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#### Oil drilling is limited in the US now.

Vick 3/5 (Vanessa Vicky, staff writer. New York Times. “Offshore Drilling and Exploration” http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/o/offshore\_drilling\_and\_exploration/index.html, 5 March 2012, JGR)

On March 31, 2010, President Obama proposed to open vast expanses of American coastlines to oil and natural gas drilling, much of it for the first time, in an apparent bid to win political support for energy and climate legislation. But that idea &mdash; which prompted distress among environmentalists and tepid support from Republicans &mdash; was sharply set back by the massive oil slick created in the Gulf of Mexico in April 2010 after a drilling rig exploded and sank off the Louisiana coast, killing 11 workers and leaving four others critically injured. A leak in a pipe a mile deep [that] spewed out what the government eventually estimated to be nearly five million barrels of oil into the Gulf of Mexico, making it the largest accidental spill in history. In response to the spill, the administration put in place a moratorium on deepwater oil and gas drilling, a step that came as a blow to the oil industry and angered Gulf Coast communities dependent on offshore drilling for jobs and income. In October, the administration announced that it was ending the moratorium and issuing new rules that tighten standards for well design, blowout preventers, safety certification, emergency response and worker training. In December 2010, pulling back further from Mr. Obama’s original proposal, the administration rescinded its decision to expand offshore oil exploration into the eastern Gulf of Mexico and along the Atlantic Coast. Drilling would remain under a moratorium for those areas for at least the next seven years, until stronger safety and environmental standards were in place. But drilling would continue in the central and western Gulf of Mexico, although under a new set of safeguards put in place after the deadly BP explosion and oil spill.

#### Republicans will expand oil drilling to pay for expanded transportation infrastructure.

LA Times 2/15 (LA Times. “House Republicans push new oil drilling to fund road projects” <http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/nationnow/2012/02/house-republicans-push-new-coastal-drilling-to-fund-road-projects.html>, 15 February 2012, JGR)

A measure that would allow new oil drilling off the Atlantic and Pacific coasts and open Alaska’s Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to energy exploration is headed for a vote in the Republican-controlled House -- but faces a gusher of opposition in the Senate. The energy legislation, which includes a measure designed to clear the way for the controversial Keystone XL pipeline project, is being considered in connection with the GOP-written $260-billion, five-year House transportation bill. The House, which began considering the energy legislation Wednesday, could complete action on it Thursday. Republicans say increased domestic energy production would generate jobs and revenue to help pay for traffic-easing projects at a time when gas tax funds have fallen. (Drivers are now motoring around in more fuel-efficient cars.) But the drilling measures face opposition in the Democratic-controlled Senate, especially from Sen. Barbara Boxer (D-Calif.), chairwoman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, who hails from a state where offshore drilling has been a hot issue since a devastating a 1969 spill off Santa Barbara. The White House also has objected to the measures, saying they would take away the Interior secretary’s discretion to determine "which areas are appropriate and safe'' for exploration. The administration also said that the provision to advance the Canada-to-Gulf Coast Keystone XL pipeline would "circumvent a long-standing process for determining whether cross-border pipelines are in the national interest." Though the legislation faces uncertain prospects, House Republicans, at the very least, hope to use Democratic opposition to expand drilling to highlight differences between the parties -- especially as high gas prices promise to become an election-year issue. "Prices will only climb higher if we don’t take action now to increase our energy independence and develop our own American energy resources," said Rep. Doc Hastings (R-Wash.), chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee. The bill would open up, within five years, areas off Southern California, the Eastern Seaboard and Alaska "considered to have the largest undiscovered, technically recoverable oil and gas resources." It also would permit new energy exploration off Santa Barbara and Ventura counties from existing offshore platforms, expand energy production in the Gulf of Mexico and promote oil shale development in the West.

#### More oil production crowds out alt energy.

Schneider 3/27 (Keith Schneider is senior editor of Circle of Blue. He is a former national correspondent and regular contributor to the New York Times. Yale Environment 360. “U.S. Fossil Fuel Boom Dims Glow of Clean Energy” <http://e360.yale.edu/feature/us_fossil_fuel_boom_dims_glow_of_clean_energy/2511/>, 29 March 2012, JGR)

How 20th century. The new narrative of American energy is this: We’ve been using less. A national boom in oil and gas production — spreading across 12 states, from California to Pennsylvania and North Dakota to Texas — is showing we have much more than we thought. And the clean energy economy, tiny by comparison and roiled by uncertain markets, is still decades away. No state embodies these trends more clearly than Ohio, which for years has been a modest oil and gas producer, and not long ago was widely viewed as a leader in passing legislation, promoting jobs, and installing manufacturing for a clean energy economy. Over the last year, though, everything in Ohio’s energy sector, like [of] the nation’s, has changed. A surge in tapping so-called unconventional gas and oil reserves locked in underground shale formations is helping drive a national economic recovery, elevating fossil fuel production to a top economic priority, and dimming the glow of clean energy in the U.S., especially in natural gas-rich states like Ohio. At night, on both sides of the upper Ohio River valley south of Pittsburgh, floodlights illuminate the table-flat summits of steep Appalachian ridges that now serve as production pads for natural gas wells and processing plants. Drilling rigs 18 stories tall are starting to tap huge reserves beneath 17,000 square miles of eastern and central Ohio. Early production results from Ohio’s Columbiana, Carroll, Harrison, and Belmont counties show the first completed wells are capable of producing millions of cubic feet of gas and more than 1,000 barrels of oil a day. Families are signing drilling leases that pay up to $5,800 an acre. Nearly $2 billion in new gas processing facilities have been announced for sites in the Ohio River Valley. The economy of the 145 miles of river from Pittsburgh to Marietta, for two generations a laboratory of industrial ruin, is perking up. “It’s fantastic what this could do for this region,” said Sharon Davis, who owns a restaurant in Sardis, Ohio, and recently received up to $5,250 an acre for the 168 acres of minerals she and her family own in Monroe County. Meanwhile, a plan to build an offshore wind farm in Lake Erie, near Cleveland, has faltered. Another proposal to build a big wind farm in western Ohio was fought to a standstill by local residents, who filed a lawsuit that went all the way to the state Supreme Court. In January, one of the state’s prominent solar manufacturing companies laid off half its workforce, and the chairman and founder of a second solar company resigned, leaving a skeletal staff and big debts. Cardinal Fastener, the Cleveland company that supplied bolts to wind turbine manufacturers, and which was visited by President-elect Obama in January 2009, declared bankruptcy last June, laid off most of the staff, and then was bought in November by a German manufacturer. “The energy picture has changed dramatically,” said Eric Burkland, president of the Ohio Manufacturers’ Association. “The price of electrical power is low. The price of natural gas is low. It’s changed the thinking on all alternative technologies. It’s affecting solar. You could say it’s taking “the wind out of wind.”

#### Continued fossil fuel consumption leads to runaway warming – brink is now – alt energy is key.

Harvey 11 (Fiona Harvey is an environment correspondent citing the International Energy Agency [IEA], an autonomous organization which works to ensure reliable, affordable and clean energy for its 28 member countries and beyond. The Guardian. [“World headed for irreversible climate change in five years, IEA warns” http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2011/nov/09/fossil-fuel-infrastructure-climate-change](%20), 9 November 2011, JGR)

The world is likely to build so many fossil-fuelled power stations, energy-guzzling factories and inefficient buildings in the next five years that it will become impossible to hold global warming to safe levels, and the last chance of combating dangerous climate change will be "lost forever", according to the most thorough analysis yet of world energy infrastructure. Anything built from now on that produces carbon will do so for decades, and this "lock-in" effect will be the single factor most likely to produce irreversible climate change, the world's foremost authority on energy economics has found. If this is not rapidly changed within the next five years, the results are likely to be disastrous. "The door is closing," Fatih Birol, chief economist at the International Energy Agency, said. "I am very worried – if we don't change direction now on how we use energy, we will end up beyond what scientists tell us is the minimum [for safety]. The door will be closed forever." If the world is to stay below 2C of warming, which scientists regard as the limit of safety, then emissions must be held to no more than 450 parts per million (ppm) of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere; the level is currently around 390ppm. But the world's existing infrastructure is already producing 80% of that "carbon budget", according to the IEA's analysis, published on Wednesday. This gives an ever-narrowing gap in which to reform the global economy on to a low-carbon footing. If current trends continue, and we go on building high-carbon energy generation, then by 2015 at least 90% of the available "carbon budget" will be swallowed up by our energy and industrial infrastructure. By 2017, there will be no room for manoeuvre at all – the whole of the carbon budget will be spoken for, according to the IEA's calculations. Birol's warning comes at a crucial moment in international negotiations on climate change, as governments gear up for the next fortnight of talks in Durban, South Africa, from late November. "If we do not have an international agreement, whose effect is put in place by 2017, then the door to [holding temperatures to 2C of warming] will be closed forever," said Birol. But world governments are preparing to postpone a speedy conclusion to the negotiations again. Originally, the aim was to agree a successor to the 1997 Kyoto protocol, the only binding international agreement on emissions, after its current provisions expire in 2012. But after years of setbacks, an increasing number of countries – including the UK, Japan and Russia – now favour postponing the talks for several years. Both Russia and Japan have spoken in recent weeks of aiming for an agreement in 2018 or 2020, and the UK has supported this move. Greg Barker, the UK's climate change minister, told a meeting: "We need China, the US especially, the rest of the Basic countries [Brazil, South Africa, India and China] to agree. If we can get this by 2015 we could have an agreement ready to click in by 2020." Birol said this would clearly be too late. "I think it's very important to have a sense of urgency – our analysis shows [what happens] if you do not change investment patterns, which can only happen as a result of an international agreement." Nor is this a problem of the developing world, as some commentators have sought to frame it. In the UK, Europe and the US, there are multiple plans for new fossil-fuelled power stations that would contribute significantly to global emissions over the coming decades. The Guardian revealed in May an IEA analysis that found emissions had risen by a record amount in 2010, despite the worst recession for 80 years. Last year, a record 30.6 gigatonnes (Gt) of carbon dioxide poured into the atmosphere from burning fossil fuels, a rise of 1.6Gt on the previous year. At the time, Birol told the Guardian that constraining global warming to moderate levels would be "only a nice utopia" unless drastic action was taken. The new research adds to that finding, by showing in detail how current choices on building new energy and industrial infrastructure are likely to commit the world to much higher emissions for the next few decades, blowing apart hopes of containing the problem to manageable levels. The IEA's data is regarded as the gold standard in emissions and energy, and is widely regarded as one of the most conservative in outlook – making the warning all the more stark. The central problem is that most industrial infrastructure currently in existence – the fossil-fuelled power stations, the emissions-spewing factories, the inefficient transport and buildings – is already contributing to the high level of emissions, and will do so for decades. Carbon dioxide, once released, stays in the atmosphere and continues to have a warming effect for about a century, and industrial infrastructure is built to have a useful life of several decades. Yet, despite intensifying warnings from scientists over the past two decades, the new infrastructure even now being built is constructed along the same lines as the old, which means that there is a "lock-in" effect – high-carbon infrastructure built today or in the next five years will contribute as much to the stock of emissions in the atmosphere as previous generations. The "lock-in" effect is the single most important factor increasing the danger of runaway climate change, according to the IEA in its annual World Energy Outlook, published on Wednesday. Climate scientists estimate that global warming of 2C above pre-industrial levels marks the limit of safety, beyond which climate change becomes catastrophic and irreversible. Though such estimates are necessarily imprecise, warming of as little as 1.5C could cause dangerous rises in sea levels and a higher risk of extreme weather – the limit of 2C is now inscribed in international accords, including the partial agreement signed at Copenhagen in 2009, by which the biggest developed and developing countries for the first time agreed to curb their greenhouse gas output. Another factor likely to increase emissions is the decision by some governments to abandon nuclear energy, following the Fukushima disaster. "The shift away from nuclear worsens the situation," said Birol. If countries turn away from nuclear energy, the result could be an increase in emissions equivalent to the current emissions of Germany and France combined. Much more investment in renewable energy will be required to make up the gap, but how that would come about is unclear at present.

## Internal Link

### Drilling Lowers Prices

#### Increased drilling lowers oil prices in tight markets.

Kreutzer 11 (David W. Kreutzer, Ph.D., is the Research Fellow in Energy Economics and Climate Change at The Heritage Foundation's Center for Data Analysis. “Three Policy Changes to Help with Gas Prices” <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/01/three-policy-changes-to-help-with-gasoline-prices>, 12 January 2011, JGR)

Relatively small changes in supply can have large impacts on price, especially when markets are tight. And tight markets are what caused the petroleum price spikes of 2008 and will cause them again if production is shut down while demand from a growing world economy squeezes the spare capacity the world has enjoyed for the past couple of years. The first and most obvious place to drill is where there are already drilling rigs and proven reserves—such as the Gulf of Mexico. Despite the majority recommendation of its own scientific panel, the Obama Administration stopped virtually all new drilling in the Gulf of Mexico. There have been recent signs that this policy might change. “Might” needs to be “will,” and soon. The Chukchi Sea, off the Alaskan coast, is estimated to hold[s] tens of billions of barrels of petroleum.[1] Bending to anti-energy pressure groups, the Obama Administration rescinded drilling permits that had already been issued on leases that had already been purchased—hobbling energy production and killing desperately needed local jobs. Putting Chukchi Sea development back on track would increase the oil supply and rejuvenate the local economy.

#### What do you know? Markets are tight now

Blewett 6/12 (Emily Blewett, CityWire Global. “Oil price to remain tight despite market turmoil, says Threadneedle's Donora” <http://citywire.co.uk/global/oil-price-to-remain-tight-despite-market-turmoil-says-threadneedles-donora/a595507>, 12 June 2012, JGR)

However, Donora believes there are still several fundamental factors underpinning commodity markets. 'Growing emerging market demand is structurally supportive not just for food but for energy, and this is positive for oil prices over the long term,' said Donora. 'With oil demand at around 91 million barrels a day, and only 2 million barrels a day of spare capacity, this is a major long-term issue.' This, alongside short-term political factors, he said, will mean oil markets will remain very tight.

#### Just announcing plans to drill will lower prices.

IBD 3/15 (Investor’s Business Daily. “Drill Our Way to Lower Oil Prices? Yes We Can!” <http://news.investors.com/article/604557/201203151838/oil-prices-drop-quickly-on-talk-of-petroleum-reserve-release.htm>, 15 March 2012, JGR)

As the Washington Post reported on Thursday, oil prices "dropped quickly ... on a news report that Britain and the United States would cooperate on a release of crude oil from strategic reserves." Got that? On a news report. No oil has been released. It's not even clear if any ever will, since the Obama administration can't get its story straight. And even if the Strategic Petroleum Reserve (SPR) were tapped, it would only be for a relatively small amount. Still, it was a glimmer of hope that Obama was actually taking the oil crisis seriously, instead of making excuses. And that was enough to knock $2 off the price of a barrel of oil. Clearly, markets respond to changes in policy, long before any oil actually reaches the tank. Yet Obama continues to peddle the fiction that drilling doesn't matter. In fact, at the very same time oil prices were falling, Obama was delivering his umpteenth speech about how the country has to stop clinging to the dream of low gas prices, because nothing we do in the short term can change anything, particularly not expanded drilling. He mocked the idea that "if we just drilled more for oil, then gas prices would immediately come down and all our problems would go away." The proof, he said was that "we are drilling" but prices are still high. Well, which do you think weighs more heavily on oil markets when determining prices? That oil companies have been able to boost production on private lands, despite Obama? Or Obama's thwarting of the industry whenever he's had the chance? Obama has cut production in public areas by 8%. He continually smears oil companies, and threatens them with $4 billion in new taxes. He reflexively kowtows to environmentalists by, among other things, killing the Keystone XL pipeline. And unless Obama puts a leash on his EPA, it's going to get much, much worse. A study released Thursday by the American Petroleum Institute found that the onerous gas and oil production rules the EPA is preparing will cut production by 37%. Meanwhile, oil markets are smart enough to know that Obama's claim that we can fix our energy problems by throwing billions of taxpayer dollars at politically correct "green" sources is pure folly. Even his own Energy Dept. admits that renewable energy will count for a fraction of the nation's supply as far out as 2035. To be clear, we oppose releasing oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, and if Obama were to do so, it would be a gross dereliction of duty. By law, the sole use of the reserve is to protect the country from a serious, short-term supply disruption, not to paper over Obama's policy failures in an election year. But Thursday's market swing makes it clear that Obama could lower oil prices today if he wanted. All he has to do is reverse course and put the country on a mission to tap into its incredibly vast supply of domestic oil.

#### More evidence – Oil prices will stay high until we expand drilling.

Driessen 11 (Paul Driessen is senior policy advisor for the Congress of Racial Equality and Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow. Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. “Drill here. Drill now. Drill ANWR.” <http://www.anwr.org/Latest-News/Drill-here.-Drill-now.-Drill-ANWR.php>, no date, but includes info about Nigerian sabotage of oil fields in delta region, which happened in April 2011 [<http://fuelfix.com/blog/2011/08/22/shell-6-oil-spills-sabotage-in-nigeria-delta/>], JGR)

Drilling is no silver bullet. But it is vital. It won’t generate overnight production. But just announcing that America is finally hunting oil again would send a powerful signal to energy markets … and to speculators – many of whom are betting that continued US drilling restrictions will further exacerbate the global demand-supply imbalance, and send “futures” prices even higher. Pro-drilling policies would likely bring lower prices, as did recent announcements that Brazil had found new offshore oil fields and Iraq would sign contracts to increase oil production. Conversely, news that supplies are tightening – because of sabotage in Nigeria’s delta region, or more congressional bans on leasing – will send prices upward.

### Low Oil Prices Kill Alt Energy

#### High oil prices trigger a move to renewable energy—this progress will grind to a halt if prices fall:

Steven Kyle, 12/16/2008 (staff writer, “For Alternative Energy's Sake--Keep Oil Prices High,”

<http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=keep-oil-prices-high>)

As oil and related energy prices soared to record highs over the past two years, interest in alternative fuels soared, too. Hybrid cars have appeared seemingly overnight, and proposals for solar, wind and other renewable technologies are being made everywhere. We need to remember, however, that all this action has one cause—high oil prices—and progress could grind to a halt if those prices fall again. It might seem ridiculous to worry about such a thing; don’t we all want to spend less on oil? And isn’t hoping for that just whistling in the dark? Not necessarily. At present, it is virtually axiomatic in the popular press that growth in demand from the U.S., China, India and elsewhere will keep oil prices high forevermore. But this common wisdom ignores the possibility of recession, or even depression, reducing demand growth to near zero, just as new drilling (mostly overseas) increases supply. Recession is already upon the U.S., and China’s economy is slowing rapidly. As Wall Street collapsed in October, oil prices dropped to around $70 a barrel. Saudi Arabia’s stated goal of maintaining a price floor of $80 a barrel or higher suddenly seemed optimistic. So what is the problem? In the short run, nothing. But sustained development of new energy sources always rests on the condition of the old ones. Coal did not arise as Europe’s main energy source until Europeans had cut down virtually all their forests for fuel, and the later switch to oil did not occur until the scarcity of coal drove its price high. In the 1970s Americans responded to high oil prices with alternative energy projects and more fuel-efficient cars. But when prices dropped in the 1980s, we threw caution to the wind—along with the energy projects. We purchased ever larger cars and SUVs and moved to ever more distant suburbs. Sure enough, now that oil prices have spiked again, we are looking at the same alternatives we had relegated to niche markets then.

#### High oil prices cause the shift to renewable energy—solving the impact of high oil prices in the long haul—the NEG scenario is the best of both worlds:

International Business Times, 5/30/2011 (“Why lower Saudi oil prices kill alternative energy,”

<http://www.ibtimes.com/articles/154524/20110530/saudi-arabia-oil.htm>)

The danger for oil producers like Saudi Arabia is that once a sustained period of high oil prices induces the Western private sector to invest the upfront costs of setting up alternative sources, the price of energy will be lowered permanently. The optimal strategy for Saudi Arabia, therefore, is to avoid a sustained period of high oil prices. For Western countries, the optimal strategy to bite the bullet, pay the upfront cost, and save money in the long-run with cheap alternative energy sources. Western capitalism, however, can be short-sighted and decentralized; if oil prices stay reasonablely low, not enough players in the private sector will have the resolve to eat the enormous upfront costs of developing alternative energy sources.

#### Lower oil prices undermine moves to alternative energy:

Robert Lenzner, 5/29/2011 (staff writer, Forbes, “Prince Alaweed Says Saudi Arabia Wants Oil Price $70-$80 A Barrel,”

<http://www.forbes.com/sites/robertlenzner/2011/05/29/prince-alaweed-says-saudi-arabia-wants-oil-price-70-80-a-barrel/>)

Prince Alaweed, a member of the Saudi Royal Family and the 26th wealthiest man in the world, told CNN today the oil kingdom would like to see oil prices decline to the $70-$80 a barrel level to forestall investment in alternative energy sources– and maintain Saudi Arabia’s strategic importance in the global economy.

#### Current surge in oil prices is creating lasting interest in renewable energy:

Tiffany Hsu, 3/15/11 (staff writer, Bellingham Herald, " Stung by oil prices, US may warm to oil alternatives ", http://www.bellinghamherald.com/2011/03/15/1917024/stung-by-oil-prices-us-may-warm.html)

LOS ANGELES The latest surge in oil prices may help the renewable energy industry reach a turning point after years of boom-and-bust cycles long dictated by the rise and fall in gas prices. Solar, wind and biofuel investors and analysts said the latest run-up in prices caused by unrest in Libya and other oil-producing nations could lead to lasting interest in alternate sources of energy. They point to several factors converging at the same time that give the industry such hope. Public awareness and worries about climate change, pollution and dwindling resources are at an all-time high. Government funding for alternative energy projects is also on the rise. "This is a crisis that's creating a teachable moment, showing us that we're going in the wrong direction," said Denise Bode, chief executive of the American Wind Energy Association. "People have been in this situation too many times, and once they see that the alternatives are the real deal, they'll never go back."

#### High oil prices cause shifts to renewable energy:

Economist, 2011 (March 3, 2011, “The 2011 oil shock,” <http://www.economist.com/node/18281774>)

At its worst, the danger is circular, with dearer oil and political uncertainty feeding each other. Even if that is avoided, the short-term prospects for the world economy are shakier than many realise. But there could be a silver lining: the rest of the world could at long last deal with its vulnerability to oil and the Middle East. The to-do list is well-known, from investing in the infrastructure for electric vehicles to pricing carbon. The 1970s oil shocks transformed the world economy. Perhaps a 2011 oil shock will do the same—at less cost.

#### Higher oil prices causes a shift to lower oil consumption:

The Economist, 3/3/2011 (“The price of fear,” <http://www.economist.com/node/18285768>)

Given enough time, the rich countries should be able to adjust to higher prices. Jim Burkhard of IHS Cera, a consultancy, notes that OECD oil demand peaked in 2005 and has been slipping since in response to the upward march of prices. In America a shift in consumer purchases towards more fuel-efficient vehicles, ethanol mandates and higher fuel-economy standards have all capped growth in petrol demand. Meanwhile, the higher world price has unlocked new supply within the United States, and elsewhere, which was previously too expensive to exploit.

#### Oil price declines to $60 to $70 a barrel would crush renewable technologies:

Steven Kyle, 12/16/2008 (staff writer, “For Alternative Energy's Sake--Keep Oil Prices High,”

<http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=keep-oil-prices-high>)

Today renewable technologies such as wind and solar are close to being competitive with fossil fuels. But we can say good-bye to that prospect if oil prices decline to $60 to $70 a barrel, which could easily happen in a recession, as we witnessed in October. Two years of lower prices can turn hybrid cars into a bad financial proposition for consumers, and green technology start-up companies could go bankrupt as demand for their goods dries up. Even a temporary decrease in petroleum prices would undermine the long-term development of the alternatives we all know we need.

#### The failure to develop adequate alternative energy supplies risks future wars for oil

Gerald **Kaufman, 2007** (May 2, 2007. Online. Internet. May 7, 2007. [http://www.sun-sentinel.com/news/opinion/letters/sfl-pb312may02,0,5136194.story?coll=sfla-news-letters](http://www.sun-sentinel.com/news/opinion/letters/sfl-pb312may02%2C0%2C5136194.story?coll=sfla-news-letters))

In my opinion, we are being governed by politicians who have been false to their obligations and therefore by definition are traitors. By not developing a comprehensive, credible plan to reduce our dependence on imported oil, we are in effect being encouraged to pollute our atmosphere, go to war for oil and enrich our enemies. This will continue until we demand action to remedy the situation. I challenge our elected officials to start a dialogue with their constituents and prove me wrong.

#### High oil prices will lead to solutions to global warming.

Steve A. **Yetiv, 2006** (San Diego Union-Tribune, February 6. Online. Lexis. Accessed February 10, 2008).

Fourth, high oil prices benefit the environment. Indeed, one study has shown that a broad energy tax on carbon content in fuels would reduce oil use and carbon emissions by over 10 percent. For that matter, vehicles that run on fuel cells emit only water and heat as waste, and hybrids emit more limited emissions than conventional vehicles. Since carbon emissions cause global warming -- a scientific fact rather than science fiction -- we should tip our hats to high oil prices, in this respect.

### Alt Energy K2 Warming

#### That kills any chance to solve warming.

Myhrvold and Caledeira 2/16 (Nathan Myhrvold of Intellectual Ventures and Carnegie Institution's Ken Caldeira. Science Daily. “[Only the Lowest Carbon Dioxide Emitting Technologies Can Avoid a Hot End-Of-Century” http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2012/02/120216095034.htm](Only%20the%20Lowest%20Carbon%20Dioxide%20Emitting%20Technologies%20Can%20Avoid%20a%20Hot%20End-Of-Century), 16 February 2012, JGR)

In each case, Myhrvold and Caldeira found that to achieve substantial benefit this century, we would need to engage in a rapid transition to the lowest emitting energy technologies such as solar, wind, or nuclear power -- as well as conserve energy where possible. The researchers found that it takes much longer to curtail the warming of Earth than one might expect. And in the case of natural gas -- increasingly the power industry's fuel of choice, because gas reserves have been growing and prices have been falling -- the study finds that warming would continue even if over the next 40 years every coal-fired power plant in the world were replaced with a gas-fueled plant. "There is no quick fix to global warming," Caldeira said. "Shifting from one energy system to another is hard work and a slow process. Plus, it takes several decades for the climate system to fully respond to reductions in emissions. If we expect to see substantial benefits in the second half of this century, we had better get started now." Researchers have previously conducted studies projecting the long-term climate effects of rolling out a single new energy technology. But this work from Myhrvold and Caldeira is the first to examine all the major candidate technologies for replacing coal power -- including conservation -- and to examine wide ranges of possible assumptions about both the emissions each technology generates and also the scope and duration of the build-out. "It takes a lot of energy to make new power plants -- and it generally takes more energy to make those that use cleaner technology--like nuclear, solar, and wind--than it does to make dirty ones that burn coal and gas," Myhrvold added. "You have to use the energy system of today to build the new-and-improved energy system of tomorrow, and unfortunately that means creating more emission in the near-term than we would otherwise. So we incur a kind of 'emissions debt' in making the transition to a better system, and it can take decades to pay that off. Meanwhile, the temperature keeps rising." The study used widely accepted models relating emissions to temperature. The two researchers also drew on a rich literature of studies, called life-cycle analyses, that total up all the greenhouse gases produced during the construction and operation of, say, a natural gas plant or a hydroelectric dam or a solar photovoltaic farm. It also examined the potential that technological improvements, such as advances in carbon capture and storage or in solar panel efficiency, could have on outcomes. "It was surprising to us just how long it takes for the benefit of a switch from coal to something better to show up in the climate in the form of a slowdown in global warming," Caldeira said. "If countries were to start right away and build really fast, so that they installed a trillion watts of gas-fired electricity generation steadily over the next 40 years," Myhrvold said, "that would still add about half a degree Fahrenheit to the average surface temperature of the Earth in 2112 -- that's within a tenth of a degree of the warming that coal-fired plants would produce by that year." The researchers found that coal- or gas-fired plants equipped with carbon capture and storage may also have good potential eventually, but that substantial advances in technology are still required for it to be able to substantially reduce the amount of climate change. The results from this study suggest that policies aimed at combating global warming should aim at faster, larger-scale transitions that reduce electricity use where possible, while building wind, solar, and nuclear plants, to meet the growth in demand for electricity

#### Renewables will solve warming:

Steve A. **Yetiv, 2006** (San Diego Union-Tribune, February 6. Online. Lexis. Accessed February 10, 2008).

Fourth, high oil prices benefit the environment. Indeed, one study has shown that a broad energy tax on carbon content in fuels would reduce oil use and carbon emissions by over 10 percent. For that matter, vehicles that run on fuel cells emit only water and heat as waste, and hybrids emit more limited emissions than conventional vehicles. Since carbon emissions cause global warming -- a scientific fact rather than science fiction -- we should tip our hats to high oil prices, in this respect.

## Impact – Warming

### Warming --> Extinction

#### Warming causes human extinction.

**Tickell, 8-11-2008**

(Oliver, Climate Researcher, The Gaurdian, “On a planet 4C hotter, all we can prepare for is extinction”, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/aug/11/climatechange>)

We need to get prepared for four degrees of global warming, Bob Watson told the Guardian last week. At first sight this looks like wise counsel from the climate science adviser to Defra. But the idea that we could adapt to a 4C rise is absurd and dangerous. Global warming on this scale would be a catastrophe that would mean, in the immortal words that Chief Seattle probably never spoke, "the end of living and the beginning of survival" for humankind. Or perhaps the beginning of our extinction. The collapse of the polar ice caps would become inevitable, bringing long-term sea level rises of 70-80 metres. All the world's coastal plains would be lost, complete with ports, cities, transport and industrial infrastructure, and much of the world's most productive farmland. The world's geography would be transformed much as it was at the end of the last ice age, when sea levels rose by about 120 metres to create the Channel, the North Sea and Cardigan Bay out of dry land. Weather would become extreme and unpredictable, with more frequent and severe droughts, floods and hurricanes. The Earth's carrying capacity would be hugely reduced. Billions would undoubtedly die. Watson's call was supported by the government's former chief scientific adviser, Sir David King, who warned that "if we get to a four-degree rise it is quite possible that we would begin to see a runaway increase". This is a remarkable understatement. The climate system is already experiencing significant feedbacks, notably the summer melting of the Arctic sea ice. The more the ice melts, the more sunshine is absorbed by the sea, and the more the Arctic warms. And as the Arctic warms, the release of billions of tonnes of methane – a greenhouse gas 70 times stronger than carbon dioxide over 20 years – captured under melting permafrost is already under way. To see how far this process could go, look 55.5m years to the Palaeocene-Eocene Thermal Maximum, when a global temperature increase of 6C coincided with the release of about 5,000 gigatonnes of carbon into the atmosphere, both as CO2 and as methane from bogs and seabed sediments. Lush subtropical forests grew in polar regions, and sea levels rose to 100m higher than today. It appears that an initial warming pulse triggered other warming processes. Many scientists warn that this historical event may be analogous to the present: the warming caused by human emissions could propel us towards a similar hothouse Earth.

#### Refugee and resource conflict will escalate globally.

James, no date(John James, medieval expert and climate researcher.“Refugees and War” <http://www.planetextinction.com/planet_extinction_refugees_war.htm>, no date, JGR)

Modern civilization has never experienced weather conditions as persistently disruptive as those we should expect from here on. Nor have we yet faced the appalling consequences of a significant rise in sea-levels. If the sea rises a modest 400mm 22% of coastal wetlands will be lost, and more when we include the likely human reaction to that change. It would impact on over 400,000 square Km of coast, especially in the deltas of Bangladesh, Vietnam and China, while the Kiribati, Fijian and Maldive islands would lose a large part of their most arable land. The cost of dealing with such a rise was recently estimated to be £9 billion. Insurers have warned that the cost of just one major flood would be almost twice that, especially in the financial district of Central London. What then if the ice sheets of Greenland melted? A one meter sea-level rise would affect 6 million people in Egypt, with some 15% of agricultural land lost, 13 million in Bangladesh with 16% of the national rice production lost, and 72 million in China with tens of thousands of hectares of agricultural land. Enormous areas of the most productive agricultural land would be underwater. One thinks immediately of Bangladesh and the North Sea farms in Holland and Anglesea. In addition frequent floods, droughts and storms caused by the huge land-form changes and increasingly disturbed atmosphere would cause severe losses every year. The reduction in food production would ensure that half the world's population would be hungry or starving The anticipated 7 meter sea rise from glacier collapse will be far worse. This will directly uproot 300 -1,000 million people, some 15% of the world's population. The ricochet will be far-reaching and incalculable. Where will all these homeless and starving people go? Who will look after them? How will their governments be forced to react? Imagine eastern European countries struggling to feed their populations with a falling supply of food, water, and energy, eyeing Russia, whose population is already in decline, for its grain, minerals, and energy. Or Japan, with flooded coastal cities and contamination of its fresh water, eying Russia’s Sakhalin Island oil to power desalination plants and energy-intensive agricultural processes. Envision Pakistan, India, and China skirmishing at their borders over refugees, access to shared rivers, and the remaining arable land. Prospects for major conflicts As abrupt climate change lowers the world’s ability to feed its people, aggressive wars are likely to be fought over food, water, and energy. Deaths from war as well as starvation and disease will decrease population size, which will, over time, bring the population down to whatever level the earth can sustain. Violence and disruption from the stresses created by abrupt change pose different conditions to any we are used to. This will create a sense of desperation, which is likely to lead to offensive aggression in order to reclaim balance. The massacres in Darfur are an early example of the coming climate wars. Military confrontation may be triggered by a desperate need for natural resources such as energy, food and water, rather than by conflicts over ideology, religion, or national honour. Such catastrophic environmental problems are likely to escalate global conflict. Nations with resources may build fortresses around their countries, preserving some security for themselves. Less fortunate nations especially those with ancient enmities with their neighbours, may be left to struggle for food, clean water, or energy. With over 200 river basins occupied by more than one nation, we can expect conflict over access to water. For example, the Danube touches twelve nations, the Nile nine, and the Amazon seven.

#### Global warming leads to extinction- highest probability

Roach 2004 (John, http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2004/01/0107\_040107\_extinction.html, *National Geographic*, July 12.4)

As global warming interacts with other factors such as habitat-destruction, invasive species, and the build up of carbon dioxide in the landscape, the risk of extinction increases even further, they say. In agreement with the study authors, Pounds and Puschendorf say taking immediate steps to reduce greenhouse gas emissions is imperative to constrain global warming to the minimum predicted levels and thus prevent many of the extinctions from occurring. "The threat to life on Earth is not just a problem for the future. It is part of the here and now," they write.

#### AND- Climate change causes extinction

**Henderson**, 8-19-200**6**

[Bill, "Runaway Global Warming - Denial," http://www.countercurrents.org/cc-henderson190806.htm, accessed 2007]

The scientific debate about human induced global warming is over but policy makers - let alone the happily shopping general public - still seem to not understand the scope of the impending tragedy. Global warming isn't just warmer temperatures, heat waves, melting ice and threatened polar bears. Scientific understanding increasingly points to runaway global warming leading to human extinction. If impossibly Draconian security measures are not immediately put in place to keep further emissions of greenhouse gases out of the atmosphere we are looking at the death of billions, the end of civilization as we know it and in all probability the end of man's several million year old existence, along with the extinction of most flora and fauna beloved to man in the world we share. Runaway global warming: there are 'carbon bombs': carbon in soils, carbon in warming temperate and boreal forests and in a drought struck Amazon, methane in Arctic peat bogs and in methane hydrates melting in warming ocean waters. For several decades it has been hypothesized that rising temperatures from increased greenhouse gases in the atmosphere due to burning fossil fuels could be releasing some of and eventually all of these stored carbon stocks to add substantually more potent greenhouse gases to the atmosphere.

### AT: No Warming

#### Temperature data and observational evidence confirm substantial global warming now:

Morris Goodman, 1/25/2011 (past president of the Dearborn Democratic Club, Dearborn Press and Guide, " Local Republican, Democrat square off: Global warming, real or imagined? ", http://www.pressandguide.com/articles/2011/01/25/opinion/doc4d3f1f77e3b1d528573259.txt)

Strange, and even bizarre, weather events are occurring on a regular basis, with 2010 being reportedly the hottest year on record. Most of the world's renowned environmental scientists warn of the dangers of global warming. Thus, it is curious that Connolly should call the concept global warming itself “the product of a quasi-religious cult.” There is incontrovertible evidence that both polar ice caps are experiencing substantial melting and, as a result, world water levels are dangerously rising.

#### We’re warming now: 2010 is the hottest year on record:

Brad Johnson, 12/31/2010 (“Hottest Year In History Ends With Freak Climate Disasters” <http://wonkroom.thinkprogress.org/2010/12/31/new-year-boiling/>)

As greenhouse pollution continues to build in the atmosphere, 2010 is entering the history books as the hottest year on record. A year of unprecedented extreme weather disasters, 2010 is ending with yet more climate disasters, from floods in Australia to winter tornadoes across America: Parts of Arkansas, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Missouri and Tennessee were on the lookout for more twisters after several touched down Friday — including one that killed three people in an Arkansas town. Two more people died in southern Missouri. Three people died in Cincinnati, a hamlet of about 100 residents about three miles from the Oklahoma border. An elderly couple died in their home, while a dairy farmer was killed while milking his cows. The tornadoes are part of an “unusual” storm front fed by “warm, moist air in place over the region.” On the colder edge of the front, “the storm responsible for the deadly tornado is also bringing a dangerous winter storm to the West and Midwest,” with up to three feet of new snow from California to Idaho. Meanwhile, Australia is being ravaged by unprecedented flooding, following tremendous rainfall for months, compounded by the Christmas Day landfall of Cyclone Tasha. Floods now cover an area “the size of France and Germany combined.” Australian Prime Minister Julia Gillard announced millions of dollars of relief funding as she described the record-breaking floods: Some communities are seeing floodwaters higher than they’ve seen in decades, and for some communities floodwaters have never reached these levels before [in] the time that we have been recording floods. For many communities we haven’t even seen the peak of the floodwaters yet, that’s a number of days away. “Some sections of coastal Queensland received over four feet of rain from September through November,” meteorologist Jeff Masters reports. The floods, which have wiped out crops, drowned livestock, and disrupted the largest coal ports in the world, are expected to cause at least $1 billion in damage. It’s looking like 2011 will thus continue the disturbing trend of rising disaster from our fossil-fueled climate.

#### Observational data, temperature records, and a ton of scientists say the earth is unequivocally warming now:

JOHN COLLINS RUDOLF, 7/28/2010 (“State of the Climate: Hottest Decade on Record”

<http://green.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/07/28/state-of-the-climate-hottest-decade-ever/>)

 Experts say that sea ice is melting, heavy rainfall is intensifying and heat waves are more common, among other indicators.

Green: Science The past decade was the hottest recorded, part of an unequivocal pattern of warming dating back 50 years, a National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration report declared on Wednesday. The annual “State of the Climate” report drew on the findings more than 300 climate scientists in 48 countries who measured 10 separate planetwide features, including air and sea temperatures, humidity, Arctic sea ice, glaciers, and spring snow cover in the Northern hemisphere. “The records come from many institutions worldwide,” Dr. Jane Lubchenco, the agency’s administrator, said in a statement. “They use data collected from diverse sources, including satellites, weather balloons, weather stations, ships, buoys and field surveys. These independently produced lines of evidence all point to the same conclusion: our planet is warming.” The findings do not include data from 2010, which is on pace to exceed the highest annual average global temperature ever recorded, NOAA said. This summer’s weather has been defined by extreme heat events in the eastern United States, Europe, Russia, China, Japan and the Middle East. According to the report, each decade since the 1980s has been progressively warmer than the last, with an average warming of about one-fifth of a degree Fahrenheit per decade. “The temperature increase of one degree Fahrenheit over the past 50 years may seem small, but it has already altered our planet,” said Deke Arndt, co-editor of the report and chief of the Climate Monitoring Branch of NOAA’s National Climatic Data Center. “Glaciers and sea ice are melting, heavy rainfall is intensifying and heat waves are more common.” The report also suggests that more than 90 percent of the warming over the past 50 years may have gone into the oceans.

#### Huge consensus of scientists supports the global warming theory:

John Cook, 7/25/2010 (<http://www.skepticalscience.com/global-warming-scientific-consensus-intermediate.htm>)

That humans are causing global warming is the position of the Academies of Science from 19 countries plus many scientific organizations that study climate science. More specifically, around 95% of active climate researchers actively publishing climate papers endorse the consensus position. Inevitably, there will be scientists who are skeptical about man-made global warming. A survey of 3146 earth scientists asked the question "Do you think human activity is a significant contributing factor in changing mean global temperatures?" (Doran 2009). More than 90% of participants had Ph.D.s, and 7% had master’s degrees. Overall, 82% of the scientists answered yes. However, what are most interesting are responses compared to the level of expertise in climate science. Of scientists who were non-climatologists and didn't publish research, 77% answered yes. In contrast, 97.5% of climatologists who actively publish research on climate change responded yes. As the level of active research and specialization in climate science increases, so does agreement that humans are significantly changing global temperatures. Figure 1: Response to the survey question "Do you think human activity is a significant contributing factor in changing mean global temperatures?" (Doran 2009)

#### More evidence…there is zero debate among scientists on whether we are warming:

John Cook, 7/25/2010 (<http://www.skepticalscience.com/global-warming-scientific-consensus-intermediate.htm>)

General public data come from a 2008 Gallup poll. Most striking is the divide between expert climate scientists (97.4%) and the general public (58%). The paper concludes: "It seems that the debate on the authenticity of global warming and the role played by human activity is largely nonexistent among those who understand the nuances and scientific basis of long-term climate processes. The challenge, rather, appears to be how to effectively communicate this fact to policy makers and to a public that continues to mistakenly perceive debate among scientists." This overwhelming consensus among climate experts is confirmed by an independent study that surveys all climate scientists who have publicly signed declarations supporting or rejecting the consensus. They find between 97% to 98% of climate experts support the consensus (Anderegg 2010). Moreover, they examine the number of publications by each scientist as a measure of expertise in climate science. They find the average number of publications by unconvinced scientists (eg - skeptics) is around half the number by scientists convinced by the evidence. Not only is there a vast difference in the number of convinced versus unconvinced scientists, there is also a considerable gap in expertise between the two groups. Figure 2: Distribution of the number of researchers convinced by the evidence of anthropogenic climate change and unconvinced by the evidence with a given number of total climate publications (Anderegg 2010).

#### Multiple independent studies from 18 different scientific organizations confirm the Earth is warming:

John Cook, 7/25/2010 (<http://www.skepticalscience.com/global-warming-scientific-consensus-intermediate.htm>)

A letter from 18 scientific organizations to US Congress states: "Observations throughout the world make it clear that climate change is occurring, and rigorous scientific research demonstrates that the greenhouse gases emitted by human activities are the primary driver. These conclusions are based on multiple independent lines of evidence, and contrary assertions are inconsistent with an objective assessment of the vast body of peer-reviewed science."

### AT: Warming is Natural

#### Peer reviewed research proves: current climate change isn’t natural—it’s caused by humans:

James Wight, 8/20/2010 (<http://www.skepticalscience.com/climate-change-little-ice-age-medieval-warm-period.htm>)

Climate reacts to whatever forces it to change at the time; humans are now the dominant forcing. A common skeptic argument is that climate has changed naturally in the past, long before SUVs and coal-fired power plants, so therefore humans cannot be causing global warming now. Interestingly, the peer-reviewed research into past climate change comes to the opposite conclusion. To understand this, first you have to ask why climate has changed in the past. It doesn't happen by magic. Climate changes when it’s forced to change. When our planet suffers an energy imbalance and gains or loses heat, global temperature changes. There are a number of different forces which can influence the Earth’s climate. When the sun gets brighter, the planet receives more energy and warms. When volcanoes erupt, they emit particles into the atmosphere which reflect sunlight, and the planet cools. When there are more greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, the planet warms. These effects are referred to as external forcings because by changing the planet's energy balance, they force climate to change. It is obviously true that past climate change was caused by natural forcings. However, to argue that this means we can’t cause climate change is like arguing that humans can’t start bushfires because in the past they’ve happened naturally. Greenhouse gas increases have caused climate change many times in Earth’s history, and we are now adding greenhouse gases to the atmosphere at a increasingly rapid rate. Looking at the past gives us insight into how our climate responds to external forcings. Using ice cores, for instance, we can work out the degree of past temperature change, the level of solar activity, and the amount of greenhouse gases and volcanic dust in the atmosphere. From this, we can determine how temperature has changed due to past energy imbalances. What we have found, looking at many different periods and timescales in Earth's history, is that when the Earth gains heat, positive feedbacks amplify the warming. This is why we've experienced such dramatic changes in temperature in the past. Our climate is highly sensitive to changes in heat. We can even quantify this: when you include positive feedbacks, a doubling of CO2 causes a warming of around 3°C. What does that mean for today? Rising greenhouse gas levels are an external forcing, which has caused climate changes many times in Earth's history. They're causing an energy imbalance and the planet is building up heat. From Earth's history, we know that positive feedbacks will amplify the greenhouse warming. So past climate change doesn't tell us that humans can't influence climate; on the contrary, it tells us that climate is highly sensitive to the greenhouse warming we're now causing.

# Oil Spills Module

## 1NC

#### Oil drilling is limited in the US now.

Vick 3/5 (Vanessa Vicky, staff writer. New York Times. “Offshore Drilling and Exploration” http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/o/offshore\_drilling\_and\_exploration/index.html, 5 March 2012, JGR)

On March 31, 2010, President Obama proposed to open vast expanses of American coastlines to oil and natural gas drilling, much of it for the first time, in an apparent bid to win political support for energy and climate legislation. But that idea &mdash; which prompted distress among environmentalists and tepid support from Republicans &mdash; was sharply set back by the massive oil slick created in the Gulf of Mexico in April 2010 after a drilling rig exploded and sank off the Louisiana coast, killing 11 workers and leaving four others critically injured. A leak in a pipe a mile deep [that] spewed out what the government eventually estimated to be nearly five million barrels of oil into the Gulf of Mexico, making it the largest accidental spill in history. In response to the spill, the administration put in place a moratorium on deepwater oil and gas drilling, a step that came as a blow to the oil industry and angered Gulf Coast communities dependent on offshore drilling for jobs and income. In October, the administration announced that it was ending the moratorium and issuing new rules that tighten standards for well design, blowout preventers, safety certification, emergency response and worker training. In December 2010, pulling back further from Mr. Obama’s original proposal, the administration rescinded its decision to expand offshore oil exploration into the eastern Gulf of Mexico and along the Atlantic Coast. Drilling would remain under a moratorium for those areas for at least the next seven years, until stronger safety and environmental standards were in place. But drilling would continue in the central and western Gulf of Mexico, although under a new set of safeguards put in place after the deadly BP explosion and oil spill.

#### Republicans will expand oil drilling to pay for expanded transportation infrastructure.

LA Times 2/15 (LA Times. “House Republicans push new oil drilling to fund road projects” <http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/nationnow/2012/02/house-republicans-push-new-coastal-drilling-to-fund-road-projects.html>, 15 February 2012, JGR)

A measure that would allow new oil drilling off the Atlantic and Pacific coasts and open Alaska’s Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to energy exploration is headed for a vote in the Republican-controlled House -- but faces a gusher of opposition in the Senate. The energy legislation, which includes a measure designed to clear the way for the controversial Keystone XL pipeline project, is being considered in connection with the GOP-written $260-billion, five-year House transportation bill. The House, which began considering the energy legislation Wednesday, could complete action on it Thursday. Republicans say increased domestic energy production would generate jobs and revenue to help pay for traffic-easing projects at a time when gas tax funds have fallen. (Drivers are now motoring around in more fuel-efficient cars.) But the drilling measures face opposition in the Democratic-controlled Senate, especially from Sen. Barbara Boxer (D-Calif.), chairwoman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, who hails from a state where offshore drilling has been a hot issue since a devastating a 1969 spill off Santa Barbara. The White House also has objected to the measures, saying they would take away the Interior secretary’s discretion to determine "which areas are appropriate and safe'' for exploration. The administration also said that the provision to advance the Canada-to-Gulf Coast Keystone XL pipeline would "circumvent a long-standing process for determining whether cross-border pipelines are in the national interest." Though the legislation faces uncertain prospects, House Republicans, at the very least, hope to use Democratic opposition to expand drilling to highlight differences between the parties -- especially as high gas prices promise to become an election-year issue. "Prices will only climb higher if we don’t take action now to increase our energy independence and develop our own American energy resources," said Rep. Doc Hastings (R-Wash.), chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee. The bill would open up, within five years, areas off Southern California, the Eastern Seaboard and Alaska "considered to have the largest undiscovered, technically recoverable oil and gas resources." It also would permit new energy exploration off Santa Barbara and Ventura counties from existing offshore platforms, expand energy production in the Gulf of Mexico and promote oil shale development in the West.

#### Offshore drilling spills are inevitable.

Mufson 4/19 (Steven Mufson, Washington Post.“Two years after BP oil spill, offshore drilling still poses risks” <http://www.washingtonpost.com/business/economy/two-years-after-bp-oil-spill-offshore-drilling-still-poses-risks/2012/04/19/gIQAHOkDUT_story_1.html>, 19 April 2012, JGR)

But three recent incidents in other parts of the world show just how risky and sensitive offshore drilling remains. In the North Sea, French oil giant Total is still battling to regain control of a natural gas well that has been leaking for nearly four weeks. Meanwhile, Brazil has confiscated the passports of 11 Chevron employees and five employees of drilling contractor Transocean as they await trial on criminal charges related to an offshore oil spill there. And in December, about 40,000 barrels of crude oil leaked out of a five-year-old loading line between a floating storage vessel and an oil tanker in a Royal Dutch Shell field off the coast of Nigeria. Many experts say that even with tougher regulations here in the United States, such incidents are inevitable. “I’m not saying we shouldn’t do it [offshore drilling], but we ought to go at it with our eyes open,” said Roger Rufe, a retired Coast Guard vice admiral. “We can’t do it with a human-designed system and not expect that there will be occasional problems with it.” Shell is one company particularly anxious to avoid the slightest whiff of trouble. It is on the verge of getting the final two permits needed to drill this summer in the Chukchi Sea, off Alaska’s Arctic Coast, a plan that has aroused opposition from a broad array of environmental groups. So on April 10 when federal regulators told Shell that they had spotted a 1-by-10-mile oil sheen in the eight miles of water between two Shell production platforms in the Gulf of Mexico, executives acted quickly. They promptly mobilized an oil cleanup vessel and sent two remotely operated underwater vehicles to scour the sea floor. It turned out that the oil — only six barrels — came from a natural seep common in the gulf. “Post-Macondo, there’s no such thing as a small spill,” said an executive from another big oil company, who asked for anonymity because he was not authorized to comment. With the anniversary of the BP spill, many experts are reassessing U.S. progress since the accident. And environmentalists are assessing damages. A National Wildlife Federation report said, for example, that the shrimp catch increased last year but that since the spill 523 dolphins have been stranded onshore, four times the historic average; 95 percent of them were dead. A team of scientists led by Peter Roopnarine of the California Academy of Sciences said oysters collected post-spill contain higher concentrations of heavy metals in their shells, gills and muscle tissue than those collected before the spill. The members of the presidential Oil Spill Commission that investigated the BP spill said in a report that they were “encouraged” by reforms at the Interior Department, which oversees drilling in U.S. waters. But they said they are dismayed by the failure of Congress to enact some reforms into law, worried about the prospect of Arctic drilling, and concerned that the United States had not altered the embargo of Cuba to allow U.S. vessels to respond if there was a spill from a rig drilling in Cuban waters. Environmental groups are more adamant. Oceana, a group opposed to offshore drilling, said “offshore drilling safety has not improved.” That assertion was disputed by Michael R. Bromwich, who oversaw the overhaul of the Interior Department agency now divided into the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement and the Bureau of Ocean Enforcement and Management. “Sometimes it takes a crisis to get changes,” Bromwich said at a recent conference. He said better regulation was built on three legs: prevention, containment and spill response. He hailed advances in the first two areas but conceded that the ability to scoop up spilled oil “has developed painfully little since the Exxon Valdez,” the infamous 1989 incident in which a drunken tanker captain ran his ship aground close to the Alaskan shore. “Once oil is in the water, it’s a mess,” Rufe said, “and we have not demonstrated an ability to get up more than 3 to 5 percent of the oil spilled.”

#### Oil spills devastate marine ecosystems.

Sutton 2/21 (Michael Sutton, Vice President, Center for the Future of the Oceans, Monterey Bay Aquarium “Business: Blue and Green” <https://www.bsr.org/en/our-insights/bsr-insight-article/business-blue-and-green>, 21 February 2012, JGR)

Pollution represents another major threat. Plastic trash, when ingested, frequently kills albatross and sea turtles. Oil spills devastate coastal communities and pose a significant and immediate threat to ocean ecosystems. It goes without saying that spills also are bad for business: Fishing, tourism, and other ocean-related industries in the Gulf of Mexico were devastated by the Deepwater Horizon spill. And BP has already lost hundreds of millions of dollars and may have to pay an additional US$25 billion to settle related litigation.

#### Healthy oceans are key to all life.

NRDC 11 (National Resources Defense Council is the nation's most effective environmental action group, combining the grassroots power of 1.3 million members and online activists with the courtroom clout and expertise of more than 350 lawyers, scientists and other professionals. “Reviving Our Oceans” <http://www.nrdc.org/water/oceans/policy.asp>, 4 October 2011, JGR)

The oceans are the planet's life support system. We depend on oceans to moderate our climate and filter pollution. We rely on the rich diversity of ocean life to supply us with food and medicines. Our oceans give us a place to play, to work, to rest and to discover. In recent years, however, two major independent commissions reported that our oceans are in serious trouble -- in a state, according to the Pew Oceans Commission, of "silent collapse," threatening jobs, cultures, coastal ecosystems and marine life. Urgent Ocean Threats Oceans are not, as once imagined, inexhaustible resources, so vast that human activity can barely make a dent. In fact, the evidence is just the opposite. Major threats to ocean health include the following:

## Impact - Marine Ecosystems

#### Collapse of Marine ecosystems causes extinction.

Shaikh 11 (Thair Shaikh, staff reporter for CNN. <http://articles.cnn.com/2011-06-21/world/ocean.extinction.global.warming_1_mass-extinction-coral-reefs-marine-life?_s=PM:WORLD>, 21 June 2011, JGR)

Marine life is under severe threat from global warming, pollution and habitat loss, with a high risk of "major extinctions" according to a panel of experts. These are the conclusions of a distinguished group of marine scientists who met at Oxford University, England, in April to discuss the impact of human activity on the world's oceans. The meeting, led by the International Programme on the State of the Ocean (IPSO), examined the combined effects of pollution, acidification, ocean warming, over-fishing and depleting levels of oxygen in the water. The panel found that oceanic conditions are similar to those of "previous major extinctions of species in Earth's history," and that we face losing marine species and entire marine ecosystems, such as coral reefs, within a single generation. The interim report, produced in partnership with the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), was presented to the U.N. on Tuesday. The study also said that the speed of decline of marine ecosystems is faster than predicted. Alex Rogers, IPSO's scientific director, said: "The oceans are a common heritage of mankind. The extinction threat we believe is real." Rogers, professor of Conservation Biology at the Department Of Zoology, University of Oxford, told CNN: "The rate of change we are seeing in the quantities of carbon dioxide going into the atmosphere and then being absorbed into the oceans is so great that it is difficult to compare what is happening now with what has happened in the past but we do know that past disturbances in the carbon cycle have been a feature of mass extinction events." According to the panel -- which consisted of 27 marine experts from 18 organizations -- most if not all the five "global mass extinctions" in Earth's history were probably caused by the "deadly trio" of global warming, ocean acidification and lack of water oxygen or hypoxia. It states that these three factors are present in the ocean today and gives examples of marine ecosystems suffering severe disturbance, such as the mass "coral bleaching" in 1998 that killed 16% of all the world's tropical coral reefs. According to the report, over-fishing has reduced some commercial fish stocks and populations of by-catch species by more than 90%. Dan Laffoley, senior advisor on Marine Science and Conservation for IUCN, and co-author of the report, said: "The challenges for the future of the ocean are vast, but unlike previous generations we know what now needs to happen. The time to protect the blue heart of our planet is now, today and urgent." Marine scientists often describe oceans as the earth's circulatory system, performing numerous vital functions which make the planet habitable, such as creating more than half our oxygen, driving weather systems while modulating the atmosphere, as well as providing us with vital resources.

# Uniqueness

### Drilling Low Now

#### Obama’s newest offshore plan doesn’t expand drilling.

Blinch 6/28 (Russ Blinch, Editor in Charge, Commodities and Energy. Reuters. “U.S. unveils final drilling plan, limits Arctic sales” <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/06/28/us-usa-drilling-offshore-idUSBRE85R1MJ20120628>, 28 June 2012, JGR)

(Reuters) - U.S. oil companies will be allowed to drill in more areas of the Gulf of Mexico but won only limited access to the Arctic under the final version of the Obama Administration's five year drilling plan that was slammed by industry and some environmentalists. The 2012-2017 plan calls for three potential lease sales in areas offshore Alaska but the auctions would not be held **until the final years of the plan** because of environmental concerns about operating in the Arctic. "Put simply, this program opens the vast majority of known offshore oil and gas resources for development over the next five years and includes a cautious but forward-looking leasing strategy for the Alaska Arctic," said Secretary Ken Salazar. The plan was called "too restrictive" by the American Petroleum Institute and criticized by Republican lawmakers who are sure to blast the drilling blueprint on the campaign trail. "Today, the Obama Administration has announced a bleak future for American energy production by keeping 85 percent of America's offshore areas under lock and key and refusing to open any new areas to drilling," said Doc Hastings, Republican chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee. The plan calls for 15 potential lease sales in six offshore areas, including in the Western and Central Gulf of Mexico, and the portion of the Eastern Gulf not currently under Congressional moratorium. 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.

#### More evidence.

AP 6/28 (Associated Press. Accessed at Delmarvanow. “VA GOV: US offshore energy snub criticized” <http://www.delmarvanow.com/article/20120628/NEWS01/120628024/VA-GOV-US-offshore-energy-snub-criticized>, 28 June 2012, JGR)

RICHMOND — Gov. Bob McDonnell is expressing his disappointment in the Obama administration’s unwillingness to allow energy exploration off Virginia’s coast until 2017. He was responding Thursday to the U.S. Interior Department’s decision to exclude[s] Virginia from its latest five-year offshore oil and gas development plan. The government was poised to open waters off Virginia to energy exploration until the BP oil spill disaster in the Gulf of Mexico. President Barack Obama then issued a moratorium on drilling off Virginia.

#### The 2010 moratorium killed momentum for offshore drilling.

White 1/30 (Jaquetta White, The Times-Picayune in New Orleans. “Deepwater drilling moratorium has created 'hidden victims,' study says” <http://www.nola.com/news/gulf-oil-pill/index.ssf/2012/01/deepwater_drilling_moratorium_13.html>, 20 January 2012, JGR)

The six-month moratorium on drilling was issued in May 2010, in the wake of the explosion of the Deepwater Horizon oil rig. The April 2010 accident killed 11 men and caused the largest oil spill in the nation's history. The restriction shut down new and existing deepwater drilling, suspended production and stopped the approval process for new drilling permits. Although the moratorium has been lifted, permit issuance has been slower than in the years before the spill. In the past three months, two deepwater permits were issued per month on average, according to the Gulf Permit Index, released each month by GNO Inc. That is a 66 percent decrease from the monthly average in the year before the spill, and a 71 percent drop from the historical monthly average of seven new permits per month, according to the GNO Inc. data.

#### More evidence – we still haven’t recovered to 2010 levels of offshore drilling.

Feinberg 11 (Adam, chair of the litigation department and member of the executive committee at Miller & Chevalier in Washington, focuses on complex federal litigation, often against the U.S. government, and on government investigations. “Regulation of offshore drilling after the BP spill: Has the government played by the rules?” <http://newsandinsight.thomsonreuters.com/Legal/Insight/2011/11_-_November/Regulation_of_offshore_drilling_after_the_BP_spill__Has_the_government_played_by_the_rules_/>, 18 November 2011, JGR)

Although the government’s formal moratorium was lifted a year ago, deepwater drilling activity has still not recovered. Some rigs have moved overseas, and it is unclear when or whether they will return. The government projected that the moratorium will end up decreasing production in the Gulf of Mexico by tens of millions of barrels of oil and hundreds of billions of cubic feet of gas.

### Oil $ High now

#### We control long term price uniqueness – oil companies will keep the prices high in the current environment.

Esposito 6/18 (Danny Esposito, B. Comm., B.A., a senior editor at Lombardi Financial, is a macro based finance and economics analyst. Penny Stock Detectives. “Higher Cost of Extracting Oil to Support Prices” <http://www.pennystockdetectives.com/penny-stocks/higher-cost-of-extracting-oil-to-support-prices>, 18 June 2012, JGR)

The major oil companies agree that the days of cheap oil costing $15.00 a barrel to explore for and extract are pretty much over. The alternatives such as deepwater drilling, tar sands deposits and heavy oil are more expensive to get to market. They don’t cost $15.00 a barrel to extract; the cost estimates range anywhere from $40.00 to $90.00 a barrel. The experts in the field tend to narrow that range from $65.00 to $90.00 a barrel. This means that, should oil prices fall further, the exploring companies finding that oil prices aren’t covering the cost of extracting the oil will simply shut down their production of expensive oil. When production shuts down, supply to the market will fall, causing oil prices to rise once more. The current economic and political environment is not conducive to higher oil prices. However, with the cost of extracting oil now higher, there then must be a price floor underneath oil prices. If oil prices fall too much, supply will be restricted, eventually driving oil prices higher once again.

#### High oil prices here to stay.

Kemp 6/29 (John Kemp. Senior Market Analyst, Commodities and Energy. “RPT-COLUMN-High prices result in soaring oil reserves: John Kemp” <http://in.reuters.com/article/2012/06/29/column-kemp-oil-reserves-idINL6E8HT43B20120629>, 29 June 2012, JGR)

(Reuters) - For all that Malthusians worry about oil running out, and analysts cite the rising costs of exploration and production, the oil industry has been adding reserves faster than they are being consumed since 2005, as high prices spur an investment boom across the industry. Contrary to the alarming predictions made a few years ago, and still periodically revived by peak oilers, there is no sense in which oil is running out. Price spikes may still be needed from time to time to restrain consumption and match it with the uneven development of new supplies and periodic interruptions. But these are short-term phenomena. There is good reason to think the long-term uptrend in (real) oil prices is over for now and the market has found a level at which adequate future supplies can be guaranteed. After a long period of low prices and stagnating exploration and production growth during the 1990s and early 2000s, real oil prices appear to have risen high enough in recent years to ensure future supplies remain adequate.

#### The neg ignores broad trends in oil prices – they’re high.

Kemp 6/29 (John Kemp. Senior Market Analyst, Commodities and Energy. “RPT-COLUMN-High prices result in soaring oil reserves: John Kemp” <http://in.reuters.com/article/2012/06/29/column-kemp-oil-reserves-idINL6E8HT43B20120629>, 29 June 2012, JGR)

Soaring oil prices since 2003 have resulted in a massive increase in expenditure on both exploration and development. In 2008, analysts were still worried about the relatively small size of newly discovered fields compared with the super giants discovered between 1940 and 1970, leading some to worry the industry was having to run faster simply to replace the steady run down of existing fields. In fact, in recent years, discoveries have not been getting smaller, as consultants Wood Mackenzie showed in a recent study on exploration trends reviewed by my colleague Dmitry Zhdannikov. Volumes per exploration well have risen by more than a third since 2005, and the frequency of large finds (over 100 million barrels) has been increasing, as oil companies have ventured into "high impact" environments such as ultra-deepwater, offshore Arctic and previously unexplored zones, according to Wood Mackenzie. During the past decade, total global reserves discoveries averaged 20 billion barrels of oil equivalent per year with Brazil being the main driver of growth, and the Arctic and Africa also big new exploration targets. Many analysts still predict that oil prices must eventually move even higher because of the rising costs of finding and producing oil, the growing revenue requirements of producing countries (both inside and outside OPEC), and demand from emerging markets. But the accelerating additions to reserves as a result of both exploration and development suggest that prices are already at a level sufficient to ensure adequate long-term supplies. Given short-term capacity constraints, for example on seismic crews and drilling rigs, higher prices are unlikely to bring forth extra barrels in the short term (though they could restrain demand if necessary). And in the long term current prices appear adequate to encourage exploration and development on the required scale.

### AT: Obama Plan

#### Obama’s plan doesn’t trigger disad – too restrictive and still develops alt energy.

Blinch 6/28 (Russ Blinch, staff reporter at Reuters. “Drilling plan could spark criticism from GOP, industry” <http://in.reuters.com/article/2012/06/27/usa-drilling-offshore-idINL2E8HRGEP20120627>, 28 June 2012, JGR)

WASHINGTON, June 26 (Reuters) - The Obama Administration will release its final, five-year blueprint for offshore drilling o n 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.

# Link

### Generic Links

#### More evidence – GOP will boost offshore drilling to pay for the plan.

Cooper et al 2/21 (Donna Cooper, Richard W. Caperton, Kate Gordon , Daniel J. Weiss, topic experts from the Center for American Progress. “Putting Big Oil Subsidies to Work” <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2012/02/oil_infrastructure.html>, 21 February 2012, JGR)

Last year was a bonanza for the top five oil companies—BP plc, Chevron Corp., ConocoPhillips, ExxonMobil Corp., and Royal Dutch Shell Group—posting combined net-income earnings of $137 billion, a new record. Undeterred, Republican leaders in Congress are seeking to pass transportation legislation that will expand oil and natural gas drilling and will force the construction of the controversial Keystone XL pipeline project. House Republicans hope the Senate will concur and give these companies access for oil and gas production to some of our natural crown jewels. Republicans in the House want to boost drilling offshore and on protected lands so that the federal revenues gained by this expansion of drilling can be used to pay for the American Energy and Infrastructure Jobs Act—the House Republican five-year highway funding bill.

,

#### Offshore drilling is the only way to pay for transportation bills.

Kroh 2/1 (Kylie Kroh, Think Progress. “America Already Runs More Drill Rigs than Rest of World Combined” <http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/02/01/416245/house-transportation-bill-giveaway-to-big-oil/>, 1 February 2012, JGR)

Transportation advocates have sought a long-term reauthorization of highway and transit programs, which currently expire on March 31. Traditionally, improvements to roads, bridges, and public transportation are funded by the federal gasoline tax, but GOP leaders in the House are taking the unprecedented step to tie funding to an unnecessary and ineffective increase in fossil fuel production. As CAP’s Donna Cooper writes, “Congressional Republicans are making this push so they can [to] block movement to create jobs and rebuild our infrastructure while sounding like they are in favor of policies that do both.” Here are the key reasons this package is no solution to repair our nation’s aging transportation infrastructure.

#### More evidence – only offshore drilling can get the plan paid for.

Crawley 1/3 (John, staff reporter at Reuters. “House Republicans want $260 billion for infrastructure” <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/01/31/us-usa-congress-infrastructure-idUSTRE80U03Z20120131>, 31 January 2012, JGR)

There are no plans by Republicans or Democrats to increase gas taxes to fortify the trust fund and House committees other than Mica's are expected to address the shortfall. Republican leaders said in November they would propose lifting a U.S. ban on new offshore oil and gas drilling and use related royalties to at least help finance any shortfall in infrastructure spending. The Obama administration has proposed a modest expansion of offshore drilling. But lifting the drilling ban stands virtually no chance of passage in the Senate.

### AT: Veto/Won’t pass

#### Obama supports new expansions of offshore drilling.

Vick 3/5 (Vanessa Vicky, staff writer. New York Times. “Offshore Drilling and Exploration” http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/o/offshore\_drilling\_and\_exploration/index.html, 5 March 2012, JGR)

On Aug. 4, 2011, the Department of the Interior granted Royal Dutch Shell conditional approval of its plan to begin drilling exploratory wells in the Arctic Ocean next summer, a strong sign that the Obama administration is easing a regulatory clampdown on offshore oil drilling that it imposed after the BP disaster in the Gulf of Mexico in April 2010. The move confirms a willingness by President Obama to approve expanded domestic oil and gas exploration in response to high gasoline prices and continuing high levels of unemployment. It comes as the issuing of drilling permits in the gulf is quickening, including the granting on Aug. 4, 2011 of a permit for a Shell floating drill rig for a 4,000-foot-deep well. That means that that all five of the company’s rigs there will be back to work after a long drilling halt.

#### It’s the only option and Obama will support it.

Rubinstein 3/27 (Dana, staff writer for Capital New York. “When is Obama Going to Have his Eisenhower Moment?” <http://www.capitalnewyork.com/article/politics/2012/03/5524547/when-obama-going-have-his-eisenhower-moment>, 27 March 2012, JGR)

Many transportation experts also argue for a significantly higher tax on gas. This is politically difficult, if not impossible, as illustrated by the way Republicans have latched onto currently high gas prices as an argument against Obama, and the president's high-profile response, cheerleading the expansion of domestic oil and gas exploration as a solution.

# \*\*\*AFF Answers\*\*\*

## UQ

### Drilling High Now

#### The DA should have been triggered – November 2011 plan opened new drilling.

Broder 11 (John M. Broder, staff reporter, New York Times. “U.S. to Open New Areas to Offshore Drilling”, <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/11/09/science/earth/us-to-open-new-areas-to-offshore-drilling.html>, 8 November 2011, JGR)

WASHINGTON — The Obama administration on Tuesday announced its proposed five-year plan for offshore oil drilling, which calls for opening new areas in the Gulf of Mexico and Alaska but bars development along the East and West Coasts. The plan disappointed environmentalists but fell far short of what the oil industry and its Congressional supporters demanded. The plan, which is subject to months of public hearings and possible revisions, expands the areas in the Gulf of Mexico that are now under development, including some near Florida that have been off limits. It will also make available broader parts of the Arctic Ocean off the North Slope of Alaska and in the Cook Inlet off the state’s southern shore.

#### Non-unique – offshore drilling is picking back up.

Dlouhy 11 (Jennifer A. Dlouhy, Washington Bureau. “U.S. approval of offshore drilling picks up” <http://www.chron.com/business/article/U-S-approval-of-offshore-drilling-picks-up-2249230.php>, 2 November 2011, JGR)

WASHINGTON - Government approvals of offshore drilling projects soared in October, as federal regulators signed off on 13 deep-water wells during the month - the most since the Obama administration lifted a moratorium on that offshore exploration a year ago. Analysts said the October statistics should inspire new confidence in the rebound of the offshore drilling industry following last year's Gulf spill. The pace of permit approvals "should justifiably bolster bullishness about a return to normal in the U.S. Gulf of Mexico," analysts at the investment bank FBR Capital Markets said in a research note for clients. The wells approved by the Interior Department's Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement included 10 new ones that were not already in progress before the five-month drilling ban last year. That compares to seven approved wells in September and nine in August. And it is higher than the typical monthly caseload from 2006 to 2009, when regulators issued roughly seven permits per month for new deep-water wells.

#### Offshore drilling is stronger now than ever before.

Krauss and Broder 3/4 (CLIFFORD KRAUSS and JOHN M. BRODER, reporters for New York Times. “Deepwater Oil Drilling Picks Up Again as BP Disaster Fades” <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/05/business/deepwater-oil-drilling-accelerates-as-bp-disaster-fades.html?pagewanted=all>, 4 March 2012, JGR)

For a time after the BP spill, the drilling moratorium ordered by the Obama administration caused a decline in gulf production, but a reversal has occurred. Forty rigs are drilling in the gulf today compared with 25 a year ago. BP has five rigs drilling in the gulf, making it one of the most active drillers there. That is the same number BP operated before the accident, and it plans to have three more rigs drilling in the gulf by the end of the year. The Energy Department recently projected that gulf oil production would expand from its 2011 level of 1.3 million barrels a day, still nearly a quarter of total domestic production, to two million barrels a day by 2020.

### Price Low Now

#### Energy prices are low now and they’ll stay that way.

Zacks 6/28 (Zacks Equity Research. NASDAQ. “Alternative Energy Stock Outlook - June 2012 - Industry Outlook” <http://community.nasdaq.com/News/2012-06/alternative-energy-stock-outlook-june-2012-industry-outlook.aspx?storyid=152050>, 28 June 2012, JGR)

However, currently energy prices have continued to fall over the past few weeks. The U.S. average weekly price of all grades of gasoline, already down from a high of approximately $4 per gallon in early April, has fallen to around $3.40 per gallon. Steady declines in energy price futures suggest that these declines are not likely to be reversed in the near-term.

#### Oil Prices low now.

AP 6/25 (Associated Press. Cleveleand.com. “Gas prices drop in Ohio, mirroring oil prices” <http://www.cleveland.com/business/index.ssf/2012/06/gas_prices_drop_in_ohio_mirror.html>, 25 June 2012, JGR)

Oil prices remain near eight-month lows. The cost of crude has plummeted over the past two months amid increasing signs of a slowdown in the global economy, led by Europe, that could reduce demand for crude.

## Internal Link

### Drilling =/= Oil Price Drop

#### Offshore drilling would have no effect on prices and take decades to affect anything.

Schoen 8 (John W. Schoen, Senior Producer. MSNBC. “Will Offshore Drilling Lower Oil Prices?” <http://today.msnbc.msn.com/id/25287795/ns/today-today_news/t/will-offshore-drilling-lower-oil-prices/#.T-oZ2LWminw>, 22 June 2008, JGR)

Every barrel of oil is going to be needed to meet growing global demand, and technology today allows oil producers to find and extract oil in places that until recently were not profitable or technically feasible. But there’s little evidence that there’s enough untapped oil within U.S. federal waters to make much of a difference in oil prices. Even if the oil is there, it would take a decade or longer until it can be tapped — offering little relief from the recent surge in oil prices. Roughly 80 percent of U.S. proven reserves — and daily production — is clustered in just four states: Louisiana, Texas, Alaska and California. There’s likely more oil to be found offshore both U.S. coasts, especially in deep water where it has only relatively recently become technically possible and economically viable to extract. But it’s highly unlikely there’s enough there to make much of a difference in oil prices. Even if new discoveries were made, it would be decades before it began flowing and the price impact would be would be minimal.

#### No chance that increased drilling drops prices.

McAuliff 11 (Michael McAuliff, staff reporter. Huffington Post. “More U.S. Oil Drilling Won't Lower Gas Prices, Experts Say” <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/05/06/more-us-oil-drilling-wont-help-gas-prices_n_858473.html>, 6 July 2011, JGR)

But people who study oil markets for a living say they are wrong. "I would really doubt that that [2008 price drop] would have been because we committed to more drilling," said Phyllis Martin, an analyst with the U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA), which just released its detailed, annual outlook on energy supply and prices. "It was most likely the recession," Martin explained. "When demand cuts back, the production cuts back and the prices fall." As for opening four new drilling leases, that's not even a drop in the bucket. Analyst Lynch said that, if the nation took an extremely vigorous stance on oil exploitation -- and relaxed restrictions on the Gulf and drilled in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska and off the coast of California, where America's most easily accessible offshore oil is located -- it still would not have much of an impact. "With the exception of the deep Gulf, where there are restrictions, people are drilling as fast as they can," said Lynch, who regards himself as a moderate Republican. He is bearish on oil prices and believes the cost of crude will drop soon, regardless of any government policies. "You might, under really optimistic scenarios, over five or six years, add 2 million barrels a day of production," said Lynch, who favors more drilling, even if he rejects the politicians' arguments. "On a global scale, it's significant. But we would still be big importers -- we would still be dependent on foreign oil." And prices would not move much because of it, the analysts explained. Oil is traded on a world market, and the United States does not have enough petroleum to increase the global supply, which would reduce demand -- and thus the price -- for fuel. "In 2009, the U.S. produced about 7 percent of what was produced in the entire world, so increasing the oil production in the U.S. is not going to make much of a difference in world markets and world prices," said the EIA's Martin. "It just gets lost. It's not that much." And boosting drilling in the outer continental shelf? "What comes out of the OCS is about 1 percent of the world total, and that's not enough to affect world prices," Martin said, even noting that she believes there are even more untapped reserves than officials can estimate at the moment.

## Impacts

### AT: Oil spills

#### Turn - Offshore drilling is environmentally better than the alternative.

Smith 10 (Eric Smith. Washington Post. “Offshore oil drilling might make environmental sense” <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/04/01/AR2010040102800.html>, 2 April 2010, JGR)

In contrast, there are relatively high environmental costs associated with importing oil as opposed to producing it in the United States. There are three problems with importing oil: First, spills from tankers and barges are the largest human-caused source of oil in the oceans. Oil is more likely to be spilled from a tanker than from a platform, and tankers have the potential to cause catastrophic spills. The groundings of the Exxon Valdez (off Alaska), the Castillo de Bellver (South Africa), the Amoco Cadiz (France), the Irenes Serenade (Greece) and the Torrey Canyon (Britain), to name a few, all had severe effects on local ecosystems. Second, the countries from which we import oil have lower environmental standards than the United States has. In particular, many foreign oil producers choose to vent methane -- a powerful greenhouse gas -- directly into the atmosphere rather than spend extra money to capture or flare it. Mexico, for example, produces less than half the oil that the United States produces but emits six times as much methane. Third, shipping oil to the United States requires burning a huge amount of diesel oil, the exhaust from which is greenhouse gas pumped into the atmosphere. Just as environmentalists argue that eating locally grown food is better for the planet because it saves transportation costs and energy, locally produced oil has less of a negative impact. Depending on the country of origin and the tanker size, 1 percent to 3 percent of the oil in every tanker is consumed merely for delivery.

#### More evidence – offshore drilling net reduces oil in the water.

SCPR 2/1 (Southern California Public Radio. ““Oil drilling off California coast approved by House panel” Oil drilling off California coast approved by House panel” <http://www.scpr.org/news/2012/02/01/31070/california-democrats-try-stall-oil-drilling-bills/>, 1 February 2012, JGR)

But Republican Congressman Tom McClintock, who grew up near Santa Barbara, told fellow members of the House Natural Resources Committee that oil spills in California have been happening for centuries. "It goes back to 1542 when Cabrillo sailed up the coast of California and recorded a massive oil spill off of Ventura, Santa Barbara. It was natural spillage that was seeping up into the ocean. Carpenteria nearby got its name because the Chumach Indians used the huge tar deposits that washed up on the beaches to caulk their canoes." He added that folks living near that beach keep turpentine in the garage to clean off “globs" of tar on their feet from what he called “natural oil seepage.” He insisted the drilling there has "actually relieved the pressure to the point that the beaches are actually cleaner there than they were in the mid-1960s."

#### Their ev is just hype – US offshore drilling is better and states won’t let offshore drilling increase.

Tierney 08 (John Tierney is a columnist for the Science Times section. NYT. “Offshore Drilling vs. Global warming” <http://tierneylab.blogs.nytimes.com/2008/06/18/offshore-drilling-v-global-warming/>, 18 June 2008, JGR)

My colleague Andy Revkin notes an interesting argument by Peter Maass in favor of offshore drilling here [is]: better to do it under the strict environmental controls of America than to “outsource” the job to places like Nigeria. I’d like to look at it from a different perspective: How is this fight about offshore oil going to affect efforts to control greenhouse emissions? If environmentalists and their allies (like Senator Barack Obama) prevail over those who want to drill (like President Bush and Senator John McCain), there would be a little less oil on the world market, which would keep prices a little higher and thereby discourage consumption. That would mean fewer greenhouse emissions. But this would be a minor effect, and it has to be balanced against the longterm damage to environmentalists’ cause. Aside from being distraction from the serious new danger of global warming, the fight over offshore drilling makes them vulnerable to the old charge that they prefer hype to science. Offshore drilling has made a photogenic enemy for environmentalists since the famous spill off Santa Barbara in 1969, but its risks have been greatly exaggerated. During the debate over allowing offshore drilling in 1984, the Times editorialized in support of the drilling and offered this response to the opponents: Why risk populated or ecologically fragile coasts, they say, when oil is available elsewhere? There surely is some risk of damage. But the technology of containing spills and vigor of regulation have come a long way since Santa Barbara. No serious spill has marred the harvesting of four billion barrels from 12,000 drilling rigs in American waters since 1970. Statistically, tankers bearing imported oil now pose a much greater environmental danger. Since then the risks have shrunk further. A 2003 report from the National Research Council noted that only 1 percent of oil that entered U.S. waters during the 1990s came from extraction operations (like the offshore platforms in the Gulf of Mexico). Even if you combined that amount with the oil spilled by tankers, it amounted to only 3 percent of the total — and only 1/20th as much oil as entered the water through natural seepage from the ocean floor. Of course, an oil spill concentrated in one spot can harm the local environment, but banning offshore drilling doesn’t lessen the risk of big oil spills — it simply makes it more likely there’ll be a spill from a foreign tanker. In 1989, when Congress moved to ban drilling off the New Jersey coast, this ban was criticized by Lawrence Schmidt of the state’s Department of Environmental Protection: I think what’s happening in Congress right now is a knee-jerk reaction to oil spills from tankers. The risks of an accident from a tanker carrying in either foreign crude or refined petroleum are many, many times greater than the risk of an oil spill from an offshore exploration or production platform. In any case, since this kind of oil is mainly a local problem, what’s wrong with letting the locals decide if they want to take the risk? Even if the federal ban is lifted, states would still have the right to forbid drilling off their coasts, and many have already promised to do just that.

### AT: Warming

#### No warming and it’s not anthropogenic

Watson 9 (Steve, citing a report conducted by the Japan Society of Energy and Resources, the academic society representing scientists from the energy and resource fields, “Top Japanese Scientists: Warming Is Not Caused By Human Activity,” February 27th, <http://www.infowars.com/top-japanese-scientists-warming-is-not-caused-by-human-activity/>)

A major scientific report by leading Japanese academics concludes that global warming is not man-made and that the overall warming trend from the mid-part of the 20th Century onwards has now stopped. Unsurprisingly the report, which was released last month, has been completely ignored by the Western corporate media. The report was undertaken by Japan Society of Energy and Resources (JSER), the academic society representing scientists from the energy and resource fields. The JSER acts as a government advisory panel, much like the International Panel on Climate Change did for the UN. The JSER’s findings provide a stark contrast to the IPCC’s, however, with only one out of five top researchers agreeing with the claim that recent warming has been accelerated by man-made carbon emissions. The **government commissioned** report criticizes computer climate modeling and also says that the US ground temperature data set, used to back up the man-made warming claims, is too myopic. In the last month, no major Western media outlet has covered the report, which prompted British based sci-tech website The Register to commission a translation of the document. Section one highlights the fact that Global Warming has ceased, noting that since 2001, the increase in global temperatures has halted, despite a continuing increase in CO2 emissions. The report then states that the recent warming the planet has experienced is primarily a recovery from the so called "Little Ice Age" that occurred from around 1400 through to 1800, and is part of a natural cycle. The researchers also conclude that global warming and the halting of the temperature rise are related to solar activity, a notion previously dismissed by the IPCC. "The hypothesis that the majority of global warming can be ascribed to the Greenhouse Effect is mistaken." the report’s introduction states. Kanya Kusano, Program Director and Group Leader for the Earth Simulator at the Japan Agency for Marine-Earth Science & Technology (JAMSTEC) reiterates this point: "[The IPCC's] conclusion that from now on atmospheric temperatures are likely to show a continuous, monotonic increase, should be perceived as an unprovable hypothesis," Shunichi Akasofu, head of the International Arctic Research Center in Alaska, cites historical data to challenge the claim that very recent temperatures represent an anomaly: "We should be cautious, IPCC’s theory that atmospheric temperature has risen since 2000 in correspondence with CO2 is nothing but a hypothesis. " "Before anyone noticed, this hypothesis has been substituted for truth… The opinion that great disaster will really happen must be broken." Akasofu concludes. The key passages of the translated report can be found here. The conclusions within the report dovetail with those of hundreds of Western scientists, who have been derided and even compared with holocaust deniers for challenging the so called "consensus" on global warming. The total lack of exposure that this major report has received is another example of how skewed coverage of climate change is toward one set of hypotheses. This serves the agenda to deliberately whip up mass hysteria on behalf of governments who are all too eager to introduce draconian taxation and control measures that won’t do anything to combat any form of warming, whether you believe it to be natural or man-made.

#### Newest data proves the greenhouse effect is a hoax

**IBT 11** (International Business Times, Citing report from NASA’s Terra Satellite, “Global Warming a Hoax? NASA Reveals Earth Releasing Heat into Space,” 7/30, <http://sanfrancisco.ibtimes.com/articles/189649/20110730/global-warming-hoax-nasa-earth-releasing-heat-space.htm>)

With new data collected from a NASA's Terra satellite, the previous model may be proven as a hoax. Hypothesis based on the satellite's findings show that planet Earth actually releases heat into space, more than it retains it. The higher efficiency of releasing energy outside of Earth contradicts former forecasts of climate change. Dr. Roy Spencer, a team leader for NASA's Aqua satellite, studied a decade worth of satellite data regarding cloud surface temperatures. "The satellite observations suggest there is much more energy lost to space during and after warming than the climate models show...There is a huge discrepancy between the data and the forecasts that is especially big over the oceans," said Dr. Spencer. By cross examining data with other Climate Change models, he concluded that carbon dioxide is just a minor part in global warming. His studies have garnered media attention and that the data are going against the beliefs of global warming alarmists by disproving their theory.

#### Cooling now - outweighs emissions

**NIPCC ’10** (Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change, multi-national scientific coalition comprised of leading climate scientists, “Acknowledging Recent Natural Cooling,” http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2010/jun/25jun2010a1.html)

In a paper entitled "A strong bout of natural cooling in 2008," which was published in *Geophysical Research Letters*, Perlwitz *et al*. (2009) recount some interesting facts about which many climate alarmists would rather the public remained unaware, including the fact that there was, in Perlwitz *et al*.'s words, "a precipitous drop in North American temperature in 2008, commingled with a decade-long fall in global mean temperatures." Perlwitz *et al*. begin their narrative by noting that there has been "a decade-long decline (1998-2007) in globally averaged temperatures from the record heat of 1998," citing Easterling and Wehner (2009). And in further describing this phenomenon, they say that U.S. temperatures in 2008 "not only declined from near-record warmth of prior years, but were in fact colder than the official 30-year reference climatology (-0.2°C versus the 1971-2000 mean) and further were the coldest since at least 1996." With respect to the geographical origin of this "natural cooling," as they describe it, the five researchers point to "a widespread coolness of the tropical-wide oceans and the northeastern Pacific," focusing on the Niño 4 region, where they report that "anomalies of about -1.1°C suggest a condition colder than any in the instrumental record since 1871." So, pushing the cause of the global and U.S. coolings that sparked their original interest back another link in the chain which -- in their estimation -- connects them with other more primary phenomena, they ask themselves what caused these *latter* anomalous and significant oceanic coolings? Perlwitz *et al*. first discount *volcanic eruptions*, because they say "there were no significant volcanic events in the last few years." Secondly, they write that *solar forcing* "is also unlikely," because its radiative magnitude is considered to be too weak to elicit such a response. And these two castaway causes thus leave them with "coupled ocean-atmosphere-land variability" as what they consider to be the "most likely" cause of the anomalous coolings. In regard to these three points, we agree with the first. With respect to Perlwitz *et al*.'s dismissal of solar forcing, however, we note that the jury is still out with respect to the interaction of the solar wind with the influx of cosmic rays to earth's atmosphere and their subsequent impact on cloud formation, which may yet prove to be substantial. And with respect to their final point, we note that the suite of real-world ocean-atmosphere-land interactions is highly complex and also not fully understood. Indeed, there may even be important phenomena operating within this realm of which the entire scientific community is ***ignorant***. And some of those phenomena may well be strong enough to ***totally compensate*** for anthropogenic-induced increases in greenhouse gas emissions, so that other natural phenomena end up dictating the ever-changing state of earth's climate, as could well be what has been happening over the last decade or more. In light of these considerations, therefore, as well as the substantial *strength* and *longevity* of the planet's current cooling phase, the path of wisdom would seem to us to be to wait and see what happens next, in the unfolding biogeophysical drama of earth's ever-changing climatic path to the future, before we undertake to attempt to *change* what we clearly do not fully *comprehend*.

Your evidence is based on flawed studies - warming’s not a threat and not anthropogenic

Leake 10 (Jonathan, Times Online, Citing John Christy of the UA Huntsville, a former author for the IPCC, “World may not be warming, say scientists,” 2-14, <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/environment/article7026317.ece?print=yes&randnum=1269060067737>)

The United Nations climate panel faces a new challenge with scientists casting doubt on its claim that global temperatures are rising inexorably because of human pollution. In its last assessment the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) said the evidence that the world was warming was “unequivocal”. It warned that greenhouse gases had already heated the world by 0.7C and that there could be 5C-6C more warming by 2100, with devastating impacts on humanity and wildlife. However, new research, including work by British scientists, is casting doubt on such claims. Some even suggest the world may not be warming much at all. “The temperature records cannot be relied on as indicators of global change,” said John Christy, professor of atmospheric science at the University of Alabama in Huntsville, a former lead author on the IPCC. The doubts of Christy and a number of other researchers focus on the thousands of weather stations around the world, which have been used to collect temperature data over the past 150 years. These stations, they believe, have been seriously compromised by factors such as urbanisation, changes in land use and, in many cases, being moved from site to site. Christy has published research papers looking at these effects in three different regions: east Africa, and the American states of California and Alabama. “The story is the same for each one,” he said. “The popular data sets show a lot of warming but the apparent temperature rise was actually caused by local factors affecting the weather stations, such as land development.” The IPCC faces similar criticisms from Ross McKitrick, professor of economics at the University of Guelph, Canada, who was invited by the panel to review its last report. The experience turned him into a strong critic and he has since published a research paper questioning its methods. “We concluded, with overwhelming statistical significance, that the IPCC’s climate data are contaminated with surface effects from industrialisation and data quality problems. These add up to a large warming bias,” he said. Such warnings are supported by a study of US weather stations co-written by Anthony Watts, an American meteorologist and climate change sceptic. His study, which has not been peer reviewed, is illustrated with photographs of weather stations in locations where their readings are distorted by heat-generating equipment. Some are next to air- conditioning units or are on waste treatment plants. One of the most infamous shows a weather station next to a waste incinerator. Watts has also found examples overseas, such as the weather station at Rome airport, which catches the hot exhaust fumes emitted by taxiing jets. In Britain, a weather station at Manchester airport was built when the surrounding land was mainly fields but is now surrounded by heat-generating buildings. Terry Mills, professor of applied statistics and econometrics at Loughborough University, looked at the same data as the IPCC. He found that the warming trend it reported over the past 30 years or so was just as likely to be due to random fluctuations as to the impacts of greenhouse gases. Mills’s findings are to be published in Climatic Change, an environmental journal. “The earth has gone through warming spells like these at least twice before in the last 1,000 years,” he said.

#### No extinction

**NIPCC 11**. Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change. Surviving the unprecedented climate change of the IPCC. 8 March 2011. <http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2011/mar/8mar2011a5.html>)

In a paper published in *Systematics and Biodiversity*, Willis *et al*. (2010) consider the IPCC (2007) "predicted climatic changes for the next century" -- i.e., their contentions that "global temperatures will increase by 2-4°C and possibly beyond, sea levels will rise (~1 m ± 0.5 m), and atmospheric CO2will increase by up to 1000 ppm" -- noting that it is "widely suggested that the magnitude and rate of these changes will result in many plants and animals going extinct," citing studies that suggest that "within the next century, over 35% of some biota will have gone extinct (Thomas *et al*., 2004; Solomon *et al*., 2007) and there will be extensive die-back of the tropical rainforest due to climate change (e.g. Huntingford *et al*., 2008)." On the other hand, they indicate that some biologists and climatologists have pointed out that "many of the predicted increases in climate have happened before, in terms of both magnitude and rate of change (e.g. Royer, 2008; Zachos *et al*., 2008), and yet biotic communities have remained remarkably resilient (Mayle and Power, 2008) and in some cases thrived (Svenning and Condit, 2008)." But they report that those who mention these things are often "placed in the 'climate-change denier' category," although the purpose for pointing out these facts is simply to present "a sound scientific basis for understanding biotic responses to the magnitudes and rates of climate change predicted for the future through using the vast data resource that we can exploit in fossil records." Going on to do just that, Willis *et al*. focus on "intervals in time in the fossil record when atmospheric CO2 concentrations increased up to 1200 ppm, temperatures in mid- to high-latitudes increased by greater than 4°C within 60 years, and sea levels rose by up to 3 m higher than present," describing studies of past biotic responses that indicate "the scale and impact of the magnitude and rate of such climate changes on biodiversity." And what emerges from those studies, as they describe it, "is evidence for rapid community turnover, migrations, development of novel ecosystems and thresholds from one stable ecosystem state to another." And, most importantly in this regard, they report "there is very little evidence for broad-scale extinctions due to a warming world." In concluding, the Norwegian, Swedish and UK researchers say that "based on such evidence we urge some caution in assuming broad-scale extinctions of species will occur due solely to climate changes of the magnitude and rate predicted for the next century," reiterating that "the fossil record indicates remarkable biotic resilience to wide amplitude fluctuations in climate."