaker modernization include the potential impact on U.S. polar missions of the United States currently having no operational heavy polar icebreakers; the numbers and capabilities of polar icebreakers the Coast Guard will need in the future; the disposition of Polar Sea following its decommissioning; whether the new polar icebreaker initiated in the FY23013 budget should be funded with incremental funding (as proposed in the Coast Guard’s Five Year Capital Investment Plan) or full funding in a single year, as required under the executive branch’s full funding policy; whether new polar icebreakers should be funded entirely in the Coast Guard budget, or partly or entirely in some other part of the federal budget, such as the Department of Defense (DOD) budget, the National Science Foundation (NSF) budget, or both; whether to provide future icebreaking capability through construction of new ships or service life extensions of existing polar icebreakers; and whether future polar icebreakers should be acquired through a traditional acquisition or a leasing arrangement.

## AT - Inherency

### Ice-breakers coming now

#### SQuo solves the Aff – we’re about to get Polar Star back

O’Rourke 6/14

Specialist in Naval Affairs, Congressional Research Service, “Coast Guard Polar Icebreaker Modernization: Background and Issues for Congress,” <http://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc85474/>

Polar Star was commissioned into service on January 19, 1976, and consequently is now several years beyond its intended 30-year service life. The ship currently is not in operational condition due to worn out electric motors and other problems. The Coast Guard placed the ship in caretaker status on July 1, 2006.7 Congress in FY2009 and FY2010 provided funding to repair Polar Star and return it to service for 7 to 10 years; the Coast Guard expects the $62.8 million reactivation project to be completed in December 2012.8 The ship is to undergo testing during the summer of 2013, and be ready for operations in FY2014.9 Although the repair work on the ship is intended to give it another 7 to 10 years of service, an August 30, 2010, press report quoted the Commandant of the Coast Guard, Admiral Robert Papp, as saying, “We’re getting her back into service, but it’s a little uncertain to me how many more years we can get out of her in her current condition, even after we do the engine repairs.”10

#### Congress already realizes need for icebreakers in SQ

Song 2011

Kyung M. Song Seattle Times Washington Bureau October 10, 2011 <http://www.mcclatchydc.com/2011/10/10/126784/global-warming-spurs-debate-over.html> global warming spurs debate over weather US should build new icebreakers. Accessed 6/28/12

This week, after years of hand wringing over the nation's diminished Arctic ambitions, Congress will receive what is meant to be the definitive independent analysis on whether it should build new icebreakers or eke even more service out of the two aged vessels. Paradoxically, experts say, the thinning ice will increase demand for icebreakers as more people flock to the hazardous polar environs. A National Research Council panel in 2006 concluded the nation's icebreaking capabilities were inadequate to support its polar missions and urged immediate construction of two ships. Another independent study by ABS Consulting in 2010 said the Coast Guard would need three each of heavy and medium icebreakers — double its current fleet.

#### Private companies are building icebreakers now

Buchanan 12

(Susan, January 17, <http://www.marinelink.com/news/exploration-icebreaker342119.aspx>)

The Nanuq was outfitted with oil-spill-response capabilities well before the 2010 Macondo spill in the Gulf, he noted. The Aiviq is designed to work in tandem with the Nanuq. (Photo Courtesy Shell) The M/V Aiviq icebreaker, contracted by Shell Oil to support drilling in Alaska’s Chukchi Sea, is scheduled to be completed by Louisiana-based Edison Chouest Offshore in early 2012. The vessel, ordered in July 2009, is on track for April 1, 2012, delivery in Galliano, La., and will then head north, according to Shell Oil spokesman Curtis Smith. The $200m Aiviq is the largest vessel ever built by Chouest, and will be among the most advanced and powerful, non-military icebreakers on the waters. Lonnie Thibodeaux, Chouest spokesman, said the vessel's hull was scheduled to leave the company's North American Shipbuilding yard in Larose, La. on Dec. 20 for its LaShip yard in Houma, where the bridge is being built for final assembly. The Aiviq will travel though the Panama Canal to Alaska this spring. Last summer, Coast Guard commandant Admiral Robert Papp warned that if a big oil spill were to occur in the Arctic, the U.S. lacks the infrastructure and equipment to respond quickly. The Coast Guard says that it needs more heavy- and medium-duty icebreakers though paying for them is a challenge. Companies need more vessels to smash through ice too. For now, foreign vessels are allowed to work in frigid U.S. waters under a Jones Act exemption that expires in 2017.

#### Private sector already working on icebreaker

Demer 2011

Lisa Demer Anchorage Daily News December 6, 2011 http://www.mcclatchydc.com/2011/12/06/132307/shell-oil-to-unveil-massive-icebreaker.html shell oil to unveil massive icebreaker ship in Alaska accessed 6/28/12

A longtime Shell contractor has nearly completed a massive, customized icebreaking ship for the company's drilling projects in the Chukchi Sea off Alaska. The icebreaker is part of a specialized fleet Shell hopes to deploy for exploration drilling next summer, if it can clear all the legal and regulatory hurdles. Named the Aiviq, the Eskimo word for walrus, the $200 million, 360-foot steel vessel's main job will be to move anchor lines that will attach drilling rigs to the sea floor in the shallow Arctic. But it's also on standby in case of an oil spill -- it could recover about 10,000 barrels of spilled crude. The ship was designed to cut through ice a meter thick and likely will be able to move through thicker ice, its builder says. It can operate at minus 58 degrees.

### Borrowing ships now

#### Groups in the US are going to different countries for their icebreaker needs

Usmilitary.com 12

Usmilitary.com publisher usmilitary.com december 2011 http://www.usmilitary.com/8379/nsf-favors-change-in-icebreaker-usage/ nsf favors change in icebreaker useage. Accessed 6/28/12

Washington, D.C.- The National Science Board utilizes Icebreakers in the Antarctic for the National Science Foundation, and for its scientific and environmental needs. Recently in a December 9th presentation, they recommended that they take a position of chartering Swedish or Russian vessels, rather than using the US Coast Guard Polar Class ships, the Polar Sea and the Polar Star. While this would perhaps save money and be more energy efficient, it is a blow to the US Coast Guard Polar class of ships. These ships have 1970s vintage combined Diesel and gasoline powered systems, and these are in many ways less efficient than the newer, more modern ships that are owned by Sweden and Russia. These ships from other nations require less fuel than the US Coast Guard ships, but the Coast Guard has kept these vessels available for use by the NSF and other civilian scientific groups. With the issues of global warming, the need for more icebreaking will rise and continue to be a vibrant need. The Coast Guard has had its ability to fund and operate its Polar Class ships interrupted by the bureaucracy of the scientific funding. The Polar Sea is operational, but the Polar Star has been in reserve status since the year 2006. The US Congress has given enough money to keep the Polar Star in reserve, but not enough to bring it to full operation again. This is frustrating for the Coast Guard, who with the Polar Class of ships pioneered much of what is now accepted as modern Icebreaking theory and practice.

### Melting Ice solves

#### No need for icebreakers-ice already melted

Northam 11

(Jackie Northam, correspondent for NPR News, 8/15/2011, “Arctic Warming Unlocking a Fabled Waterway”

<http://www.npr.org/2011/08/15/139556207/arctic-warming-unlocking-a-fabled-waterway>)

It appears as just a speck on the horizon, a slightly darker shape against a vista of Arctic ice. Soon enough, the ship's bridge makes the announcement: "Polar bear, starboard." Crew and passengers onboard the CCGS Louis S. St.-Laurent, Canada's largest icebreaker, head to the open deck, binoculars and cameras ready, and watch as the bear lumbers from one ice floe to another, quickly dipping into the inky blue water and effortlessly pulling himself back up again. Often, a bear will head toward the ship and gaze up at the people gazing down at it, head tilted to one side. The massive creatures don't demonstrate any fear, just curiosity. That's likely because they rarely see anything like a ship passing through the Northwest Passage, a series of waterways winding through Canada's Arctic archipelago of 36,000 islands. It's midsummer and the first time the coast guard icebreaker, affectionately known as the Louis, is making its way through the ice-choked waters this season. [Enlarge](javascript:void(0);)Jackie Northam/NPR A polar bear approaches the Louis S. St.-Laurent, Canada's largest icebreaker, as it makes its way through the Northwest Passage in mid-July. The ship was on a journey that began in Newfoundland and would ultimately take it to the Beaufort Sea. But temperatures in the Arctic are rising faster than anywhere else in the world, making the Northwest Passage easier to navigate. As the ice melts faster, the vitally strategic waterway is expected to open up for longer periods of time — an attractive notion for shipping companies hoping to shorten trade routes and gain easier access to economic powerhouses such as China and India, as well as for nations within the Arctic Circle jockeying for vast, untapped natural resources. 'Everything Is Going To Change' For hundreds of years, the Northwest Passage has been prized as a potential transit route across the polar region, linking the Atlantic and Pacific oceans and greatly reducing transit times for ships that would have relied on the long, southern route through the Panama Canal. In the past, it proved to be a dangerous and difficult waterway, and the chilly Arctic waters hold the wrecks of earlier attempts to navigate the passage. Andrew McNeill, captain of the Louis, says it's not nearly as difficult as it was when he first started sailing in Arctic waters some 30 years ago. "My first season here was, it was 36 hours of constant ramming of ice to get through this area. ... There's been times when the ship has had to reschedule events because of delays getting through the passage," he recalls. More In This Series [Russia Pushes To Claim Arctic As Its Own](http://www.npr.org/2011/08/16/139577789/russia-pushes-to-claim-arctic-as-its-own) Russia has launched a drive to own vast parts of the Arctic, including its oil and gas deposits. [In The Land Of White Nights And Erik The Red](http://www.npr.org/2011/08/16/139673096/in-the-land-of-white-nights-and-erik-the-red) Change is coming to Greenland, the world's largest island, and its 56,000 residents. [In The Arctic Race, The U.S. Lags Behind](http://www.npr.org/2011/08/19/139681324/in-the-arctic-race-the-u-s-lags-behind) U.S. readiness for increased activity in the Arctic is limited, and it's not part of a key treaty. [The Arctic's Diminishing Sea Ice](http://www.npr.org/2011/08/15/139261223/the-arctics-diminishing-sea-ice) The Earth is warming, with profound consequences for the Arctic, the roof of the world. As the Louis makes its way through the waterway, it slices easily through the polar ice sheet. It's mesmerizing: Enormous blocks of shimmering ice shoot up, twist onto their sides and bob along in the clear water, regrouping in the ship's wake. Eddy Carmack, a leading oceanographer with Fisheries and Oceans Canada, has carefully charted the changes in the Arctic since he first visited in 1969. He is part of a diverse group of business, science and government leaders who are traveling aboard the Louis, brainstorming about the Arctic and its future. The ship is wending its way from Newfoundland in Canada's northeast, with stops in Resolute and Cambridge Bay, all the way, ultimately, to the Beaufort Sea off the country's northwest coast. Carmack says the ice on this voyage looks the same as earlier trips he's made on the Northwest Passage, but it has a different feel. "I would say what we're experiencing now is softer ice, it's not as formidable, it's yielding to the pressure of the ship, it's breaking easily. And that's because the ice itself is warmer," he says. Rising air and water temperatures in the Arctic mean there is less ice each year, and for longer periods of time. Steve MacLean, president of the Canadian Space Agency, says that trend is expected to continue throughout the Northwest Passage. "It's always opened up for the last 15 years for about six weeks in the summer. Now it is expected that period will extend. And because it's going to extend, everything is going to change," MacLean says. Historically, that season has generally spanned late July into early September — and sometimes as late as October. [Enlarge](javascript:void(0);)Jackie Northam/NPR As Arctic temperatures rise, the Northwest Passage will be open up for longer periods of time. Here, the Louis slices through sea ice. These longer periods of ice-free waters will likely mean more vessels trying to navigate the narrow straits and channels of the Northwest Passage, including commercial shippers looking for a shortened trade route. Yet only about 10 percent of the Northwest Passage is charted. Competing Claims In The Region As the waterway opens up, so, too, does the issue of who controls it. The U.S. and other nations see it as an international waterway that just happens to pass through Canada's Arctic region. Under that premise, Canada would not have the right to deny passage to foreign ships. But Canada calls the Northwest Passage an internal waterway, and maintains it has the right to regulate and protect the passage. Leona Aglukkaq, Canada's minister of health, is from Gjoa Haven, a tiny town along the Northwest Passage. She says Canada's sovereignty over its land and its waters in the Arctic is longstanding and well-established. "Our position is that these waters are Canadian, subject to full Canadian regulation and control. And [foreign vessels] only enter Canadian internal waters with the consent of Canada. That's our position; that remains our position," Aglukkaq says. Last year, Canada released a new northern strategy that emphasized how it would bolster its sovereignty claims. That includes increasing scientific and environmental research of the region, and promoting exploration, along with economic development and governance of the indigenous communities. Canada is beefing up military operations in the Arctic as well, and is conducting a five-year, $100 million study of the region's natural resources — oil, gas and minerals. It's believed that more than 20 percent of the world's oil and gas reserves are hidden in the Arctic. [Enlarge](javascript:void(0);)Jackie Northam/NPR Much of the Northwest Passage experiences 24 hours of light during the summer months. But as the Louis heads further south toward Cambridge Bay, a sunset appears on the horizon. David Boerner, a director general of the Canadian Geological Survey, says he believes those figures are generally "in the right ballpark." But he says they're often underestimated because geologists aren't able to conduct enough detailed work to establish the full extent of the resources. Canada has also been mapping the Arctic seabed to determine how far its land mass, or continental shelf, extends past its visible coastline. This is critical to proving its right to resources under the water. Canada has until 2013 to present its case to the United Nations. The U.S., Russia and others are doing the same. Warwick Vincent, director of the Center for Northern Studies at Laval University in Quebec City, says there's a need to quickly put international border and sovereignty agreements into place because development of the region is already taking place. And, he says, it's accelerating. "Right at this moment, the Arctic is experiencing unprecedented transformation as a result of not only climate but as a result of economic development. So we need those regulations in place, rapidly," Vincent says. Challenges Remain In Inhospitable Terrain Even if all of these claims are settled, the Arctic is still an extremely difficult place to operate, says Martin Bergmann, director of Natural Resources Canada's Polar Continental Shelf Program, a key logistical facility for research in the Arctic. "The Arctic in Canada is basically the size of Europe, has maybe 30 kilometers of roads, no trains, very few airports," Bergmann says, adding that about 30 communities have the capability to land small aircraft on gravel. It's an untouched area; very few people come through here still. You feel very humbled and fortunate to experience that. - Andrew McNeill, captain of the icebreaker Louis S. St.-Laurent Bergmann says sealift — the main form of bringing heavy cargo and larger equipment to the region — only happens "once a year when a ship visits the Arctic, just like Christmas comes once a year." But the land and the weather are inhospitable, and the waters will stay frozen for much of the year for decades to come. And that, geophysicist Boerner says, makes it extremely expensive to do any kind of work in the area. Given all that, he says, it's unlikely there will be a mad rush to the Arctic by oil and gas companies anytime soon. "You don't really know what's there until you've tried to extract it or drill it. ... It's also not sort of who gets there first. There are well-established regulatory regimes for giving out land, and giving the rights to explore and ... a whole bunch of environmental checks and controls and balances," he says. Given the warming trend, development is inevitable in the Arctic. Yet despite the changes, McNeill, captain of the Louis, says he still feels the magic, and mystique, as he journeys through this pristine, mostly unexplored area. "It's an untouched area; very few people come through here still," McNeill says. "You feel very humbled and fortunate to experience that, and you can relate to the hardships that those early explorers and traders had to deal with back then."

#### Melting ice solves the case

Northam 11

Jackie, correspondent for NPR News, 8/15/2011, “Arctic Warming Unlocking a Fabled Waterway,” <http://www.npr.org/2011/08/15/139556207/arctic-warming-unlocking-a-fabled-waterway>

It appears as just a speck on the horizon, a slightly darker shape against a vista of Arctic ice. Soon enough, the ship's bridge makes the announcement: "Polar bear, starboard." Crew and passengers onboard the CCGS Louis S. St.-Laurent, Canada's largest icebreaker, head to the open deck, binoculars and cameras ready, and watch as the bear lumbers from one ice floe to another, quickly dipping into the inky blue water and effortlessly pulling himself back up again. Often, a bear will head toward the ship and gaze up at the people gazing down at it, head tilted to one side. The massive creatures don't demonstrate any fear, just curiosity. That's likely because they rarely see anything like a ship passing through the Northwest Passage, a series of waterways winding through Canada's Arctic archipelago of 36,000 islands. It's midsummer and the first time the coast guard icebreaker, affectionately known as the Louis, is making its way through the ice-choked waters this season. Jackie Northam/NPR A polar bear approaches the Louis S. St.-Laurent, Canada's largest icebreaker, as it makes its way through the Northwest Passage in mid-July. The ship was on a journey that began in Newfoundland and would ultimately take it to the Beaufort Sea. But temperatures in the Arctic are rising faster than anywhere else in the world, making the Northwest Passage easier to navigate. As the ice melts faster, the vitally strategic waterway is expected to open up for longer periods of time — an attractive notion for shipping companies hoping to shorten trade routes and gain easier access to economic powerhouses such as China and India, as well as for nations within the Arctic Circle jockeying for vast, untapped natural resources. 'Everything Is Going To Change' For hundreds of years, the Northwest Passage has been prized as a potential transit route across the polar region, linking the Atlantic and Pacific oceans and greatly reducing transit times for ships that would have relied on the long, southern route through the Panama Canal. In the past, it proved to be a dangerous and difficult waterway, and the chilly Arctic waters hold the wrecks of earlier attempts to navigate the passage. Andrew McNeill, captain of the Louis, says it's not nearly as difficult as it was when he first started sailing in Arctic waters some 30 years ago. "My first season here was, it was 36 hours of constant ramming of ice to get through this area. ... There's been times when the ship has had to reschedule events because of delays getting through the passage," he recalls. More In This Series Russia has launched a drive to own vast parts of the Arctic, including its oil and gas deposits. Change is coming to Greenland, the world's largest island, and its 56,000 residents. U.S. readiness for increased activity in the Arctic is limited, and it's not part of a key treaty. The Earth is warming, with profound consequences for the Arctic, the roof of the world. As the Louis makes its way through the waterway, it slices easily through the polar ice sheet. It's mesmerizing: Enormous blocks of shimmering ice shoot up, twist onto their sides and bob along in the clear water, regrouping in the ship's wake. Eddy Carmack, a leading oceanographer with Fisheries and Oceans Canada, has carefully charted the changes in the Arctic since he first visited in 1969. He is part of a diverse group of business, science and government leaders who are traveling aboard the Louis, brainstorming about the Arctic and its future. The ship is wending its way from Newfoundland in Canada's northeast, with stops in Resolute and Cambridge Bay, all the way, ultimately, to the Beaufort Sea off the country's northwest coast. Carmack says the ice on this voyage looks the same as earlier trips he's made on the Northwest Passage, but it has a different feel. "I would say what we're experiencing now is softer ice, it's not as formidable, it's yielding to the pressure of the ship, it's breaking easily. And that's because the ice itself is warmer," he says. Rising air and water temperatures in the Arctic mean there is less ice each year, and for longer periods of time. Steve MacLean, president of the Canadian Space Agency, says that trend is expected to continue throughout the Northwest Passage. "It's always opened up for the last 15 years for about six weeks in the summer. Now it is expected that period will extend. And because it's going to extend, everything is going to change," MacLean says. Historically, that season has generally spanned late July into early September — and sometimes as late as October. [Enlarge](javascript:void(0);)Jackie Northam/NPR As Arctic temperatures rise, the Northwest Passage will be open up for longer periods of time. Here, the Louis slices through sea ice. These longer periods of ice-free waters will likely mean more vessels trying to navigate the narrow straits and channels of the Northwest Passage, including commercial shippers looking for a shortened trade route. Yet only about 10 percent of the Northwest Passage is charted. Competing Claims In The Region As the waterway opens up, so, too, does the issue of who controls it. The U.S. and other nations see it as an international waterway that just happens to pass through Canada's Arctic region. Under that premise, Canada would not have the right to deny passage to foreign ships. But Canada calls the Northwest Passage an internal waterway, and maintains it has the right to regulate and protect the passage. Leona Aglukkaq, Canada's minister of health, is from Gjoa Haven, a tiny town along the Northwest Passage. She says Canada's sovereignty over its land and its waters in the Arctic is longstanding and well-established. "Our position is that these waters are Canadian, subject to full Canadian regulation and control. And [foreign vessels] only enter Canadian internal waters with the consent of Canada. That's our position; that remains our position," Aglukkaq says. Last year, Canada released a new northern strategy that emphasized how it would bolster its sovereignty claims. That includes increasing scientific and environmental research of the region, and promoting exploration, along with economic development and governance of the indigenous communities. Canada is beefing up military operations in the Arctic as well, and is conducting a five-year, $100 million study of the region's natural resources — oil, gas and minerals. It's believed that more than 20 percent of the world's oil and gas reserves are hidden in the Arctic. [Enlarge](javascript:void(0);)Jackie Northam/NPR Much of the Northwest Passage experiences 24 hours of light during the summer months. But as the Louis heads further south toward Cambridge Bay, a sunset appears on the horizon. David Boerner, a director general of the Canadian Geological Survey, says he believes those figures are generally "in the right ballpark." But he says they're often underestimated because geologists aren't able to conduct enough detailed work to establish the full extent of the resources. Canada has also been mapping the Arctic seabed to determine how far its land mass, or continental shelf, extends past its visible coastline. This is critical to proving its right to resources under the water. Canada has until 2013 to present its case to the United Nations. The U.S., Russia and others are doing the same. Warwick Vincent, director of the Center for Northern Studies at Laval University in Quebec City, says there's a need to quickly put international border and sovereignty agreements into place because development of the region is already taking place. And, he says, it's accelerating. "Right at this moment, the Arctic is experiencing unprecedented transformation as a result of not only climate but as a result of economic development. So we need those regulations in place, rapidly," Vincent says. Challenges Remain In Inhospitable Terrain Even if all of these claims are settled, the Arctic is still an extremely difficult place to operate, says Martin Bergmann, director of Natural Resources Canada's Polar Continental Shelf Program, a key logistical facility for research in the Arctic. "The Arctic in Canada is basically the size of Europe, has maybe 30 kilometers of roads, no trains, very few airports," Bergmann says, adding that about 30 communities have the capability to land small aircraft on gravel. It's an untouched area; very few people come through here still. You feel very humbled and fortunate to experience that. - Andrew McNeill, captain of the icebreaker Louis S. St.-Laurent Bergmann says sealift — the main form of bringing heavy cargo and larger equipment to the region — only happens "once a year when a ship visits the Arctic, just like Christmas comes once a year." But the land and the weather are inhospitable, and the waters will stay frozen for much of the year for decades to come. And that, geophysicist Boerner says, makes it extremely expensive to do any kind of work in the area. Given all that, he says, it's unlikely there will be a mad rush to the Arctic by oil and gas companies anytime soon. "You don't really know what's there until you've tried to extract it or drill it. ... It's also not sort of who gets there first. There are well-established regulatory regimes for giving out land, and giving the rights to explore and ... a whole bunch of environmental checks and controls and balances," he says. Given the warming trend, development is inevitable in the Arctic. Yet despite the changes, McNeill, captain of the Louis, says he still feels the magic, and mystique, as he journeys through this pristine, mostly unexplored area. "It's an untouched area; very few people come through here still," McNeill says. "You feel very humbled and fortunate to experience that, and you can relate to the hardships that those early explorers and traders had to deal with back then."

#### Warming takes away need for new boats

Gimarc 2012

[Alex Gimarc](http://redcounty.com/alex-gimarc) red county October 19th, 2011 <http://redcounty.com/content/icebreakers-or-global-warming> Icebreakers or Global Warming? Accessed 6/28/12

I always like to use tools and arguments from the left against them in the political wars. One of my favorites is to maximize the contradictions in what they do and what they believe. Take the taxpayer-financed fraud known as manmade global warming due to carbon dioxide emissions. This has morphed into the much harder to argue against notion of “climate change.” As climate is always changing, it is difficult to disprove. Our two US Senators, Lisa Murkowski and Mark Begich have famously called Alaska ground zero for climate change. The clear implication is that as climate changes (read this as believing that things are irrevocably warming up), they in congress simply must do something about it. Typically this involves stealing tax dollars from some other state and pumping it into Alaska. But the foundation for all their concerns and insistence for legislative action is the notion that temperatures here in Alaska and in the Arctic are warming up and will continue to do so for decades to come. One would safely conclude that as the climate continues to warm up, there will be less ice, snow, permafrost, and cold statewide and across the Arctic Ocean. So if they and their staffs believe that things are going to be warming up, why do they believe we need a new icebreaker in the Arctic? Icebreakers are boats that are specifically designed to cut paths through pack ice on the oceans. If there is less ice, there ought to be less need for an icebreaker. Why is Lisa Murkowski running around making the case that the lack of a polar class icebreaker is slowing down development in the Arctic? Color me confused. If there is manmade global warming due to carbon dioxide emissions, which both Murkowski and Begich have supported legislation to control at various times, simply wait long enough and we won’t need any new boats. On the other hand, if this is not going on, and we are moving into a time of colder temperatures due to the quiet sun, they are correct and prescient in their call for new icebreakers in the Arctic. They might even be pretty smart starting that process today, as the lead time to construct and launch a new boat is significant. So here is a question for Lisa and Mark: What’s it going to be? Icebreakers or global warming? You probably ought not to believe two mutually exclusive things at the same time.

## AT - Solvency

#### The ice-breakers you build will suck – we don’t have the capability

Ewing 11

Philip; December 1; Staff writer for DoDBuzz; http://www.dodbuzz.com/author/philewing/

There’s another problem: The best warships in the world are built in the United States. But American yards do not have a lot of experience building the kind of heavy-duty icebreakers the Coast Guard needs. The yard that built the polar rollers, up in Seattle, is long gone. So in a perfect world, the best option for the Coast Guard might be to send its requirements to a Finnish builder and then fly its crew over to take delivery. But first somebody would have to stand up and tell Congress to send hundreds of millions of dollars worth of work to a foreign shipyard.

#### It takes a decade to build the icebreakers

Ewing 11

Philip; December 1; Staff writer for DoDBuzz; http://www.dodbuzz.com/author/philewing/

A Congressional Research Service report by shipbuilding expert Ron O’Rourke last month quoted a Coast Guard study that said it would take between eight and 10 years to design, contract and build a new icebreaker. Plus replacing the service’s two main ships, the Polar Sea and Polar Star, could cost a lot. Not a lot by the standards of the Pentagon, which today sneezes billions of dollars, but a lot for the Coast Guard, which tends to struggle with budgets and acquisitions as compared with the four larger DoD services.

#### The unpredictable conditions of the Arctic prevent solvency since even icebreakers are susceptible to damage

US Coast Guard ‘8

US Coast Guard; “Report to Congress: U.S. Coast Guard Polar Operations;” 2008; <http://www.uscg.mil/history/docs/2008CRSUSCGPolarOps.pdf>; page i; retrieved 6/27/12

In the Arctic, there is now water part of the year where there used to be ice; however, more open water does not equate to a safer operating environment. Indeed, it may mean more hazardous conditions for vessels and their crews and passengers if greater access is accompanied by larger, more numerous ice floes, limited navigation information, and harsh and unpredictable weather patterns. If more vessels operate in the nascent “open water” of the Arctic Ocean, the risk of a vessel becoming beset by an ice ridge or unexpectedly impacting thicker multi-year ice increases. This brings a corresponding increase in risk to their crews and the environment as well. Even icebreakers and ice-strengthened vessels may encounter unexpected conditions that could cause vessel damage or loss. If changes in summer Arctic conditions continue the trend observed in the past six years, we may expect incidents and casualties to occur with greater frequency and/or farther from U.S. shores. The USCG’s ability to respond to these incidents, provide access to support other agencies and governments, and enforce laws and treaties in the region will be driven by the availability of icebreakers, ice-strengthened vessels and cold-weather air support. The logistics and basing infrastructure in the region must be enhanced to provide extended operational presence.

## **AT – Adv - Research**

### Link – Spending DA

#### The base requires massive amounts of resources and money to run, plus additional funds for special scientific operations

Ulhmann ‘7

Danny Ulhmann; guide at McMurdo station, Antarctica; “Antarctica and Beyond;” 9-22-07; <http://coldantarctica.blogspot.com/2007_09_22_archive.html>

What one needs understand about McMurdo to understand what it is exactly, is that its a huge organism made up of massive amounts of human and physical resources. From cooks, to janitors, to heavy machinery mechanics, to mountaineers, to GIS technicians, to helicopter pilots, to recreation coordinators; McMurdo is a small town with all or more than the average small town. For instance, the entire continent is strewn with fuel caches so that the airplanes (or aeroplane if you're a Kiwi), can travel anywhere they want, despite the limiting 2.5 range of their normal fuel capacity. Theoretically every single person has a purpose that is necessary for the function of the whole base.

The base exists solely for the purpose of science, and the yearly cost of running McMurdo and its field operations is around 250 million dollars, American dollars (which aren't that far off Kiwi dollars these days). The figure is significantly higher when one adds in the cost of scientific equipment, such as 10 million dollar balloons sent up over the continent to collect data.

#### The budget is already large—and additional projects warrant additional funds, it adds up quickly

Rejcek ‘10

Peter Rejcek; editor of The Antarctic Sun; “NSF FY11 Budget Request;” 3-12-10; <http://antarcticsun.usap.gov/features/contenthandler.cfm?id=2055>; retrieved 6-28-12

The proposed $280 million Antarctic Infrastructure and Logistics budget for NSF OPP continues to stress the use of alternative and renewable energies for the USAP, and maintaining communications and data-handling capabilities to support science and operations. A comprehensive review of McMurdo Station’s energy supply and usage was recently completed, setting the stage for improvements and savings in FY 2011, according to the budget request. For example, the agency has asked for $3 million to fund energy upgrades at McMurdo Station’s Black Island telecommunications facility. Black Island provides satellite communications supporting McMurdo, as well as the National Polar-Orbiting Operational and Environmental Satellite System (NPOESS) and NASA’s Ground Networks for the relay of data. The project will emphasize the use of wind and solar energy. A project to install “smart grid” technology for power distribution at McMurdo is planned to continue in FY 2011 for the tune of $2 million. This project will install metering and networked direct digital controls to monitor and manage power, lighting, heating, and water for more cost-effective and efficient operation of McMurdo’s power grid. Antarctic research funding stands to grow by nearly 6 percent, to about $75.2 million. Most of the money is slated for research grants, with about 40 percent earmarked for new grants. Arctic science would receive a nearly 5 percent bump to about $111 million.

### AT – US key to ATS

#### Research adv is non-unique – the US hasn’t been supplying McMurdo for years

O’Rourke 6/14

Specialist in Naval Affairs, Congressional Research Service, Quote from July 2010 Coast Guard High Latitude Study,“Coast Guard Polar Icebreaker Modernization: Background and Issues for Congress,” <http://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc85474/>

Although Coast Guard polar icebreakers in the past have performed the annual McMurdo break-in mission, the NSF in recent years has chartered Russian and Swedish contractor-operated icebreakers to perform the mission (with a Coast Guard polar icebreaker standing ready to assist if needed). The NSF has also noted that Healy, though very capable in supporting Arctic research, operates at sea for about 200 days a year, as opposed to about 300 days a year for foreign contractor-operated polar icebreakers.

### AT – Proliferation impact

#### No impact to proliferation – states won’t become reckless and terrorists cannot access nuclear weapons

Gavin 10

Francis J., professor of international affairs and director of the Robert S. Strauss Center for Internationa Security and Law, LA Times, March 9, “No need to ban the bomb,” http://articles.latimes.com/2010/mar/09/opinion/la-oe-gavin9-2010mar09/2

Iran's announcement last month that it will begin enriching uranium for use in a medical reactor sparked a rare bipartisan consensus in Washington. Politicians on both sides of the aisle treated the news as the latest evidence we are moving closer to a nuclear crisis. There is cause for concern, with Iran unwilling to bend to global pressure, terrorists eager to acquire an atomic device, an erratic North Korea threatening stability in East Asia and an international nuclear nonproliferation regime that appears to be getting weaker by the minute. So how worried should we be? Not very. These threats, though serious, are overstated. Three common claims in particular are open to scrutiny. The first is that we are at a nuclear tipping point. Many experts contend the world is on the verge of a proliferation epidemic. By their reasoning, a nuclear Iran might drive Egypt, Saudi Arabia and Turkey into the nuclear club. And North Korea's nuclear program could leave Japan, South Korea and Taiwan feeling they have little choice but to develop a nuclear capability, perhaps spurring Australia, Indonesia and Malaysia to follow suit. This threat of "nuclear dominoes" has been exaggerated since the time of President Kennedy, who in 1963 predicted that there could be 25 nuclear weapons states by the 1970s. In fact, the number of nuclear weapons programs in the world has decreased dramatically in the last three decades. South Africa, Ukraine, Kazakhstan and Belarus gave up their weapons, while states such as Australia, Brazil and Sweden abandoned efforts to build the bomb. Even the weapons programs we worry about most -- Pakistan, Iran and North Korea -- began decades ago, and as far as we know, no new country has started a nuclear weapons program since the end of the Cold War 20 years ago. The most pessimistic predictions of a sudden epidemic of new nuclear states are highly unlikely. The second overstatement is that a catastrophic terrorist nuclear attack against the United States is inevitable. Eight and a half years after the horrific 9/11 terrorist attacks, we have not had the atomic attack on our soil that many experts predicted. That may be a matter of luck. But it also may be that it is far more difficult than conventional wisdom suggests for a nonstate actor, without secure territory or the institutions of a modern state, to acquire, assemble, transport and detonate a nuclear weapon in an American city. Nuclear terrorism is not impossible, but rhetoric about the inevitability and catastrophic nature of such an attack does more harm than good. The third exaggeration is that the threat of rogue nuclear nations today is unprecedented in history. To some, a nuclear Iran or North Korea is so unacceptable as to justify preemptive strikes against their nuclear capabilities. We forget that the so-called rogue threat is not new: The peril presented by a nuclear-armed Mao in the 1960s was far more dangerous than anything Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's Iran could offer today. After much debate, the United States ruled out a preemptive attack and learned to live with both a nuclear Russia and China during the Cold War. We should do the same today. Remember, neither of our Cold War enemies used their nuclear weapons or became reckless and undeterrable. Using a nuclear weapon -- or supplying one to a terrorist group -- would invite massive retaliation on the country that struck first, and that is a powerful deterrent.

## AT – Adv - Drilling

### Low prices now

#### We don’t need more oil production – Russia’s got it covered

Jason Bush, Business Week, 2004

(Jason, writer @ BusinessWeek “Oil: What's Russia Really Sitting On?”, 11-22-04, http://www.businessweek.com/magazine/content/04\_47/b3909079\_mz054.htm)

**This increasing recoverability, and not dramatic new discoveries of oil,** explains why Russia's proven reserves keep shooting up.The **leading Russian oil companies have all announced big increases this year**, following independent international audits. Lukoil ([LUKOY](javascript:%20void%20showTicker('LUKOY')) ), Russia's largest oil outfit, saw a boost of 4.7% in proven reserves both this year and last, according to Society of Petroleum Engineers SPE standards. No. 2 producer Yukos, meanwhile, jumped 13.2% this year, according to stringent standards set by the U.S. Securities & Exchange Commission. **The growth in Russia's proven reserves is mainly happening at existing fields in western Siberia, a supposedly "mature" region where production had been declining until recently**. DeGolyer & MacNaughton predicts that western Siberia could boost its output to 10 million bbl. a day by 2012, up from less than 6 million at present, and keep production at that level for at least 10 years. The use of even newer technologies available by then means that western Siberian oil production may not decline for decades to come**.** Russia's **reserve potential is vaster still when undeveloped regions, such as the Arctic,** the Caspian, and in particular eastern Siberia, **are factored in.** And then there's Russia's plentiful supply of natural gas. It is already acknowledged as having the world's largest gas reserves, with 47 trillion cubic meters, or 26.7% of global reserves. But tapping Russia's vast oil pool will require billions in investment, especially in export pipelines. Although on course for 8% growth this year, production gains could slow as export bottlenecks appear. But infrastructure investment is likely to go up in tandem with reserve estimates. If Russia finds a way to get all that lovely oil to needy international consumers, its days as a global energy powerhouse could be just beginning.

### Arctic Drilling now

#### Drilling increasing now and requires federal permits – the plan can’t provide them

Klimasinska 12

(Katarzyna Klimasinska “Republicans Fault Obama’s Five-Year Oil Plan As Too Restrictive” 6/28/12 http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-06-28/republicans-fault-obama-s-five-year-oil-plan-as-too-restrictive.html accessed on 6/28/12 SA

Republicans criticized the Obama administration’s latest five-year offshore oil-leasing plan for failing to open new areas for drilling, while environmentalists said the U.S. has put too many areas at risk. The Interior Department today scheduled 15 lease sales through 2017 in the Gulf of Mexico and Arctic waters, while keeping areas along the Atlantic and Pacific coasts off-limits. The agency also pushed back by two years a sale in Alaska’s Beaufort Sea to collect additional scientific information. “There is far too great of potential to put people back to work, improve the economy and make American more energy independent for President Obama to ignore America’s vast offshore energy resources,” House Natural Resources Committee Chairman Doc Hastings, a Washington Republican, said in a statement. “It’s extremely disappointing that the Obama administration continues to have such a narrow vision for American energy production.” President Barack Obama has set a target of reducing U.S. oil imports by a third by 2025 through more domestic oil production and increased use of natural gas and renewable resources. Republican challenger Mitt Romney has called for more extensive drilling. The five-year plan includes 12 sales in the Gulf of Mexico, an auction in Alaska’s Cook Inlet in 2016, in Chukchi Sea in 2016 and in the Beaufort Sea in 2017. The regions hold more than 75 percent of total undiscovered, recoverable oil, according to the agency.

#### Investment now – don’t need the plan

Murphy 6/26

(6/26/12 Kim Murphy LA Times. “Salazar: U.S. to open more of Arctic Ocean to oil, gas drilling” <http://www.latimes.com/news/nation/nationnow/la-na-nn-arctic-drilling-salazar-20120626,0,5503849.story>)

The full scope of the offshore-leasing program in the Arctic for 2012-17 will not be released for another several days, but U.S. Interior Secretary Ken Salazar made it clear that the U.S. plans to expand the march of drilling rigs into the Arctic after Shell’s initial exploratory drilling program this summer. Salazar said that program is likely to win final federal approvals soon. “I do anticipate having seen the conditions that Shell has already met that it is probable that they are going to get these permits. I think it’s highly likely that the permits will be issued,” Salazar said in a conference call with reporters from [Norway](http://www.latimes.com/topic/intl/norway-PLGEO00000040.topic). He was meeting with officials from other Arctic nations on a coordinated approach to expanding oil production while protecting resources in the remote, sensitive region.

#### More evidence

Broder and Krauss 5/23

(5/23/12 John M. Broder and Clifford Krauss. New York Times. “New and Frozen Frontier Awaits Offshore Oil Drilling” <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/05/24/science/earth/shell-arctic-ocean-drilling-stands-to-open-new-oil-frontier.html?pagewanted=all>)

Industry experts and national security officials view the Alaskan Arctic as the last great domestic oil prospect, one that over time could bring the country a giant step closer to cutting its dependence on foreign oil. But many Alaska Natives and environmental advocates say drilling threatens wildlife and pristine shorelines, and perpetuates the nation’s reliance on dirty fossil fuels. In blessing Shell’s move into the Arctic, Mr. Obama continues his efforts to balance business and environmental interests, seemingly project by project. He pleased environmentalists by delaying the [Keystone XL pipeline](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/k/keystone_pipeline/index.html?8qa) from Canada and by adopting tough air standards for power plants, yet he has also delighted business concerns by rejecting an [ozone standard](http://www.nytimes.com/2011/03/17/science/earth/17epa.html) deemed too costly to the economy. And now, the president is writing a new chapter in the nation’s unfolding energy transformation, in this case to the benefit of fossil fuel producers. “We never would have expected a Democratic president — let alone one seeking to be ‘transformative’ — to open up the Arctic Ocean for drilling,” said Michael Brune, executive director of the [Sierra Club](http://sierraclub.org/). Shell’s Arctic quest has consumed seven years and $4 billion over two presidential administrations, overcoming a raft of environmental concerns, the opposition of a wily and unpredictable Inupiat Eskimo leader and the fallout from the BP disaster. To do so, it mounted a relentless, two-front campaign. After initial missteps in wooing Alaska Natives, Shell deployed a personable executive named Pete Slaiby, who traveled to remote villages and chewed raw whale meat while listening to local concerns. The company’s efforts in Washington were even more strategic. Beyond the usual full-court lobbying effort, Shell abandoned its oil industry brethren and joined advocates pushing for a strong response to climate change. Ultimately, Shell won the backing of a president it had viewed warily during the 2008 campaign. While he signaled conditional support for the proposal years ago, Mr. Obama came under pressure from rising gasoline prices and the assiduous lobbying of a freshman Democratic senator from Alaska eager to show he could make things happen in Washington.

#### Shell is beginning to set sail with equipment in hands

Dlouhy 6/27

(Jennifer A. “Shell’s Arctic-bound drilling units set sail for Alaska” 6/27/12 <http://fuelfix.com/blog/2012/06/27/shells-arctic-bound-drilling-units-set-sail-for-alaska/> Accessed on 6/27/12 SA

Two of Shell Oil’s drilling rigs are now beginning a long trek to Arctic waters, where they are expected to begin boring five exploratory oil wells later this summer. The departure marks one of the final phases in Shell’s seven-year quest to drill in the Chukchi and Beaufort seas north of Alaska. Although the company is still awaiting final drilling permits to launch the work, Interior Secretary Ken Salazar told reporters on Tuesday that those approvals are “probable.” Shell spokeswoman Kelly op de Weegh confirmed the drilling rigs and other support vessels have left the Seattle shipyard where they underwent hundreds of millions of dollars in renovations to prepare them for the planned drilling. **The upgrades included adding new engines, installing exhaust systems to restrain emissions and removing all traces of previously used fuel that pollutes more than the ultra-low sulphur diesel Shell has committed to using in the region. Shell ultimately plans to station the Kulluk conical drilling unit in the Beaufort Sea and the Noble Discoverer drillship in the Chukchi Sea. But with thick layers of ice still clinging to Alaska’s northern coastline, the ships won’t go to the Arctic seas immediately. Instead, they will lay over in Dutch Harbor, Alaska as they wait for the ice to clear.** “The fleet will await the opportunity to make an ice-free entry to the Beaufort and Chukchi seas,” op de Weegh said. “We look forward to adding to our long, successful history in the Beaufort and Chukchi Seas; providing jobs and verifying what could prove to be a significant and extremely valuable natural resource base for Alaska and the nation.” Environmentalists and some native Alaskans bitterly oppose Shell’s planned drilling, which would be the first oil exploration in the region since the early 1990s. Shell and other companies drilled more than 30 wells in the Beaufort and Chukchi seas in the 1980s and 1990s. Although some of the projects turned up oil, they were abandoned when the relatively low price of crude at the time made further development too costly. Even now, it likely would take a decade or more to bring any newly discovered oil in the region to consumers, because Shell would be seeking government approvals to build pipelines connecting the wells with the Trans-Alaskan Pipeline System. Such a proposal would require extensive environmental reviews. Shell’s Arctic-bound flotilla includes roughly two dozen vessels. Here is an overview of the fleet: Two drilling rigs: Kulluk: A conical drilling rig built in 1983, the Kulluk is slated to drill in Shell’s Sivulliq prospect in the Beaufort Sea. Although it previously was used for drilling in Canada’s Beaufort Sea waters, the vessel later spent more than a decade hibernating, locked in ice in McKinley Bay, until Shell bought it. Shell spent roughly $292 million refurbishing the Kulluk, with improvements to its engines and emission control systems as well as a new paint job to strip off the potentially whale-frightening orange veneer it had previously. The 266-foot-diameter vessel can hold up to 108 people. Discoverer: The Noble Discoverer is a 1960s-era drill ship that spent a previous life as a log carrier before being converted to a turret moored drillship in 1976. Shell said it has poured $193 million into revamping and upgrading the Discoverer over the past six years. Most recently, it was drilling near New Zealand, before it sailed to Shell for additional emissions systems modifications and some winterization upgrades. The  ship can hold up to 124 crew members. Ice management vessels: Shell plans on using two ships, the Nordica and Fennica, to move ice out of the way as necessary when forging a path to the planned drill sites and in case ice encroaches later. Oil spill response ships: The Nanuq and Aiviq oil recovery and supply vessels will be the hub of any oil spill response. Both ships will carry three smaller oil spill response vessels capable of deploying boom to corral crude on the water, as well as first responders and other equipment in case of an emergency. Meant to be among the first vessels responding in case of a spill, the Nanuq and Aiviq also are capable of storing some recovered crude. The Affinity is a 748-foot oil spill tanker that would be able to carry recovered crude. There will be two oil spill response barges (the 205-foot Arctic Endeavor barge and 320-foot Klamath barge) and associated tugs — one each at each drilling site. A deck barge, the Arctic Challenger, will house Shell’s oil spill containment system and will be maneuvered by an ocean-going tug known as the Corbin Foss; both will be located equidistant between the drilling sites. Other vessels: The 275-foot Tor Viking will be used to set and remove anchors. The transfer of waste material will be handled by the 280-foot Carol Chouest. The 280-foot Harvey Spirit and 134-foot Arctic Seal will be responsible for resupplying equipment in the Chukchi and Beaufort seas. Two barges and tugs will also be used to manage waste and deliver it to disposal facilities.

### **Drilling bad - environment**

#### Drilling causes long term damage to the Artic ecosystems, oil spill is the greatest threat

#### [Kollewe](http://www.guardian.co.uk/profile/juliakollewe) & [Terry](http://www.guardian.co.uk/profile/terrymacalister) 12

cites report from Lyods(Julia, Macalister) [The Guardian](http://www.guardian.co.uk/theguardian), Wednesday 11 April 2012((Arctic oil rush will ruin ecosystem, warns Lloyd's of London)(http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2012/apr/12/lloyds-london-warns-risks-arctic-oil-drilling)

But the new report from Lloyd's, written by Charles Emmerson and Glada Lahn of Chatham House, **says it is "highly likely" that future economic activity in the Arctic will further disturb ecosystems already stressed by the consequences of climate change."Migration patterns of caribou and whales in offshore areas may be affected. Other than the direct release of pollutants into the Arctic environment, there are multiple ways in which ecosystems could be disturbed, such as the construction of pipelines and roads, noise** [**pollution**](http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/pollution) **from offshore drilling, seismic survey activity or additional maritime traffic as well as through the break-up of sea ice.** The authors point out that **the Arctic is not one but several ecosystems, and is "highly sensitive to damage" that would have a long-term impact.** They are calling for "baseline knowledge about the natural environment and consistent environmental monitoring". Pollution sources include mines, oil and gas installations, industrial sites and, in the Russian Arctic, nuclear waste from civilian and military installations, and from nuclear weapons testing on Novaya Zemlya. **The report singles out a potential oil spill as the "greatest risk in terms of environmental damage,** potential cost and insurance" – but says there are significant knowledge gaps in this area.

## AT – Adv - Oil Spills

### Low risk of spills

#### Low risk of oil spills

Nuka Research and Planning Group LLC 10

November, “Oil Spill Prevention and Response in the U.S. Arctic Ocean: Unexamined Risks, Unacceptable Consequences,” http://www.pewtrusts.org/uploadedFiles/wwwpewtrustsorg/Reports/Protecting\_ocean\_life/PEW-1010\_ARTIC\_Report.pdf

Risk” is a product of probability and consequence. Understanding the risks associated with an activity require (1) the ability to predict the likelihood or probability of such an event occurring, and (2) the ability to anticipate the potential adverse consequences of such an event. Spill sizes and scenarios may range from a catastrophic well blowout to smaller spills from a pipeline, tank or vessel. Very large oil spills and well blowouts are low probability events, but the consequences can be disastrous. Most of the planning that has been done to date in the U.S. Arctic Ocean expresses the risk of oil spills as being extremely low, based on probability estimates that have been derived from spill statistics in other regions of the United States. There have been various estimates of oil spill “risks” in the U.S. Arctic Ocean, but none represents a comprehensive estimation of these risks.

#### Shell passed safety and environmental emergency standards for an oil leak.

Offshore Staff 6/29

(Offshore Staff “Shell Arctic capping stack passes BSEE review” 6/28/12 [http://www.offshore-mag.com/articles/2012/06/shell-arctic-capping-stack.html accessed on 6/29/12](http://www.offshore-mag.com/articles/2012/06/shell-arctic-capping-stack.html%20accessed%20on%206/29/12) SA

The US Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement (BSEE) says Shell successfully deployed and tested its emergency capping stack in Puget Sound. The testing was done in 200 ft (61 m) water depth. That is deeper than the proposed Arctic drilling sites Shell seeks permission to spud. If the drilling permits are approved, Shell will keep the capping stack ready to deploy on the Fennica icebreaker, which would be stationed mid-way between the proposed [drill sites in the Beaufort](http://www.offshore-mag.com/articles/2011/08/shell-gets-conditional.html) and Chukchi seas. Before those permits are issued, Shell has a number of additional demonstrations regarding emergency response that BSEE must approve. BSEE already has approved Shell’s oil spill response plans for both the Beaufort and [Chukchi seas](http://www.offshore-mag.com/articles/2010/04/us-epa-gives-shell.html), but Shell must still obtain approval from BSEE for well-specific drilling permits prior to commencing operations. Shell has requested approval to drill two exploratory wells in the Beaufort Sea and three exploratory wells in the Chukchi Sea this summer.

#### Shell and other oil companies have been drilling for decades with no issues in the arctic

Royal Dutch Shell 11

Royal Dutch Shell April 2011 <http://www-static.shell.com/static/innovation/downloads/arctic/alaska_oil_spill_response_brochure.pdf> <http://www-static.shell.com/static/innovation/downloads/arctic/alaska_oil_spill_response_brochure.pdf> PREVENTING AND RESPONDING TO OIL SPILLS IN THE ALASKAN ARCTIC 6/28/12 TL

Drilling exploration wells in the offshore Alaskan Arctic is not new for Shell. Shell drilled multiple wells in the Chukchi and Beaufort Seas in the 1980s and 1990s. In fact, Shell has decades of experience drilling in challenging conditions throughout Alaska, including in the Bering Sea, St. George Basin, Gulf of Alaska and Cook Inlet, where Shell installed Alaska’s first platforms. Those platforms are still producing oil today. In total, more than 500 exploratory, production, and disposal wells have been drilled in the Arctic waters of Alaska, Canada, Norway, and Russia. More than 150 wells have been drilled offshore in Arctic waters of the US and Canada and more than 50 wells have been drilled in the US Beaufort and Chukchi Seas. Shell has drilled 33 wells in Alaska, 32 of which were offshore. During these 40 years of offshore operations, there has never been an oil spill caused by a well blowout in state or federal waters in the Alaskan and Canadian Arctic.

### Oil Spills good

#### Oil spills rally support for the environment and alternative energy

Kho 10

Jennifer Daily Finance 05/05/10 http://www.dailyfinance.com/2010/05/05/oil-spills-impact-bad-for-the-environment-good-for-clean-ener/ Oil Spill's Impact: Bad for the Environment, Good for Clean Energy? 6/28/12 TL

But though the environmental impact may be devastating, the environment could benefit in at least one way: The worst-case scenario for deep-sea oil drilling makes renewable alternatives look that much better by comparison. The blogosphere is already buzzing with jokes about massive wind spills and solar spills, pointing out that with these sources, "the worst thing that happens is you stop producing electricity, not destroy entire ecosystems," says Adam Browning, executive director of solar-advocacy group Vote Solar. As Ron Pernick, principal of research firm Clean Edge, puts it, the spill "has the potential to be a watershed moment" that could end up changing the way oil and other fossil fuels are developed and paving the way for cleaner energy. While the story is still unfolding and the full extent of the damage remains unclear, the spill already has exposed some of the vulnerabilities of our reliance on oil, including ever-fluctuating prices based on accidents, military actions and many other variables, Pernick says. "The volatility of fossil fuels is exactly what makes it untenable for our long-term energy supply -- we're one disaster away from pretty significant disruptions in pricing," he says.

#### Oil spill will provide economic gains to the US

Di Leo 10

Luca, WSJ, June 15, 2010 <http://blogs.wsj.com/economics/2010/06/15/oil-spill-may-end-up-lifting-gdp-slightly/> Oil Spill May End Up Lifting GDP Slightly. 6/28/12 TL

The continuing oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico could end up adding a bit of growth to the U.S. economy as the huge cleanup efforts in some ways outweigh negative factors, analysts at J.P. Morgan Chase said. “The spill clearly implies a lot of economic hardship in some locations, but given what we know today, the magnitude of these setbacks looks dwarfed by the scale of the US macroeconomy,” said chief U.S. economist Michael Feroli. If anything, he added, U.S. GDP could gain slightly from it. The six-month moratorium on deep-water drilling may cut U.S. oil production by around 3% in 2011 and cost more than 3,000 jobs, according to J.P. Morgan’s energy analysts. Commercial fishing in the Gulf is also likely to suffer, but that’s only about 0.005% of U.S. GDP. The impact on tourism is the hardest to measure, although it’s fair to expect that many hotel workers who lose their jobs will find it hard to get new ones. Still, cleaning up the spill will likely be enough to slightly offset the negative impact of all this on GDP, J.P. Morgan said. The bank cites estimates of 4,000 unemployed people hired for the cleanup efforts, which some reports have said could be worth between $3 and $6 billion. “If realized, this would likely mean a near- to medium-term boost to activity that might offset the drags,” Feroli said. U.S. Democrats Monday asked BP to set aside $20 billion in a special account to be used to pay for economic damages and cleanup costs. President Barack Obama said on Monday that his administration has begun “preliminary conversations” with BP about setting up such a fund.

#### Spill creates a push for alternative energy

Stebbins 10

Christine, Correspondent, Reuters, Jun 8, 2010 <http://www.reuters.com/article/2010/06/09/us-grains-ethanol-idUSTRE65801T20100609> Economist says oil spill helps renewable fuels 6/28/12 TL

Renewable fuels like corn-based ethanol will get a boost as the massive oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico feeds worries by Americans about long-term dependence on oil, a top U.S. private agricultural economist said on Tuesday. "The spill has heightened the concern about our dependence on fossil fuels so that quite naturally is causing people to want us to reduce our dependence on fossil fuels. That brings us to renewables," JB Penn, chief economist at farm equipment maker John Deere, said in an interview on the sidelines at a Kansas City Federal Reserve ag banking meeting. "Agriculture so far is the only big source of renewable fuels. We talk a lot about next-generation renewables -- but corn ethanol is about the only thing we've seen in the U.S. and sugar ethanol in South America," said Penn, a former undersecretary at the U.S. Agriculture Department.

### AT – Ecosystem Impact

#### The environment is resilient – we’re well passed the “threshold” for collapse

AFP 99

Agence France Presse, September 15, 1999, “Outlook Grim For World’s Environment Says UN,” http://www.rense.com/earthchanges/grimoutlook\_e.htm

The United Nations warned Wednesday that the world’s environment was facing catastrophic damage as the new millennium nears, ranging from irreversible destruction to tropical rainforests to choking air pollution and a threat to the polar ice caps. In a lengthy report, the UN Environment Programme painted a grim tableau for the planet’s citizens in the next millennium, saying time was fast running out to devise a policy of sustainable human development. And for some fragile eco-systems and vulnerable species, it is already too late, warns the report, called GEO-2000. “Tropical forest destruction has gone too far to prevent irreversible damage. It would take many generations to replace the lost forests, and the cultures that have been lost with them can never be replaced,” it warns. “Many of the planet’s species have already been lost or condemned to extinction because of the slow response times of both the environment and policy-makers; it is too late to preserve all the bio-diversity the planet had.” Sounding the alarm, the UNEP said the planet now faced “full-scale emergencies” on several fronts, including these: -- it is probably too late to prevent global warming, a phenomenon whereby exhaust gases and other emissions will raise the temperature of the planet and wreak climate change. Indeed, many of the targets to reduce or stabilise emissions will not be met, the report says. -- urban air pollution problems are reaching “crisis dimensions” in the developing world’s mega-cities, inflicting damage to the health of their inhabitants. -- the seas are being “grossly over-exploited” and even with strenuous efforts will take a long time to recover.

#### It’s too late to solve

Myers 97

Norman, Visiting Fellow of Green College at Oxford University, Senior Fellow at the World Wildlife Fund, Biodiversity II, edited by Marjorie Reaka-Kudla and E. O. Wilson, p. 135-6

While formulating our responses to the mass extinction crisis, we need to bear in mind the length of time still available to us. The critical criterion for our efforts is not whether we are doing far more than before, but whether it will be enough—and that in turn raises the question of “enough by when?” How soon might we cross a threshold after which our best efforts could prove to be of little avail? Of course, not all habitats are going to be destroyed outright within the immediate future. But that is hardly the point. What looks set to eliminate many if not most species in the long run will be the “fragmentation effect,” i.e., the break up of extensive habitats into small isolated patches that are too small to maintain their stocks of species into the indefinite future. This phenomenon has been widely analyzed through the theory of island biogeography, and appears to be strongly supported through abundant empirical evidence, albeit with a good number of variations on the general theme. True, the process of ecological equilibriation, with its delayed fall-out effects, will take an extended period to exert its full depletive impact; in some instances, it will be decades and even centuries before species eventually disappear. But the ultimate upshot, which is what we should be primarily concerned with, will be the same. Consider the environmental degradation that already has occurred. Through dynamic inertia, it will continue to exert an increasingly adverse effect for a good way into the future, no matter how vigorously we try to resist the process: much potential damage is already “in the pipeline.” An obvious example is acid rain, which will keep on inflicting injury on biotas by reason of pollutants already deposited though not yet causing apparent harm. Similarly, tropical forests will suffer desiccation through climatic changes induced by deforestation that already has taken place. Desertification will keep on expanding its impact through built-in momentum. Ozone-destroying CFCs now in the atmosphere will continue their work for a whole century even if we were to cease releasing them forthwith. There is enough global warming in store through past emissions of greenhouse gases to cause significant climatic change no matter how much we seek to slow it, let alone halt it. In light of this on-going degradation of the biosphere, let us suppose, for the sake of argument, that in the year 2000 the whole of humankind were to be removed from the face of the Earth in one fell swoop. Because of the many environmental perturbations already imposed, with their impacts persisting for many subsequent decades, gross biospheric impoverishment would continue and thus serve to eliminate further large numbers of species in the long term (Myers, 1990b).

#### Environmental collapse won’t cause extinction

Easterbrook 3

Gregg, senior fellow at The New Republic, July, Wired Magazine, “We’re All Gonna Die!” http://www.wired.com/wired/archive/11.07/doomsday.html?pg=1&topic=&topic\_set=

If we’re talking about doomsday - the end of human civilization - many scenarios simply don’t measure up. A single nuclear bomb ignited by terrorists, for example, would be awful beyond words, but life would go on. People and machines might converge in ways that you and I would find ghastly, but from the standpoint of the future, they would probably represent an adaptation. Environmental collapse might make parts of the globe unpleasant, but considering that the biosphere has survived ice ages, it wouldn’t be the final curtain. Depression, which has become 10 times more prevalent in Western nations in the postwar era, might grow so widespread that vast numbers of people would refuse to get out of bed, a possibility that Petranek suggested in a doomsday talk at the Technology Entertainment Design conference in 2002. But Marcel Proust, as miserable as he was, wrote Remembrance of Things Past while lying in bed.

### AT – Biodiversity Impact

#### Cryo-preservation solves species loss

Cannell 99

Michael, freelance writer, October 10, 1999, The Washington Post, “Ice Age at the Zoo,” p. W14

With his beard and khaki safari shirt, Wildt, 49, could pass as Ken Burns’s rugged older brother. He operates from a scrupulously neat office perched on a broad, open hill in the zoo’s 3,100-acre Conservation and Research Center in Front Royal. Fifty years ago, the Army bred cavalry horses on these sloping pastures overlooking the Shenandoah Valley. Today, in a complex of laboratories built within unassuming red-roofed barns, Wildt is summoning the tools of cryo-preservation -- the storage of living tissue in extreme cold -- to amass a frozen zoo, a 21st-century ark that offers hope of survival to species on the brink of extinction. It is the stuff of science fiction: Hundreds of six-inch glass straws loaded with sperm and embryos are chilled in vaporous freezers to minus 196 degrees centigrade, colder than the lunar night. The frozen zoo’s repositories, samples from some 300 species, are genetic time capsules. As long as the reproductive cells reside in their coolers, the donor species -- from Indian elephants to black-footed ferrets -- cannot go genetically extinct. These samples can lie in a suspended state for hundreds, and perhaps thousands, of years. Someday they could be used to restart a species long after it has disappeared from the face of the earth. In the meantime, Wildt and his colleagues at the National Zoo, along with cryobiologists at half a dozen other U.S. zoos, are drawing on the samples to increase today’s animal populations and alleviate inbreeding by injecting genetic “booster shots” into isolated groups.

#### Claims of ecosystem destruction are false – ecosystems empirically recover

Boucher 96

Douglas, Department of Biology at Hood College, Appalachian Environmental Laboratory at the University of Maryland, Fall 1996, Science & Society, “Not with a bang but a whimper,” Vol. 60, Iss. 3, proquest

The political danger of catastrophism is matched by the weakness of its scientific foundation. Given the prevalence of the idea that the entire biosphere will soon collapse, it is remarkable how few good examples ecology can provide of this happening - even on the scale of an ecosystem, let alone a continent or the whole planet. Hundreds of ecological transformations, due to introductions of alien species, pollution, overexploitation, climate change and even collisions with asteroids, have been documented. They often change the functioning of ecosystems, and the abundance and diversity of their animals and plants, in dramatic ways. The effects on human society can be far-reaching, and often extremely negative for the majority of the population. But one feature has been a constant, nearly everywhere on earth: life goes on. Humans have been able to drive thousands of species to extinction, severely impoverish the soil, alter weather patterns, dramatically lower the biodiversity of natural communities, and incidentally cause great suffering for their posterity. They have not generally been able to prevent nature from growing back. As ecosystems are transformed, species are eliminated - but opportunities are created for new ones. The natural world is changed, but never totally destroyed. Levins and Lewontin put it well: “The warning not to destroy the environment is empty: environment, like matter, cannot be created or destroyed. What we can do is replace environments we value by those we do not like” (Levins and Lewontin, 1994).

## AT – Adv - Shipping

### Shipping increasing now

#### Receding ice line opens up new shipping lanes, no need for icebreakers

Blunden 12

Margaret, The Royal Institute of International Affairs. 2012, http://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/default/files/public/International%20Affairs/2012/88\_1/88\_1blunden.pdf

With the world’s maritime transport system at the forefront of globalization, the emergence of a new sea lane would have global consequences. The major trading powers of Europe and Asia, particularly Germany and China, are preparing their strategies and capabilities in anticipation of the possible opening of one such new sea lane, the Northern Sea Route (NSR), to regular commercial transit. Although the obstacles are formidable, current trends in the melting of the sea ice on the Arctic Ocean, the projected increase in commercial maritime traffic to 2018, and piracy and potential political instability along the existing route through the Suez Canal are all prompting the major players to hedge their bets. The NSR across the top of Russia—not one single clearly defined route, but a number of alternative passages between Novaya Zemlya and the Bering Strait—is likely to become operational before the less developed North-West Passage through the Canadian archipelago, since the ice is receding more quickly for shipping routes off Siberia than on average across the Arctic as a whole.

### Shipping will be limited

#### Inefficiencies make arctic shipping routes limited

Iswara nodate

VijayaDirector at Fastfix Inc.; a firm majority owned by Deep Sea Logistics Inc, hightable.com, <https://www.hightable.com/maritime-and-shipping/insight/arctic-shipping-routes-good-or-bad-54637>, “Arctic shipping routes - good or bad?” Accessed 6/27/12. CD

The attempt to achieve shorter transit times to asia by developing an arctic channel is commendable for exploratory reasons but falls short on account of safety, security and environmental hazards. Key limitations at present are: - seasonality aspects as it is usable only during summer months - russian or other sovereign influences over controlling and maintaining the channel - dearth of proper international monitoring of the region for illegal trade - commercial viability to be unclear till around 2020 - bering straits For commercial navigation Arctic remains a very speculative endeavor for 3 reasons: • It is highly uncertain to what extent the receding perennial ice cover is a confirmed trend or simply part of a long term climatic destruction cycle. • There is very limited economic activity around the Arctic Circle, implying that shipping services across the Arctic have negligible opportunity to drop and pick up cargo as they pass through. Thus, unlike other long distance commercial shipping routes there is limited revenue generation potential for shipping lines along the Arctic route, which limits the emergence of transshipment hubs. • The Arctic remains a frontier in terms of charting and building a navigation system, implying uncertainties and unreliability for navigation. This also implies that substantial efforts have to be made to insure that navigation can take in place in a safe manner. It may not be dissimilar to great lakes style activity except farther from ice cap. Both USA and Canada are aiming to be environmentally progressive in legal, social and cultural view to influence the way companies operate. Russia can take advantage of far east markets by developing modern train systems for freight trains to go into western China to haul ore, coal and other commodities. From east coast of russia where year round ports are located they can access Japanese and northern chinese industrial bases much more efficiently while building the domestic infrastructure on land. In conclusion Arctic shipping may sound very attractive in terms of shorter transit times but the perils of such activity will have unforeseen consequences on human existence. Freight rates are still under pressure. No notable short term rewards may be reaped. The commercial potential in this region is inadequate and investors should exercise diligence and social responsibility in their efforts

### AT – economy impact

Wars are costly and government budgets are extremely curtailed during economic collapse – protectionism is more likely than military intervention

Deudney 91

Hewlett Fellow in Science, Technology, and Society at the Center for Energy and Environmental Studies, Princeton [Daniel, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, April]

Poverty Wars. In a second scenario, declining living standards first cause internal turmoil. then war. If groups at all levels of affluence protect their standard of living by pushing deprivation on other groups class war and revolutionary upheavals could result. Faced with these pressures, liberal democracy and free market systems could increasingly be replaced by authoritarian systems capable of maintaining minimum order.9 If authoritarian regimes are more war-prone because they lack democratic control, and if revolutionary regimes are warprone because of their ideological fervor and isolation, then the world is likely to become more violent. The record of previous depressions supports the proposition that widespread economic stagnation and unmet economic expectations contribute to international conflict. Although initially compelling, this scenario has major flaws. One is that it is arguably based on unsound economic theory. Wealth is formed not so much by the availability of cheap natural resources as by capital formation through savings and more efficient production. Many resource-poor countries, like Japan, are very wealthy, while many countries with more extensive resources are poor. Environmental constraints require an end to economic growth based on growing use of raw materials, but not necessarily an end to growth in the production of goods and services. In addition, economic decline does not necessarily produce conflict. How societies respond to economic decline may largely depend upon the rate at which such declines occur. And as people get poorer, they may become less willing to spend scarce resources for military forces. As Bernard Brodie observed about the modein era, “The predisposing factors to military aggression are full bellies, not empty ones.”’” The experience of economic depressions over the last two centuries may be irrelevant, because such depressions were characterized by under-utilized production capacity and falling resource prices. In the 1930 increased military spending stimulated economies, but if economic growth is retarded by environmental constraints, military spending will exacerbate the problem. Power Wars. A third scenario is that environmental degradation might cause war by altering the relative power of states; that is, newly stronger states may be tempted to prey upon the newly weaker ones, or weakened states may attack and lock in their positions before their power ebbs firther. But such alterations might not lead to war as readily as the lessons of history suggest, because economic power and military power are not as tightly coupled as in the past. The economic power positions of Germany and Japan have changed greatly since World War 11, but these changes have not been accompanied by war or threat of war. In the contemporary world, whole industries rise, fall, and relocate, causing substantial fluctuations in the economic well-being of regions and peoples without producing wars. There is no reason to believe that changes in relative wealth and power caused by the uneven impact of environmental degradation would inevitably lead to war. Even if environmental degradation were to destroy the basic social and economic fabric of a country or region, the impact on international order may not be very great. Among the first casualties in such country would be the capacity to wage war. The poor and wretched of the earth may be able to deny an outside aggressor an easy conquest, but they are themselves a minimal threat to other states. Contemporary offensive military operations require complex organizational skills, specialized industrial products and surplus wealth.

US not key to global economy

La Monica 9

(Paul R., CNNMoney.com editor at large, CNNMoney.com, 6/3, http://money.cnn.com/2009/06/03/markets/thebuzz/) JAS

U.S. economic might, decided to sell its Hummer brand to a Chinese manufacturer after GM ([GMGMQ](http://money.cnn.com/quote/quote.html?symb=GMGMQ&source=story_quote_link)) filed for bankruptcy. We may not like to admit it, but it's time to get used to this fact: emerging markets such as China and India are quickly becoming the world's new economic powerhouses. In fact, according to a report from a leading economic research group released earlier this week, emerging market economies may overtake the U.S. and the rest of the Western world this year. The Centre for Economics and Business Research (CEBR), a London-based economic consulting firm, predicted that the United States, Canada and Europe will contribute 49.4% to the world's total gross domestic product in 2009. According to the CEBR, this will be the first time since the beginning of the Industrial Revolution in the mid-19th century that non-Western economies produced more than half of the world's GDP. The CEBR said it had originally predicted emerging markets would make up a bigger portion of the world's economy than the West -- but not until 2015. The firm said the resurgence of China's economy is the main reason why it expects the West's share of global GDP to dip below 50% this year. "We had expected this to happen, but not quite so soon. The West will have to start to get to grips with the fact that we are no longer dominant and cannot expect to have things our own way," said Douglas McWilliams, chief executive of CEBR, in a statement. Now the United States is still the world's economic leader. If the global economy were a basketball team, the U.S. is Kobe Bryant. But China is LeBron James (sorry, Cavs fans). In other words, China isn't the champ yet, but it's catching up fast. Along those lines, CEBR forecast that China will surpass Japan this year as the world's second largest economy. China is already the largest holder of U.S. Treasury notes and the country's second biggest trading partner. Those are key reasons why Treasury Secretary Tim Geithner is in China this week: he's trying to make nice with our largest creditor and a key market for exports. It's smart to do so. Talkback: Are you concerned by the increased economic clout of China, India and other emerging markets? [Leave your comments](http://money.cnn.com/2009/06/03/markets/thebuzz/#FacebookConnect) at the bottom of this story. After Chinese leaders expressed concerns earlier this year about how much debt the U.S. government is incurring to bail out financial firms and stimulate the economy, it's important to convince China that the dollar is not going to be devalued into oblivion and that Treasurys will remain safe investments. "China is now the largest of the U.S. creditors and its willingness to absorb U.S. Treasurys could be key to the success of the U.S. fiscal stimulus and banking sector rescues," wrote analysts for RGE Monitor, the economic research firm run by NYU Stern economics professor Nouriel Roubini, this week. "No wonder Treasury Secretary Geithner faced questions about the U.S. fiscal deficit reduction plan in Beijing." This doesn't necessarily mean that the United States is doomed to a massive economic fall from grace. In fact, it does not appear to be a coincidence that hopes of a U.S. economic recovery have helped lead a surge in stocks in China, India, Latin America and other emerging markets. According to mutual fund research firm Morningstar, emerging markets funds have actually outperformed the broader U.S. market since the rally began in March. Latin American stock funds, for example, are up a staggering 78% in the past three months, while Pacific/Asia funds (excluding Japan) are up 66%. The S&P 500, by way of comparison, is up about 35% during the same period. If nothing else, both the reaction to a potential U.S. recovery and the fallout from the problems in the U.S. housing and credit markets should prove beyond any shadow of a doubt that the notion of economic decoupling was a myth. America led the rest of the West into recession, as many European banks had massive exposure to bad mortgage loans in the United States. The credit crisis wound up contributing to a slowdown for China and other emerging markets. China's economy grew at its lowest level in nearly two decades during the first quarter. And now that the United States is showing some signs of economic stabilization, emerging markets have snapped back. So rather than bemoaning the West's inevitable slip in economic importance, investors need to embrace emerging markets and realize that interdependence is key to the global economy. "China and other emerging markets have tied themselves intricately to the U.S. economic system," said James Swanson, chief investment strategist with MFS Investment Management in Boston. "As the U.S. recovers, that means that there will be a lot of earnings growth coming out of China and other emerging markets like India and Brazil." With that in mind, Swanson said investors need to be thinking more about buying shares of multinational U.S. construction firms that will benefit from increased demand in emerging markets, as well as mining, energy and manufacturing companies in China, India and Brazil. So if companies such as Alcoa ([AA](http://money.cnn.com/quote/quote.html?symb=AA&source=story_quote_link), [Fortune 500](http://money.cnn.com/magazines/fortune/fortune500/2009/snapshots/15.html?source=story_f500_link)), Ford Motor ([F](http://money.cnn.com/quote/quote.html?symb=F&source=story_quote_link), [Fortune 500](http://money.cnn.com/magazines/fortune/fortune500/2009/snapshots/160.html?source=story_f500_link)) and ExxonMobil ([XOM](http://money.cnn.com/quote/quote.html?symb=XOM&source=story_quote_link), [Fortune 500](http://money.cnn.com/magazines/fortune/fortune500/2009/snapshots/387.html?source=story_f500_link)) are in your portfolio, you might also want to take a look at Aluminum Corp. of China ([ACH](http://money.cnn.com/quote/quote.html?symb=ACH&source=story_quote_link)), India's Tata Motors ([TTM](http://money.cnn.com/quote/quote.html?symb=TTM&source=story_quote_link)) and Brazil's Petrobras ([PBR](http://money.cnn.com/quote/quote.html?symb=PBR&source=story_quote_link)) as well. "U.S. investors can't have 80% to 90% of their portfolio in the U.S. anymore," Swanson said. "The old notion of having 5% to 10% in international stocks is outdated. Americans should increase their weight in emerging markets."

## AT – Adv – Smuggling

### Status quo solves

#### Russia is policing Arctic routes – they’ll solve smuggling

WWF 2007

world wildlife foundation, Sep 4. “President Putin: Illegal Fishing Must Be Stopped”http://www.wwf.ru/about/what\_we\_do/seas/fish/State\_in\_Action/eng/

Fishing in Russia’s maritime economic zone is the source of enormous costly illegal activity and the government must take immediate measures to restore order, Russian President Vladimir Putin has said. Speaking at a meeting of the State Council Presidium on Effective Management of the Fishing Industry in Russia, Mr. Putin also highlighted the importance of aquaculture and said that, until now, Russia has paid «almost no attention» to this growing industry. Mr. Putin said that, in order to obtain the maximum benefit from the industry, the Government is prioritizing support for fish processing in Russia and the interdiction of illegal fishing and smuggling. He said that this conservation of aquatic resources and their development will serve the interests of future generations.

### Link turn

#### Link turn – breaking up all the ice increases the risk of terrorism, smuggling, and illegal immigration

Byers 9

Michael, “Who Owns the Arctic? Understanding Sovereignty Disputes in the North,” ISBN 978-1-55365-499-5, page 69

Drug smugglers, gunrunners and illegal immigrants could also take advantage of an ice-free Northwest Passage. It would be relatively easy to transfer passengers or cargo from an ocean-going vessel to a small plane on one of dozens of gravel airstrips scattered along the waterway for travel to another small airstrip farther south. And every summer, as noted, hundreds of undocumented foreign nationals from cruise ships go ashore at communities such as Pangnirtung, Pond Inlet, Grise Fiord and Resolute Bay that have scheduled air service but no immigration controls.

Byers 9

Michael, “Who Owns the Arctic? Understanding Sovereignty Disputes in the North,” ISBN 978-1-55365-499-5, page 141

In the circumstances, our best ally might be the United States. According to former U.S. ambassador Paul Cellucci, the State Department has been reassessing whether the traditional U.S. position- that the Northwest Passage is an international strait – remains in the U.S. national interest. The worry is that terrorists and other non-state actors might use an increasingly ice-free waterway to access North America and, potentially, traffic in WMD.

Byers 9

Michael, “Who Owns the Arctic? Understanding Sovereignty Disputes in the North,” ISBN 978-1-55365-499-5, page 29

Former U.S. ambassador Paul Cellucci has expressed concern about the risk that terrorist groups might use the Northwest Passage to traffic in weapons of mass destruction. An ice-free Northwest Passage could also serve as an entry point for drugs, guns, and illegal immigrants. Gravel airstrips are scattered along the waterway, a forgotten legacy of the Cold War and countless research and prospecting expeditions. Each summer, cruise ships put hundreds of undocumented foreign nationals on shore in Inuit communities with scheduled air service but no immigration controls. Stories about attempts at illegal immigration abound in Canada’s Arctic. In September 2006, a Romanian man was deported from Canada after overstaying his student visa. Desperate to return to his Canadian girlfriend in Toronto, the young man flew to Thule, Greenland, bought a six-metre fiberglass motorboat and set out for Ellesmere Island. Miraculously, he made it across Baffin Bay to the tiny hamlet of Grise Fiord, where scheduled flights would have taken him to Iqaluit, Ottawa and ultimately back to Toronto. But news travels fast in communities of only two hundred people, and he was soon facing questions from the local RCMP.

### AT – Terrorism impact

#### No terrorism threat

Mearsheimer 10

12/16, John J., the R. Wendell Harrison Distinguished Service Professor of Political Science at the University of Chicago. He is on the Advisory Council of The National Interest, and his most recent book, Why Leaders Lie: The Truth About Lying in International Politics, was published in January 2011 by Oxford University Press, The National Interest, “Imperial by Design,” <http://nationalinterest.org/article/imperial-by-design-4576>

The fact is that states have strong incentives to distrust terrorist groups, in part because they might turn on them someday, but also because countries cannot control what terrorist organizations do, and they may do something that gets their patrons into serious trouble. This is why there is hardly any chance that a rogue state will give a nuclear weapon to terrorists. That regime’s leaders could never be sure that they would not be blamed and punished for a terrorist group’s actions. Nor could they be certain that the United States or Israel would not incinerate them if either country merely suspected that they had provided terrorists with the ability to carry out a WMD attack. A nuclear handoff, therefore, is not a serious threat. When you get down to it, there is only a remote possibility that terrorists will get hold of an atomic bomb. The most likely way it would happen is if there were political chaos in a nuclear-armed state, and terrorists or their friends were able to take advantage of the ensuing confusion to snatch a loose nuclear weapon. But even then, there are additional obstacles to overcome: some countries keep their weapons disassembled, detonating one is not easy and it would be difficult to transport the device without being detected. Moreover, other countries would have powerful incentives to work with Washington to find the weapon before it could be used. The obvious implication is that we should work with other states to improve nuclear security, so as to make this slim possibility even more unlikely. Finally, the ability of terrorists to strike the American homeland has been blown out of all proportion. In the nine years since 9/11, government officials and terrorist experts have issued countless warnings that another major attack on American soil is probable—even imminent. But this is simply not the case.3 The only attempts we have seen are a few failed solo attacks by individuals with links to al-Qaeda like the “shoe bomber,” who attempted to blow up an American Airlines flight from Paris to Miami in December 2001, and the “underwear bomber,” who tried to blow up a Northwest Airlines flight from Amsterdam to Detroit in December 2009. So, we do have a terrorism problem, but it is hardly an existential threat. In fact, it is a minor threat. Perhaps the scope of the challenge is best captured by Ohio State political scientist John Mueller’s telling comment that “the number of Americans killed by international terrorism since the late 1960s . . . is about the same as the number killed over the same period by lightning, or by accident-causing deer, or by severe allergic reactions to peanuts.” One might argue that there has been no attack on American soil since 9/11 because the GWOT has been a great success. But that claim is undermined by the fact that al-Qaeda was trying hard to strike the United States in the decade before 9/11, when there was no GWOT, and it succeeded only once. In February 1993, al-Qaeda exploded a truck bomb in a garage below the World Trade Center, killing six people. More than eight years passed before the group struck that same building complex for the second time. None of this is to deny that 9/11 was a spectacular success for the terrorists, but it was no Pearl Harbor, which launched the United States into battles against Imperial Japan and Nazi Germany, two truly dangerous adversaries. Roughly 50 million people—the majority of them civilians—died in that conflict. It is absurd to compare al-Qaeda with Germany and Japan, or to liken the GWOT to a world war. This conspicuous threat inflation has hurt the American effort to neutralize al-Qaeda. By foolishly widening the scope of the terrorism problem, Washington has ended up picking fights with terrorist groups and countries that otherwise had no interest in attacking the United States, and in some cases were willing to help us thwart al-Qaeda. Enlarging the target set has also led American policy makers to take their eyes off our main adversary. Furthermore, defining the terrorist threat so broadly, coupled with the constant warnings about looming attacks that might be even more deadly than 9/11, has led U.S. leaders to wage war all around the globe and to think of this struggle as lasting for generations. This is exactly the wrong formula for dealing with our terrorism problem. We should instead focus our attention wholly on al-Qaeda and any other group that targets the United States, and we should treat the threat as a law-enforcement problem rather than a military one that requires us to engage in large-scale wars the world over. Specifically, we should rely mainly on intelligence, police work, carefully selected covert operations and close cooperation with allies to neutralize the likes of al-Qaeda.

#### No risk of the impact

Carle, 8

(a member of the CIA's Clandestine Service for 23 years, Carle, L. Glenn, “ A member of the CIA's Clandestine Service for 23 years , ” The Salt Lake Tribune, July 16, 2008, <http://www.sltrib.com/opinion/ci_9901142>) TH

The next commander in chief should base his counterterrorism policies on the following realities: We do not face a global jihadist "movement" but a series of disparate ethnic and religious conflicts involving Muslim populations, each of which remains fundamentally regional in nature and almost all of which long predate the existence of al-Qaida. Osama bin Laden and his disciples are small men and secondary threats whose shadows are made large by our fears. Al-Qaida is the only global jihadist organization and is the only Islamic terrorist organization that targets the U.S. homeland. Al-Qaida remains capable of striking here and is plotting from its redoubt in Waziristan, Pakistan. The organization, however, has only a handful of individuals capable of planning, organizing and leading a terrorist operation. Al-Qaida threatens to use chemical, biological, radiological or nuclear weapons, but its capabilities are far inferior to its desires. Even the "loose nuke" threat, whose consequences would be horrific, has a very low probability. For the medium term, any attack is overwhelmingly likely to consist of creative uses of conventional explosives. No other Islamic-based terrorist organization, from Mindanao to the Bekaa Valley to the Sahel, targets the U.S. homeland; is part of a "global jihadist movement"; or has more than passing contact with al-Qaida. These groups do and will, however, identify themselves with global jihadist rhetoric and may bandy the bogey-phrase of "al-Qaida." They are motivated by hostility toward the West and fear of the irresistible changes that education, trade, and economic and social development are causing in their cultures. These regional terrorist organizations may target U.S. interests or persons in the groups' historic areas of interest and operations. **None** of these groups is likely to succeed in seizing power or in destabilizing the societies they attack, though they may succeed in killing numerous people through sporadic attacks such as the Madrid train bombings. There are and will continue to be small numbers of Muslims in certain Western countries - in the dozens, perhaps - who seek to commit terrorist acts, along the lines of the British citizens behind the 2005 London bus bombings. Some may have irregular contact with al-Qaida central in Waziristan; more will act as free agents for their imagined cause. They represent an Islamic-tinged version of the anarchists of the late 19th century: dupes of "true belief," the flotsam of revolutionary cultural change and destruction in Islam, and of personal anomie. We need to catch and neutralize these people. But they do not represent a global movement or a global threat. The threat from Islamic terrorism is no larger now than it was before Sept. 11, 2001. Islamic societies the world over are in turmoil and will continue for years to produce small numbers of dedicated killers, whom we must stop. U.S. and allied intelligence do a good job at that; these efforts, however, will never succeed in neutralizing every terrorist, everywhere. Why are these views so starkly at odds with what the Bush administration has said since the beginning of the "Global War on Terror"? This administration has heard what it has wished to hear, pressured the intelligence community to verify preconceptions, undermined or sidetracked opposing voices, and both instituted and been victim of procedures that guaranteed that the slightest terrorist threat reporting would receive disproportionate weight - thereby comforting the administration's preconceptions and policy inclinations. We must not delude ourselves about the nature of the terrorist threat to our country. We must not take fright at the specter our leaders have exaggerated. In fact, we must see jihadists for the small, lethal, disjointed and miserable opponents that they are.

## DA – Marine Life

#### Increase of arctic shipping harms marine life

ScienceDaily 12

“Increase in Arctic Shipping Is Risk to Marine Mammals” Mar. 16, 2012, http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2012/03/120316112549.htm

As Arctic sea ice melts, Alaska's whales, walruses, and polar bears may face a new obstacle as they navigate local waters: traffic. According to an assemblage of Alaska Native groups and WCS, the rapid increase in shipping in these formerly frozen waterways poses a heightened risk to the region's marine mammals and the local communities that rely on them for food security and cultural identity. The groups recently convened at a workshop in Anchorage, Alaska to examine these potential impacts. At issue is the effect of climate change on Arctic waters, which over the last few decades have become increasingly ice-free during summer and fall. The lengthening of the open-water season has led to new industrial developments, including oil and gas activities and a rising number of large maritime vessels. The ships transit either the Northern Sea Route over the Russian Arctic from Europe, or the Northwest Passage through the Canadian Arctic from the Atlantic. Both routes require passage through the Bering Strait, the only gateway to the Pacific and a key migratory pathway for marine mammals heading to and from the Arctic Ocean.

#### Ice-breakers are loud and disruptive to marine life

Arctic Marine Shipping Assessment 2009

“Environmental Considerations and Impacts” http://ine.uaf.edu/accap/documents/AMSAEnvironmentalConsiderationsImpacts.pdf

**All icebreaking operations,** whether by independent commer- cial icebreaking ships or government icebreaker escort, can poten- tially **cause disturbances to wildlife** and local communities **both through the noise they create and the trail of open water left astern**. Compared to other vessels, **icebreakers produce louder and more variable sounds**. This is because of the episodic nature of the icebreaking, which involves ramming forward into the ice and then reversing to begin the process again. **Some icebreakers are equipped with bubbler systems** to aid in clearing ice from the vessel’s path **and these can create an additional noise source**. **Noise from bubbler sys- tems and propeller cavitation associated with icebreaker movement has the potential to alter animal behavior and to disrupt the hearing ability and vocalization of marine mammals.** Wildlife has been found to exhibit a range of behavior in the presence of icebreakers. For example, beluga whales were found to be aware of the icebreaker vessels presence at distances of more than 80 kilometers away, and exhibit strong avoidance response at 35 to 50 km away. However, narwhal whales were found to display only subtle responses to the same disturbance. **The opening of channels through the ice** by icebreaking vessels **can impact** Arctic residents **and alter animal behavior. Open water channels take time to freeze and this can disrupt the movements of animals** and people **over the ice**. In many areas of the Arctic in win- ter, the only naturally occurring ice openings are polynyas caused by winds or ocean currents. **Artificially opened water channels can be problematic for marine mammals and other species, which confuse them for polynyas and can get trapped too far from the ice edge as the channel eventually refreezes.**

### Ext - Links

#### Link - noise

Arctic Marine Shipping Assessment 2009

“Environmental Considerations and Impacts” http://ine.uaf.edu/accap/documents/AMSAEnvironmentalConsiderationsImpacts.pdf

**For most marine vertebrates, making, hearing and processing sounds serve critical biological functions.** These i**nclude** **communica- tion, foraging, reproduction, navigation and predator-avoidance**. In particular, toothed whales have developed sophisticated biosonar capabilities to help them feed and navigate; large baleen whales have developed long-range communication systems using sound in reproductive and social interaction; and pinnipeds (i.e., seals, sea lion, walrus, etc.) make and listen to sounds for critical communica- tive functions. **Many** fish **utilize sounds in mating and other social interactions**. The **introduction of noise into the environment can adversely affect the ability of marine life to use sound in various ways and** can **induce alteration of behavior**; **reduction of communication ranges for social interactions, foraging, and predator avoidance; and** tem- porary or **permanent compromise of the auditory or other systems**. In extreme cases, too much **noise can lead to habitat avoidance or even death**. Noise can also affect physiological functions and cause more generalized stress. Determining when impacts of noise exposure from any source become biologically significant to a species is often diffi- cult.

#### Link – vessel strikes

Arctic Marine Shipping Assessment 2009

“Environmental Considerations and Impacts” http://ine.uaf.edu/accap/documents/AMSAEnvironmentalConsiderationsImpacts.pdf

**Vessel collisions, resulting in death or serious injury of marine mammals, are a threat to marine organisms** worldwide. Vessel col- lisions or ship **strikes occur mainly with large whale species**, **small cetaceans (i.e., dolphins, narwhal, beluga), marine turtles and sire- nians (i.e., manatees, dugongs).** Records indicate that **nearly all large whale species are vulnerable to ship strikes.** Vessel collisions with marine mammals can result in death, massive trauma, hemor- rhaging, broken bones and propeller wounds. Databases have been constructed which track the number of ship strikes occurring. These report more than **750 known cetacean vessel strikes** through the world’s oceans, **including nearly 300 incidents involving large whales**. Virtually **all motorized vessel types, sizes and classes are represented in these databases.** It should be noted, however, that any database will likely underestimate the number.. of actual occurrences because **many go either undetected or unre- ported.** In some cases carcasses are found, but because injuries are internal or due to advanced decomposition, it may be difficult to determine cause of death. When large vessels are involved, the mari- ner may not be aware that a strike has occurred.

There are relatively few known incidents of Arctic or ice-adapted marine mammal species being involved in ship strikes. The relatively infrequent occurrence is a result of relatively lower vessel traffic in high latitudes as compared to major trading routes and human population centers in lower latitudes. However, of consideration is that certain **Arctic species, such as the bowhead and Pacific right whale, have features that make them potentially vulnerable to ship strikes, particularly as vessel traffic increases in their waters.** Arctic toothed whales, namely narwhals and beluga whales, are probably less vulnerable to ship strikes, given their greater maneuverability and social behavior that lends them to aggregating in large groups enhancing their detection. It should be noted, however, that records of roughly comparable mid-sized species such as **pilot whales, killer whales and various species of beaked whales also appear in ship strike databases.**

#### Link – invasive species

Arctic Marine Shipping Assessment 2009

“Environmental Considerations and Impacts” http://ine.uaf.edu/accap/documents/AMSAEnvironmentalConsiderationsImpacts.pdf

**The introduction and spread of alien invasive species is a serious problem that has ecological, economic, health and environmental impacts, including the loss of native biological diversity** worldwide. Although **the introduction of invasive species into the Arctic envi- ronment** has been minimally studied, it is an issue that **deserves further study in the context of a changing climate and potential increased shipping in the Arctic region. The risk of introduction of invasive species will increase as ship- ping volume increases in this region.** As with ship operations in non-Arctic areas, **the threat** of introduction **comes from** four sources**: ballast water discharge, hull fouling, cargo operations and casualties or shipwrecks.**

#### Link - shipping

Arctic Marine Shipping Assessment 2009

“Environmental Considerations and Impacts” http://ine.uaf.edu/accap/documents/AMSAEnvironmentalConsiderationsImpacts.pdf

From an environmental point of view**, Arctic shipping poses a threat to the region’s unique ecosystems.** This threat can be effectively mitigated through careful planning and effective regulation in areas of high risk. **Release of oil into the Arctic marine environment, either through accidental release, or illegal discharge, is the most significant threat from shipping activity.** **Ship strikes** of whales and other marine mammals **are of concern in areas where shipping routes coincide with seasonal migration and areas of aggregation.** The **introduction of invasive species into the Arctic marine environment from shipping can occur** and the risk may be enhanced due to changing climate, possibly making conditions more favorable to some species. The most risk exists where a transfer of organisms from ecosystems of similar latitudes and conditions can occur. **Of particular future concern is the transfer of organisms across the Arctic Ocean from the North Pacific to the North Atlantic or vice versa**. There are **certain areas in the Arctic region that are of heightened ecological significance,** many of which **will be at risk from** current and/or **increased shipping**. Many of these areas are located in geographically restrictive loca- tions or chokepoints where much shipping activity also occurs, such as the Bering Strait, Hudson Strait, Lancaster Sound, Pechora Sea and the Kara Port. Migratory marine mammals such as bowhead, beluga, narwhal and walrus have wintering areas in the southern extent of the sea ice and spring migration routes into the Arctic through systems of leads and polynyas also used by many seabirds, ducks and other marine birds during spring migration. These migration corridors correspond broadly to the current main shipping routes and travel through geographic chokepoints. **The black carbon emitted from shipping in the Arctic could have significant regional impacts by accelerating ice melt. Ship emissions including greenhouse gases (GHGs), Nitrogen Oxides (NOx), Sulfur Oxides (SOx) and Particulate Matter (PM) may have negative effects on the Arctic environment and will increase in the Arctic region propor- tionately with increased shipping activity.** Effective reduction of ship emissions can be achieved through the application of feasible and best available technologies, through air emissions reduction techniques and, most importantly, through effective implementation of relevant IMO regulations. Sound is of vital biological importance to marine mammals and **anthropogenic noise produced through shipping and other vessel activity can have various adverse effects on Arctic species**. Subarctic seas support some of the richest fisheries in the world in the Bering Sea and the Barents Sea. These two areas are also the location of the heaviest shipping traffic now occurring in the Arctic region. **A potential accidental spill of oil or other hazardous and noxious substances in these areas could have large economic, social and environmental impacts.** Environmental effects on marine mammals, seabirds and fisheries from ship sourced disturbances, noise, or poten- tial accidental/illegal release of oil and other hazardous and noxious substances may impact culturally and eco- nomically significant subsistence harvests of these animals. The most immediate impacts of climate change in the Arctic will be the reduction of summer sea ice, longer open water seasons in the fall and the reduction of the year-round presence of multi-year ice. These changes may have far reaching implications for Arctic ecosystems and will also result in the lengthening of the current shipping season. Shipping in the future may be occurring much later into the fall and possibly earlier in the spring, thereby increasing the possibility of interaction between migrating and calving

### I/L – keystone species

#### Toothfish are a keystone species

Cooper 12

Jordan Cooper. The Last Ocean. May 16th 2012 <http://lastocean.wordpress.com/tag/antarctic-fisheries/> Hope for the Ross Sea June 28th 2012

Even so, longlining for toothfish in the Ross Sea and the waters surrounding Antarctica has been going on since the 1970’s and still continues today.  It’s important to remember that the fish coming from Antarctica are not being harvested in order to feed the hungry; instead they are sold to fine restaurants in the West and Asia for up to $30 per pound And some recent signs suggest that toothfish are now becoming more scarce, as are certain types of killer whales that depend on them for prey.  A collapse in the toothfish population would have far-reaching and possibly devastating consequences for the ecosystem as a whole because toothfish serve as a staple in the diet of many top predators in the region. it’s still not too late to save the Ross Sea, but if we don’t act now it may soon be.  The effects of climate change will likely severly impact many species indigenous to the region because of their interdependence with the sea ice.  Compounding this uncertainty by decimating a critical food source could doom many of the larger predators, whose presences are in part what makes the Ross Sea ecosystem so special and unique. It’s time for the human species to prove that we are capable of exercising a measure of restraint.  It is now up to us to ensure that the Emperor Penguin and the Weddel seal do not go the way of the American bison or the polar bear.  The Ross Sea is a priceless and irreplaceable natural wonder, and to plunder it for short-term gain seems akin to looting a cherished painting or sculpture and then selling the materials as scrap.  What a tragic end this would be for a place so ancient, so pure, and so wild.

#### Decrease in fish causes whale migration

Ainley 09

David G. Ainley 2009 <http://www.penguinscience.com/Paper%202.pdf> An Apparent Decrease in the Prevalence of “Ross Sea Killer Whales” in the Southern Ross Sea. June 28th 2012

In the southern Ross Sea, which has 10% of the world population of Adélie penguins and 15% of emperor penguins, as well as the largest concentration anywhere of Weddell seals and notable numbers of minke whales (Ainley, 2009), it has been shown by “natural experiments” that changes in one predator population immediately cause changes in others (e.g., penguins vs minke and killer whales) (Ainley et al., 2006a; Ainley, 2007). Without the benefit of eating large toothfish, the option for killer whales is to move out of the foraging ambits of their more physiographically constrained and densely populated competitors, the Weddell seals and penguins. If killer whales cannot find large fish elsewhere, then a reduction in calf production seemingly would become evident and eventually true population decline would ensue. This is the scenario that has been documented off the Pacific coast of Canada, where the disappearance of large-bodied chinook salmon (Oncorhynchus tshawytscha) has, in part, led to a noticeable decrease in the resident killer whale population (Ford & Ellis, 2006).

#### Killer whales are key to the Antarctic ecosystem and on the brink

Ainley 09

**David G. Ainley 2009** [**http://www.penguinscience.com/Paper%202.pdf**](http://www.penguinscience.com/Paper%202.pdf) **An Apparent Decrease in the Prevalence of “Ross Sea Killer Whales” in the Southern Ross Sea. June 28th 2012**

Killer whales (Orcinus orca), both ecotype-B and -C, are important to the Ross Sea, Antarctic ecosystem. The ecotype-C is referred to as “Ross Sea [RS] killer whale.” Herein, we review data on occurrence patterns and diet of RS killer whales and present new information on numbers observed in the southwestern Ross Sea, 2002-2003 to 2008-2009 austral summers. These “resident” whales appear to feed principally on fish, including the large Antarctic toothfish (Dissostichus mawsoni). On the basis of sea watches from Cape Crozier, Ross Island, sighting frequency and average group size appears to have decreased; prevalence as indicated by casual observations from helicopter pilots flying over the area on a daily basis has also decreased in nearby McMurdo Sound. Consistent with a decrease in the catch-per-unit-effort of scientific fishing for toothfish in McMurdo Sound, we suggest and review evidence that the change in RS killer whale numbers in the southern Ross Sea is related to an industrial fishery-driven, densitydependent northward contraction of the toothfish stock and not to changes in the physical (and, in turn, biological) environment. We surmise that in this closely coupled foodweb, composed of very abundant penguin, seal, and whale components, loss of the toothfish option for RS killer whales would force more direct competition with other predators for capture of the smaller-fish prey. Therefore, we propose, the RS killer whales have opted to move elsewhere, in a scenario consistent with that of the Pacific coast of Canada, where numbers of resident killer whales have decreased following the loss of large fish as a prey choice

### Ext - Impacts

#### Impact - whales

SCHOOF 6/28

(Renee Schoof “Oil exploration in Alaskan Arctic brings lots of noise to whales’ domain” 6/28/12 http://www.kansascity.com/2012/06/28/3680466/oil-exploration-in-alaskan-arctic.html accessed on 6/28/12 SA

As the Arctic Ocean's ice cover declines in summer and oil companies move in with ships, drilling equipment and seismic surveys, what used to be a mostly very quiet home for whales and other marine animals is getting a lot louder. Next month will mark a new stage in oil and gas development in the Beaufort and Chukchi seas north of Alaska, when Shell returns to the Alaskan Arctic to drill exploratory wells. If it's successful, this could be beginning of a new boom. Scientists are asking how whales and other marine animals will react to the sound. The overall level of man-made underwater noise in the Arctic is increasing, not only from oil and gas development but also from shipping and soon from commercial fishing and tourism vessels. Whales, dolphins, walruses and seals all rely on sound in the water. Bowhead whales, for example, are adept at using their voices to navigate in complete darkness through ice. "They can live to 200, and they're adapted to a world of extreme quiet under the frozen ocean, broken at times by extremely loud tectonic crashes of giant blocks of ice," said Christopher Clark, the director of the Bioacoustics Research Program at Cornell University. "An oil spill may be more dramatic in terms of actually exposing animals to toxic substances," added John Hildebrand, a professor at the Scripps Institution of Oceanography at the University of California at San Diego, "but the stress that may come from the increased noise is something that we should be concerned about." The oil company is keenly aware of the potential disturbance below the surface. "The sound we're putting in the water is something we're watching very closely," because it could directly impact marine mammals and communities that rely on subsistence hunts, said Shell spokesman Curtis Smith in Anchorage. The sound from seismic surveys "is something that's at the top of our list for mitigating our impact," he said. The company has had acoustic recorders in the Beaufort and Chukchi seas for several months at a time since 2006 to understand marine mammals' behavior, how they respond to the sound Shell puts into the water and also how they respond to climate change and ship traffic sounds. Oil and gas exploration is loud, often for many hours at a time. Shell has spent billions of dollars on Alaskan Arctic exploration already, and the company says it's working to reduce its sound impact on marine mammals. Shell plans to expand its operations if the next two summers of exploration are successful. Other companies also are getting in. Interior Secretary Ken Salazar on Tuesday announced plans to offer new lease sales in the Chukchi in 2016 and in the Beaufort in 2017. Estimates show 25 billion barrels of oil in the seas - more than the 17 billion barrels of oil that's been produced in the last 30 years on the North Slope. Shell drilled most of the wells in the Beaufort in the 1980s and '90s and four of the five wells ever drilled in the Chukchi. But there hasn't been any exploratory drilling in the offshore waters of the Alaskan Arctic over the past decade. Shell now is waiting for one final federal permit and favorable ice conditions to set up in the Beaufort and Chukchi with drilling equipment, support vessels and aircraft. In addition, the company will conduct seismic testing in its new wells for periods of up to 14 hours at each well. Shell conducted major seismic surveys in the Beaufort and Chukchi seas in 2007 to 2009. Seismic survey air guns shoot explosions of compressed air that send acoustic energy through the water and into the Earth's crust. The sound is repeated about every 10 seconds, some 360 per hour, sometimes for hours at a time. Measuring how long it takes to reflect the sound waves back provides information about subsurface rocks. Oil companies use the information to figure out where to drill. "It essentially creates a large hammer. The ocean surface lifts up and slams down. Most people have no concept how heavy this hammer is," Clark said. Meanwhile, the federal government is considering opening parts of the Atlantic from Delaware to Florida to oil and gas drilling. The area is home to the North Atlantic right whale, whose numbers are down to about 350. A proposed environmental impact statement about the effects of surveying in the Atlantic noted that the government's preferred plan would not allow air-gun surveys in some areas regarded as critical right whale habitat. Overall, the biggest source of noise in the world's oceans is from shipping. In the last 50 years, the oceans have become 10 times louder from shipping, said Michael Stocker, the director of Ocean Conservation Research, a group that studies ocean sounds. But seismic air-gun surveys are "increasing at a huge clip," he said. Some studies have looked at the results of high stress levels from sound, or changes in the amount of food whales consume when they have to swim away from seismic surveys in other places. Loud sounds in a certain frequency also can reduce the ability of some marine mammals to hear natural sounds. Some of the largest whales, including bowheads, hear at very low frequencies, said Darlene Ketten, a senior scientist at the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution in Massachusetts and an assistant clinical professor at Harvard Medical School. Most seismic tests, including those used by Shell, are also low frequency, or infrasound. "The primary concern will be those animals that may be sensitive to really low infrasonic sounds," she said. Beluga whales and dolphins, by contrast, don't hear well at low frequency, and so aren't likely to be bothered by seismic activity unless they are very close to it, Ketten said. The Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission, which promotes Alaska's cultural and subsistence whaling, said in comments to the National Marine Fisheries Service that oil and gas vessels and underwater noise would have a direct impact on bowhead whales and might send them farther out to sea. During its seismic work, Shell was required to hire people to spot marine mammals. When the animals entered a specified zone, Shell would "ramp down" the air-gun work and then slowly increase it again after the mammals moved on. Candace Nachman of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Office of Protected Resources said the zone that was watched was based on where scientists think there might be potential auditory injury or hearing impairment. In May, NOAA granted Shell permits that allow non-lethal harassment due to sound after it reviewed studies and collected public comments. The agency determined that the drilling this summer wouldn't kill or injure the animals or damage subsistence hunting. The permit requires Shell to take certain precautions, including slowing ship speeds when marine mammals are nearby and flying helicopters higher to minimize noise. "There's always more to learn. But because of statutes and regulations, we're required to make a decision based on the best science we have," Nachman said. Shell also reached an agreement with the Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission to halt its operations in the Beaufort Sea on Aug. 25 and move its operations out of the area during the Alaskan natives' bowhead whale hunting season. "There are unanswered science questions," said Clark, the Bioacoustics Research Program director at Cornell. "It's not clear what happens if a whale hears 1,000 of the explosions from air guns, or where it will go if an area is saturated with the sound. In addition, scientists are only beginning to study the effects of the sound on fish and other animals that make up the whole ecosystem." "We have amazingly strong evidence showing massive avoidance of bowhead whales of seismic survey areas. They won't go in there. Their calling rates change. Their whole communication is totally distorted," he said. What does that mean for the whales? "It's not really known," Clark said. Can they get away? "We don't know," he said. "We have not any really satisfactory data where we went out and put a bunch of (satellite) tags on the animals and said, 'OK, we're going to watch you and listen to you and see exactly what you do.' "

#### Whales are people too – you must include them in your utilitarian calculations – this framework is key to democracy

The Economist 12

2/25, “Whales are people, too,” http://www.economist.com/node/21548150

The proposition that whales have rights is founded on the idea that they have a high degree of intelligence, and also have self-awareness of the sort that humans do. That is a controversial suggestion, but there is evidence to support it. Lori Marino of Emory University, in Atlanta, Georgia, reviewed this evidence. One pertinent observation is that dolphins, whales and their kind have brains as anatomically complex as those of humans, and that these brains contain a particular type of nerve cell, known as a spindle cell, that in humans is associated with higher cognitive functions such as abstract reasoning. Cetacean brains are also, scaled appropriately for body size, almost as big as those of humans and significantly bigger than those of great apes, which are usually thought of as humanity’s closest intellectual cousins. Whales and dolphins have complex cultures, too, which vary from group to group within a species. The way they hunt, the repertoire of vocal signals and even their use of tools differs from pod to pod. They also seem to have an awareness of themselves as individuals. At least some can, for example, recognise themselves in a mirror—a trick that humans, great apes and elephants can manage, but most other species cannot. Thomas White, of Loyola Marymount University, in Los Angeles, then discussed the ethical implications of what Dr Marino had said. Dr White is a philosopher, and he sought to establish the idea that a person need not be human. In philosophy, he told the meeting, a person is a being with special characteristics who deserves special treatment as a result of those characteristics. In principle, other species can qualify. For the reasons outlined by Dr Marino, he claimed, cetaceans do indeed count as persons and therefore have moral rights—though ones appropriate to their species, which may therefore differ from those that would be accorded a human (for example, the right not to be removed from their natural environment). Chris Butler-Stroud, of the Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society, in Britain, and Kari Koski of the Whale Museum in San Juan Island, Washington state, then charted some of the hesitant steps already being taken in the direction of establishing cetacean rights. Mr Butler-Stroud showed how the language used by international bodies concerned with these animals is changing. The term “stocks”, for example, with its implication that whales and dolphins are a resource suitable for exploitation, is being overtaken by “populations”, a word that is also applied to people. Ms Koski gave an even more intriguing example. She told of how a group of killer whales that lives near Vancouver, passing between waters controlled (from a human point of view) by Canada and the United States, have acquired legal protection even though the species as a whole is not endangered. After a battle in the American courts these particular whales have been defined by their culture, and that culture is deemed endangered. The idea of rights for whales is certainly a provocative one, and is reminiscent of the Australian philosopher Peter Singer’s proposal that human rights be extended to the great apes—chimpanzees, bonobos, gorillas and orang-utans. Like Dr Singer’s suggestion, though, it does ignore one nagging technicality. The full title of the French revolutionary document was “Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen”. No one has yet argued for votes for whales and dolphins. But considering some of the politicians who manage to get themselves chosen by human electorates, maybe it would not be such a bad idea.

## DA links – Politics

#### Obama would get the credit/blame – he opposed a bill for refurbishment as too limited

Ewing 11

Philip, DoD Buzz, November 4, “White House: We must keep our icebreakers,” http://www.dodbuzz.com/2011/11/04/white-house-we-must-keep-our-icebreakers/

That same day, this year’s Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act was referred to the full House, prompting this message from the Office of Management and Budget: The Administration strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 2838 because it includes a provision that would require the Coast Guard to decommission the icebreaker USCGC POLAR STAR. The Administration has requested, and Congress has appropriated, funds to reactivate the USCGC POLAR STAR by December 2012 and extend that vessel’s service life for seven to 10 years. This effort will stabilize the United States’ existing polar fleet until long-term icebreaking capability requirements are finalized. By directing the Commandant to decommission the USCGC POLAR STAR within three years, the bill would effectively reduce the vessel’s service life to two years and create a significant gap in the Nation’s icebreaking capacity. The Administration supports Title II (Coast Guard and Servicemember Parity), which would promote parity between the Coast Guard and the other branches of the armed forces. The Administration looks forward to working with the Congress to improve H.R. 2838 as the bill moves through the legislative process.

#### Coast Guard doesn’t get protected like the rest of the DOD budget

Ewing 11

Philip, DoD Buzz, November 4, “White House: We must keep our icebreakers,” http://www.dodbuzz.com/2011/11/04/white-house-we-must-keep-our-icebreakers/

Because of the nature of the federal bureaucracy, the Coast Guard and its needs don’t enjoy the mother-hen protections of the Armed Services Committees, now in see-no-evil overdrive mode trying to protect the DoD budget. Instead, as they have for years, Transportation Committee lawmakers are looking at the bottom line and saying, well, it’s gonna cost a lot to keep the old girl in service, so off she goes.

#### Plan links to anti-spending fervor

Ewing 11

Philip, DoD Buzz, November 4, “White House: We must keep our icebreakers,” http://www.dodbuzz.com/2011/11/04/white-house-we-must-keep-our-icebreakers/

The Coast Guard has been caught in this vortex for years — maybe the polar rollers will go away, maybe they’ll be upgraded — and the Obama administration’s caution is just the latest delay. This was one of the things former Coast Guard Commandant Adm. Thad Allen always said required a “national discussion,” because the U.S. needed to determine what exactly it was willing to do, defend and concede up in the Arctic. But as you see from OMB’s message, the Obama administration’s desire to add 10 years of life to the Polar Star is only another stopgap “until long-term icebreaking capability requirements are finalized.” Translation: We consider this one of those nice things but not nice enough to actually deal with — and, most importantly, to fund. So file the polar icebreakers along with the Navy’s submarine tenders and amphibious command ships: Old vessels that perform critical missions, but which probably will remain low priorities in Austerity America.

#### Offshore drilling is strongly opposed by environmentalists

Blinch 6-28-12

Russ Blinch; staff writer for Reuters; Reuters International; 6-28-12; “US to unveil final drilling plan, cautious on Alaska;” retrieved 7-1-12; <http://in.reuters.com/article/2012/06/27/usa-drilling-offshore-idINL2E8HRGEP20120627>

The Obama Administration will release its final, five-year blueprint for offshore drilling on T hursday and is expected to offer a go-slow approach to Arctic drilling and keep restricting rigs from operating off the east and west coasts of the country. The drilling plan is likely to draw criticism from Republicans on the campaign trail as too restrictive, while sparking concern from environmentalists that drilling off Alaska is too risky. The oil and gas industry has criticized the Obama administration for tightening regulation of offshore drilling since the massive oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico in 2010. The spill also prompted the administration to backtrack on plans to open areas off the Atlantic coast to drilling. The Interior department said the plan to be unveiled on Thursday was part of President Barack Obama's "all-of-the-above" strategy that also seeks to stimulate the renewable energy industry. The plan runs to 2017 and is expected to be similar to an earlier version released by the Interior Department late last year, which also continues to emphasize drilling off the Gulf Coast, according to Oceana, an environmental advocacy group. But the new plan would likely delay the Alaskan lease sales to the final years of the plan in order to allow for more scientific and environmental studies. Environmentalists like the idea of more studies but still strongly oppose drilling in the Arctic where the concern is the environment is too harsh and dangerous for exploration, especially after the Deepwater Horizon disaster in the Gulf. "The Arctic is the worst possible place where we can be producing oil and gas," said Jacqueline Savitz, the North American vice president for Oceana. Interior Secretary Ken Salazar recently flagged that Alaska would remain an important energy source for the United States, but cautioned drilling must proceed slowly to protect the environment.

## DA links – Global Warming

#### New Arctic shipping routes will accelerate warming

Melville 10

Kate -VP, Associate Media Director at Mullen 26 October, http://www.scienceagogo.com/news/20100925230304data\_trunc\_sys.shtml

As the Arctic Ocean warms and ice-packs retreat, new routes will open up which will likely prove irresistible to shipping companies. A Northwest Passage and Northeast Passage through the Arctic Ocean would provide a distance savings of about 25 percent and 50 percent, respectively, with coincident time and fuel savings. But these new trade routes will come at a price as maritime engine exhaust particles will dramatically increase Arctic warming, according to a U.S. and Canadian research team. "One of the most potent 'short-lived climate forcers' in diesel emissions is black carbon, or soot," explains marine scientist James J. Corbett, from the University of Delaware. "Ships operating in or near the Arctic use advanced diesel engines that release black carbon into one of the most sensitive regions for climate change." Produced by the incomplete burning of marine fuel, these tiny particles of carbon absorb sunlight - both directly from the sun, and reflected from the surface of snow and ice. Other particles released by ship engines also rank high among important short-lived climate forcers, and this new study estimates their combined global warming impact potential. To better understand the potential impact of black carbon and other ship pollutants on climate, including carbon dioxide, methane and ozone, the research team produced high-resolution scenarios that account for growth in shipping in the region through 2050, and also outline potential new Arctic shipping routes. Significant findings in the study include: Global warming potential in 2030 in the high-growth scenario suggests that short-lived forcing of ~4.5 gigatons of black carbon from Arctic shipping may increase the global warming potential due to ships' carbon dioxide emissions (~42,000 gigagrams) by between 17 and 78 percent. Ship traffic diverting from current routes to new routes through the Arctic is projected to reach 2 percent of global traffic by 2030 and to 5 percent in 2050. In comparison, shipping volumes through the Suez and Panama canals currently account for about 4 percent and 8 percent of global trade volume, respectively. "To understand the value of addressing short-lived climate forcers from shipping, you need to know the impacts of these emissions, the feasibility and availability of technologies that could be put in place to reduce these impacts, and then engage the policy-making community to debate the evidence and agree on a plan," Corbett notes. "Our hope is that this study will enable better communication of emerging science with policy makers and aid the eight Arctic Council nations with climate policy."

#### Shipping is dirty- Icebreakers exacerbate global warming

Howden ’12

Daniel Howden, Deputy Foreign Editor. Shipping pollution 'far more damaging than flying. The Independent. WEDNESDAY 10 OCTOBER 2007. <http://www.independent.co.uk/environment/climate-change/shipping-pollution-far-more-damaging-than-flying-396455.html>. Date Accessed: June 27, 2012. LY.

New research suggests that the impact of shipping on climate change has been seriously underestimated and that the industry is currently churning out greenhouse gases at nearly twice the rate of aviation. Shipping, although traditionally thought of as environmentally friendly, is growing so fast that the pollution it creates is at least 50 per cent higher than previously thought. Maritime emissions are also set to leap by 75 per cent by 2020. The International Maritime Organisation, the UN body set up to regulate shipping, has set up a working group due to report this year. Research seen by the group suggests previous calculations, which put the total at about 600 million tonnes per year, are signifi-cantly short. The true figure is set to be more than one billion tonnes, according to a confidential report produced for the IMO by Intertanko, the International Association of Independent Tanker Owners. In comparison, aviation produces an estimated 650 million tonnes. The old figures were based on 2001 estimates, but shipping has grown by 4.5 per cent on average annually. While other industries have come under pressure to clean up their acts, shipping has so far escaped. Bill Box, from Intertanko, said the industry knows it has been slow to respond. "Shipping has not yet been regulated and for politicians it is the last low hanging fruit," Mr Box said. In California, the Attorney General has launched a petition aimed at forcing the Environmental Protection Agency to curb emissions of climate change gases from shipping in US waters. In the UK, the Government is under pressure to include shipping in emission targets for the Climate Change Bill next month. And new EU regulations come into force in November to compel ship owners to use cleaner fuel in coastal shipping lanes throughout continental waters. "Shipping is an invisible industry," said Mr Box. "Ports are away from population centres and many people don't see a ship from one year to another." The industry serves more than 90 per cent of global trade and as commerce has grown, so has the shipping fleet. At present it is more efficient to ship a container from Beijing to London than it is to transport it 100km by road. The world fleet of ocean-going vessels stands at 90,000, says Oceana, a US-based ocean protection organisation that is part of a coalition of environmental groups that has signed the California petition. The petition claims that the fleet generates emissions equivalent to nearly 190 million cars, all the vehicles in the US. Michael Woods, co-chair of the UK Environmental Law Association's climate change working party, said government curbs on pollution were coming sooner than the industry realises. He said that shipping could be included in the European Emissions Trading Scheme. With land-based polluters already heavily regulated, the shipping industry could provide the most cost-effective way to reduce climate change gases. Since the 1970s, the bulk of commercial vessels have run on heavy "bunker" fuel, a by-product of the oil refining process for higher grade fuels. One industry insider described it as "the crap that comes out the other end that's half way to being asphalt". It has potentially lethal side effects such as the release of sulphur dioxide, carbon dioxide, nitrogen oxide and sulphuric acid. Recent studies in the US and the Netherlands showed pollutants from ships contribute half of the smog-related sulphur dioxide in Los Angeles. In Rotterdam, North Sea shipping lanes run within 25 miles of the shore, spewing pollution that can travel up to 1,000 miles. "If you want to improve air quality on land, you will have a larger effect from spending one euro at sea than you will have spending one euro on land," said Pieter Hammingh, from the Dutch environment agency.

### Ext – GW is real

#### Warming is real and human induced – consensus is on our side – numerous studies prove

Rahmstorf 8 – Professor of Physics of the Oceans

Richard, of Physics of the Oceans at Potsdam University, Global Warming: Looking Beyond Kyoto, Edited by Ernesto Zedillo, “Anthropogenic Climate Change?,” pg. 42-4

It is time to turn to statement B: human activities are altering the climate. This can be broken into two parts. The first is as follows: global climate is warming. This is by now a generally undisputed point (except by novelist Michael Crichton), so we deal with it only briefly. The two leading compilations of data measured with thermometers are shown in figure 3-3, that of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and that of the British Hadley Centre for Climate Change. Although they differ in the details, due to the inclusion of different data sets and use of different spatial averaging and quality control procedures, they both show a consistent picture, with a global mean warming of 0.8°C since the late nineteenth century. Temperatures over the past ten years clearly were the warmest since measured records have been available. The year 1998 sticks out well above the longterm trend due to the occurrence of a major El Nino event that year (the last El Nino so far and one of the strongest on record). These events are examples of the largest natural climate variations on multiyear time scales and, by releasing heat from the ocean, generally cause positive anomalies in global mean temperature. It is remarkable that the year 2005 rivaled the heat of 1998 even though no El Nino event occurred that year. (A bizarre curiosity, perhaps worth mentioning, is that several prominent "climate skeptics" recently used the extreme year 1998 to claim in the media that global warming had ended. In Lindzen's words, "Indeed, the absence of any record breakers during the past seven years is statistical evidence that temperatures are not increasing.")33 In addition to the surface measurements, the more recent portion of the global warming trend (since 1979) is also documented by satellite data. It is not straightforward to derive a reliable surface temperature trend from satellites, as they measure radiation coming from throughout the atmosphere (not just near the surface), including the stratosphere, which has strongly cooled, and the records are not homogeneous' due to the short life span of individual satellites, the problem of orbital decay, observations at different times of day, and drifts in instrument calibration.' Current analyses of these satellite data show trends that are fully consistent with surface measurements and model simulations." If no reliable temperature measurements existed, could we be sure that the climate is warming? The "canaries in the coal mine" of climate change (as glaciologist Lonnie Thompson puts it) ~are mountain glaciers. We know, both from old photographs and from the position of the terminal moraines heaped up by the flowing ice, that mountain glaciers have been in retreat all over the world during the past century. There are precious few exceptions, and they are associated with a strong increase in precipitation or local cooling.36 I have inspected examples of shrinking glaciers myself in field trips to Switzerland, Norway, and New Zealand. As glaciers respond sensitively to temperature changes, data on the extent of glaciers have been used to reconstruct a history of Northern Hemisphere temperature over the past four centuries (see figure 3-4). Cores drilled in tropical glaciers show signs of recent melting that is unprecedented at least throughout the Holocene-the past 10,000 years. Another powerful sign of warming, visible clearly from satellites, is the shrinking Arctic sea ice cover (figure 3-5), which has declined 20 percent since satellite observations began in 1979. While climate clearly became warmer in the twentieth century, much discussion particularly in the popular media has focused on the question of how "unusual" this warming is in a longer-term context. While this is an interesting question, it has often been mixed incorrectly with the question of causation. Scientifically, how unusual recent warming is-say, compared to the past millennium-in itself contains little information about its cause. Even a highly unusual warming could have a natural cause (for example, an exceptional increase in solar activity). And even a warming within the bounds of past natural variations could have a predominantly anthropogenic cause. I come to the question of causation shortly, after briefly visiting the evidence for past natural climate variations. Records from the time before systematic temperature measurements were collected are based on "proxy data," coming from tree rings, ice cores, corals, and other sources. These proxy data are generally linked to local temperatures in some way, but they may be influenced by other parameters as well (for example, precipitation), they may have a seasonal bias (for example, the growth season for tree rings), and high-quality long records are difficult to obtain and therefore few in number and geographic coverage. Therefore, there is still substantial uncertainty in the evolution of past global or hemispheric temperatures. (Comparing only local or regional temperature; as in Europe, is of limited value for our purposes,' as regional variations can be much larger than global ones and can have many regional causes, unrelated to global-scale forcing and climate change.) The first quantitative reconstruction for the Northern Hemisphere temperature of the past millennium, including an error estimation, was presented by Mann, Bradley, and Hughes and rightly highlighted in the 2001 IPCC report as one of the major new findings since its 1995 report; it is shown in figure 3\_6.39 The analysis suggests that, despite the large error bars, twentieth-century warming is indeed highly unusual and probably was unprecedented during the past millennium. This result, presumably because of its symbolic power, has attracted much criticism, to some extent in scientific journals, but even more so in the popular media. The hockey stick-shaped curve became a symbol for the IPCC, .and criticizing this particular data analysis became an avenue for some to question the credibility of the IPCC. Three important things have been overlooked in much of the media coverage. First, even if the scientific critics had been right, this would not have called into question the very cautious conclusion drawn by the IPCC from the reconstruction by Mann, Bradley, and Hughes: "New analyses of proxy data for the Northern Hemisphere indicate that the increase in temperature in the twentieth century is likely to have been the largest of any century during the past 1,000 years." This conclusion has since been supported further by every single one of close to a dozen new reconstructions (two of which are shown in figure 3-6).Second, by far the most serious scientific criticism raised against Mann, Hughes, and Bradley was simply based on a mistake. 40 The prominent paper of von Storch and others, which claimed (based on a model test) that the method of Mann, Bradley, and Hughes systematically underestimated variability, "was [itself] based on incorrect implementation of the reconstruction procedure."41 With correct implementation, climate field reconstruction procedures such as the one used by Mann, Bradley, and Hughes have been shown to perform well in similar model tests. Third, whether their reconstruction is accurate or not has no bearing on policy. If their analysis underestimated past natural climate variability, this would certainly not argue for a smaller climate sensitivity and thus a lesser concern about the consequences of our emissions. Some have argued that, in contrast, it would point to a larger climate sensitivity. While this is a valid point in principle, it does not apply in practice to the climate sensitivity estimates discussed herein or to the range given by IPCC, since these did not use the reconstruction of Mann, Hughes, and Bradley or any other proxy records of the past millennium. Media claims that "a pillar of the Kyoto Protocol" had been called into question were therefore misinformed. As an aside, the protocol was agreed in 1997, before the reconstruction in question even existed. The overheated public debate on this topic has, at least, helped to attract more researchers and funding to this area of paleoclimatology; its methodology has advanced significantly, and a number of new reconstructions have been presented in recent years. While the science has moved forward, the first seminal reconstruction by Mann, Hughes, and Bradley has held up remarkably well, with its main features reproduced by more recent work. Further progress probably will require substantial amounts of new proxy data, rather than further refinement of the statistical techniques pioneered by Mann, Hughes, and Bradley. Developing these data sets will require time and substantial effort. It is time to address the final statement: most of the observed warming over the past fifty years is anthropogenic. A large number of studies exist that have taken different approaches to analyze this issue, which is generally called the "attribution problem." I do not discuss the exact share of the anthropogenic contribution (although this is an interesting question). By "most" I imply mean "more than 50 percent.”The first and crucial piece of evidence is, of course, that the magnitude of the warming is what is expected from the anthropogenic perturbation of the radiation balance, so anthropogenic forcing is able to explain all of the temperature rise. As discussed here, the rise in greenhouse gases alone corresponds to 2.6 W/tn2 of forcing. This by itself, after subtraction of the observed 0'.6 W/m2 of ocean heat uptake, would Cause 1.6°C of warming since preindustrial times for medium climate sensitivity (3"C). With a current "best guess'; aerosol forcing of 1 W/m2, the expected warming is O.8°c. The point here is not that it is possible to obtain the 'exact observed number-this is fortuitous because the amount of aerosol' forcing is still very' uncertain-but that the expected magnitude is roughly right. There can be little doubt that the anthropogenic forcing is large enough to explain most of the warming. Depending on aerosol forcing and climate sensitivity, it could explain a large fraction of the warming, or all of it, or even more warming than has been observed (leaving room for natural processes to counteract some of the warming). The second important piece of evidence is clear: there is no viable alternative explanation. In the scientific literature, no serious alternative hypothesis has been proposed to explain the observed global warming. Other possible causes, such as solar activity, volcanic activity, cosmic rays, or orbital cycles, are well observed, but they do not show trends capable of explaining the observed warming. Since 1978, solar irradiance has been measured directly from satellites and shows the well-known eleven-year solar cycle, but no trend. There are various estimates of solar variability before this time, based on sunspot numbers, solar cycle length, the geomagnetic AA index, neutron monitor data, and, carbon-14 data. These indicate that solar activity probably increased somewhat up to 1940. While there is disagreement about the variation in previous centuries, different authors agree that solar activity did not significantly increase during the last sixty-five years. Therefore, this cannot explain the warming, and neither can any of the other factors mentioned. Models driven by natural factors only, leaving the anthropogenic forcing aside, show a cooling in the second half of the twentieth century (for an example, See figure 2-2, panel a, in chapter 2 of this volume). The trend in the sum of natural forcings is downward.The only way out would be either some as yet undiscovered unknown forcing or a warming trend that arises by chance from an unforced internal variability in the climate system. The latter cannot be completely ruled out, but has to be considered highly unlikely. No evidence in the observed record, proxy data, or current models suggest that such internal variability could cause a sustained trend of global warming of the observed magnitude. As discussed, twentieth century warming is unprecedented over the past 1,000 years (or even 2,000 years, as the few longer reconstructions available now suggest), which does not 'support the idea of large internal fluctuations. Also, those past variations correlate well with past forcing (solar variability, volcanic activity) and thus appear to be largely forced rather than due to unforced internal variability." And indeed, it would be difficult for a large and sustained unforced variability to satisfy the fundamental physical law of energy conservation. Natural internal variability generally shifts heat around different parts of the climate system-for example, the large El Nino event of 1998, which warmed, the atmosphere by releasing heat stored in the ocean. This mechanism implies that the ocean heat content drops as the atmosphere warms. For past decades, as discussed, we observed the atmosphere warming and the ocean heat content increasing, which rules out heat release from the ocean as a cause of surface warming. The heat content of the whole climate system is increasing, and there is no plausible source of this heat other than the heat trapped by greenhouse gases. ' A completely different approach to attribution is to analyze the spatial patterns of climate change. This is done in so-called fingerprint studies, which associate particular patterns or "fingerprints" with different forcings. It is plausible that the pattern of a solar-forced climate change differs from the pattern of a change caused by greenhouse gases. For example, a characteristic of greenhouse gases is that heat is trapped closer to the Earth's surface and that, unlike solar variability, greenhouse gases tend to warm more in winter, and at night. Such studies have used different data sets and have been performed by different groups of researchers with different statistical methods. They consistently conclude that the observed spatial pattern of warming can only be explained by greenhouse gases.49 Overall, it has to be considered, highly likely' that the observed warming is indeed predominantly due to the human-caused increase in greenhouse gases. ' This paper discussed the evidence for the anthropogenic increase in atmospheric CO2 concentration and the effect of CO2 on climate, finding that this anthropogenic increase is proven beyond reasonable doubt and that a mass of evidence points to a CO2 effect on climate of 3C ± 1.59C global-warming for a doubling of concentration. (This is, the classic IPCC range; my personal assessment is that, in-the light of new studies since the IPCC Third Assessment Report, the uncertainty range can now be narrowed somewhat to 3°C ± 1.0C) This is based on consistent results from theory, models, and data analysis, and, even in the absence-of any computer models, the same result would still hold based on physics and on data from climate history alone. Considering the plethora of consistent evidence, the chance that these conclusions are wrong has to be considered minute. If the preceding is accepted, then it follows logically and incontrovertibly that a further increase in CO2 concentration will lead to further warming. The magnitude of our emissions depends on human behavior, but the climatic response to various emissions scenarios can be computed from the information presented here. The result is the famous range of future global temperature scenarios shown in figure 3\_6.50 Two additional steps are involved in these computations: the consideration of anthropogenic forcings other than CO2 (for example, other greenhouse gases and aerosols) and the computation of concentrations from the emissions. Other gases are not discussed here, although they are important to get quantitatively accurate results. CO2 is the largest and most important forcing. Concerning concentrations, the scenarios shown basically assume that ocean and biosphere take up a similar share of our emitted CO2 as in the past. This could turn out to be an optimistic assumption; some models indicate the possibility of a positive feedback, with the biosphere turning into a carbon source rather than a sink under growing climatic stress. It is clear that even in the more optimistic of the shown (non-mitigation) scenarios, global temperature would rise by 2-3°C above its preindustrial level by the end of this century. Even for a paleoclimatologist like myself, this is an extraordinarily high temperature, which is very likely unprecedented in at least the past 100,000 years. As far as the data show, we would have to go back about 3 million years, to the Pliocene, for comparable temperatures. The rate of this warming (which is important for the ability of ecosystems to cope) is also highly unusual and unprecedented probably for an even longer time. The last major global warming trend occurred when the last great Ice Age ended between 15,000 and 10,000 years ago: this was a warming of about 5°C over 5,000 years, that is, a rate of only 0.1 °C per century. 52 The expected magnitude and rate of planetary warming is highly likely to come with major risk and impacts in terms of sea level rise (Pliocene sea level was 25-35 meters higher than now due to smaller Greenland and Antarctic ice sheets), extreme events (for example, hurricane activity is expected to increase in a warmer climate), and ecosystem loss. The second part of this paper examined the evidence for the current warming of the planet and discussed what is known about its causes. This part showed that global warming is already a measured and-well-established fact, not a theory. Many different lines of evidence consistently show that most of the observed warming of the past fifty years was caused by human activity. Above all, this warming is exactly what would be expected given the anthropogenic rise in greenhouse gases, and no viable alternative explanation for this warming has been proposed in the scientific literature. Taken together., the very strong evidence accumulated from thousands of independent studies, has over the past decades convinced virtually every climatologist around the world (many of whom were initially quite skeptical, including myself) that anthropogenic global warming is a reality with which we need to deal.

#### Vast scientific consensus warming exists, and is human induced

Monbiot 7 – Professor @ Oxford

George, Professor @ Oxford Brookes University, Heat: How to Stop the Planet from Burning, pg. 5

But the link has also been established directly. A study of ocean warming over the past forty years, for example, published in the journal Science in 2005, records a precise match between the distribution of heat and the intensity of manmade carbon dioxide emissions. Its lead author described his findings thus: The evidence is so strong that it should put an end to any debate about whether humanity is causing global warming." This sounds like a strong statement, but he is not alone. In 2004, another article in Science reported the results of a survey of scientific papers containing the words 'global climate change." The author found 928 of them on the database she searched, 'None of the papers, she discovered, disagreed with the consensus position…Politicians, economists, journalists and others may have the impression of confusion, disagreement, or discord among climate scientists, but that impression is incorrect. In 2001 the Royal Society, the United Kingdom's pre-eminent scientific institution, published the following statement: Despite increasing consensus on the science underpinning predictions of global climate change, doubts have been expressed recently about the need to mitigate the risks posed by global climate change. We do not consider such doubts justified. It was also signed by the equivalent organisations in fifteen other countries."' Similar statements have been published by the US National Academy of Sciences, the American Meteorological Society, the American Geophysical Union" and the American Association for the Advancement of Science."

### Ext - Impacts

#### Now is the key time-slowing warming is key to avoid positive feedbacks

James E. **Hanson**, Head, NASA Goddard Institute, Testimony before House Select Committee on Energy Independnece and Global Warming, 6—23—**08**, www.columbia.edu/~jeh1/2008/TwentyYearsLater\_20080623.pdf

Fast feedbacks—changes that occur quickly in response to temperature change—amplify the initial temperature change, begetting additional warming. As the planet warms, fast feedbacks include more water vapor, which traps additional heat, and less snow and sea ice, which exposes dark surfaces that absorb more sunlight. Slower feedbacks also exist. Due to warming, forests and shrubs are moving poleward into tundra regions. Expanding vegetation, darker than tundra, absorbs sunlight and warms the environment. Another slow feedback is increasing wetness (i.e., darkness) of the Greenland and West Antarctica ice sheets in the warm season. Finally, as tundra melts, methane, a powerful greenhouse gas, is bubbling out. Paleoclimatic records confirm that the long-lived greenhouse gases— methane, carbon dioxide, and nitrous oxide—all increase with the warming of oceans and land. These positive feedbacks amplify climate change over decades, centuries, and longer. The predominance of positive feedbacks explains why Earth’s climate has historically undergone large swings: feedbacks work in both directions, amplifying cooling, as well as warming, forcings. In the past, feedbacks have caused Earth to be whipsawed between colder and warmer climates, even in response to weak forcings, such as slight changes in the tilt of Earth’s axis.2 The second fundamental property of Earth’s climate system, partnering with feedbacks, is the great inertia of oceans and ice sheets. Given the oceans’ capacity to absorb heat, when a climate forcing (such as increased greenhouse gases) impacts global temperature, even after two or three decades, only about half of the eventual surface warming has occurred. Ice sheets also change slowly, although accumulating evidence shows that they can disintegrate within centuries or perhaps even decades. The upshot of the combination of inertia and feedbacks is that additional climate change is already “in the pipeline”: even if we stop increasing greenhouse gases today, more warming will occur. This is sobering when one considers the present status of Earth’s climate. Human civilization developed during the Holocene (the past 12,000 years). It has been warm enough to keep ice sheets off North America and Europe, but cool enough for ice sheets to remain on Greenland and Antarctica. With rapid warming of 0.6°C in the past 30 years, global temperature is at its warmest level in the Holocene.3 The warming that has already occurred, the positive feedbacks that have been set in motion, and the additional warming in the pipeline together have brought us to the precipice of a planetary tipping point. We are at the tipping point because the climate state includes large, ready positive feedbacks provided by the Arctic sea ice, the West Antarctic ice sheet, and much of Greenland’s ice. Little additional forcing is needed to trigger these feedbacks and magnify global warming. If we go over the edge, we will transition to an environment far outside the range that has been experienced by humanity, and there will be no return within any foreseeable future generation. Casualties would include more than the loss of indigenous ways of life in the Arctic and swamping of coastal cities. An intensified hydrologic cycle will produce both greater floods and greater droughts. In the US, the semiarid states from central Texas through Oklahoma and both Dakotas would become more drought-prone and ill suited for agriculture, people, and current wildlife. Africa would see a great expansion of dry areas, particularly southern Africa. Large populations in Asia and South America would lose their primary dry season freshwater source as glaciers disappear. A major casualty in all this will be wildlife.

#### These positive feedback loops ensure that climate change will be abrupt and rapid—like flipping a switch—and makes ice and wars inevitable

John **Carey**, journalist, “Global Warming,” BUSINESS WEEK, 8—30—**04**, p. 48.

More worrisome, scientists have learned from the past that seemingly small perturbations can cause the climate to swing rapidly and dramatically. Data from ice cores taken from Greenland and elsewhere reveal that parts of the planet cooled by 10 degrees Celsius in just a few decades about 12,700 years ago. Five thousand years ago, the Sahara region of Africa was transformed from a verdant lake-studded landscape like Minnesota's to barren desert in just a few hundred years. The initial push -- a change in the earth's orbit -- was small and very gradual, says geochemist Peter B. deMenocal of Columbia University's Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory. ``But the climate response was very abrupt -- like flipping a switch.'' The earth's history is full of such abrupt climate changes. Now many scientists fear that the current buildup of greenhouse gases could also flip a global switch. ``To take a chance and say these abrupt changes won't occur in the future is sheer madness,'' says Wallace S. Broecker, earth scientist at Lamont-Doherty. ``That's why it is absolutely foolhardy to let CO2 go up to 600 or 800 ppm.'' Indeed, Broecker has helped pinpoint one switch involving ocean currents that circulate heat and cold (table, page 68). If this so-called conveyor shuts down, the Gulf Stream stops bringing heat to Europe and the U.S. Northeast. This is not speculation. It has happened in the past, most recently 8,200 years ago. Can it happen again? Maybe. A recent Pentagon report tells of a ``plausible...though not the most likely'' scenario, in which the conveyor shuts off. ``Such abrupt climate change...could potentially destabilize the geopolitical environment, leading to skirmishes, battles, and even war,'' it warns.

#### Moreover fast warming undermines adaptation

James M. **Lindsay**, Senior Fellow, Brookings Institution, BROOKINGS REVIEW, Fall 20**01**, pp. 26-29.

Considerable uncertainty also surrounds future warming trends. The IPCC now projects that global temperatures could rise as little as 2.5 degrees or as much as 10.5 degrees by 2100, or double the range it predicted five years ago. Skeptics insist that the IPCC's computer-generated projections exaggerate possible temperature change because the underlying mathematical models do not capture the complex interaction of natural feedback loops, such as increased cloud formation, that could dampen temperature increases. How much and how fast temperatures rise matters. Small, slow temperature increases make it easier for humans to adapt. (Whether plants and animals could is another matter.) Large, rapid temperature changes, however, could swamp adaptation. Even these statements are guesses. No one knows how higher temperatures will affect the earth's climate. Small changes might disrupt weather patterns and devastate agricultural production. Conversely, higher temperatures might turn frozen wastelands into productive farmland.

## DA links – Spending

#### Plan will cost billions

Klimas 12

Jacqueline, March 24, Staff writer-Navy Times. “Coast Guard asks to buy new Arctic Icebreaker.” <http://www.navytimes.com/news/2012/03/navy-coast-guard-arctic-ice-breaker-032412w/>

The Defense Department willhelpbolster the Coast Guard’s presence in the Arctic, the commander of U.S. Northern Command told the Senate Armed Services Committee. Army Gen. Charles Jacoby and Coast Guard Commandant Adm. Bob Papp signed a white paper March 13 that addresses capability gaps in infrastructure, communications, domain awareness and presence in the Arctic. **“**Traffic has already increased over 61 percent in the Arctic since 2008,” Jacoby said at the March 13 hearing. **“**Security interests follow closely behind economic interests, and we will be participating in a number of venues to help lead that for the Department of Defense.” Rising global temperatures and melting sea ice are opening the Arctic as a new frontier for research, travel and oil drilling — and creating more area for the Coast Guard to patrol. To keep up, the Coast Guard is asking for $8 million in the fiscal 2013 budget to begin procurement of a new large icebreaker. Such a ship could cost $1 billion. Neither of the U.S.’s two heavy-duty Polar-class icebreakers is in service. The Polar Star is awaiting a $57 million upgrade set to be finished in December. Its sister ship, Polar Sea, has been docked in Seattle since 2010 with engine issues. The medium-duty polar icebreaker Healy is designed for research and cannot cut through the thickest ice. As countries like Russia and even China grow their icebreaker fleet**,** Sen. Mark Begich, D-Alaska, emphasized how critical it is for the U.S. to keep up**.**

#### The plan will cost 100x what the Coast Guard is getting now

Klimas 12

Jacqueline, March 24, Staff writer-Navy Times. “Coast Guard asks to buy new Arctic Icebreaker.” <http://www.navytimes.com/news/2012/03/navy-coast-guard-arctic-ice-breaker-032412w/>

“Icebreakers are of critical importance to America’s national security as well as our economic interests in the Arctic,” Cantwell said in a statement. “According to the Coast Guard’s own comprehensive analysis, we need to invest in at least six new icebreakers to fulfill our nation’s icebreaking missions.” The Coast Guard’s responsibilities in the Arctic include national security, protection of the environment, sustainable economic development of the area, cooperation with other nations with Arctic claims and involvement of the indigenous communities in decisions, according to Lt. Paul Rhynard, the service’s deputy chief of media relations. “The bottom line is that the Coast Guard has the same responsibilities in the Arctic as it does in the Gulf of Mexico or any other U.S. maritime region, yet the Arctic coast provides unique challenges, especially during the winter months, due to extreme conditions of severe weather, sea ice, extended periods of darkness and remoteness of the region,” Rhynard said in a statement. The $8 million request is less than 1 percent of the $860 million being asked for icebreaker acquisition in the Department of Homeland Security’s five-year budget projection. Begich pointed out that in the fiscal 2012 budget request, it was zero, so even this amount is an improvement. “It’s a small amount. I wish it was more, but just the fact to have it down and in their five-year plan shows their commitment to move forward,” he said.

#### Spending link

O’Rourke 6/14

Specialist in Naval Affairs, Congressional Research Service, Quote from July 2010 Coast Guard High Latitude Study,“Coast Guard Polar Icebreaker Modernization: Background and Issues for Congress,” <http://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc85474/>

The Coast Guard estimated in February 2008 that new replacement ships for the Polar Star and Polar Sea might cost between $800 million and $925 million per ship in 2008 dollars to procure.31

#### Spending link

O’Rourke 6/14

Specialist in Naval Affairs, Congressional Research Service, Quote from July 2010 Coast Guard High Latitude Study,“Coast Guard Polar Icebreaker Modernization: Background and Issues for Congress,” <http://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc85474/>

The High Latitude Study provided to Congress in July 2011 states that the above figure of $800 million to $925 million in 2008 dollars equates to $900 million to $1,041 million in 2012 dollars. The study provides the following estimates, in 2012 dollars, of the acquisition costs for new polar icebreakers: • $856 million for 1 ship; • $1,663 million for 2 ships—an average of about $832 million each; • $2,439 million for 3 ships—an average of $813 million each; • $3,207 million for 4 ships—an average of about $802 million each; • $3,961 million for 5 ships—an average of about $792 million each; and • $4,704 million for 6 ships—an average of $784 million each. The study refers to the above estimates as “rough order-of-magnitude costs” that “were developed as part of the Coast Guard’s independent Polar Platform Business Case Analysis.”33

## DA – DOD budget t/o

#### Normal means is funding through the DOD – most predictable

O’Rourke 6/14

Specialist in Naval Affairs, Congressional Research Service, Quote from July 2010 Coast Guard High Latitude Study,“Coast Guard Polar Icebreaker Modernization: Background and Issues for Congress,” <http://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc85474/>

There is precedent for funding Coast Guard icebreakers in the DOD budget: The procurement of Healy was funded in FY1990 in the DOD budget—specifically, the SCN account.52 Advocates of funding new icebreakers partly or entirely through the SCN account or the NDSF might argue that this could permit the funding of new icebreakers while putting less pressure on other parts of the Coast Guard’s budget. They might also argue that it would permit the new icebreaker program to benefit from the Navy’s experience in managing shipbuilding programs. Opponents might argue that funding new icebreakers in the SCN account or the NDSF might put pressure on these other two accounts at a time when the Navy and DOD are facing challenges funding their own shipbuilding and other priorities. They might also argue that having the Navy manage the Coast Guard’s icebreaker program would add complexity to the acquisition effort, and that it is unclear whether the Navy’s recent performance in managing shipbuilding programs is better than the Coast Guard’s, since both services have recently experienced problems in managing shipbuilding programs—the Coast Guard with the procurement of new Deepwater cutters, and the Navy in the Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) program and the LPD-17 class amphibious ship program

#### Budget re-allocation will force cuts to readiness and modernization, eroding our deterrent

James 6/22

Casey, kxan news, “Army's chief of staff visits Ft. Hood,” http://www.kxan.com/dpp/news/texas/armys-chief-of-staff-visits-ft-hood

As the national debt tips past $15 trillion, there have also been some major cuts at the Department of Defense. Those cuts are trickling down and impacting U.S. military bases all over the world, including Fort Hood. On Friday, one of the Army's top General's visited Central Texas to outline the challenges the U.S. military faces. $487 billion in budget cuts prompted by the Department of Defense (DoD) means a lot of belt tightening for the army, including reducing the size of the force. Army's chief of staff General Ray Odierno said that could total at least 80,000 people in the next five years. "The specific impact on Fort Hood, my guess would be relatively small," said Gen. Odierno. While the current impact might be small, things could get worse if Congress can't reach a deal about the national debt by the end of this year. The Budget Control Act will go into effect, forcing an additional $500 billion in cuts. If that happens, then all bets are off. "We will have to take a look at how we are going to reorganize ourselves with the impact it will have on readiness and modernization," said Gen. Odierno. "So to me, that is a very different problem." Fort Hood has 40,000 soldiers on base but with cuts, those numbers could drop dramatically. Gen.Odierno worries about weakening the force and is adamant about maintaining the right size in order to be a credible deterrent. "I have testified several times in front of Congress -- that we believe -- that would not be the best interest of our national security and best interest for our country," said Gen. Odierno. Family and veteran programs won't be on the chopping block. Suicide prevention programs will also be a priority. "It's about creating environments where we can identify those who might be at risk and helping those with the proper programs," said Gen. Odierno.

#### Drawdown kills US leadership – perception of forward projection atrophe destroys soft power, the commitment of our allies and global stability, creating a vacuum of power

Holmes 9

PhD from Georgetown University, former Senior Fellow at the Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis, at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, member of the Council on Foreign Relations and a former member of its Washington Advisory Committee, for the Defense Department, author and editor of many foreign policy publications and books, Vice President of Foreign and Defense Policy Studies and Director of the Kathryn and Shelby Cullom Davis Institute for International Studies at Heritage (Kim R., “Sustaining American Leadership with Military Power”, The Heritage Foundation, 6/1/09, http://www.heritage.org/Research/NationalSecurity/sr0052.cfm)

To witness the consequences when policymakers and politicians believe that hard and soft power are disconnected, one need look no further than Europe. The Europeans--many of whom believe that the peace that has broken out on their continent is the model for a post-sovereign world order--have become convinced that the anarchic order of the Westphalian system of nation-states can be breached through the exercise of soft power alone. In their view, bridging the often hardened differences between states and shaping their decisions requires only negotiation and common understanding. Many liberals are now pressing the U.S. government to adopt this vision, but the futility of this approach can be seen everywhere, from the failure of negotiations to deter both Iran and North Korea from their nuclear programs over the past five years--a period in which their efforts have only matured--to the lackluster response to Russia's invasion of Georgian territory. Whether it is states like Iran and North Korea that believe a nuclear weapons program is central to regime survival, or human-rights abusers like Sudan, Burma, and Zimbabwe, or rising powers like China, which continues to use its military to emphasize its sovereignty in the South China Sea, diplomacy alone has not been enough to bring about change in a direction that is favorable to America's interests. At times, America and its leaders have also been guilty of this type of strategic myopia. After applying pressure on North Korea so diligently in 2006, the Bush Administration relaxed its posture in early 2007, and North Korea concluded that it was again free to backslide on its commitments. Two years later, this weak diplomatic approach, which the Obama Administration continued even after North Korea's April 5 missile test, has only brought North Korea to believe that it can get away with more missile tests and nuclear weapons detonations. And so far, it has. Backing Carrots with Sticks Works In the past, when America chose to flex its diplomatic muscle with the backing of its military might, the results were clear. During the Cold War, the foundational document for U.S. strategy toward the Soviet Union, NSC-68, concluded that military power is "one of the most important ingredients" of America's national power. This power gave the U.S. the ability not just to contain and, if necessary, wage war against the Soviet Union and its proxies, but also, during tense diplomatic stand-offs like the Cuban Missile Crisis, to reinforce its political objectives with robust strength. This same equation of military-diplomatic power proved effective in easing tensions during the Taiwan Strait crisis in 1995-1996, when President Bill Clinton sent two aircraft carriers to demonstrate America's firm commitment to the Taiwanese democracy. Similarly, the display of America's military strength against a defiant Saddam Hussein in 2003 convinced Libyan President Moammar Qadhafi to abandon his weapons of mass destruction program. Obama's Risky "Rebalancing" Act Before he became President, Barack Obama raised the important connection between our hard and soft power, arguing that America must "combine military power with strengthened diplomacy" while also building and forging "stronger alliances around the world so that we're not carrying the burdens and these challenges by ourselves."[1] While his statements are correct, his actions as President have done little to demonstrate actual commitment to forging a policy that combines America's military power with its diplomatic authority. **For America to be an effective leader and arbiter of the international order, it must be willing to invest in a world-class military** by spending no less than 4 percent of the nation's gross domestic product on defense.[2] Unfortunately, President Obama's FY 2010 proposed defense budget and Secretary Robert Gates's vision for "rebalancing" the military are drastically disconnected from the broad range of strategic priorities that a superpower like the United States must influence and achieve. Instead of seeking a military force with core capabilities for the conventional sphere to the unconventional--including a comprehensive global missile defense system[3]--in order to deter, hedge against, and if necessary defeat any threat, Secretary Gates argues that "we have to be prepared for the wars we are most likely to fight."[4] He is echoing the view of President Obama, who has argued that we must "reform" the defense budget "so that we're not paying for Cold War-era weapons systems we don't use."[5]vBut the conventional Cold War capabilities that this Administration believes we are unlikely to use are the same platforms that provide America with both the air dominance and the blue-water access that is necessary to project power globally and maintain extended deterrence, not to mention free trade. The Importance of Sustaining Military Power The consequences of **hard-power atrophy will be a direct deterioration of America's diplomatic clout**. This is already on display in the western Pacific Ocean, where **America's ability to hedge against the growing ambitions of a rising China is being called into question by** some of our key Asian allies. Recently, Australia released a defense White Paper that is concerned primarily with the potential decline of U.S. military primacy and the implications that this decline would have for Australian security and stability in the Asia-Pacific. These developments are anything but reassuring. The ability of the United States to reassure friends, deter competitors, coerce belligerent states, and defeat enemies does not rest on the strength of our political leaders' commitment to diplomacy; it rests on the foundation of a powerful military. Only by retaining a "big stick" can the United States succeed in advancing its diplomatic priorities. Only by building a full-spectrum military force can America reassure its many friends and allies and count on their future support.

## CP - Alaska

#### Text: The Alaskan state government should [do the plan]

#### Alaska can do the plan without triggering Congressional budget battles

DeMarban ’12

“Should Alaska take the lead in financing icebreakers?” http://www.alaskadispatch.com/article/should-alaska-take-lead-financing-new-icebreakers Alex DeMarban | Apr 11, 2012

Gov. Sean Parnell says the state might be interested in helping finance a new icebreaker so the U.S. can make up lost ground in the race for Arctic dominance. That's the gist of the governor's response to a lengthy letter from Rep. Don Young offering ideas on how Alaska can help the cash-strapped federal government put costly new icebreakers off Alaska's increasingly busy northern coasts. With the nation's icebreaking fleet reduced to a single working ship -- its two large icebreakers are undergoing repairs or being decommissioned -- the state and U.S. government should consider sharing costs to make new icebreakers a reality, Young suggested in a Feb. 7 letter to Parnell. New or refurbished icebreakers will cost hundreds of millions of dollars. More ships are plowing through the Bering Strait as sailing seasons lengthen in the warming but often ice-choked Arctic. The U.S. Coast Guard predicts traffic will continue growing as shipping, resource development and tourism expands. But the Healy, a "medium duty" icebreaker that escorted a Russian fuel tanker to Nome this winter, is the Coast Guard's lone functioning icebreaker. Without access to heavy icebreakers, we will be unable to adapt to historic changes in the Arctic," Young wrote. "Icebreakers are critical for ensuring safe shipping and resource operations and providing for field research opportunities." He continues: "Given the current fiscal climate in D.C., funding the acquisition of new vessels presents a significant challenge**.** It is clear thatwe must consider creative financing and ownership options to move forward." In addition to helping bankroll the project, the state should also think about owning an icebreaker with private firms. The state could refurbish the Polar Sea or the Polar Star. It could then lease its icebreakers to the Coast Guard and National Science Foundation, wrote Young. Last fall, Young introduced legislation calling on the federal government to lease two large icebreakers for at least 10 years from private entities that own and operate the ships. The ships must be built on American soil, according to the bill, which remains in the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. Parnell wrote Young back in a March 15 letter: "You must be as dismayed as I am to see the federal mission in the Arctic to assist marine trade, provide search and rescue, and provide law enforcement through ice-breaking services diminish so significantly." Parnell said the state won't subsidize US responsibilities such as icebreaking. But it is willing to help the federal government improve its ice-breaking capability. "We can look at all the ways the state can be supportive and helpful, such as financing," Parnell wrote. Parnell's letter didn't address the kinds of "financing" the state could provide. A request to his office seeking clarification wasn't returned Wednesday evening.

#### Alaska can afford the plan without deficit spending

Harris ’12

[Marlys Harris](http://www.minnpost.com/author/marlys-harris) | investigative reporter and editor with specialties in consumer protection and finance for Money Magazine and Consumer Reports. 02/29/12. MinnPost. http://www.minnpost.com/politicspolicy/2012/02/outlook-state-budgets-getting-brighter-far-rosy

For starters, some states' success derives less from fiscal discipline than dumb luck. The soaring price of oil has conferred on Alaska a $3.4 billion surplus, which it can add to the $11 billion the state has already stashed in a rainy day fund. Oil also bears much of the credit for putting Texas in the black by $1.6 billion -- after a $27 billion budget shortfall last year. South Dakota, home to several large credit card companies since the 1980s when it removed caps on interest rates, is enjoying a small surplus from its bank franchise tax, as the card business gradually improves.

### Ext – Alaska can afford it

#### Alaska can’t possibly link to a budget DA – its got its fiscal house in order

Council on Intergovernmental Relations 87

July 1987. Fiscal Discipline in the Federal System: National Reform and the Experience of the States.

Tax and Expenditure Limits in an Environment of Budgetary Balance. The most restrictive fiscal environment is in these states in which there are both stringent balanced budget requirements and limits on the growth of spending and or taxes. When a state is required to balance its budget each fiscal year and, at the same time, maintain a lid on spending, both deficits and spending growth (beyond a certain defined percentage) can be eliminated. California lawmakers are confronted with this situation. There is a limit on the growth of appropriable tax revenues (the "Gann Limit," passed as a constitutional amendment by way of an initiative in 1979)15 and a state constitutional requirement for a balanced budget. Yearly growth in appropriations may not exceed the percentage increase in population and inflation. Also, surplus revenues must be returned to taxpayers by revision of tax rates or fee schedules within two fiscal years. The California limit is unusual in that it is defined in terms of state population increase and inflation. It is not de- fined as a maximum allowable percentage rate of growth in state government appropriations (as in Colorado), the average rate of growth of state appropriations over a previous period (as in Hawaii), or as a percentage of state personal income (as in Arizona). Alaska is the only other state that has a limit defined in terms similar to that of California.

#### Alaska can afford to undertake a project of this size - their economy has not faltered, recession proves.

Forgey ’10

Alaska's economy powers through recession Posted: Tuesday, August 24, 2010 By PAT FORGEY <http://juneauempire.com/stories/082410/sta_699586622.shtml>. Retrieved June 25, 2012.

With the nation still struggling to pull itself out of recession, Alaska is in the welcome - but decidedly unusual - position of having one of the nation's strongest economies**.** "We're a place of envy right now," said Neal Fried, a state labor economist who has watched the state's economy for decades. The state's unemployment rate in July dropped to 7.7 percent, down from 7.9 percent in June and from 8.1 percent in July of 2009. The national unemployment rate is at 9.5 percent, where it has hovered for more than a year. Alaska's boom-and-bust economy typically posts much higher unemployment rates than the national economy, Fried said. "This is the first time we've ever seen a [year] of the unemployment rate coming in below the national average," he said. Many of Alaska's industries have shown to be largely immune to the ongoing national recession, which has hit the manufacturing and construction sectors hardest. Fishing, oil, government and mining are all important Alaska industries that are evading the impacts of the recession**.** "When you look at what makes our economy tick, its largely different than the national average," Fried said. Some parts of the economy, such as manufacturing and real estate, faltered elsewhere but not in Alaska. Alaska's tiny manufacturing sector is holding up well, mostly due to the thriving seafood industry, Fried said. The continued strength of seafood prices, even in the face of a recession, is somewhat remarkable, said Eric Norman, vice-president and general manager at Taku Fisheries/Smokeries in Juneau. "It's a little bit of a surprise to us the levels that fish prices have gone to, especially halibut and black cod," Norman said. Despite the higher prices, they can still move what they can bring in, even with the recession. "We've gotten some comments out the market but they're still playing ball," he said. That's meant full employment for a big crew, as many as 100 workers. A solid salmon season has helped, as well. is today, but while ours slowed, we haven't had the balloon pop that others have had," Fried said. High oil prices have also benefited the state in a big way, providing strong employment in the industry, though they are down. ANS West Coast crude enjoyed an average spot price of $133.78 a barrel in June 2008, according to information on the Alaska Deartment of Revenue's website.

#### Low unemployment in Alaska

Fried ’12

Neal Fried, Economist. Research and Analysis Web site: laborstats.alaska.gov. State of Alaska Department of Labor and Workforce Development. June 15, 2012. Retrieved June 25, 2012.

[Alaska’s seasonally adjusted unemployment rate for May was 7.0 percent, and the national rate was 8.2 percent. Both rates were essentially unchanged from April, up one-tenth of a percent- age point. The rates for both Alaska and the U.S. remain well below their year-ago levels**.** Alaska’s rate is also below its historical average, and it remains lower than the rates in most states**.** In April (the most recent month available for all states), 28 states had higher rates, 19 had lower rates and two were the same as Alaska. State rates ranged from a low of 3.0 percent in North Dakota to a high of 11.7 percent in Nevada. Alaska was one of only seven states that had more jobs in April than in December 2007, the start of the recent recession. Nationally, the job count is still 5 million lower than it was in 2007. Regional rates, which are not seasonally ad- justed, were down in four of six regions. This is typical in May as seasonal work picks up. Two examples are Skagway and the Denali Borough — both major tourist destinations and homes to national parks. Skagway had one of the state’s highest unemployment rates in April at 15.4 percent, and then one of the lowest in May at 3.6 percent. Denali’s rate dropped from 16.2 percent in April to 7.6 percent in May. The highest jobless rate was 21.8 percent in the Wade Hampton Census Area, which tends to have high unemployment year-round.](http://www.businessweek.com/ap/2012-06/D9VDO94G0.htm)

#### Alaska should build its own polar icebreaker

Epler 12

Patti, Alaska Dispatch Jun 21, 2011 <http://www.alaskadispatch.com/article/should-alaska-build-its-own-arctic-icebreaker> Should Alaska build its own Arctic icebreaker? 6/28/12 TL

Anchorage Sen. Lesil McGuire thinks the state should build its own Polar-class icebreaker, much like the U.S. Coast Guard uses for Arctic patrols. The Coast Guard's two "heavy" icebreakers are out of commission right now, and the service is relying on one "medium" icebreaker -- primarily a scientific research vessel -- for anything that's needed in the Arctic. The problem? Repairing or retrofitting an icebreaker costs hundreds of millions of dollars. Building a new one? Even more. Congress has been reluctant to commission a new ship due to the high cost. An April report by the Congressional Research Service put the pricetag of a new icebreaker at about $1 billion, $500 million to fix up one of the existing ships enough to last another 25 years. The heavy icebreakers have been in service more than 30 years. McGuire, addressing the Arctic Imperative Conference that ended Tuesday night, called the icebreaker a "key part of the Arctic," saying the Alaska Legislature should pay for one itself, using some of the billions of dollars the state has socked away in various budget reserve accounts. The ship could be used for search and rescue operations and help in oil spill response, among other things. It's one of those big Alaska dreams, the kind Wally Hickel used to propose. McGuire didn’t address who would operate the ship or what exactly it would do when it wasn't needed to save a tour boat trapped in the ice.

### **Ext – Alaska wants to do it**

#### No link to Alaska politics – they think the CP will save them money

Alaska Dispatch ’12.

Alex DeMarban | Jun 15, 2012. The Alaska Dispatch. http://www.alaskadispatch.com/article/begich-murkowski-buy-more-time-ill-fated-us-icebreaker

The U.S. Coast Guard on Friday gave a six-month stay of execution to the Polar Sea, one of only three icebreakers owned by the U.S. government, Alaska's senators said in a written statement. The scrapping of the ship, previously set for Monday, is postponed until year's end, according to an agreement involving the Coast Guard and Alaska Sens. Lisa Murkowski and Mark Begich, and Sen. Maria Cantwell of Washington. The promise followed a meeting with Admiral Robert Papp, Jr., Coast Guard commandant, a written statement from the senators said. The senators, [along with Rep. Don Young](http://www.alaskadispatch.com/article/should-alaska-take-lead-financing-new-icebreakers), R-Alaska, have fought to boost the nation's hobbled icebreaking force, as climate change and melting ice increase maritime traffic and resource-extraction efforts in the Far North. Young has tried to save the 400-foot-long Polar Sea by introducing a bill requiring that the Coast Guard gauge whether private companies want to operate it.    While other countries are boosting their Arctic naval forces, the U.S. operates only one active icebreaker, the 420-foot Healy, a medium-duty ship home-ported in Seattle. The two U.S. heavy-duty icebreakers capable of powering through thicker sea ice, including the Polar Sea, have long been out of commission. The also-disabled Polar Star is being refitted and is set to return to service in a year, the statement said. Cantwell said the ship's hull remains in good shape, and that refurbishing it would create jobs in her state of Washington. Murkowski said she plans to keep working on a solution to boost the country's icebreaking ability. Begich said he'll work to see the Polar Sea refurbished and back in action.“Rebuilding this valuable cutter would save taxpayer dollars, create jobs, and increase our ability to operate in the Arctic," he said.

## CP - Canada

#### Text: Canada should use its ice-breakers to perform the functions of the plan.

#### Canada has enough ice-breakers

O’Rourke 6/14

Specialist in Naval Affairs, Congressional Research Service, Quote from July 2010 Coast Guard High Latitude Study,“Coast Guard Polar Icebreaker Modernization: Background and Issues for Congress,” <http://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc85474/>

Regarding the first two factors above, some observers note the size of the polar icebreaking fleets operated by other countries. Countries with interests in the polar regions have differing requirements for polar icebreakers, depending on the nature and extent of their polar activities. According to one source, as of January 2009, Russia had a fleet of 25 polar icebreakers (including 6 active heavy icebreakers, 2 heavy icebreakers in caretaker status, 15 other icebreakers, and 2 additional icebreakers leased from the Netherlands); Finland and Sweden each had 7 polar icebreakers; and Canada had 6.44

#### Canada could do the plan in US waters

Morgan 11

Spring, LT Benjamin Morgan has served in the U.S. Coast Guard for nine years, including tours aboard domestic and polar icebreakers and in waterways management, “Domestic Icebreaking Operations,” http://www.uscg.mil/proceedings/Spring2011/articles/39\_Morgan.pdf

The USCG and Canadian Coast Guard keep each other advised on the location and status of icebreaking facilities/ assets and coordinate operations to keep critical waterways open for commerce. A cooperative agreement between our two nations allows the assets from one country to conduct icebreaking operations in the territorial waters of the other, as necessary.

#### Canada will let us use their routes

Flemming 08

(Brian Flemming, Fellow of the Canadian Defence & Foreign Affairs Institute and Honorary Fellow, Marine and Environmental Law Program Dalhousie Law School, “Canada-U.S. Relations in the Arctic: A Neighbourly Proposal” Canadian Defence & Foreign Affairs Institute. December 2008. Page 2. Accessed 6/25/12.

http://www.cdfai.org/PDF/Canada-U.S.%20Relations%20in%20the%20Arctic%20%20A%20Neighbourly%20Proposal.pdf) WK

Most importantly, Canada’s closest neighbour and ally, the United States of America, not only challenges Canada’s claim that the North West Passage runs mostly through Canadian “internal waters,” but also worries – behind the scenes in a post-9/11 world – about the security holes a warming Arctic may punch in the perimeter protecting North America from violent extremists, illegal immigrants or drug lords.6 The swearing in of a new American administration in 2009 under president-elect Barack Obama will give Canada an unparalleled opportunity to cooperate more closely with America in scientific studies in the Arctic and perhaps allow the two countries to negotiate a new legal regime for the North West Passage, a regime that will accommodate key foreign policy goals in both Ottawa and Washington. Indeed, in the summer of 2008, the following statement by Obama was posted on the Internet:

#### Canada possesses a state of the art icebreaker that can give them access to arctic sovereignty, economic development, and environmental protection.

CCG 12

(Canadian Coast Guard “The CCGS John G. Diefenbaker National Icebreaker Project” 4/17/12. Accessed 6/25/12. http://www.ccg-gcc.gc.ca/e0010762) WK

CCGS John G. Diefenbaker is one of the centerpieces of the Government of Canada’s high profile Northern Strategy, which focuses on strengthening Canada’s Arctic sovereignty, economic and social development, governance, and environmental protection. The new vessel will be the pride of Canada’s Coast Guard fleet. It will possess greater icebreaking capabilities than any other vessel currently in the Canadian fleet. When completed, this ship will replace CCGS Louis S. St-Laurent, which is expected to be decommissioned in 2017. “We are going to harness the energy and expertise of Government, the Canadian Coast Guard, the Canadian Navy, Canadian shipbuilders and all the communities that support these institutions,” Prime Minister Harper said. The new icebreaker will provide the Canadian Coast Guard with increased coverage in the Canadian Arctic and adjacent waters and will be able to operate for three seasons in the Arctic, over a larger area and in more difficult ice conditions. By comparison, CCGS Louis S. St-Laurent is able to operate in the Arctic for two seasons

#### Canada has a new ship capable of withstanding 7 feet of ice for 270 days.

Felix 12

(Robert Felix, full time Ice age researcher and writer, author of the book *Not by Fire but by Ice,* “Canada’s new icebreaker able to operate “in more difficult conditions”” 3/11/12. http://iceagenow.info/2012/03/canadas-icebreaker-operate-in-difficult-conditions/ Accessed 6/25/12) WK

“Aker Arctic Technology of Finland will be joining a team led by STX Canada Marine, to design the Canadian Coast Guard’s future flagship, the CCGS John G. Diefenbaker,” says this article on IANSlive. Several stories tall and able to accommodate 100 personnel, the new vessel “will be able to operate autonomously for 270 days in the Arctic, over a larger area and in more difficult conditions than any of Canada’s current icebreakers.” “The new ship will be able to break through 2.5 metres (7 feet) of ice at three knots, according to a statement of Good News, a Finland based news portal.”

## CP – Consult the Inuits

#### Text: The United States federal government should enter into binding consultation with the Inuit Circumpolar Council over…

#### The Inuits demand consultation before agreeing to allow use of Arctic territory – they’ll say yes, and their cooperation is key to solve the environment impacts – Russia is doing it, which proves its possible

Norrell 11

Brenda, Feburary 18, “Wikileaks: The Arctic belongs to the Inuit,” http://narcosphere.narconews.com/notebook/brenda-norrell/2011/02/wikileaks-arctic-belongs-inuit/

While diplomats debated who owns the Arctic and what to do about melting ice, climate change, shipping and the impending spread of oil and gas development, Inuit brought their own message to the Arctic Ocean Conference in 2008. "Much of the Arctic belongs to the Inuit," Aqqaluk Lynge, vice president of the Inuit Circumpolar Council (ICC) and now chair of the ICC, told the diplomats from five countries in 2008. Wikileaks now provides a new look at the closed door discussions at the inaugural Arctic Ocean Conference, held in Ilulissat, Greenland May 27 — May 29, 2008. At the conference, Canada, Denmark, Norway, Russia and the United States, discussed environmental regulation, maritime security, mineral exploration, polar oil oversight, and transportation. The Ilulissat Declaration was the result. The Wikileaks cable provides the United States' perspective on the closed door talks. The cable includes Inuit statements on sovereignty and the necessity for Inuit consultation in decision making. The cable also includes Russia's statement on Russia's priority to Indigenous Peoples in policy making. The cable was written by US Ambassador James Cain in Copenhagen. (Full names have been added in parenthesis.) The Cable: US Ambassador Cain states, "(Inuit Aqqaluk) Lynge emphasized colonial errors of the past (including relocation of indigenous people from a community near Thule AFB) and asserted that 'all Inuit own the Arctic.' "Asked by (Danish Foreign Minister Per Stig) Moeller whether he was afraid of new opportunities in the Arctic, Lynge replied 'we are not afraid of anything when we are included in the response.' He cited increased cooperation with U.S. researchers as positive and concluded that 'we need your assistance and you need our (traditional) knowledge,'" the cable states. "Canadian minister (of natural resources Gary) Lunn lauded Inuit cultural respect for the environment and said that while continental shelf territorial claims could only be handled by sovereign states, local and indigenous residents of the Arctic should be involved in decision-making. "(Russian Foreign Minister Sergei) Lavrov asked Lynge whether existing Arctic institutions needed to be modified. Lynge urged greater indigenous participation in all Arctic institutions," the cable states. Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov led the Russian delegation. Lavrov is quoted in the US cable. "On indigenous participation, Lavrov claimed Russia listened 'attentively' to concerns of indigenous residents of the Russian Arctic, saying that protection of indigenous rights is 'integral' to Russian Arctic policy." The cable says the conference was a Danish initiative, in response to the "Race for the Arctic." Inuit on Sovereignty and Climate Change Later, in November of 2008, Lynge, president of the Greenland chapter of the Inuit Circumpolar Council (ICC) in 2008, stressed the importance of including Inuit in any negotiations among governments regarding sovereignty of the Arctic Ocean, according to an ICC press statement. Lynge, said that the new question of who owns the Arctic is an old one for Inuit. “We debated this with our former colonizers and polar explorers who drew the maps and named places," Lynge said. "The debate is reignited because of the anticipated acceleration of resource development in the Arctic as a result of the global warming." The issue of geographic names and sovereignty was mentioned as an issue for Lynge when he told the ministers that place names now known as Hans Island (Tartupaluk) and Ellesmere Island (Umimmaat Nunaat) continue to have Inuit names and, in fact in the past the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, explorers, and others could not travel in the Arctic without the assistance of Inuit. “The debate became most intense over the past few decades when we negotiated various self government arrangements” with the respective countries now claiming the Arctic. Lynge called upon the foreign ministers to respect the land claims and self-government arrangements they have negotiated with Inuit. ICC announced that a pan-Inuit meeting would be held in Kuujjuaq, Canada in November, 2008, in which Inuit leaders would determine how they should collectively respond to the increasing debate about who owns the Arctic, whose ships will be allowed to traverse and benefit from it, and how to collectively protect its environment from potential disaster. ICC is the organization that represents the 160,000 Inuit living in Russia, Alaska, Canada, and Greenland on matters of international concern. After the Arctic Ocean Conference, in November of 2008, Inuit leaders from Greenland, Alaska, and Canada met in Kuujjuaq and developed an "Inuit Declaration on Sovereignty in the Arctic." Inuit: Sovereignty and Climate Change There was a two-day Inuit Leader’s Summit on Arctic Sovereignty in Kuujjuaq. Patricia Cochran, Chair of Inuit Circumpolar Council (ICC) said, "Sovereignty is a complex issue. It has a variety of overlapping elements, anchored in international law. But fundamentally it begins with the history and reality of Inuit use and occupation of Arctic lands and waters; that use and occupation is at the heart of any informed discussion of sovereignty in the Arctic. Arctic nation states must respect the rights and roles of Inuit in all international discussions and commitments dealing with the Arctic," according to ICC's Nov. 10th press statement from this gathering. "Climate change has moved Arctic sovereignty to the front of the international agenda. We have all seen the escalating speculation about how drastic reduction of ice coverage will open the Arctic waterways to increased shipping traffic and expedited oil and gas development. "Leaders agreed that the pursuit of resources through an agenda of Arctic sovereignty must involve coordinated strategies to ensure the Arctic has viable and healthy communities, sound civil administration, and responsible environmental management, not just ports, training facilities, and military exercises. “One clear message from the convening of our meeting is that for all sorts of reasons - law, politics, and the very practical reason that the world stands to learn the most about the Arctic from the people who know the Arctic best - Inuit have an essential role in international discussions about arctic waters, marine transportation plans, environmental initiatives and mechanisms, and the future of international Arctic institutions and relations generally,” added Ms. Cochran. US Conclusion: Hyperbole 'Race for the Arctic' is over Meanwhile, US Ambassador Cain's diplomatic cable ends with the usual hyperbole, in a reference to the press conference, and claims the 'Race to the Arctic' was over. The cable states, "Asked if the 'race for the Arctic' had ended in Ilulissat, (Denmark's Foreign Minister) Moeller gave an emphatic 'Yes,' and (Canadian) minister Lunn called out 'it never started!,' concluding the exchange with the press." In his final comments, Cain admits that the conclusion of the conference was never in doubt, since the final agreement was made in advance. He also adds a comment about Russian Foreign Minister Lavrov. "Conference outcomes were never in doubt, with the Ilulissat Declaration negotiated beforehand between all participants. FM Lavrov seemed keen to downplay Russian flag-planting and earn Russia credit for its search and rescue proposal."

#### The concepts of cultural and physical genocide are impossible to separate; both include social death which is the most catastrophic impact in the round.

Card 03

(Claudia [Emma Goldman Professor of Philosophy at the University of Wisconsin]; Genocide and Social Death; Hypatia 18.1 (2003) 63-79; kdf)

This essay develops the hypothesis that social death is utterly central to the evil of genocide, not just when a genocide is primarily cultural but even when it is homicidal on a massive scale. It is social death that enables us to distinguish the peculiar evil of genocide from the evils of other mass murders. Even genocidal murders can be viewed as extreme means to the primary end of social death. Social vitality exists through relationships, contemporary and intergenerational, that create an identity that gives meaning to a life. Major loss of social vitality is a loss of identity and consequently a serious loss of meaning for one's existence. Putting social death at the center takes the focus off individual choice, individual goals, individual careers, and body counts, and puts it on relationships that create community and set the context that gives meaning to choices and goals. If my hypothesis is correct, the term "cultural genocide" is probably both redundant and misleading—redundant, if the social death present in all genocide implies cultural death as well, and misleading, if "cultural genocide" suggests that some genocides do not include cultural death. 1. What Is Feminist about Analyzing Genocide? The question has been asked, what is feminist about this project? 1 Why publish it in a journal devoted to feminist philosophy? The answer is both simple and [End Page 63] complex. Simply, it is the history behind the project and the perspective from which it is carried out, rather than a focus on women or gender, that make the project feminist. Some of the complexities are as follows. The evil of genocide falls not only on men and boys but also on women and girls, typically unarmed, untrained in defense against violence, and often also responsible for care of the wounded, the sick, the disabled, babies, children, and the elderly. Because genocide targets both sexes, rather than being specific to women's experience, there is some risk of its being neglected in feminist thought. It is also the case that with few exceptions (for example, Schott 1999; Card 1996 and 1997), both feminist and nonfeminist philosophical reflections on war and other public violence have tended to neglect the impact on victims. Philosophers have thought mostly about the positions of perpetrators and decision-makers (most of them men), with some feminist speculation on what might change if more women were among the decision-makers and if women were subject to military conscription. The damage of war and terrorism is commonly assessed in terms of its ruin of individual careers, body counts, statistics on casualties, and material costs of rebuilding. Attention goes to preventing such violence and the importance of doing so, but less to the experience and responses of the majority of victims and survivors, who are civilians, not soldiers. In bringing to the fore the responses of victims of both sexes, holocaust literature stands in sharp contrast to these trends. Central to holocaust literature is reflection on the meaning of genocide. Women's Studies, in its engagement with differences among women, has moved from its earlier aim to train a feminist eye on the world and all kinds of issues (such as evil) to the more limited aim of studying women and gender. I return here to the earlier conception that recognizes not only the study of women, feminism, or gender, but feminist approaches to issues of ethics and social theory generally, whether the word "feminist" is used or not. My interests move toward commonalities in our experiences of evil, not only commonalities among women differently situated but commonalities shared with many men as well. Yet my lens is feminist, polished through decades of reflection on women's multifarious experiences of misogyny and oppression. What we notice, through a feminist lens, is influenced by long habits of attending to emotional response, relationships that define who we (not just women and girls) are, and the significance of the concrete particular. Centering social death accommodates the position, controversial among genocide scholars, that genocidal acts are not always or necessarily homicidal (more below). Forcibly sterilizing women or men of a targeted group or forcibly separating their children from them for re-education for assimilation into another group can also be genocidal in aim or effect. 2 Such policies can be aimed at or achieve the eventual destruction of the social identity of those so treated. It may appear that transported children simply undergo change in [End Page 64] social identity, not that they lose all social vitality. That may be the intent. Yet, parents' social vitality is a casualty of children's forced re-education, and in reality, transported children may fail to make a satisfying transition. The holocaust was not only a program of mass murder but an assault on Jewish social vitality. The assault was experienced by hidden children who survived as well as by those who died. Hitler's sterilization program and Nuremberg laws that left German Jews stateless were parts of the genocide, not just preludes to it. Jews who had converted to Christianity (or whose parents or grandparents had done so) were hunted down and murdered, even though one might think their social identities had already changed. 3 This pursuit makes a certain perverted sense if the idea was to extinguish in them all possibility of social vitality, simply on grounds of their ancestral roots. Mass murder is the most extreme method of genocide, denying members of targeted groups any degree or form of social vitality whatever. To extinguish all possibility of social vitality, child transportation and re-education are insufficient; it may be necessary to commit mass murder or drive victims mad or rob them of self-respect, all of which were done to holocaust victims. Although I approach genocide from a history of feminist habits of research and reflection, I say very little here about the impact of genocide on women and girls as opposed to its impact on men and boys. I would not suggest that women suffer more or worse than the men who are also its victims. Nor am I especially interested in such questions as whether lifelong habits of caregiving offer survival advantages to segregated women. (In fact, the evidence appears to be that no one survives without others' care and help.) My interest here is, rather, in what makes genocide the specific evil that it is, what distinguishes it from other atrocities, and what kinds of atrocities are rightly recognized as genocidal. Feminist habits of noticing are useful for suggesting answers to these questions. 2. Genocide, War, and Justice Genocide need not be part of a larger war, although it commonly is. But it can be regarded as itself a kind of one-sided war. Precedents for regarding one-sided attacks as wars are found in the idea of a "war on drugs" and in the title of Lucy Dawidowicz's The War against the Jews (1975). If genocide is war, it is a profoundly unjust kind of war, perniciously unjust, an injustice that is also an evil. John Rawls (1999) opened his first book on justice with the observation that justice is the first virtue of institutions as truth is of systems of thought. No matter how efficient and well-arranged, he wrote, laws and institutions must be reformed or abolished if they are unjust (3).

## CP – Privatization

#### Privatizing the fleet solves all your advantages

Davis 11

Tyler, December 9, 2011 The Heritage Foundation, http://blog.heritage.org/2011/12/09/the-lone-icebreaker-u-s-sovereignty-in-the-arctic/

The United States Coast Guard is being left behind in the Arctic. While countries such as Russia are building up their icebreaker fleet and actively increasing their presence in the Arctic, the United States is losing its only form of sovereignty in the region. On December 1, Rear Admiral Jeffrey M. Garrett, U.S. Coast Guard, testified before Congress on protecting U.S. sovereignty in the Arctic. He stated in Second Line of Defense that “the Icebreaker fleet represents the main surface presence that the U.S. can exert in what is essentially a maritime domain in the Arctic Ocean.” Yet today, the Coast Guard has an icebreaker fleet of only three ships. Worse yet, two of these ships are out of commission due to maintenance work and will not be available for at least seven more years. The lone icebreaker in commission is the USCGC Healy, which conducts all types of missions from search and rescue to navigational aid to scientific research. Though the ship has been effective at its job in the Arctic, it is designed to break through ice of only medium thickness; for ice of heavy thickness, the Healy is absolutely useless. And like the other two icebreakers, it is quickly aging. Without efforts to modernize the fleet, the future of the U.S. national maritime interest and security in the Arctic is looking pretty bleak. Icebreakers are a necessity in the region, and without them the U.S. might as well throw in the towel. These ships are key to year-round access to the Arctic and are the only U.S. insurance policy for future hazardous events. If something happens to the Healy, then the United States would not only lose access to the region but would not be able to react to potential oil spills and would become less effective in search-and-rescue missions. Complicating matters even further, ice in the Arctic is melting, producing more ocean area for the transportation of goods and services in the region. Essentially, whoever best utilizes this route will control trade and transportation of goods and materials in the upper hemisphere. With all other nations around the Arctic building their icebreaker fleets and exploiting the key transportation route that connects the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, the United States is falling behind. In order to create an icebreaking fleet to maintain U.S. presence in the region, the Administration should look toward privatizing the fleet. Allowing private companies to own and operate the U.S. icebreaking fleet and perform national security functions would not only allow for crucial modernization but also save federal dollars and expand U.S. capabilities in the Arctic. This is particularly important at a time when the government is looking to cut corners in federal spending. Ultimately, something must be done. If the U.S. does not act fast, it will come in last in the race for the Arctic.

#### CP key to avoid spending link

Demarban 2012

Alex DeMarban Apr 11, 2012 , Alaska Dispatch. “Should Alaska take the lead in financing new icebreakers?” Accessed on 6/28/12 http://www.alaskadispatch.com/article/should-alaska-take-lead-financing-new-icebreakers

He continues: "Given the current fiscal climate in D.C., funding the acquisition of new vessels presents a significant challenge. It is clear that we must consider creative financing and ownership options to move forward." In addition to helping bankroll the project, the state should also think about owning an icebreaker with private firms. The state could refurbish the Polar Sea or the Polar Star. It could then lease its icebreakers to the Coast Guard and National Science Foundation, wrote Young.

#### Private companies build the ships now anyway

O’Rourke 6/14

Specialist in Naval Affairs, Congressional Research Service, “Coast Guard Polar Icebreaker Modernization: Background and Issues for Congress,” <http://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc85474/>

The nation’s fourth polar icebreaker is Nathaniel B. Palmer, which was built for the NSF in 1992 by North American Shipbuilding, of Larose, LA. The ship, called Palmer for short, is owned by Edison Chouest Offshore (ECO) of Galliano, LA, a firm that owns and operates research ships and offshore deepwater service ships.14 NSF uses a contractor, Raytheon Polar Services Company (RPSC), to lease the ship from ECO.15

#### Private building and leasing would solve the plan faster and cheaper – prefer our evidence from the Commandant of the Coast Guard

O’Rourke 6/14

Specialist in Naval Affairs, Congressional Research Service, Quote from July 2010 Coast Guard High Latitude Study,“Coast Guard Polar Icebreaker Modernization: Background and Issues for Congress,” <http://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc85474/>

Another potential issue for Congress is whether future polar icebreakers should be acquired through a traditional acquisition (i.e., the government procuring the ship and owning it throughout its service life) or through a leasing arrangement (under which the icebreakers would be privately built and privately owned, leased to the Coast Guard, and crewed by an all-Coast Guard crew or a mix of Coast Guard personnel and civilian mariners). Factors to consider in assessing this issue include the comparative costs of the two options and the potential differences between them in terms of factors such as average number of days of operation each year and capability for performing various missions. Comparing the potential costs of leasing versus purchasing a capital asset often involves, among other things, calculating the net present value of each option. At a December 1, 2011, hearing that focused on the polar icebreaker fleet (see “December 1, 2011, Hearing” in “Background”), Admiral Robert Papp, the Commandant of the Coast Guard, stated: As far as we can determine, there are no icebreakers available—no heavy icebreakers available for leasing right now. They would have to be constructed [and then leased]. If we were to lease an icebreaker, I’m sure that a company building an icebreaker outside of the government does not have to contend with the same federal acquisition rules that we have to if we were to construct an icebreaker. It could probably be done quicker. Personally, I’m ambivalent in terms of how we get an icebreaker for the Coast Guard. We’ve done the legal research. If we lease an icebreaker, we can put a Coast Guard crew on it and still have it as a U.S. vessel supporting U.S. sovereignty. But the—but they aren’t available right now. And the other challenge that we face is the federal acquisition rules and [Office of Management and Budget Circular] A-11 requirements that [direct how to] score the money [in the budget] for leasing. We’d have to put up a significant amount of upfront money even with a lease that we don’t have room for within our budget currently.58 At another point in the hearing, Admiral Papp stated: We have looked at various business case scenarios, each and every time looking at, once again, from our normal perspective, the Coast Guard perspective, which has been owning ships forever. And generally, we keep ships 30-40 years or beyond. There is a point where leasing becomes more expensive, it’s at or about the 20-25-year timeline. I just don’t have the experience with leasing to be able to give you a good opinion on it. And once again, I'm ambivalent. We just need the icebreaking capability, I think it’s for people who can do the analysis, the proper analysis of—but also have to take into account the capabilities required and we need to get about the business of determining the exact capabilities that we need which would take into account National Science Foundation requirements, Coast Guard requirements, requirements to break-in at McMurdo, to come up with a capable ship.59 At another point in the hearing, he stated: As I said, sir, I am truly ambivalent to this except from what I experienced. I do have now two points, yes the Navy leases some ships, but we've got a Navy that has well over 300 ships. So if they lose a leased vessel or something is pulled back or something happens, they have plenty of other ships they can fall back upon. Right now, all I am falling back on is the Coast Guard cutter Healy. And it feels good to know that we own that and that is our ship for 30 or 40 years and we can rely upon it. In terms of leasing, I don't know. My personal experience is I lease one of my two cars and I pay a lot of money leasing my car. But at the end of the lease period, I have no car and I've spent a lot of money. So I don’t know if that’s directly applicable to ships as well, but right now I got half my garage is empty because I just turned one in.60 At another point in the hearing, he stated: We’ve looked through the legal considerations on this, as long as we have a Coast Guard crew. In fact, you can even make a mixed crew of civilians and Coast Guard people. But as long as it’s commanding by—commanded by [a] commissioned officer, you can assert sovereignty, you can take it into war zones and, in fact, the Navy does that as well.61 Another witness at the hearing—Mead Treadwell, the lieutenant governor of Alaska—stated: [Regarding] The issue of the ships, the company that is building these ships for Shell [Oil] has visited with me and other state officials, and that’s why you heard us say in our testimony that we think the leasing option should be considered. We don’t have a way to judge the relative cost. But if on the face of it, it seems like it may be a way to get us the capability that the admiral needs.62

## CP – Incremental Funding

#### Incremental funding CP solves Coast Guard budget trade-off DA

O’Rourke 6/14

Specialist in Naval Affairs, Congressional Research Service, Quote from July 2010 Coast Guard High Latitude Study,“Coast Guard Polar Icebreaker Modernization: Background and Issues for Congress,” <http://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc85474/>

Supporters of using incremental funding to acquire a new polar icebreaker could argue that funding this ship in a single year would create a one-year “spike” in Coast Guard funding requirements that could require offsetting and potentially disruptive one-year reductions in other Coast Guard programs, and that using incremental funding mitigates the spiking issue by spreading the ship’s cost over several years. Supporters could argue that avoiding such budget spikes is a principal reason why the Navy in recent years has been given permission by OMB and Congress to use incremental funding to procure aircraft carriers and amphibious assault ships,48 and that a polar icebreaker is analogous to an aircraft carrier or an amphibious assault ship in being a very expensive (for the Coast Guard) ship that is procured once every several years.

#### Fiat means immediate full funding – it’s the only way to guarantee durable support

O’Rourke 6/14

Specialist in Naval Affairs, Congressional Research Service, Quote from July 2010 Coast Guard High Latitude Study,“Coast Guard Polar Icebreaker Modernization: Background and Issues for Congress,” <http://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc85474/>

Supporters of using full funding to acquire a new polar icebreaker could argue that the acquisition cost of a polar icebreaker (roughly $900 million), though large by Coast Guard standards, is much less than that of an aircraft carrier (more than $11 billion) or an amphibious assault ship (more than $3 billion). They could argue that OMB believes using full funding reduces risks in the acquisition of capital assets,49 and that permitting the use of incremental funding for the procurement of a polar icebreaker could weaken adherence to the policy by setting a precedent for using incremental funding for acquiring other capital assets costing less than $1 billion.